DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management BRAC Division Seneca Army Depot, Seneca, NY

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

17 May 2017

SUBJECT: Environmental Liabilities for site SEAD-006-R-01 RCRA Closure of the OB/OD Grounds (alias SEAD-115, SEAD 45) at Seneca Army Depot

1. This memorandum serves as formal documentation of the information used to develop the Cost-To-Complete (CTC) estimate for site SEAD-006-R-01 during the 2017 data call. Estimators experience is documented on the Estimator Experience Form, enclosure 7, per the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) Handbook Technical Release 2. This site also encompasses SEAD-023 (OB Grounds). Well Abandonment costs including site closeout were estimated using costs from the FY11 contract W912DY-08-D-0003, Task Order 0008; 6 wells @ \$31,398= \$5,223, and closeout report, \$18,206.00. These costs were escalated to FY16 in the FY16 CTC. These costs were escalated from FY16 to FY17 using the FY17 escalation factor in the 3 April 2017 Data Call Memorandum. The technical and project management oversight costs were estimated using the hourly rates in the FY17 Data Call Memorandum. Seneca Army Depot Activity is in the "other US" areas and additional locality adjustment is not required. The SEAD-23 monitoring program, which was initiated in 2007 under this project, will be carried under the RI/FS phase until completion of the remediation. It is assumed six additional wells will be installed at SEAD 006-R-01 for additional GW monitoring at the site as part of a LTM plan. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 5, (Enclosure 5) provides the cost of the Long Term Monitoring Plan, well installation, first year monitoring cost, and out year monitoring cost. The cost for the GW monitoring during the RI/FS phase for SEAD 23 is provided by contract W912DY-0-D-0062 Delivery Order 0023 task 0003a. (Enclosure 6) and the requirement for testing is established in the ROD for the OB Grounds (Enclosure 2). It is assumed that after the completion of the remediation, monitoring GW for SEAD-006-R-01 will require sampling at a quarterly interval for the first year and then semi-annually in subsequent years for cap inspection and effectiveness. It is further assumed that the monitoring efforts at SEAD 23 will continue as part of the overall project (Enclosure 6). After the remediation is completed the monitoring will be carried out under the LTM phase. Due to EPA's disagreement with the planned IRA to include a cap, and due to the Army's agreement with Land Use Controls for munitions sites, the FS will be finalized and a ROD signed for the final remediation. It is assumed that the final remediation will be accomplished with funding provided in prior years. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 5, Enclosure 5, was terminated for convenience. Funding remains for the final remediation. This included the contract cost for

the cap alternative. It was assumed the first 5 year review will occur in 2021, this may need to be in 2026 given ROD signature and completion of remediation in 2019. The Owner Support for RA is S&A for the remedial action, which was postponed due to the ROD. This cost is shown in FY2019.

2. Site History: The Army destroyed ammunition by detonation and open burning at this site, which was in operation from 1948 through 1998. The OB ground consists of elevated burning tray. The site is in the northwest portion of the installation and covers 364 acres. The investigation of this site revealed contamination consisting of ordnance and explosives (OE) and heavy metals. This is a RCRA interim permitted site. This site also encompasses SEAD-023, OB Grounds, where a CERCLA remediation was completed in 2003.

3. Current Site Status:

- a. The cleanup strategy includes the ongoing removal of all munitions potentially posing an explosive hazard from the outer perimeter of the site at approximately 2500 feet, inwardly to the proposed 8 acre landfill cap. The work from 2500 feet to 1000 feet is underway through a Removal Action. The preferred FS Alternative has been to consolidate all soil that contains HTRW contamination will be placed under the cap. The cap will comply with State Regulatory standards. Soil under the cap will not have ordnance removed prior to the capping.
- b. Groundwater will require annual testing until results demonstrate cleanup criteria.
- c. EPA raised numerous concerns on MPPEH and disagrees with the cap alternative. A large amount of the <1000 feet radius was geophysically mapped and MPPEH removed. EPA has disagreed with the cap only alternative and has taken the position of removal of one foot and geophysics to three feet below this point on the entire site similar to the Umatilla site (\$47M). The Army position is surface sweep is adequate for this site for the known future use of restricted access conservation. Higher level discussions are occurring and other alternatives are being considered. To address EPA's concerns, final remediation alternatives are to be evaluated using MMR LUCs, the Open Burning Grounds ROD as a precedent for HTRW soils (only), cap with slurry wall, mechanical separation, and soil stabilization.

4. Exit Strategy:

LTM includes Cap Maintenance, GW monitoring, LUCs, Five-Year reviews, and site closeout effort. MMR LUCs will be critical to final agreement on remediation.

For cost estimating purposes, the LTM duration as indicated in the phase schedule extends only to the end of the second five-year review; however, LTM is anticipated to continue in perpetuity.

5. Enclosures:

- 1. Draft Final Feasibility Study Report for Open Detonation Grounds Munitions Response Action, Parsons, April 2013
- Final Record of Decision Former Open Burning Grounds Site, January 1999
- 3. Final Long Term Monitoring Plan for Open Burning Grounds, January 2007
- 4. Performance Work Statement for Contract W912DY-10-D-0014, DO #5
- 5. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014, Delivery Order #0005, DTD Nov 24, 2011
- Final 2011 Long Term Monitoring Annual Report for the Open Burning Grounds, May 2013; Contract W912DS-09-D-0062 TO 0023; Escalation Rates.
- 7. Estimator's Experience Sheet, Environmental Liabilities training
- 8. Estimate Summary Table
- 9. Engineering Estimate for Site Closeout and Well Abandonment

6. Engineering Estimate Assumptions:

Site Closeout Documentation (LTM):

- 1. Site Closeout is moderate complexity
- 2. Kick-off, review and regulatory meetings
- 3. Work Plans and reports all default values
- 4. Documents will be stored for 30 years

Well abandonment (LTM):

- 1. Number of wells: 12
- 2. Well depth: 15 feet
- 3. Well diameter: 2 inches
- 4. Formation type: Unconsolidated
- 5. Method: Overdrill/excavation

Five year MPPEH & CERCLA review

- 1. Review cycles (SEAD 006-R-01 and SEAD 23 combined)
- 2. Five year review cycle starts 2016 for SEAD 23
- 3. Five year review cycle starts 2021 for SEAD 006-R-01 and SEAD 23 combined
- 4. Site is moderate complexity
- 5. Reports, reviews, interviews and site inspections include all default parameters
- 6. MEC review included

Environmental Liabilities fo Grounds (alias SEAD-115)	r site SEAD-006-R at Seneca Army D	-01 RCRA Clo)epot	osure of the OB/OD
7. Cost Summary	SEAD-006-R-01	(SEAD-115/	(45)
Long Term Monitoring F \$23,333.12 (rounded	Plan preparation (e d to \$23,334)	nclosure 5)	\$ 23,334
Install 6 and Monitor 12 ((source 5) \$160,509	GW wells quarterly .05 (rounded to \$1	[,] 1 st year, 2016 60,510	\$ \$160,510
For years 2017-2045, Monitor 12 GW wells \$49,663.35X29= \$1,	s, semiannually x 2 440,237.15	9 years (sourc	ce 5)
(rounded to \$1,440,2	237)		\$1,440,237
Subtotal RA(O) = X FY17 Escalation Factor S	\$1.624.081 x 1.033	38=	\$1,624,081
\$1,678,974.94 (Rounded, \$	1,678,975)		\$1,678,975
Assumption:			
Owner Support for GW M 11% of total LTM Co (\$184.50 X 980 Hou (Rounded \$180,810)	lonitoring (Source st urs = \$180,810.00	∍ 4)	\$180,810
Owner Support for RA (So 11% of total LTM Co (\$184.50 X 851 Ho (Rounded \$157,010)	ource 4) st urs = \$157,009.50		\$157,010
Six five-year reviews for (Starting in FY17) and N & Site Closeout (see Cost \$293,594 (Rounded, \$2	⁻ SEAD-23 and SE Well Abandonment Engineering Estim 4.73 293,595)	AD-006-R-01 t nate)	\$293,595
Total Cost			\$2,310,390

The cost to complete sum in the EST is rounded to \$2,311K.

Material Change: The CTC for FY16 was \$2,092,515 the CTC for FY17 is \$2,310,390. The calculated percentage change was 6.8%. The Material Change was 6.8% (Rounded 7%).

Material Change = absolute value of (indexed prior year CTC - current CTC current obligations)/indexed prior year CTC

MC = ((\$2,092,515 * 1.0338) - \$2,310,390 - 0) / (\$2,092,515 * 1.0338) = 6.8%

Prepared by: Randall Batt	BATTAGLIA.RANE LL.W.1228816724	 Digitally signed by BATTAGLIA.RANDALL.W.1228816724 DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=USA, cn=BATTAGLIA.RANDALL.W.1228816724 Date: 2017.05.17 14:18:44 -04'00'
Cost Estimator	Signature	Date
Reviewed by: Bill Millar	MILLAR.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.139146 0309	Digitally signed by MILLAR.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.1391460309 DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=CONTRACTOR, on=MILLIAM.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.1391460309 Dote: 2017.09 27.09:18:48.4000

Reviewed by: Bill Millar Cost Estimate Reviewer

Signature

Date

Date: 2017.09.27 09:18:48 -04'00'

ENCLOSURE 1

DRAFT FINAL

FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT

for

OPEN DETONATION GROUNDS MUNITIONS RESPONSE ACTION

SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY ROMULUS, SENECA COUNTY, NEW YORK

Prepared for:

U.S. Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville -



and SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY ROMULUS, NEW YORK

Prepared by:

PARSONS 100 High Street Boston, MA 02110

Contract Number W912DY-08-D-0003 Task Order No. 0013 EPA Site ID# NY0213820830 NY Site ID# 8-50-006

APRIL 2013

ENCL1

Seneca Army Depot Activity

3.0 DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section summarizes the remedial action alternatives that were developed from the technologies screened in Section 2.0. Prior to the development of alternatives, an evaluation of general response actions and a technology screening was performed for inclusion into proposed remedial action alternatives for the OD Grounds. Technologies were combined into alternatives considering potential waste-limiting and site-limiting factors unique to the OD Grounds and the level of technical development for each technology. This information was used to differentiate alternatives with respect to effectiveness and implementability. This FS focuses on identifying and evaluating alternatives for the OD Grounds.

3.2 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

The following remedial action alternatives were developed for the OD Grounds:

- Alternative 1: NFA
- Alternative 2: Geophysical mapping, intrusive investigation, capping, LUCs; and
- Alternative 3: Geophysical mapping, intrusive investigation, excavation, off-site disposal, and LUCs.

Technologies and processes associated with these actions were assembled into remedial action alternatives.

3.2.1 Alternative 1, No-Further Action

Alternative 1 is the no further action alternative. CERCLA and NYSDEC guidance for conducting feasibility studies recommends that the no-action alternative be considered against all other alternatives.

The no further action alternative would leave the OD Grounds undisturbed with the continuation of existing site security measures, such as locked gates, to prevent civilian access and direct contact with contaminated soil and possible exposure to potential MPPEH.

3.2.2 Alternative 2, Geophysical Mapping/Intrusive Investigation/Capping/LUCs

This alternative would complete the MPPEH clearance in areas that were not previously cleared by previous investigations. In the open and accessible areas, previously identified anomalies will be reacquired and removed. In areas that are wooded or inaccessible and were not previously cleared, mag and dig operations will be completed using a handheld magnetometer, such as a Schonstedt. In accessible areas that were not previously mapped (0 - 1,000 foot radius), DGM surveys will be conducted using EM61s over approximately 60 acres in the area surrounding the OD Hill. The newly mapped areas will be designated in two different categories:

- 1. metals saturated areas where the high density prohibits individual anomalies from being identified and manually removed (0 500 foot radius)
- lower metals density areas where individual anomalies can be identified and manually removed (500 - 1,000 foot radius)

April 2013 /BosfaCt/projects/PIT/Projects/Huntsville Cont W912DY-08-D-0003/TO#13 - OD Grounds RI-FS/Documents/FS/DraftFinal FS/Text/DF OD FS.doc



REMED

÷.

11

đ

It is anticipated that metallic saturation (or a high density of potential MPPEH) will be encountered in areas located closer to the OD Hill (0 – 500 foot radius). At locations where the DGM survey indicates that there is metallic saturation, the top 6 inches of soil will be excavated. The soil will be screened to remove potential MPPEH, and the overburden will be staged on-site for potential reuse and/or incorporation into the site cap. The excavated area will then be resurveyed and the results of the DGM survey will be used to generate a dig list of target anomalies to be investigated. In the event that the results of the DGM survey indicate that areas are still saturated with metal an additional 6 inches of soil may be excavated, screened, and staged, as previously described, followed by a subsequent DGM survey of that area.

For the lower density metals areas, the anomalies on the generated dig list from the DGM surveys will be reacquired and intrusively investigated by a geophysicist and UXO dig team, in the same manner as the intrusive investigation in the Kickout area. A two-person UXO technician/ demolition team will perform any required MPPEH demolition procedures. The demolition team will dispose of any MPPEH suspected of containing explosives/spotting charges or inaccessible voids by detonation. All MD will be certified and disposed of as MDAS in accordance with current regulations.

The excavated soil that passed through the screen will be placed on the OD Hill and the resulting surface will be compacted and graded. An engineered cap, covering approximately 10 acres in aerial extent and approximately 75,000 cy (+/- 35%) of material, will be installed over the OD Hill and the surrounding area. The cap will comply with NYS Part 360 requirements. A geomembrane layer will be selected, and the total thickness of the cap will be at least 18 inches. Any identified soil with contaminant levels exceeding the selected soil cleanup goals would be incorporated under the cap. A design work plan will be prepared and the exact limits of the cap will be determined during the design phase of the project.

LTM would include maintenance of the cap and LUC inspections. Potential LTM of site groundwater conditions may be appropriate subsequent to the remedial alternative selected in this FS.

Signature of the site for use as a daycare or a residential facility.

Implementation of this alternative would be highly effective in achieving the RAOs, long-term effectiveness, preventing exposure, and implementability. The costs for this alternative are moderate.

3.2.3 Alternative 3, Geophysical Mapping/Intrusive Investigation/Excavation/Off-Site Disposal/LUCs

Alternative 3 is similar to Alternative 2, but this alternative would involve the excavation and off-site disposal of all soil containing MPPEH or contaminant concentrations that exceed cleanup goals in lieu of capping these soils. Similar to Alternative 2, reacquisition would be completed in the Kickout area. In areas outside of the OD Hill that are wooded or inaccessible and were not previously surveyed, mag and dig operations will be completed using a handheld magnetometer, such as a Schonstedt. In accessible areas that were not previously mapped (0 - 1,000 foot radius), DGM surveys will be conducted using EM61s over approximately 60 acres in the area surrounding the OD Hill. At locations where the DGM survey indicates that there is metallic saturation, the top 6 inches of soil will be excavated (estimate

Page 3-2

Seneca Army Depot Activity

in.

. 0

36

. . . .

8N

58

116

111

Que

April 2013

. :_

Draft Final Feasibility Study Report OD Grounds

e (ommeno Et)

Page 4-11

Alternative 1 must be ruled out because it is ineffective in long-term permanence and does not achieve the RAOs. Overall, Alternatives 2 and 3 have similar levels of protectiveness, permanence, long-term effectiveness, and short-term effectiveness. They will both limit exposure to potential MPPEH or contaminated soil. Alternative 3 ranks slightly higher for reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume due to the volume reduction of off-site disposal. Alternative 2 rates more favorably for implementability. Alternative 2 ranks better in terms of cost.

4.5 **RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE**

Based on a comparison of the criteria, the most effective remedy for the OD Grounds is Alternative 2, DGM Mapping, intrusive investigation, cap, and LUCs. Alternative 2 limits human exposure to potential MPPEH or soil contamination, is implementable using known techniques, and is cost effective. The capital cost for the alternative is \$8.0M. The TPV is \$8.9M. The total costs include \$31,500 per year for LUC inspections and cap maintenance, plus \$40,300 per five-year review over the 30 year period.

\Bosf02\Projects\PIT\Projects\P

FINAL RECORD OF DECISION (ROD) FORMER OPEN BURNING (OB) GROUNDS SITE SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY (SEDA) ROMULUS, NY

Prepared For: United States Army Corps of Engineers

Prepared By: Parsons Engineering Science, Inc. 30 Dan Road Canton, MA 02021-2809 January 1999 CONTRACT NO. DACA87-92-D-0022

Delivery Order 001

FNCL 2

70

2. ¹⁵

10. 10.10

Seea

The selected remedy outlined in this ROD addresses potential exposure to elevated le metals, such as lead, in the on-site soils and sediment in Reeder Creek. The following de: the significant aspects of the remedy:

- The OB Grounds was used for surface burning of explosive trash and propellants. concern for OE below the surface, at depth, at this site is small. Although OE is not exp to be found at depth at this site, through a combination geophysics, excavation, si removal and soil cover, the Army will nevertheless remediate OE to meet the Departme Defense Explosive Safety Board (DDESB) requirements for unrestricted use or put place land use restrictions as may be required by the DDESB.
- Excavation of soils with lead concentrations above 500 mg/kg and sediments from Re Creek with concentrations of copper and lead above the NYSDEC criteria of the 16 m and 31 mg/kg, respectively.
- Treatment of soils exceeding the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TC estimated to be approximately 3,800 CY of the excavated soil, via solidification/stabiliza will be performed to remove the RCRA characteristic of toxicity. This will allow the so. be landfilled, in accordance with the requirements of the Land Disposal Restrictions (LI of RCRA.
- Disposal of the excavated and solidified soil in an off-site Subtitle D landfill. The to quantity of soil to be disposed of is estimated to be 17,900 CY, including the 3,800 CY solidified soil.
- Construction of a soil cover of at least 9 inches of compacted soils in the areas of the (Grounds with soils remaining on the site with lead concentrations above 60 ppm. The area be covered is estimated to be approximately 27.5 acres, which encompasses most of the ar of the OB Grounds. The PRAP incorrectly identified the area to be covered as 43.8 acre The cap will be vegetated with indigenous grasses to prevent erosion and to prevent dire contact and incidental soil ingestion by terrestrial wildlife. The monitoring program w ensure that the 9-inch soil/vegetative cover is maintained after the remedy is complete.
- Control of surface water runoff, as necessary, to prevent crossion of the vegetative cover an solids loading to the creek. This will be accomplished with vegetation, regrading of sit topography and drainage swales
- Conducting a monitoring program for site groundwater and sediment in Reeder Creek. This program will monitor metals. For groundwater, the level of detection will be to below 15 ug/L, the federal action level for lead in groundwater. For sediment, the detection limit for lead will be to 10 mg/kg. Should a significant exceedance be noted, the exceedance will be

January 1999

Louise all (A)

E:MSenecalProjects OB Grounds RDRA RJ410B RODVINAL OB ROD Text. DOC

Page J-

Governië (de l.) Period Log Ober La

ಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಕ್ರಾಣ್ಯರ uro di ingritta ci chanachtanaí si ann mathia ua Airen Hona Cons Years and the s . And the second ic whereas

and the failer

H. (Mateli) LENGALL

e di ins(C) 11111111111111 o interror et i Stilleraere. n marging all and STRUM BUDANS 1 ישראנטי Para solutions to part failing on

ico isatilba

Trayella' Hoursell.

January 1999

will be implemented to eliminate the threat posed by the exceedance. For groundwater action may include metals removal via filtering. A similar process will apply for a sed. exceedance observed in Reeder Creek. First, the source of the exceedance will be ider and confirmed. If the exceedance is determined to originate from the OB Grounds site, maintenance of or improvements to the existing erosion control systems will be institute reduce the threat due to erosion of on-site soils to the Creek. This may include revegata or the construction of drainage control swales or structures.

STATE CONCURRENCE

NYSDEC has concurred with the selected remedy. Appendix B of this Record of Dec contains a copy of the Declaration of Concurrence.

DECLARATION

The selected remedy is consistent with CERCLA and to the extent practicable the NCF protective of human health and the environment, complies with federal and state requirem that are legally applicable or relevant and appropriate to the remedial action, and is (effective. The remedy uses a permanent solution for soil contamination. This remedy will result in hazardous substances, above cleanup goals, remaining at SEDA. Because th alternatives would result in hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants remaining on-t above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, CERCLA requires that lead agency review the remedial action no less than every five years after its initiation. justified by the review, remedial actions may be implemented to remove or treat the wastes.

ENAScheen Projects OB Grounds RDRA RIHOB RODVFINAL OB ROD TexLDO:

Page J.

Section C - Descriptions and Specifications

Performance Work Statement Remedial Action Seneca Army Depot Activity (SEDA **Open Detonation Ground** Romulus, New York 22 Nov 2011

Project Site

1.0 OBJECTIVE: The objective of this task order is to design and complete the installation of a NYS Part 360 landfill cap to inter hazardous soils at the Seneca Army Depot Activity (SEDA) in Romulus, New York.
Additionally, the Contractor shall perform other activities in support of the landfill construction to include additional investigation and Long Term Monitoring at the site. All activities shall be performed in compliance with CERCLA and Department of Defense, Army, and USACE Regulations and Guidance to include Interim Guidance and Data Item Descriptions (DID's). The subject site is considered a Munitions Response (MRS) and Hazardous, Lowie and Radiological Waste (HTRW) site.

This task order shall be conducted pursuant to Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), and National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan (NCP) requirements, with regulatory coordination, as apprepriate, of the New York Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Region II.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Work under this Performance Work Statement (PWS) falls within the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) for the Open Burn/Open Detonation Ground Area of Concern (AOC) at Seneca Army Depot located in Seneca County, NY. The AOC consists of 365 acres and was used to perform open detonation and open burning of munitions.

()) particular concern for this effort is an area of approximately 18 acres with potential ancillary needs over a wider area than the actual landfill cap construction. The contractor will complete all actions necessary to meet CERCLA requirements and achieve acceptance of the required designs and construction so the parcel can be closed out.

This requirement involves a legacy BRAC-funded, Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) site (Munitions Response Site or MRS). The Department of Defense (DoD) established the MMRP under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) to address unexploded ordnance (UXO), discarded military munitions (DMM), and munitions constituents (MC) located on current and former military installations. The Contractor shall perform all work in compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the National Contingency Plan (NCP), 40 CFR Part 300. Any activities involving work in areas potentially containing explosive hazards shall be conducted in full compliance with United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Department of the Army (DA), and Department of Defense (DOD) regulations.

3.9 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:

5.0.1 Contractor Methods: This is a performance based task order. The performance objectives and standards included herein are the basis of the task order requirements. The technical approach and level of effort expended to be help e task order objectives and standards are solely up to the contractor to select and adjust as necessary through the hile of the task order. Government recognizes the contractor's right to change the technical approach and level of effort expended to a effort from that proposed with the understanding that the contractor shall still meet all project objectives and gain government Quality Assurance acceptance in order to receive payment. Given the short time available during the pre-award phase to evaluate the site it is possible that after award and refinement of the conceptual site model and data needs that the contractor will wish to adjust the investigation strategy. If before the field work begins, an adjustment in the quantities or types of field investigations are required to achieve the performance standard or the Covertment determines that the performance standard must be adjusted the Government at its discretion may choose to modify the contract with the price adjustment based upon the prorated unit prices proposed in the available to excepted proposal. Once these adjustments are complete the contractor shall be obligated to deliver the required

ENCLL

When specific Incentives/Disincentives: Satisfactory or greater CPARS rating/poor CPARS rating and/or reperformance of work at contractor's expense.

Specific Task Requirements:

- All UXO, DMM and MC encountered during this effort shall be processed in accordance with the approved work and safety plans.

- Hazardous, Toxic and Radiological Waste (HTRW) Disposal: The Contractor shall collect, secure, store,

and arrange for disposal of any HTRW generated as a result of field activities. The HW containers shall be staged, secured, labeled, sampled and analyzed (if required) IAW the approved work plan. The Contractor shall recommend appropriate disposal actions for all waste items. The Contractor shall perform the HW disposal in a timely manner.

3.6 Task 6, Preparation of A Long Term Monitoring Plan. This is a Firm Fixed Price task.

Objective: The Contractor shall prepare, submit and gain acceptance of a Long Term Monitoring (LTM) Plan for the monitoring of groundwater and the management of the installed cap. Groundwater monitoring shall be based upon the six existing wells and the installation of another six wells. The Contractor shall assume an average depth of 15 feet per well.

Performance Standard: Prepare the plan in accordance with DID WERS-001 and EM 1110-1-4009, EM 385-1-1 and EM 385-1-97. Prepare the sampling and analysis plan, field sampling, and UFP-QAPP in accordance with EM 1110-1-4009, DID WERS-009.01, and UFP-QAPP, as appropriate. UFP-QAPP content shall also meet the requirements of DoD Quality Systems Manual for Environmental Laboratories (current version). Draft QASP includes requirements in regulations, guidance, DIDs and the Quality Control Plan in the WP.

AU: Acceptance of LTM Plan and UFP-QAPP with two revisions. Draft QASP reflects requirements and QCP with one revision required.

Nteasurement / Monitoring: Review of LTM Plan, UFP-QAPP and QASP per guidance to verify that the minimum acceptable content has been provided and acceptance by the project team and regulatory agencies.

Task specific Incentives/Disincentives: Satisfactory or greater CPARS rating/poor CPARS rating and/or reperformance of work at contractor's expense.

Specific Task Requirements: The sampling and analysis plan (SAP) shall include the Contractor's phased eporouch and address contaminants of interest and sample media (soil/groundwater/sediment/surface water). The Contractor shall provide a discussion on data evaluation.

3.7 Task 7, Performance of Long Term Monitoring. This is a Firm Fixed Price task.

Objective: Following regulatory approval of the Long Term Monitoring Plan prepared under Task 6, the transactor shall implement the LTM plan and perform monitoring of the ground water and management of the installed cap. The Contractor shall provide all the labor, material and equipment required to install ground water monitoring wells required in the approved plan. As part of this task, the contractor shall perform one year of Long Term Monitoring on a quarterly basis. The effort will also include submission and approval of Long Term Monitoring reports presenting a description of the effort performed, the results achieved and recommendations for the next period of monitoring.

GW. Nonto ST-

SOW

Performance Standard: Field work, data quantity and quality, and analysis of said data provides the results required to meet approved plans and be acceptable to the regulators.

- Demonstrate that the work was performed in accordance with the applicable laws, regulations, and guidance

documents;

- Perform the field sampling activities in accordance with the accepted Work Plans (prepared previously)/ LTM

Plan.

- Proper processing and disposition of any UXO, DMM and MC encountered in accordance with approved Work

Plan(s).

- Any Material Potentially Presenting an Explosive Hazard (MPPEH) and munitions debris processed in accordance with Chapter 14, EM 1110-1-4009 and Errata Sheet No. 2.

- Meet the project DQOs.

NC: Conduct the field activities in accordance with the accepted/approved LTM Plan. QC data submitted meets LTM Plan requirements. No more than 3 CARs for non-critical violations and/or 1 CAR for critical violations. No uncendived Corrective Action Requests. All final data and QC tests/documentation submitted. Government QA acceptance QC tests/documentation gained. No Class "A" Safety, contractor at fault, violations during execution of work. "I non-explosive related Class D, accidents, or <2 non-explosive Class C accidents IAW AR 385-40. Major safety violations, 1 non-explosive related safety violation. Minor safety violations, 2 safety violations. Zero letters of reprinand, grievances, or formal complaints.

Steasurement / Monitoring: Period inspection/review of field work. Verify compliance with accepted LTM Plan and other Plans as required. Quality control tests/documentation submitted per the QASP for government review, Boundary precision will be determined by evaluation of the sampling footprint as it relates to the reported contaminated/ uncontaminated areas in question.

tiant specific Incentives/Disincentives: Satisfactory or greater CPARS rating/poor CPARS rating and/or repartisimance of work at contractor's expense.

Specific Task Requirements:

Any UXO, DMM and MC encountered during this effort shall be processed in accordance with the approved work and safety plans.

- Hazardous, Toxic and Radiological Waste (HTRW) Disposal: The Contractor shall collect, secure, store,

and arrange for disposal of any HTRW generated as a result of field activities. The HW containers shall be staged, secured, labeled, sampled and analyzed (if required) IAW the approved work plan. The Contractor shall recommend appropriate disposal actions for all waste items. The Contractor shall perform the HW disposal in a timely manner.

3.8 <u>Task 8, Performance of Additional Long Term Monitoring (Optional)</u>. These are Firm Fixed Price tasks. Objective: If awarded, the Contractor shall provide additional LTM for the site and perform monitoring of the ground water and management of the installed cap. As part of this task, the contractor shall perform Long Term Atomatic on the basis requested as part of the individual options. The effort will also include submission and approval of Long Term Monitoring reports presenting a description of the effort performed, the results achieved and recommendations for the next period of monitoring.

Performance Standard: Field work, data quantity and quality, and analysis of said data provides the results required to meet approved plans and be acceptable to the regulators.

- Demonstrate that the work was performed in accordance with the applicable laws, regulations, and guidance

documents:

Phan

- Perform the field sampling activities in accordance with the accepted Work Plans (prepared previously)/

- Proper processing and disposition of any UXO, DMM and MC encountered in accordance with approved Work

121:00(5).

- Any Material Potentially Presenting an Explosive Hazard (MPPEH) and munitions debris processed in accordance with Chapter 14, EM 1110-1-4009 and Errata Sheet No. 2.

Meet the project DQOs.

Conduct the field activities in accordance with the accepted/approved LTM Plan. QC data submitted meets (1) At Plan requirements. No more than 3 CARs for non-critical violations and/or 1 CAR for critical violations. No missolved Corrective Action Requests. All final data and QC tests/documentation submitted. Government QA acceptance QC tests/documentation gained. No Class "A" Safety, contractor at fault, violations during execution of work, 41 non-explosive related Class D, accidents, or <2 non-explosive Class C accidents IAW AR 385-40. Major safety violations, 1 non-explosive related safety violation. Minor safety violations, 2 safety violations. Zero letters of reprimand, grievances, or formal complaints.

infeasurement / Monitoring: Period inspection/review of field work. Verify compliance with accepted LTM Plan and other Plans as required. Quality control tests/documentation submitted per the QASP for government review. Boundary precision will be determined by evaluation of the sampling footprint as it relates to the reported contaminated/ uncontaminated areas in question.

Task specific Incentives/Disincentives: Satisfactory or greater CPARS rating/poor CPARS rating and/or reperformance of work at contractor's expense.

Specific Task Requirements:

··· ·

- Any UXO, DMM and MC encountered during this effort shall be processed in accordance with the approved work and safety plans.

- Hazardous, Toxic and Radiological Waste (HTRW) Disposal: The Contractor shall collect, secure, store,

and arrange for disposal of any HTRW generated as a result of field activities. The HW containers shall be staged, accurad, labeled, sampled and analyzed (if required) IAW the approved work plan. The Contractor shall recommend appropriate disposal actions for all waste items. The Contractor shall perform the HW disposal in a timely manner.

 \therefore 8.1 <u>Task 8.1</u>, <u>Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring (Optional)</u>. If awarded, the toutractor shall provide LTM for an additional (2nd overall) year on a quarterly basis.

3.8.2 <u>Task 8.2</u>, <u>Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring (Optional)</u>. If awarded, the Contractor shall provide LTM for an additional (3rd overall) year on a quarterly basis.

3.8.3 <u>Task 8.3</u>, <u>Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring (Optional)</u>. If awarded, the Contractor shall provide LTM for an additional (4th overall) year on a semi-annual basis.

Monter orun Bisis

3.9 <u>Task 9</u>, <u>Performance of the Five Year Review (Optional</u>). This is a Firm Fixed Price task. Objective:

- If awarded, the Contractor shall provide an additional (5th overall) year of LTM for the site and perform

monitoring of the ground water and management of the installed cap on a semi-annual basis.

- If awarded, the Contractor shall perform the regulatory-required Five Year Review. This review shall include presentation and analysis of the five years of annual monitoring and maintenance activities and will include meetings, presentations, report preparation/ revision/ response to comments and recommendations for the future of the site.

The Contractor shall prepare, submit and gain acceptance of the Five Year Review report which shall certify

that all items identified in the Work Plans and the LTM Plan have been completed.

Performance Standard:

- Field work, data quantity and quality, and analysis of said data provides the results required to meet approved plans and be acceptable to the regulators.

- Demonstrate that the work was performed in accordance with the applicable laws, regulations, and guidance

discuments:

13

Perform the field sampling activities in accordance with the accepted Work Plans (prepared previously)/

1.The Plan.

Proper processing and disposition of any UXO, DMM and MC encountered in accordance with approved

Work Plan(s).

- Any Material Potentially Presenting an Explosive Hazard (MPPEH) and munitions debris processed in accordance with Chapter 14, EM 1110-1-4009 and Errata Sheet No. 2.

Meet the project DQOs.

- Prepare report documents in accordance with the DIDS, the WP/LTM Plan and all applicable Federal, State and local regulations.

AC

- Conduct the field activities in accordance with the accepted/approved LTM Plan. QC data submitted meets

1.751 Plan requirements. No more than 3 CARs for non-critical violations and/or 1 CAR for critical violations. No nuresolved Corrective Action Requests. All final data and QC tests/documentation submitted. Government QA acceptance QC tests/documentation gnined. No Class "A" Safety, contractor at fault, violations during execution of with 1 non-explosive related Class D, accidents, or <2 non-explosive Class C accidents IAW AR 385-40. Major step violations, 1 non-explosive related safety violation. Minor safety violations, 2 safety violations. Zero letters of exprimand, grievances, or formal complaints.

Acceptance of all report documents (with two revisions) by the Project Team and regulators.

Measurement / Monitoring:

Period inspection/review of field work. Verify compliance with accepted LTM Plan and other Plans as required. Quality control tests/documentation submitted per the QASP for government review. Boundary precision will be determined by evaluation of the sampling footprint as it relates to the reported contaminated/ uncontaminated areas in guestion.

Review of reports per guidance to verify that the minimum acceptable content has been provided.

Task specific Incentives/Disincentives: Satisfactory or greater CPARS rating/poor CPARS rating and/or reperformance of work at contractor's expense.

Specific Task Requirements:

- Any UXO, DMM and MC encountered during this effort shall be processed in accordance with the approved work and safety plans.

- Hazardous, Toxic and Radiological Waste (HTRW) Disposal: The Contractor shall collect, secure, store,

and arrange for disposal of any HTRW generated as a result of field activities. The HW containers shall be staged, secured, labeled, sampled and analyzed (if required) IAW the approved work plan. The Contractor shall recommend appropriate disposal actions for all waste items. The Contractor shall perform the HW disposal in a timely manner.

2.10 (fask 10) Project Management. The Contractor shall manage the task order in accordance with the basic contract statement of work. All project management associated with the task order, with the exception of the direct technical oversight of the work described in the preceding tasks, shall be accounted for in this task.

LE SEBMITTALS.

Even though draft and draft final submittals are requested, the term "draft" shall not reflect upon the quality of the submittal being provided by the Contractor. Submittals shall include all supporting materials including supporting does whether electronic or hardcopy. Submittals not meeting the requirements of referenced guidance or Data Item Descriptions or missing supporting data may be rejected and revised by the contractor at the contractor's own expense.

4.1 The Contractor shall deliver the specified number of copies shown in Table 4.2 of each report listed in Table 4-1 to the tollowing addresses (addresses to be verified by Contractor):

14. data 1. provincem						ENCLO	SURE 5	. –	
		(0)	Frait						
		De	liveryorpe	F					
······································		ORDER FOR	SUPPLIES OR	SERVIC	ES			P	AGELOF 40
o ng tan M.L.		2. DELIVER ORDER	CALL NO. J. DATE OF	DRDERICA [.L	4. KEDZP	UKCII. REOURS	TNO		1128177
(WOLKENENT KO WOLKDY - 10-0-0014	0005	אאאנדנירנ <u>ז</u> 2011 Nov	(DD) 23	V/318 /0132	54257			
-11	G ISSU'ED DY	CODH WEIZOY	7. ADAIINISTER	ED BY (If och	er ihas 6) CODE			
	CEHNC CT 4020 URIVERSITY SOUARE HUNTSYILLE AL 35810-1427		SEE ITE	M 6				(8. D	ELIVERY FOR X DESTINATION OTHER
								(Se	eo Schedule if o ther)
	9 CONTRACTOR SHAW ENVIRONIZENTAL NAME WILLIAN WINKLER AND 312 DIRECTORS DR	CODE 8X202 & INFRASTRUCTURE, INC	FACILITY	\$X20.2	10.DE /)' SEE 8 12.DIS	LIVER TO FOD TTIMMED BCHEDULE	роінт ву (Ц)atc) [],.M	AARK IF BUSIKESS IS SMALL SMALL SMALL DISAD YANTAGRI
	. ADDRESS KNOXVILLE TN 37923-4705				13. kJ	AIL INVOICE	STOTIE	ADDRESS	IN BLOCK
	:= SHIP TO	ODE Walsoy	IS. PAYMENT W	ILL BE MAD	DI: BY	CODE 964145			
	UK ARUY ENGINEERING & SUPPOR NO CONTACI SPECIFIED CEHNIC-CT 4010 UNIVERSITY SOURCE HUNISVILLE AL 35816-1822	T GENTER .	US ARMY ENG LS US AR MY CORPS 5722 INTEGRITY DI WILLINGTON TH 38	UP CENTER - DF ENGRS FIN R IVE 064-5005	FINANCE (ANCE CT	OFFIC R		PA P/ IDJ N	MARKALL CKAGESAND APERSWITH ENTIFICATION UNIBERSIN
				•				1,020	CKS I KND 2.
	16. DELIVERY/ X Thirden TYPE CALL Refree OF PURCHASE Femish ACCF. ORDUR AND	ivery orderfall is issued on in cover quote dated the blowing on terms specific PTANCK. THE CONTRA RASIT NAY REVIOUS CONDITIONSAGET FORT	alter Gurembent sparsy u ad hazein. REF: ACTOR HERERY ACC SI, Y HAVE BEEN OR BJ, AXJJ AGREESTO	EPTSTHEC ISNOW MO PERFORMT	OFFER RE	PRESENTED	DY THE A	UMBEREI HETERMS	D PURCIASE
	16. DELIVERY X Thirder TYPE CALL OF FURCHASE Reference ORDIN FURCHASE Reference ORDE AND C DITALIC E = I I AC NAME OF CONTRACTOR DIT this box is marked, supplier of 1". ACCOUNTING AND APPROPTI	ivery orderfail is issued on in c your quote dated the bilowing uniternispeciate r ANCI, THE CONTRA R AS IT MAY PREVIOU CONDITIONS/SETFORT VALUE SI usi sign Accuptance and CIATION DAT A/LOCAL	alter Guren beni spaney u editorein. REF: ACT OR HERERY ACC SI, Y HAVE BEEN OR GY, AXIM AGREES TO ACT OR A TURE ICN A TURE return the following no L USE:	r in secondunce v EPTS THE C ISNOW AIO PERFORM T	DFFER RE DIFEED.S ILE SAM DE AM DE AM TY	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. G. Muran / PED NAME	DY THE NALL OF T	RUM DERES HE TERNS Margan Mangan E	D PURCIASE S 241 <u>2011 Nov 24</u> DATE SIGNED (11TTNAISIDO)
	16. DELIVERY/X Thirdel TYPE CALL Refread OF PURCHASE Refread DRDIN PURCHASE Refread ORD AND O ONDE AND O MANE OF CONTRACTOR DI this box is marked, rupplier 1". ACCOUNTING AND APPROPT See Schedule	ivery orderfall is issued on in te your quuit dated the fallowing on terms specific PTANCE. THE CONTRA RASIT MAY PREVIOU CONDIT (O'SASET FORT AVAILANT SJ nusi sign Accuptance and RIATION DATA/LOCAL	alter Guvern bent spansy u control of the spansy of the s	r in accordance of EPTS THE C ISNOW ALO PERFORM T (oith and rul DFFER RE JIFIED. S JIFIED. S JIFI	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. G. Muran H IPED NANTE	DY THEN ALL OF T C MMA	VUM DERET HE TERNS PAJAM FMSAC	D PURCIJASE S MARCIASE DATE SIGNED (NTYPIAIADO)
	16. DELIVERY/X Thirdet TYPE CALL Refreat OF PURCHASE Refreat ORDUR PURCHASE Refreat ORDUR PURCHASE Refreat ORDUR PURCHASE Refreat ORDE NO ORDE ORDE Integer NO MAME OF CONTRACTOR Integer Integer IT this box is marked, ruppiler r IT. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPT Sc o Schadule IN. IT EN NO. 19.5	ivery addertall is issued on an incover quote dated the billowing on terms specific PTANCE. THE CONTRA R ASIT MAY PREVIOU CONDITIONARE FORT SI nust stign Accuptance and CIATION DATA/LOCAL	alter Guvern Bent spansy a cd herein. REF: ACTOR HERERY ACC SLY HAVE BEEN OR OC. ANH AGREES TO MILLAM IGNATURE return the following no L USE: SY SERVICES	r in accord unce v EPTS THE C ISNOW ALO PERFORM T (OFFER RE INIFIED. INE SAM TY SE NT ITY GRED/ EPTED	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. <u>G</u> MUTAN PED NAME	DY THE A ALL OF T G 1941 AND TITL 22. UNIT F	VUN DEREI HE TERNS Auguno Marsan Price	D PURCIJASE S DATE SIGNED (ITTYJAJADO) 23. AMOUNT
	16. DELIVERY/X Thirdet TYPE CALL Refres OF PURCHASE Refres DRDDR PURCHASE Refres ORD ACCE. ORDE AND C DAME OF CONTRACTOR DI this box is marked, ruppiler 1". ACCOUNTING AND APPROPT Ge & Schadule 11. ITEN NO. 19. S	Y ery orderfeilt is issued on in te your quuie dated the billowing on terms specific PTANCE, THE CONTRA R ASIT MAY PREVIOU CONDITIONER FORT AUXIMUT IN A CONTRACT ON THE IN A CONTRACT OF SUPPLIES SEE SCHEDU	alter Guvern bent spansy a control of the spansy of the s	r in accordance of EPTS THE C ISNOW MO PERFORM T (OFFER RE INFIED S INFIED S INFIED S INFITS GRED/ EPTED	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. <u>G</u> MULAN / IPED NANTE	DY THE NALL OF T	VUM DERE NE TERIS IA JAW IA JAW PRICE	D PURCIJASE S ALT 2011 Nov 24 DATE SIGNED (ITTSIMMOO) 23. AMOUNT
	16. DELIVERY/X Thirdet TYPE CALL Refreat OF PURCHASE Refreat ORDIR PURCHASE Refreat ORDIR PURCHASE Refreat ORDE ACCH. ORDE Indito E ← J IAC ACCOUNTING AND APPROPT Sc o Schadule IF. ITEN NO. IF. S IF. ITEN NO. IF. S Output Government of address for State of Action guarantic action for the state of a schedule of the state of the schedule of the sc	yr ery o (derfeill is Issued on in te cywr gudie daled The billewing on terms specific PTANCE. THE CONTRA R ASIT MAY PREVIOU CONDITIONAR FORT AND TO ASSET NUSI SIGN ACCUPTANCE AND ACCUPTANCE SI NUSI SIGN ACCUPTANCE SEE SCHEDU SEE SCHEDU 22. WITCH SI SEE SCHEDU 22. WITCH SI SUBSCHEDU 22. WITCH SI SEE SCHEDU SEE SCHEDU SEE SCHEDU SEE SCHEDU SEE SCHEDU SUBSCHEDU	alter Gurern Bent sparsy a cd herein. REF: ACT OR HEREFY ACCO SI, Y HAYE BEEN OR OF. ANH AGREES TO MINUTE return the following nu L UST: SY SERVICES DLE TATES OF AMERICA	r in second unce in EPTS THE C ISNOW ALO PERFORM TO C Umber of copi 20. QUA ORD ACC	NT ITY UREDA INT ITY UREDA INT ITY UREDA EFTEDA	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. <u>G. MUTAN</u> PED NAME	EDDY THE NALL OF T	VUM BEREI HE TERNS Augunt PASSAN E PRICE	23. AM OHNT 15.460,010 51
	16. DELIVERY/X Thirdet TYPE CALL Refreat OF PURCHASE Refreat OF PURCHASE Refreat ORDIN PURCHASE Refreat ORD AND ORDE AND CONTRACTOR Inthis box is marked, rupplier 17. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPH Ge a Schadule 18. 18. ITEN NO. 19.5 22. ACOUNTING AND APPROPH 22. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPH Construction 19.5	A CUBER CONTRACT ENCL	ather Guvern bent spansy a contraction. REF: ACT OR HERERY ACC SLY HAVE BEEN OR OF, AMA AGREES TO IL WAY IN A GREES TO IL WAY IN A GREES TO IL USE: IN SERVICES ILE TRATES OF ANERICA CONFORMS TO THE TT AS NOTED	EPTSTHEC ISNOW MO PERFORM T (NT ITY BRED ETDO / C	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. <u>G</u> MULAN PED NAME	DY THE NALL OF T ALL OF T C I'.M.I AND TITL 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 23 26 cr. DI	VUN DERE INE TERNIS ANJAN ANJAN PARACE	23. AM OUNT
	16. DELIVERY/X Thirdet 17. CALL Referent 0.6. PURCHASE Referent 0.7. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPH See 6 9.6. Schadtlie PROPH 9.7. Schadtlie PROPH 9.7. Schadtlie PROPH 9.7. Schadtlie <td>Are of a start of the start of</td> <td>Alter Guvern bent spansy a constraint of the spansy of th</td> <td>EPTSTHEC ISNOW MO PERFORM T C 20. QUA ACC 20. QUA ACC C. DATE (TTTSIAAA</td> <td>NT ITY BRED/</td> <td>PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. MUTAN / PED NAME</td> <td>DY THE NALL OF T ALL OF T ALL OF T AND TITL 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 24. D 24. D 25. D 26. D 27. D 26. D 27. D 27. D 26. D 27. D 26. D 27. D 27.</td> <td>VUM DEREI HE TERNS PASSAW PASSAW PRICE S. TOTAL S. FFERINCES</td> <td>F AUT HORIZED</td>	Are of a start of the start of	Alter Guvern bent spansy a constraint of the spansy of th	EPTSTHEC ISNOW MO PERFORM T C 20. QUA ACC 20. QUA ACC C. DATE (TTTSIAAA	NT ITY BRED/	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. MUTAN / PED NAME	DY THE NALL OF T ALL OF T ALL OF T AND TITL 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 24. D 24. D 25. D 26. D 27. D 26. D 27. D 27. D 26. D 27. D 26. D 27.	VUM DEREI HE TERNS PASSAW PASSAW PRICE S. TOTAL S. FFERINCES	F AUT HORIZED
	16. DELIVERY/X Thirdet TYPE CALL Refreat OF PURCHASE Refreat ORDER PURCHASE Refreat ORDER AND ACCH. MAME OF CONTRACTOR Introduct of a control of the contro	A CONTRACT ENTER	Alter Guvern Bent Sparsy of ACT OR HEREBY ACC SLY HAVE BEEN OR DY. ANH AGREES TO HEAM IGN AT URE return the following no L UST: SY SERVICES HEE TRATES OF ANERICA CONFORMS TO THE TT AS NOTED SENT AT IVE REPRESENT AT IVE	EPTS THE C ISNOW MO PERFORM T (20. QUA ACC 20. QUA ACC C. DATE (YTTJJAAA 28. SHIT N	NT ITY BRED/ ETDIO// C	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. DED NAME 21. UNIT 21. UNIT DED NAME UNIT DED NAME 21. UNIT 21. UNIT 2	DY THE NALL OF T ALL OF T G AMA AND TITL 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 22. UNIT F 23. UNIT F 24. UNIT F	VUN DEREI HE TERNS ANJAMAN PHIACE E S. TOTAL S. TOTAL	PURCIJASE D PURCIJASE SALI Nov 24 DATE SIGNED (ITTY)AIMOOI 23. AMOUNT 55.460,01051 F AUTHORIZED E
	16. DELIVERY/X Thirdet TYPE CALL Refreat OF PURCHASE Refreat OF PURCHASE Refreat ORDE AND O ORDE AND OF ORDE AND O MAME OF CONTRACTOR It this box is marked, rupplier r IT this box is marked, rupplier r I". ACCOUNTING AND APPROPH Ge o Schadule IN. IT ENINO. 19.5 IN. IT ENINO. 19.5 IN. IT ENINO. 19.5 ONANTITY IN COLUMIN 20 DESPECTED INSGRATURE OF AUTHORIZED RECEIVED IN SIGRATURE OF AUTHORIZED INALLING ADDRESS OF AUTHORIZED INALLING ADDRESS OF AUTHORIZED INALLING ADDRESS OF AUTHORIZED	A CONTRACT ENCE SEE SCHEDU SEEN CONTRACT ENCE SIZE SCHEDU SIZE SC	Alter Guvern bent spansy a control of the spansy of the s	C. DATE (TTTTAA) C. DATE (TTTAA) C. DATE (TT	ANT ITY ANT	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. () MUTAN / PED NAME 21. UNIT 21. UNIT 21. UNIT 21. UNIT 9. DO YOUCI 2. PAID BY	DY THE NO. 25 CONTINUE OF THE NO. 25 CONTENT OF THE NO. 25 CONTENT OF THE NO. 26 CONTENT OF THE NO. 26 CONTEN	VUM DERE NUM DERE NE TERNIS A.J.J. (M J.M.J. (M MARKER PRICE S. TOTAL S. TOTAL	PURCIJASE D PURCIJASE SCI 2011 Nov 24 DATE SIGNED (ITTY)MMDD) 23. AMOUNT 15. (60,01051 F AUTHORIZED E T VERIFIED OR
	16. DELIVERY/X Thirdet 17. CALL Refreat 0.F PURCHASE Refreat 0.RDD.R PURCHASE NAND (0.RDD.R PURCHASE NAND (0.RDD.R PURCHASE PURCHASE 1	ACCEPTED AND CONTRACT ENAMENT REPRESS	Alter Guvern Bent Sparsy of ACT OR HEREPY ACC SI, Y HAVE BEEN OR SI, Y HAVE BEEN OR ON AT URE return the following no L USE: SY SERVICES DLE TATES OF AMERICA CONFORMS TO THE TT AS NOTED SENTATIVE REPRESENTATIVE MG OFFICER	T IN SECONDUCE T IN SECONDUCE THE C IS NOW ALCO PERFORM T C C	NT ITY URE SALA NT ITY URE SALA TY URE ENT PLETE ITAL I STATE	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. G. MUTAN PED NAME 21. UNIT 21. UNIT MUTAN SOVERNMEN 9. DO VOUCI 2. PAID BY	DY THE NO JO	VUM BEREI HE TERNS August PASSAW PRICE S. TOTAL S. TOTAL	F AUT HORIZED
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	16. DELIVERY/X Thirdet 17. CALL Refreat 0.F PURCHASE Refreat 0.RDD.R PURCHASE PURCHASE 0.SCOUNTING AND APPROPT See Schadule 19.5 1	ACCEPTED. AND CONTRACT ENCL CONTRACT ENCL CONTRACT ENCL CONDITION DATA/LOCAL CONDITION DATA/LOCAL CONDITION DATA/LOCAL CONTRACT ENCL CONTRACT ENCL	Alter Guren Bent Remey a control of the sense of the sense of a control of the sense of the sense a control of the sense a	T IN SECONDUCE T IN SECONDUCE	NT ITY UNT ITY UNT ITY UNT ITY UNT ITY UNT UNT ITY UNT UNT UNT UNT UNT UNT UNT UNT UNT UNT	PRESENTED SUBJECT TO E. G. MUTAN / PED NAME 21. UNIT 21. UNIT MUTAN / SOVERNMEN 9. DO VOUCI 2. PAID BY	DY THE NALL OF T	VUMBEREI HETERNIS Aufam E PRICE S. TOTAL S. TOTA	F AUT HORIZED E T VERIFIED OR LADING NO.

ENCL 5

					O R	DER	FORS	UPPLIE	SOR	SERV	ICES						1	PAGEIOF 40	-
1. CON A G R W912	8337779 2016 947 252-20-2	'RC11 (97) 20014	nnder		2. DEI 0005	JVERY O	KDER/CA	LL NO. 3.D () 20	ATE OF O YYYMMM 11 Nov 2	RDER/CA D/DJ 23	LL (.RE	Q J P L	URCH. REQ 54157	UES	STNO.		5. P	RIORITY	
6, ISSE	ED 65			C	ODE	/912DY		7. ADMIN	ISTERE	DBY (V	ather th	an 6)	CO	DΕ	· ·		1		
US AR CEHNE 4820 U HUNTS	NÝ ENGI -CT NIVERSI VILLE AL	NGERI TY SQU 35816	NG & : JARE -1822	SUPPOR T	GENTER	•		SEI	EITEN	46	*						8. D	DELIVERY FOB X DESTINATION OTHER	۲
																	(5	ee Schedule if other)
9. CUN	Γ R A ('T	OR		C'0	DE 8X	202		FAC	CILITY	8X202	1	0. D E	LIVER TO F	08	POINTB	Y (Date)	11.1	ARK IF BUSINESS IS	1
	SHAV			ENTAL & I	NFRAST	RUCTUR	E, INC				s	EE S	C HEDUL	1				SMALL	
AND	312 D	IRECT	ORSE	R							11 N	. DIS(COUNT TEL ays	CM S			ł		D
ADDRES	S MUX	VILLE	111 373	123-4703													L		
	•											I. M7	AIL INVO	ICE	сято т	HEADDI	RESS	IN BLOCK	
1.1. 0011					DE W91	2DY		15 04 7 24	ENT MI	11 95 4	ADE PY			14.46					4
US ARM	Y SNOIN	EERIN	IG & S	UPPORT	EN TER			US ARMY E	NG & SU	PCENTE	R - FINAI	105	OFFIC					MARKALL	
CEHNC	CT	- corrie						US ARMY C 5722 INTEG	ORPS O RITY OR	F ENGRS IVE	FINANC	ECTR	२				P A D	CKAGES AND	
HUNTS	ILLE AL	9 SQU 35816-	1822					MILLINGTO	N TN 380	54-5005							IDI	ENTIFICATION	
							[BLC	DCKSIAND 2,	
•	1									. <u>.</u>									
16, ' T Y P E	CALL	LERY/	×	This delive	ry nider/e	11 15 19800		r G o vern men i	ayoncy or	in accordar	ice with an	1 3119	juct to terms	and	condition	ns of above	numb.	end contract.	
OF	P1:804	IASE		Ruining the	aarquote Gilowuu	dated Fon terms	socolficel be	ruin, REF:											
		F	t	ACCEPT ORDER / AND CO	ANCE. (SIT M NDITIO	THE CO AYPRE NSSET	NT RA CT VIOUSLY FORT H, 7	OR HEREB 'HAVE BE AND AGRE	Y ACCE EN OR I ES TO P	EPTSTH SNOW N ERFORM	E OFFEI MODIFIE M THE S	R REI D, S A ME	PRESENT UBJECT	ED	BY TH ALL OF	E NUMB THE TE	EREI	D PURCHASE	
N 1		.'ON'T	RACT	OR		·	SIGN	ATURE		<u> </u>	·	ΤY	PEDNAN	E,	ANDTI	TLE		DATE SIGNED	
0 17 1	is box i	s mark	ed, su	plier mu	at sign A	ceptane	e and retu	irn the follo	wing nur	nber of c	opies:			1	<u> </u>			("TTTMMMDD)]
I7. ACC See	אויראטר Schedu	ig AN Ie	DAP	PROPRIA	TION I	DATA/L	OCAL US	SE .											
18. JTEA	טא ו.			19, SC)	EDULE	OFSUP	PLIES/SI	ERVICES		20.Q	UANT IT RDEREC CCEPT F	Υ)/	21. UNI	r	22. UNI	T PRICE		23. AMOUNT	
					 S E	ESCH	EDULE												
• //		i hn the	Game	ment is set	11. 11.5	24. UNI	TED STATE	S OF AMERIC	A							25 7.07	A 1	\$5,460.010.54	
nantis a.	ar i m	lieu te b	e X. If	llffer ent, en	ter netsal	PENAJE:						,				26.			
nuntro ···	ope dae soort ne	IN CO	ntity a.	N 20 HA	S BEEN	}h7 :			a	CON	FRACTING	/ OR	DERING OF	£IC)	ER	DIFFERE	VCES		
	99999 1997 1902		RECE	IVED	ACCE	PTED. RACT	AND CON EXCEPT	FORMS TO	отне							•			
i, siçina İ	TURE	DF AU	THO.	RIZED GO	VERNA	IENT R	EPRESEN	TATIVE		c. DATI (17777M	Е (MMDD)	d. G	PRINTE	D N EN J	T REPR	ND TITL ESENTA	E OI TIVE	FAUTHORIZED	
e. MAIL	NGAD	DRESS	OFA	UTHORI	ZEDGO	VERNN	IENT REI	PRESENTA	TIVE	28. SHIP	NO.	29	DO YOU	JCH	ERNO	30,		·	
Ì.																	10		
! Г. ТЕГЕ	HUNF	×umi	BER.	y. E-N1.	AHL ADI	DRESS				P A F11	RTIAL	32	PAID B	Ŷ		33, AMO CORREC	DUNT CT FC	T VERIFIED Dr	
36. Levit	ily nets	acco	untis	correct	andpr	operio	грауте	πt.		31, PAY	MENT	1				34. CHE	CKN	IUMBER	
n. DAFT CEPEVAAA	non h.	S]GN2	4 T U R	E AND T	IT LE O	FCERT	ודיואס C	DFFICER			MPLET RTIAL	E				35 BUL	OF	LADING NO	ŀ
37 8675	VED A	1	25	RECEIVIE	DBY		39. DA	TERECEN	VED	10 FI	₩ÅL AL	41	. S/R A C C		INT NO	12.5/17	VOID	CHER NO	
1	11.17.28				• •		(11)	TYMMMDD)		CON	TAINER	s		υŪ	,	12,010	.00		
			1				-									1			

_ · ..

	Section A - Solicitation/Contract Form				
	AWARD NARRATIVE	•			
1	Tisk Order 0005, which contains Firm Fixed Price (FFP) and Fixe	d Unit Pri	ce (FUP) task	s, is being issue	d to Shaw
	Detonation Ground in Romulus, New York in accordance with the	eneca Arm Performa	nce Work Stat	ement entitled f	en Rennedial
	Action Seneca Army Depot Activity (SEDA) Open Detonation Gro	ound in Ro	omulus, New '	York, dated 11/	August
	2011.				
	The Period of Performance for this Task Order is 24 months from t	he NTP o	Date of Awa	rd.	
 ,;:,:,:,;	The terms and conditions of the basic contract, W912DY-10-D-001	4 takes r	recedence in t	he case of any a	unhimity
	ur conflict.	, , , , , , , ,		ne ouse of any t	anoiguity
- 2.57	US Department of Labor Wage Determination Number 2005-2381	Revision	11 dated lune	17 2011 chall	he used
	with project task order.	1 (01 13/01	- 1 unioù 2000	in, aona anan'i	Do Mach
•••••	The following Tack Listing reflects funding allocation:				
1	The following Task Disting reflects funding underform	` .			
	Seneca ADA OB/OD Grounds	Remedia	Action		
	Task, Title, Type	Qty	Unit	Price	Funded
<i>*</i>	BASICTASKS				
- +	Task I. Preparation of Work Plans and Designs (FFP)	1.0	LS	\$360,199.55	\$360,199.5
	Task 2. Field Sampling Activities (FFP/FUP).				
	Task <u>2a.1</u> (Formerly Task 2a.1 and 2a.3). The Contractor shall				
	Contractor shall delineate all areas which exhibit metallic saturation,	69.6		P1 C(0.00	
	whereby individual anomalies >50mV are not distinguishable. The Contractor's work shall include construction support while this work is on-	0.8C	Acres	20,208.98	\$209,142.44
	going.				
	Task 2a.2 (Formerly Task 2a.4). The Contractor shall excavate those areas while interaction to a depth of 6 inches anything or				
	transporting the excavated soils to within the 0-500 foot radius area and				
	regrading these with the existing OD hill uniterial. The regraded material shall be maintained within the 0-500 foot radius area as necessary. The	.20	Acres	\$24,336.56	\$486,731.20
	Contractor's work shall include construction support while earth work is				
	on-going. For the purposes of estimation, the Contractor shall assume that 20 acres of this overall area will exhibit saturation.				
· [Fask 2a.3 (Formerly Task 2b.1 and 2b.2). The Contractor shall perform a				· ·
	surface sweep of the existing OD hill material for potential MPPEH. The	' 900	Anomalies	\$76.60	\$62 938 31
	the purposes of estimation, the Contractor shall assume that this will	700		W/0.00	400,000,00
.5.5	amount to 50 anomalies per acre or 900 anomalies.				
	Task 2a.4 (Formerly Task 2a.5). The Contractor shall geophysically re- map the portions of the 500-1000 foot radius area which were considered				
	saturated and which were excuvated to a depth of 6 inches. For the	20	Acres	\$911.82	\$18,236,46
· •• 4	purposes of estimation, the Contractor shall assume that 20 neres of this overall area will require re-mapping. The Contractor's work shall include	2.			Q100-001.0
	construction support while this work is on-going.				
	<u>1.3 ik 2a.5 (Formerly Task 2a.2)</u> . The Contractor shall reacquire and	15 240	Aponalias		0656 160 00
	radius which exceed the 50mV threshold (15,240).	13,240	Anomanes	343.U/	3020,40V.82
<u> </u>			•	L	

ł	Seneca ADA OB/OD Grounds	Remedia	l Action		
Ľ	Task, Title, Type	Qty	Unit	Price	Funded
	<u>Lesk 3c</u> . Area of 0-1000 foot radius for the existing OD Hill. The Contractor shall mag, flag and prosecute identified targets in wooded or severely overgrown or sloped terrain in this area. For purposes of estimation, the cost for this task shall be based upon 700 anomalies per area and an FUP cost per additional anomaly given as well	9,800	Anomalies	\$28.42	\$278,564.32
· · ·]	Task 29, Open Burning Tray. The Contractor shall close the Open Burning Tray IAW the approved work plan	1.0	LS	\$82,556.23	\$82,556.23
1	ask 3. Environmental Sampling & Analysis (Optional): (FFP/FUP)	2	EA/SDG	\$57,740.48	\$115,480.96
[]	usk 4. Remedial Action Report (FFP)	1.0	LS	\$54,324.63	\$54,324.63
1	ask 5. Installation of an Engineered Cap (FFP)	1.0	LS	\$2,655,220.43	\$2,655,220.43
1	and Areparation of a Long Terra Monitoring Plan	1.0	LS	\$23,333.12	\$23,333.12
1	at: k 7. Performance of Long Term Monitoring	1.0	LS	\$160,509.05	\$160,509.05
1	ack 10, Project Management	1.0	LS	\$290,313.02	\$290,313.02
0	PTIONAL TASKS				
T.	nsk 8. Performance of Additional Long Term Monitoring (Optional)				
	(56 8.1. Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring optional). If awarded, the Contractor shall provide LTM for an additional "overall) year on a quarterly basis.	1.0	- LS	\$99,875.46	
<u>T:</u> (0 (3)	usk 8.2, Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring (ptional). If awarded, the Contractor shall provide LTM for an additional red overall) year on a quarterly basis.	. 1.0	LS	\$98,282.29	
<u>Ta</u> (0	sk 8.3. Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring ptional). If awarded, the Contractor shall provide LTM for an additional haverally year on a semi-annual basis.	1,0	LS	\$49,663.35	
<u></u>	sk 9. Performance of Five Year Review (Optional).	1.0	LS	\$76,255.29	
				Total Funded	\$5,460,010.54

The following Payment Milestone Schedule is acceptable for use on this project task order:

Payment Milestone Schedule					
Pinal Submittals	Upon government acceptance				
Field Work	For defined units and activities completed and QA review and acceptance				
Meetings	After completion of meetings with government acceptance of meeting minutes				

PSS-.arg-2.822

ţ

!

....

V



MAX NET AMT

\$5,460,010.54

\$5,460,010.54

ACRN AA CIN: W31RYO132548570001

: :

• • . . • •

1000-024

. . .

170

	ITEM NO	SUPPLIES/SER VICES	MAX	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	MAX AMOUNT
			QUANTITY			
	0002	·	2	Each	\$0.00	\$0.00 NC
*		Contractor Manpower Re	porting			400000
1.19 1.00		FFP				
		This CLIN is used for the	pricing of the colle	ection and repo	orting of Contractor	
		Manpower Reporting data	as described in Se	ction C. Repo	orting period will be the	
		period of performance not	to exceed twelve r	nonths ending	30 September of each	
	· •	·Government Fiscal Year a	nd must be reporte	d by 31 Octob	er of each calendar	
		year.	-			
	· •	FOB: Destination				
-		MILSTRIP: W31RYO132	54857			
		PURCHASE REQUEST N	UMBER: W31RY	O13254857		. •
				-		

MAX NET AMT \$0.00

.. . ů

.

. .

. . .

· ..

FINAL

2011 LONG-TERM MONITORING ANNUAL REPORT

FOR THE OPEN BURNING GROUNDS SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY, ROMULUS, NEW YORK

Prepared for:

U.S. ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, ENGINEERING AND SUPPORT CENTER, HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA

and

SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY ROMULUS, NEW YORK

Prepared by:

PARSONS

100 High Street Boston, MA 02110

Contract Number W912DY-08-D-0003 Task Order No. 0008 EPA Site ID# NY0213820830 NY Site ID# 8-50-006

· ; , '

-1

in.

May 2013

ENCL 6

Seneca Army Depot Activity

6.0

LONG-TERM MONITORING CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions can be made based on the results of the sixth round of LTM at the OB Grounds:

- Residual lead and copper concentrations remaining in the soils have not impacted groundwater at, or in the immediate vicinity of, the Site above the applicable action levels.
- The integrity of the vegetated soil cover overlying interred contaminated soils at the Site was intact and there was no evidence that terrestrial wildlife are exposed or will be exposed to the lead-contaminated soils interred below the 9-inch soil cover.
- The washout area noted during in Grid Cell L7 in (identified as L8 in 2008 Report) during the February and May 2008 inspections and in the August 2010 inspection was observed again during the 2011 soil cover inspection. As discussed in Section 4.2 the washout area is outside of the areas where contaminated soils were interred beneath clean soil; this area therefore will not be repaired by the Army at this time. If subsequent inspections suggest that this area is becoming larger, the Army will evaluate the need for a permanent repair.
- An approximately 21-ft long area of minor erosion was observed in Grid Cell K6, outside of the area where lead-contaminated soil is interred beneath clean soil. Grid Cell K6 is located adjacent to Grid Cell J6, which is part of the soil cover, and therefore the condition of this location will be reassessed during the next inspection event to determine if corrective measures are needed.
- The Army will continue to monitor soil cover erosion, and will note any instance of cover erosion or exposed native or interred soil.
- Based on evaluation of the groundwater data and the results of the cover inspection, there is no evidence to suggest that the OB Grounds may be contributing to the degradation of sediment quality in Reeder Creek.
- The Army will continue to inspect Reeder Creek for evidence of sediment deposition and if it is observed, a sediment sampling and analysis program plan will be prepared, submitted for approval, and implemented for Reeder Creek at locations adjacent to the OB Grounds.

Based on the result of the LTM events conducted at the OB Grounds, the Army recommends continuing the monitoring frequency of once per year. As presented and summarized above, available monitoring data shows no evidence of lead or copper in the groundwater above the cleanup goals subsequent to the completion of the remedial action for the Site. These findings are consistent with the groundwater analytical results obtained during the remedial investigation stage (1990s) of work at the Site, indicating that there is no evidence of groundwater quality deterioration over approximately 15 years. Further, the annual inspections of the soil cover have shown minimal evidence of erosion or animal breaching of the

	ORDER FO	R SUPPI	IES OR SE	RVICE	S.			P.	AGE 1 0.F 58
F. CONTRACT/PURCH. ORDER/ AGREEMENT NO. W912DY-09-D-0062	2. DELIVERY ORD	ER CALL NO.	3. DATE OF ORDE (YYFYWM, WDD) 2016 Mai 30	ER'CALL 4.)	85Q P	URCH_REQUES 838903	TNO.	5. P.R	10 R 11.Y
6. ISSUED BY US ARMY ENGINEERING & SUPF Cennc.ct 482q UNIVERSITY SQUARE HUNTSVILLE AL 35816-1822	CODE 1 49124	7. AD DIRE ATTN: 256-89 HUNT	IMINIST ERED I CTORATE DE ÓOI MICHELLE BLAC 95-2531 SVILEE AL 35816	Y (if other NTRACTING KMON	ιλαη δ - ΗΝΟ.) CODE	W 9 12D 1	8. D:	ELIVERY FOB X DESTINATION OTHER.
9. CONTRACTOR PARSONS GOVERNME MICHELLE SMITH AND 100 W MALNUT ST ADDRESS PASADEN& CA 91124-0	CDDE: 18VK6 NT SERVICES: INC.		FACILITY		10: DE FE SEE 12DIS Net 30:0	ELIVER TO FOB YYYMM MDDJ. SCHEDULE SCOUNT TERMS	POINTBY (I	Diale) '[.M	HARK IF BUSINESS IS SMALL SMALL DISADYANTAGED WOMEN-OWNED
					13. M See l	AIL INVOICE	STOTHE	ADDRESS	IN BLOCK
NA. SHIP TO SEE SCHEDULE SEE SCHEDULE SEE SCHEDULE SEE SCHEDULE	CORE MAISDA	US AR US AR 5722 IN MILLIN	YMENT WILL. MY ENG & SUP C MY CORPS OF E VTEGRITY DRIVE GTON TN 38064,	BE MADE ENTER - FIN NGRS FINAN	BY NANCE	CODE 96414: OFFIC IR.	5	PA PA IDI N BLC	MARKALL CKACES AND AFERS WITH ENTIFICATION UMBERS IN OCKS I AND 2.
16. DELIVERY/ X This TYPE CALL	delivery and second in issued o	a another Govern	incent agoncy or in a	cordan cewith	and su	bject.to-lerms and	conditions (ລ້າມສາເອ ແມກເອັນ	red contract;
OF FURCHASE Rea	enge gour quote ested ish the fullowing on terms spo	ipided herein, RE	Ê:						
ANA POR COALL (OV) NAME OF CONTRACTOR If this box is marked, supplie 7, ACCOUNTING AND APPRO See Schedule	DER AS IT MAY PREVI P CONDITIONS SET FO DEVICES IN must sign A cceptionee P RIATION DATA/ CO	GUSLY JIAN NTH, AND/A SIGNATURI and return the CAL-USE	GREES TO PER	OW MODI FORM THI	FIED, E SAM	SUBJECT TO NE. N <u>TILE</u> YPED NAME	ALL OF T	LE JERMS	DAYE SIGNED
8: ITEM NO. JS	SCREDULE OF SUPP	LIEV SERVIC	ĘS	20. QUANT ORDER ACCEP	TED	21UNIT	22. ÜNIT	PRICE	23. AMDUNT
lf quantily accepted by the Governmen uantily ordered, indicate by N. If differ uantily ordered below quantily orders	SEE SCHE 24. UNITE (Is sum c 35 en I: chier actuar) BHAIL:MU d and encircle: bx:	DULE IN STATES OF UN	MERICA ARDJ.10900402	Digitally signed 282' Dir cold. cold. Control 2001 Control 2001 Cont	TOP	ACCARDING OF TO	2 2 2 2	5. TOTAL 6.	\$637;95LB3
73. QUANT ITY IN COLUMN 2 INSPECTED RÉCEIVE	0 HAS BEEN D ACCEPTED, AT CONTRACT EX	ND CONFORM	ASTOTHE DTED						
SIGNATURE OF AUT HORIZI	ED-GOVERNMENT REF	RESENTATI	VE c.	DATE (YYYMM) D	с.)	GO VERNMEN	NAME AN	D TITLE O SENTATIV	FAUTHORIZED E
MAILING ADDRESS OF AUT	HORIZED GOVERNME	NT REPRESE	NTATIVE 28	SHIP NO.		29. DO ¥OUC	HER NO.3	IO. NITIĀLS	
TELEPHONE NUMBER g.	E-MAIL ADDRESS			PARTIA FINAL	L. 1	32PAID BY	3	3. AMOUN CORRECT F	T VERIFIED OR:
5. I certify this account is co DATE 6. SIGNATURE A YYYMMMDD	trect and proper for ND TITLE OF CERTIF	paym.e.nt. YING OFFICE	31 2.R	PAYMEN COMPL PARTIA FINAL	T ETE L.		3	4. CHECK	NUMBER
RECEIVED AT	ETVED BY	39. DATE RE (YYYYMMM	CEIVED 40	TOTAL CONTAIN	ERS	1. STR ACCO	סא, דאש	42. Ş/R YO (JCHER NO.
D Form 1155, DEC 2001		t	PREVIOUSEE	IT ION IS	BSOL	.ET E.			

.

W912DY-09-D-0062 0023 Page 2 of 58

Section A - Solicitation/Contract Form

AWARD NARRATIVE

Task Order 0023, which contains Firm Fixed-Price (FFP) tasks, is being issued to Parsons Government Services, Inc for Remedial Action at Seneca Army Depot Activity, Romulus, NY, EPA Site ID# NY0213820830, NY Site ID# 8-50-006 in accordance with Performance Work Statement Revision 2, dated March 24, 2016.

The period of performance is date of award through March 30, 2018.

US Department of Labor Wage Determination Number 15-2381, Revision 1, dated March 1, 2016 shall be used with project task order.

The Terms and Conditions of the basic contract, W912DY-09-D-0062 takes precedence in the case of any ambiguity or conflict.

This task order is awarded in the amount of \$1,211,190.20 of which \$637,951.83 is being funded at the time of award.

Task	Description	Туре	Amount	Total]
1	UFP-QAPP and QASP	FFP	7,063.20	7,063.20	
2	GIS	FFP	3,908.96	3,908.96	}
2a	Optional, Additional GIS per FY	FFP	1,525.90]
3	Long Term Monitoring of The OB Grounds	FFP			
3a	(FY17) First Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	21,453.84	21,453.84	6
3b	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	21,457.76		
3c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	21,461.68]
3d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	21,465.59		
3e	Optional, (FY21) Fifth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	21,469.51]
4	Long Term Monitoring of the Fire Training and Demonstration Pad Area	FFP]
4a	(FY17) First Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	26,049.47	26,049.47]
4b	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	26,080.17		
4c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	26,110.87]
4d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	26,141.57]
4e	Optional, (FY21) Fifth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	26,172.27]
5	Long Term Monitoring of the Ash Landfill Operable Unit	FFP			
5a	(FY17) First Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	51,594.03	51,594.03]
5Ъ	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	51,686.28]
5c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	51,778.54]
5d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	51,870.79]
5e	Optional, (FY21) Fifth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	51,963.04]
6	Ash Landfill Operable Unit Biowall Recharge	FFP	440,038.65	440,038.65]
7	Long Term Monitoring of the Deactivation Furnaces Operable Unit	FFP			· .
7a	(FY17) First Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	23,146.49	23,146.49].
7Ъ	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	23,178.47]
7c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	23,210.46]
7d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	23,242.44]
7e	Optional, (FY21) Fifth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	23,274.43		
8	Monitoring of LUCs at Various Sites	FFP]
8a	(FY17) First Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	17,934.42	17,934.42]

W912DY-09-D-0062 0023

Page 3 of 58

8b	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	17,934.42		
8c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	17,934.42		
8d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	17,934.42		
9	Monitoring of LUCs at Various Munition Sites	FFP			
9a	(FY17) First Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	5,895.00	5,895.00	
9Ъ	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	5,895.28		
9c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	5,895.28		
9d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	5,895.28		
10	Five-year Review	FFP	27,488.41	27,488.41	. 6
11	Community Relations Support	FFP	13,379.36	13,379.36	E
11a	Optional, Additional Meetings	FUP	8,646.02		
12	Optional, Administrative Record	FFP	1,013.48		
	Totals		\$1,211,190.20	\$637,951.83	

ESCALATION RATES

Constant Year (FY17) Dollars

The CTC estimates shall be reported on a current cost basis (unadjusted for inflation). The following factors should be used to bring previous year costs to the current year.

Base Fiscal Year	Escalation Rate*
FY12	1.0897
FY13	1.0736
FY14	1.0578
FY15	1.0463
FY16	1.0338

* Rates based on FY18 Joint Inflation Calculator (weighted index) - 9 Mar 2017

6

ESTIMATOR EXPERIENCE

ESTIMATOR NAME: Randall Battaglia	POSITION: Project Manager
LOCATION: USACE NY Seneca Proj. Ofc	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE: 31 years
EMAIL: Randy.W.Battaglia@usace.army.mil	PHONE NUMBER: 607-869-1532

DESCRIPTION: (Insert description of experience here, such as educational background, training, etc.) B.S. Chemical Engineering, 1982; Certified Project Manager, 2007

<u>Work Experience</u>: <u>Project Manager</u>, USACE, 1995-Present: Prepare and manage Life-Cycle Cost for HTRW projects; executes the COE project management business process & establishing a project management plan with a project development team consisting of interdisciplinary, regional or other agencies teams to execute & ensure all projects meet customer, budgetary, safety, scope and schedule requirements during the life cycle of the project, under changing management parameters. Represents the Army as an Alternate for the installation manager in all customer/sponsor, congressional, public contacts, including public meetings, organizations, property transfers with the state, EPA, county, & independent organizations interested in the projects. Served also as the BRAC Environmental Coordinator, 2016-Present.

Environmental Coordinator, Seneca Army Depot, 1985-1995; performed all program management, cost estimation, budget regulatory, permitting, and other management for the environmental program at the active Seneca Army Depot for hazardous waste, TSDF, air, wetlands, CERCLA, RCRA, engineering projects, etc.

Process Engineer, IEC Electronics, 1983-1985 Process engineering for production, product development, personnel, process & Quality

<u>Relevant Continuing Education</u>: Network Systems Analysis; Project Management for Military Projects & HTRW projects; Environmental Auditing; Economic Assessment; Various Project Management & environmental remediation courses; Cost Estimating

SITE TYPE REVIEWED: Insert site number(s) at which experience gained for each site type to the maximum extent possible.						
SITE TYPE	SITENUMBER	SI	TE TYPE	SITENUMBER		
Above Ground Storage Tank	SEAD 5,59,71		Open Burn	SEAD 23, 24, 006-R-01, 003-R-01, 007-R-01		
Burn Area	SEAD 24,45,25,26		Plating Shop			
Chemical Disposal	SEAD 13,72,4		POL (Petroleum/Lubricant Lines	SEAD 9		
Contaminated Buildings	SEAD 12, 16,17, 3		Radioactive Waste Area	SEAD 012,48,72, 63, NRC License closeout		
Contaminated Fill	SEAD 3, 9,4		Sewage Treatment Plant	SEAD 20,21		
Contaminated Groundwater	SEAD 025,006, 001-R-01, 023, 064B&D, 041		Small Arms Range	SEAD 57, 46, 120B,122A,122B		
Contaminated Sediments	SEAD 4, 3,		Soil Contamination After Tank Removal	SEAD 59,		
Contaminated Soil Piles	SEAD 5		Spill Site Area	SEAD 122		
Dip Tank			Storage Area	SEAD 123		
Disposal Pit/Dry Well			Surface Disposal Area			
Explosive Ordnance Disposal Area	SEAD 23, 24, 006-R-01, 003-R-01, 007-R-01		Training and Maneuver Area			
Fire/Crash Training Area	SEAD 025,026		Underground Storage Tank	SEAD 27		
Firing Range			Underground Tank Farm			
Incinerator	SEAD 006, 001-R-01,019, 018		Unexploded Munitions/Ordnance	SEAD 115		
Industrial Discharge			Wash rack			
Landfill	SEAD 006, 064 A,B&D, 011,		Waste Lines			
Maintenance Yard	SEAD 122		Waste Treatment Plant	SEAD		
Oil Water Separator	SEAD 27					



US Army Corps of Engineers.

Certificate of Completion

Randall Battaglia

has successfully completed

Environmental Liability (EL)/Cost to Complete (CTC) Training

Jan 18, 2017 - Web/Audio Teleconference

ander 1

Sandi Zebrowski, F.E. Director, USACE Environmental and Munitions Center of Expertise,

FUDS Training Services fudstraining@usace.army.mil

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management BRAC Division Seneca Army Depot, Seneca, NY

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

27 September 2017

SUBJECT: Environmental Liabilities for site SEAD-006-R-01 (HQAES WBS# 36760.1100) RCRA Closure of the OB/OD Grounds (alias SEAD-115 [not listed in HQAES], SEAD 45 [Demolition Area HQAES WBS# 36760.1045]) at Seneca Army Depot

This memorandum serves as formal documentation of the information used to develop the Cost-To-Complete (CTC) estimate for site SEAD-006-R-01 during the 2017 data call. This site also encompasses SEAD-023 (OB Grounds) (not listed in HQAES). Estimators experience is documented on the Estimator Experience Form, enclosure 7, per the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) Handbook Technical Release 2.

Well abandonment and site closeout costs were previously covered in a contract from FY11 (W912DY-08-D-0003, Task Order 0008). The contract is out of date and not used for cost estimating. The cost for well abandonment and site closeout will require a new contract or an engineering estimate, until a valid cost estimate is available the cost is to be determined.

The SEAD-23 monitoring program, which was initiated in 2007 under this project, will be carried under the RI/FS phase until completion of the remediation. A zero dollar CTC has been prepared for SEAD-23. It is assumed six additional wells will be installed at SEAD 006-R-01 for additional GW monitoring at the site as part of a LTM plan. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 5, 23 November 2011, (Enclosure 5) provides the cost of the Long Term Monitoring Plan, well installation, first year monitoring cost, and out-year monitoring cost. The cost for the GW monitoring during the RI/FS phase for SEAD 23 is provided by contract W912DY-09-D-0062 Delivery Order 0023 task 0003a, 30 March 2016. (Enclosure 6) and the requirement for testing is established in the ROD for the OB Grounds (Enclosure 2). It is assumed that after the completion of the remediation, monitoring GW for SEAD-006-R-01 will require sampling at a guarterly interval for the first year and then semi-annually in subsequent years for cap inspection and effectiveness. It is further assumed that the monitoring efforts at SEAD 23 will continue as part of the overall project (Enclosure 6). After the remediation is completed the monitoring will be carried out under the LTM phase. Due to EPA's disagreement with the planned IRA to include a cap, and due to the Army's agreement with Land Use Controls for munitions sites, the FS will be finalized and a ROD signed for the final remediation. It is assumed that the final remediation will be accomplished with funding provided in prior years. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 5, 23 November 2011, Enclosure 5, was terminated for convenience. Funding remains for the final remediation. This included the contract cost for the cap alternative. It was

assumed the first 5 year review will occur in 2021, this may need to be in 2026 given ROD signature and completion of remediation in 2019. The Owner Support for RA is S&A for the remedial action, which was postponed due to the ROD. This cost is shown in FY19.

1. Site History: The Army destroyed ammunition by detonation and open burning at this site, which was in operation from 1948 through 1998. The OB ground consists of elevated burning trays. The site is in the northwest portion of the installation and covers 364 acres. The investigation of this site revealed contamination consisting of ordnance and explosives (OE) and heavy metals. This is a RCRA interim permitted site. This site also encompasses SEAD-023 (not listed in HQAES), OB Grounds, where a CERCLA remediation was completed in 2003.

2. Current Site Status:

- a. The cleanup strategy includes the ongoing removal of all munitions potentially posing an explosive hazard from the outer perimeter of the site at approximately 2500 feet, inwardly to the proposed 8 acre landfill cap. The work from 2500 feet to 1000 feet is underway through a Removal Action. The preferred FS Alternative has been to consolidate all soil that contains hazardous toxic or radiological waste (HTRW) contamination will be placed under the cap. The cap will comply with State Regulatory standards. Soil under the cap will not have ordnance removed prior to the capping.
- b. Groundwater will require annual testing until results demonstrate cleanup criteria.
- c. EPA raised numerous concerns on materials potentially presenting an explosive hazard (MPPEH) and disagrees with the cap alternative. A large amount of the <1000 feet radius was geophysically mapped and MPPEH removed. EPA has disagreed with the cap only alternative and has taken the position of removal of one foot and geophysics to three feet below this point on the entire site similar to the Umatilla site (\$47M). The Army position is surface sweep is adequate for this site for the known future use of restricted access conservation. Higher level discussions are occurring and other alternatives are being considered. To address EPA's concerns, final remediation alternatives are to be evaluated using MMR LUCs, the Open Burning Grounds ROD as a precedent for HTRW soils (only), cap with slurry wall, mechanical separation, and soil stabilization.

3. Exit Strategy:

LTM includes Cap Maintenance, GW monitoring, LUCs, Five-Year reviews, and site closeout effort. MMR LUCs will be critical to final agreement on remediation.

For cost estimating purposes, the LTM duration as indicated in the phase schedule extends only to the end of the second five-year review; however, LTM is anticipated to continue in perpetuity.

4. Enclosures:

1. Draft Final Feasibility Study Report for Open Detonation Grounds Munitions Response Action, Parsons, April 2013

- 2. Final Record of Decision Former Open Burning Grounds Site, January 1999
- 3. Final Long Term Monitoring Plan for Open Burning Grounds, January 2007
- 4. Performance Work Statement for Contract W912DY-10-D-0014, DO 0005, 23 November 2011
- 5. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014, Delivery Order 0005, DTD 23 November 2011
- Final 2011 Long Term Monitoring Annual Report for the Open Burning Grounds, May 2013; Contract W912DS-09-D-0062 TO 0023, 30 March 2016; Escalation Rates.
- 7. Estimator's Experience Sheet, Environmental Liabilities training
- 8. Estimate Summary Table
- 9. Engineering Estimate for Site Closeout and Well Abandonment

5. Engineering Estimate Assumptions:

Site Closeout Documentation (LTM):

- 1. Site Closeout is moderate complexity
- 2. Kick-off, review and regulatory meetings
- 3. Work Plans and reports all default values
- 4. Documents will be stored for 30 years

The cost estimate for site closeout documentation is out of date, the cost to complete is to be determined.

Well abandonment (LTM):

- 1. Number of wells: 12
- 2. Well depth: 15 feet
- 3. Well diameter: 2 inches
- 4. Formation type: Unconsolidated
- 5. Method: Overdrill/excavation

The cost estimate for well abandonment is out of date, the cost to complete is to be determined.

Five year MPPEH & CERCLA review

- 1. Review cycles (SEAD 006-R-01 and SEAD 23 combined)
- 2. Five year review cycle starts 2016 for SEAD 23
- 3. Five year review cycle starts 2021 for SEAD 006-R-01 and SEAD 23 combined
- 4. Site is moderate complexity
- 5. Reports, reviews, interviews and site inspections include all default parameters
- 6. MEC review included

7. Cost Summary SEAD-006-R-01 (SEAD-115/45)

Remedial Action (Operations) (RA(O)):

Long Term Monitoring Plan preparation (enclosure 5); FY12 \$23,333.12 escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 =	\$25,426.10
Install 6 and Monitor 12 GW wells quarterly 1 st year, 2016 (source 5); FY12 \$160,509.05 escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 =	\$174,906.71
For years 2017-2045, Monitor 12 GW wells, semiannually x 29 years (source 5); FY12 \$49,663.35 x 29 years x escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 =	\$1,569,426.42
Owner Support for RA (Source 4) 11% of total LTM Cost \$184.50 x 851 Hours =	\$157,009.50
Subtotal RA(O) = or \$1,927K	\$1,926,768.74
Long Term Monitoring (LTM):	
Six five-year reviews for SEAD-23 and SEAD-006-R-01 (W912DY-09-D-0023, 30 March 2016) 27,488.41 x 1.0338 (escalate to FY17) = \$28,417.52 x 6 events =	\$170,505.11
Well abandonment and site closeout (no current estimate)	TBD
Owner Support for GW Monitoring (Source 4) 11% of total LTM Cost \$184.50 x 980 Hours =	\$180,810.00
Subtotal LTM: or \$351K	\$351,315.11
Total Cost or \$2,278K	\$2,278,083.84

Material Change: The CTC for FY16 was \$2,093K the CTC for FY17 is \$2,278K. The calculated percentage change was 5.3%. No material change.

Material Change = absolute value of (indexed prior year CTC – current CTC – current obligations)/indexed prior year CTC

MC = ((2,093 * 1.0338) - 2,278 - 0) / (2,093 * 1.0338) = 5.3%

Prepared by: Randall Battaglia	BATTAGLIA.RANDALL.W.122881 6724	Digitally signed by BATTAGLIA.RANDALL.W.1228816724 DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=USA, cn=8ATTAGLIA.RANDALL.W.1228816724 Date: 2017.09.27 16:42:48 -04'00'
Cost Estimator	Signature	Date

Reviewed by: Peter F. Tuebner _ Cost Estimate Reviewer

Signature

Date
ENCLOSURE 1

DRAFT FINAL

FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT

for

OPEN DETONATION GROUNDS MUNITIONS RESPONSE ACTION

SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY ROMULUS, SENECA COUNTY, NEW YORK

Prepared for:

U.S. Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville -



and SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY ROMULUS, NEW YORK

Prepared by:

PARSONS 100 High Street Boston, MA 02110

Contract Number W912DY-08-D-0003 Task Order No. 0013 EPA Site ID# NY0213820830 NY Site ID# 8-50-006

APRIL 2013

ENCL1

3.0 DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section summarizes the remedial action alternatives that were developed from the technologies screened in Section 2.0. Prior to the development of alternatives, an evaluation of general response actions and a technology screening was performed for inclusion into proposed remedial action alternatives for the OD Grounds. Technologies were combined into alternatives considering potential waste-limiting and site-limiting factors unique to the OD Grounds and the level of technical development for each technology. This information was used to differentiate alternatives with respect to effectiveness and implementability. This FS focuses on identifying and evaluating alternatives for the OD Grounds.

3.2 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

The following remedial action alternatives were developed for the OD Grounds:

- Alternative 1: NFA
- Alternative 2: Geophysical mapping, intrusive investigation, capping, LUCs; and
- Alternative 3: Geophysical mapping, intrusive investigation, excavation, off-site disposal, and LUCs.

Technologies and processes associated with these actions were assembled into remedial action alternatives.

3.2.1 Alternative 1, No-Further Action

Alternative 1 is the no further action alternative. CERCLA and NYSDEC guidance for conducting feasibility studies recommends that the no-action alternative be considered against all other alternatives.

The no further action alternative would leave the OD Grounds undisturbed with the continuation of existing site security measures, such as locked gates, to prevent civilian access and direct contact with contaminated soil and possible exposure to potential MPPEH.

3.2.2 Alternative 2, Geophysical Mapping/Intrusive Investigation/Capping/LUCs

This alternative would complete the MPPEH clearance in areas that were not previously cleared by previous investigations. In the open and accessible areas, previously identified anomalies will be reacquired and removed. In areas that are wooded or inaccessible and were not previously cleared, mag and dig operations will be completed using a handheld magnetometer, such as a Schonstedt. In accessible areas that were not previously mapped (0 - 1,000 foot radius), DGM surveys will be conducted using EM61s over approximately 60 acres in the area surrounding the OD Hill. The newly mapped areas will be designated in two different categories:

- 1. metals saturated areas where the high density prohibits individual anomalies from being identified and manually removed (0 - 500 foot radius)
- 2. lower metals density areas where individual anomalies can be identified and manually removed (500 - 1,000 foot radius)





Page 3-1

REMED

It is anticipated that metallic saturation (or a high density of potential MPPEH) will be encountered in areas located closer to the OD Hill (0 – 500 foot radius). At locations where the DGM survey indicates that there is metallic saturation, the top 6 inches of soil will be excavated. The soil will be screened to remove potential MPPEH, and the overburden will be staged on-site for potential reuse and/or incorporation into the site cap. The excavated area will then be resurveyed and the results of the DGM survey indicate that areas are still saturated with metal an additional 6 inches of soil may be excavated, screened, and staged, as previously described, followed by a subsequent DGM survey of that area.

For the lower density metals areas, the anomalies on the generated dig list from the DGM surveys will be reacquired and intrusively investigated by a geophysicist and UXO dig team, in the same manner as the intrusive investigation in the Kickout area. A two-person UXO technician/ demolition team will perform any required MPPEH demolition procedures. The demolition team will dispose of any MPPEH suspected of containing explosives/spotting charges or inaccessible voids by detonation. All MD will be certified and disposed of as MDAS in accordance with current regulations.

The excavated soil that passed through the screen will be placed on the OD Hill and the resulting surface will be compacted and graded. An engineered cap, covering approximately 10 acres in aerial extent and approximately 75,000 cy (+/- 35%) of material, will be installed over the OD Hill and the surrounding area. The cap will comply with NYS Part 360 requirements. A geomembrane layer will be selected, and the total thickness of the cap will be at least 18 inches. Any identified soil with contaminant levels exceeding the selected soil cleanup goals would be incorporated under the cap. A design work plan will be prepared and the exact limits of the cap will be determined during the design phase of the project.

LTM would include maintenance of the cap and LUC inspections. Potential LTM of site groundwater conditions may be appropriate subsequent to the remedial alternative selected in this FS.

- LUCs will be placed on the site to prohibit the use of groundwater, prohibit digging, and prevent the use of the site for use as a daycare or a residential facility.

Implementation of this alternative would be highly effective in achieving the RAOs, long-term effectiveness, preventing exposure, and implementability. The costs for this alternative are moderate.

3.2.3 Alternative 3, Geophysical Mapping/Intrusive Investigation/Excavation/Off-Site Disposal/LUCs

Alternative 3 is similar to Alternative 2, but this alternative would involve the excavation and off-site disposal of all soil containing MPPEH or contaminant concentrations that exceed cleanup goals in lieu of capping these soils. Similar to Alternative 2, reacquisition would be completed in the Kickout area. In areas outside of the OD Hill that are wooded or inaccessible and were not previously surveyed, mag and dig operations will be completed using a handheld magnetometer, such as a Schonstedt. In accessible areas that were not previously mapped (0 - 1,000 foot radius), DGM surveys will be conducted using EM61s over approximately 60 acres in the area surrounding the OD Hill. At locations where the DGM survey indicates that there is metallic saturation, the top 6 inches of soil will be excavated (estimate

Page 3-2

:..

. .

. 0

177

<u>کې</u>

ΞĒ

. ...

111

Sec. ...

Draft Final Feasibility Study Report OD Grounds

Alternative 1 must be ruled out because it is ineffective in long-term permanence and does not achieve the RAOs. Overall, Alternatives 2 and 3 have similar levels of protectiveness, permanence, long-term effectiveness, and short-term effectiveness. They will both limit exposure to potential MPPEH or contaminated soil. Alternative 3 ranks slightly higher for reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume due to the volume reduction of off-site disposal. Alternative 2 rates more favorably for implementability. Alternative 2 ranks better in terms of cost.

4.5 RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE

Based on a comparison of the criteria, the most effective remedy for the OD Grounds is Alternative 2, DGM Mapping, intrusive investigation, cap, and LUCs. Alternative 2 limits human exposure to potential MPPEH or soil contamination, is implementable using known techniques, and is cost effective. The capital cost for the alternative is \$8.0M. The TPV is \$8.9M. The total costs include \$31,500 per year for LUC inspections and cap maintenance, plus \$40,300 per five-year review over the 30 year period.

e (ommenoto)

Page 4-11

FINAL RECORD OF DECISION (ROD) FORMER OPEN BURNEYG (OB) GROUNDS SITE SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY (SEDA) ROMULUS, NY

Prepared For: United States Army Corps of Engineers

Prepared By:

Parsons Engineering Science, Inc. 30 Dan Road Canton, MA 02021-2809 January 1999 CONTRACT NO. DACA87-92-D-0022

Delivery Order 001

FNCL 2

7/1

ing. The second

Yrea

The selected remedy outlined in this ROD addresses potential exposure to elevated le metals, such as lead, in the on-site soils and sediment in Reeder Creek. The following de: the significant aspects of the remedy:

- The OB Grounds was used for surface burning of explosive trash and propellants, concern for OE below the surface, at depth, at this site is small. Although OE is not exp to be found at depth at this site, through a combination geophysics, excavation, si removal and soil cover, the Army will nevertheless remediate OE to meet the Departmeet Defense Explosive Safety Board (DDESB) requirements for unrestricted use or put place land use restrictions as may be required by the DDESB.
- Excavation of soils with lead concentrations above 500 mg/kg and sediments from Re Creek with concentrations of copper and lead above the NYSDEC criteria of the 16 m and 31 mg/kg, respectively.
- Treatment of soils exceeding the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TC estimated to be approximately 3,800 CY of the excavated soil, via solidification/stabiliza will be performed to remove the RCRA characteristic of toxicity. This will allow the so. be landfilled, in accordance with the requirements of the Land Disposal Restrictions (LI of RCRA.
- Disposal of the excavated and solidified soil in an off-site Subtitle D landfill. The to quantity of soil to be disposed of is estimated to be 17,900 CY, including the 3,800 CY solidified soil.
- Construction of a soil cover of at least 9 inches of compacted soils in the areas of the (Grounds with soils remaining on the site with lead concentrations above 60 ppm. The area be covered is estimated to be approximately 27.5 acres, which encompasses most of the ar of the OB Grounds. The PRAP incorrectly identified the area to be covered as 43.8 acre The cap will be vegetated with indigenous grasses to prevent erosion and to prevent dire contact and incidental soil ingestion by terrestrial wildlife. The monitoring program w ensure that the 9-inch soil/vegetative cover is maintained after the remedy is complete.
- Control of surface water runoff, as necessary, to prevent crossion of the vegetative cover an solids loading to the creek. This will be accomplished with vegetation, regrading of single topography and drainage swales
- Conducting a monitoring program for site groundwater and sediment in Reeder Creek. This program will monitor metals. For groundwater, the level of detection will be to below 15 ug/L, the federal action level for lead in groundwater. For sediment, the detection limit for lead will be to 10 mg/kg. Should a significant exceedance be noted, the exceedance will be

E:VASeneca/Projects/OB Grounds RDRA RJ4/OB ROD/FINAL OB ROD Text.DOC

Page J-

January 1999

Lauwa@HG}

Governö (au) (Rombne deu) a

enpaddingsi (1). Ensone apport wordlag situ wordlag situ wordlag gatere

te Ston Kon Sone Yeme Sone (2015) Stables Schekel

nie (Meender) Nesonievo -

e of int (40) is continent is continent is continent is 18.187 morenti (firm is preprint is contine is con

ingerich Anterennes setze

na seibe

January 1999

will be implemented to eliminate the threat posed by the exceedance. For groundwater action may include metals removal via filtering. A similar process will apply for a sed. exceedance observed in Reeder Creek. First, the source of the exceedance will be ider and confirmed. If the exceedance is determined to originate from the OB Grounds site, maintenance of or improvements to the existing erosion control systems will be institute reduce the threat due to erosion of on-site soils to the Creek. This may include revegata or the construction of drainage control swales or structures.

STATE CONCURRENCE

NYSDEC has concurred with the selected remedy. Appendix B of this Record of Dec contains a copy of the Declaration of Concurrence.

DECLARATION

The selected remedy is consistent with CERCLA and to the extent practicable the NCF protective of human health and the environment, complies with federal and state requirement that are legally applicable or relevant and appropriate to the remedial action, and is ceffective. The remedy uses a permanent solution for soil contamination. This remedy will result in hazardous substances, above cleanup goals, remaining at SEDA. Because the alternatives would result in hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants remaining orrelated agency review the remedial action no less than every five years after its initiation, justified by the review, remedial actions may be implemented to remove or treat the wastes.

ENASeneca Projects OB Grounds RDRA ROHOB RODVEINAL OB ROD TexLDO:

Page J.

Section C - Descriptions and Specifications

Performance Work Statement Remedial Action Seneca Army Depot Activity (SEDA) Open Detonation Ground Romulus, New York 22 Noy 2011

Project Site

1.0 OBJECTIVE: The objective of this task order is to design and complete the installation of a NYS Part 360 landfill cap to inter hazardous soils at the Seneca Army Depot Activity (SEDA) in Romulus, New York.
Additionally, the Contractor shall perform other activities in support of the landfill construction to include additional investigation and Long Term Monitoring at the site. All activities shall be performed in compliance with CERCLA and Department of Defense, Army, and USACE Regulations and Guidance to include Interim Guidance and Data Item Descriptions (DID's). The subject site is considered a Munitions Response (MRS) and Hazardous, Lowie and Radiological Waste (HTRW) site.

This task order shall be conducted pursuant to Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), and National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan (NCP) requirements, with regulatory coordination, as apprepriate, of the New York Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Region II.

2.0 BACKGROUND

1.1645

2.1 Work under this Performance Work Statement (PWS) falls within the Military Munitions Response Program (MIMRP) for the Open Burn/Open Detonation Ground Area of Concern (AOC) at Seneca Army Depot located in Seneca County, NY. The AOC consists of 365 acres and was used to perform open detonation and open burning of muchicus.

Of particular concern for this effort is an area of approximately 18 acres with potential ancillary needs over a wider area than the actual landfill cap construction. The contractor will complete all actions necessary to meet CERCLA requirements and achieve acceptance of the required designs and construction so the parcel can be closed out.

This requirement involves a legacy BRAC-funded, Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) site (Munitions Response Site or MRS). The Department of Defense (DoD) established the MMRP under the Defense Eavironmental Restoration Program (DERP) to address unexploded ordnance (UXO), discarded military munitions (DMM), and munitions constituents (MC) located on current and former military installations. The Contractor shall perform all work in compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the National Contingency Plan (NCP), 40 CFR Part 300. Any activities involving work in areas potentially containing explosive hazards shall be conducted in full compliance with United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Department of the Army (DA), and Department of Defense (DOD) regulations.

3.4 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:

5.0.1 Contractor Methods: This is a performance based task order. The performance objectives and standards included herein are the basis of the task order requirements. The technical approach and level of effort expended to behave task order objectives and standards are solely up to the contractor to select and adjust as necessary through the life of the task order. Government recognizes the contractor's right to change the technical approach and level of effort expended to at effort from that proposed with the understanding that the contractor shall still meet all project objectives and gain government Quality Assurance acceptance in order to receive payment. Given the short time available during the pre-award phase to evaluate the site it is possible that after award and refinement of the conceptual site model and data needs that the contractor will wish to adjust the investigation strategy. If before the field work begins, an adjustment in the quantities or types of field investigations are required to achieve the performance standard or the Government determines that the performance standard must be adjusted the Government at its discretion may choose to modify the contract with the price adjustment based upon the protect unit prices proposed in the average proposal. Once these adjustments are complete the contractor shall be obligated to deliver the required

ENCL 4

West specific Incentives/Disincentives: Satisfactory or greater CPARS rating/poor CPARS rating and/or reperformance of work at contractor's expense.

Specific Task Requirements:

- All UXO, DMM and MC encountered during this effort shall be processed in accordance with the approved work and safety plans.

- Hazardous, Toxic and Radiological Waste (HTRW) Disposal: The Contractor shall collect, secure, store,

and arrange for disposal of any HTRW generated as a result of field activities. The HW containers shall be staged, sourced, labeled, sampled and analyzed (if required) IAW the approved work plan. The Contractor shall recommend appropriate disposal actions for all waste items. The Contractor shall perform the HW disposal in a timely manner.

3.6 Task 6, Preparation of A Long Term Monitoring Plan. This is a Firm Fixed Price task.

Objective: The Contractor shall prepare, submit and gain acceptance of a Long Term Monitoring (LTM) Plan for the monitoring of groundwater and the management of the installed cap. Groundwater monitoring shall be based upon the six existing wells and the installation of another six wells. The Contractor shall assume an average depth of 15 feet per well.

Performance Standard: Prepare the plan in accordance with DID WERS-001 and EM 1110-1-4009, EM 385-1-1 and EM 385-1-97. Prepare the sampling and analysis plan, field sampling, and UFP-QAPP in accordance with EM 1110-1-4009, DID WERS-009.01, and UFP-QAPP, as appropriate. UFP-QAPP content shall also meet the requirements of DoD Quality Systems Manual for Environmental Laboratories (current version). Draft QASP includes requirements in regulations, guidance, DIDs and the Quality Control Plan in the WP.

AU: Acceptance of LTM Plan and UFP-QAPP with two revisions. Draft QASP reflects requirements and QCP with one revision required.

Measurement / Monitoring: Review of LTM Plan, UFP-QAPP and QASP per guidance to verify that the minimum acceptable content has been provided and acceptance by the project team and regulatory agencies.

Task specific Incentives/Disincentives: Satisfactory or greater CPARS rating/poor CPARS rating and/or reperformance of work at contractor's expense.

Specific Task Requirements: The sampling and analysis plan (SAP) shall include the Contractor's phased eporouch and address contaminants of interest and sample media (soil/groundwater/sediment/surface water). The Contractor shall provide a discussion on data evaluation.

3.7 Task 7, Performance of Long Term Monitoring. This is a Firm Fixed Price task.

Objective: Following regulatory approval of the Long Term Monitoring Plan prepared under Task 6, the contractor shall implement the LTM plan and perform monitoring of the ground water and management of the installed cap. The Contractor shall provide all the labor, material and equipment required to install ground water monitoring wells required in the approved plan. As part of this task, the contractor shall perform one year of Long Term Monitoring on a quarterly basis. The effort will also include submission and approval of Long Term Nonitoring reports presenting a description of the effort performed, the results achieved and recommendations for the next period of monitoring.

SOW

Forfarmance Standard: Field work, data quantity and quality, and analysis of said data provides the results required to meet approved plans and be acceptable to the regulators.

- Demonstrate that the work was performed in accordance with the applicable laws, regulations, and guidance

documents;

1.TM

- Perform the field sampling activities in accordance with the accepted Work Plans (prepared previously)/

Plan.

- Proper processing and disposition of any UXO, DMM and MC encountered in accordance with approved Work

Plan(s).

- Any Material Potentially Presenting an Explosive Hazard (MPPEH) and munitions debris processed in accordance with Chapter 14, EM 1110-1-4009 and Errata Sheet No. 2.

- Meet the project DQOs.

Definition of the state of the

Measurement / Monitoring: Period inspection/review of field work. Verify compliance with accepted LTM Plan and other Plans as required. Quality control tests/documentation submitted per the QASP for government review. Boundary precision will be determined by evaluation of the sampling footprint as it relates to the reported contaminated areas in question.

Each specific Incentives/Disincentives: Satisfactory or greater CPARS rating/poor CPARS rating and/or repartisionance of work at contractor's expense.

Specific Task Requirements:

Any UXO, DMM and MC encountered during this effort shall be processed in accordance with the approved work and safety plans.

- Hazardous, Toxic and Radiological Waste (HTRW) Disposal: The Contractor shall collect, secure, store,

and arrange for disposal of any HTRW generated as a result of field activities. The HW containers shall be staged, secured, labeled, sampled and analyzed (if required) IAW the approved work plan. The Contractor shall recommend appropriate disposal actions for all waste items. The Contractor shall perform the HW disposal in a timely manner.

3.8 <u>Task 8, Performance of Additional Long Term Monitoring (Optional)</u>. These are Firm Fixed Price tasks. Objective: If awarded, the Contractor shall provide additional LTM for the site and perform monitoring of the ground water and management of the installed cap. As part of this task, the contractor shall perform Long Term A connoring on the basis requested as part of the individual options. The effort will also include submission and approval of Long Term Monitoring reports presenting a description of the effort performed, the results achieved and recommendations for the next period of monitoring.

MONT

Performance Standard: Field work, data quantity and quality, and analysis of said data provides the results required to meet approved plans and be acceptable to the regulators.

- Demonstrate that the work was performed in accordance with the applicable laws, regulations, and guidance

documents:

- Perform the field sampling activities in accordance with the accepted Work Plans (prepared previously)/

Pian

- Proper processing and disposition of any UXO, DMM and MC encountered in accordance with approved Work

Pinn(s).

- Any Material Potentially Presenting an Explosive Hazard (MPPEH) and munitions debris processed in accordance with Chapter 14, EM 1110-1-4009 and Errata Sheet No. 2.

Meet the project DQOs.

ACC Conduct the field activities in accordance with the accepted/approved LTM Plan. QC data submitted meets (1) Al Plan requirements. No more than 3 CARs for non-critical violations and/or 1 CAR for critical violations. No timesolved Corrective Action Requests. All final data and QC tests/documentation submitted. Government QA acceptance QC tests/documentation gained. No Class "A" Safety, contractor at fault, violations during execution of work, ~1 non-explosive related Class D, accidents, or <2 non-explosive Class C accidents IAW AR 385-40. Major safety violations, 1 non-explosive related safety violation. Minor safety violations, 2 safety violations. Zero letters of reprimand, grievances, or formal complaints.

infeasurement / Monitoring: Period inspection/review of field work. Verify compliance with accepted LTM Plan and other Plans as required. Quality control tests/documentation submitted per the QASP for government review. Boundary precision will be determined by evaluation of the sampling footprint as it relates to the reported contaminated/ uncontaminated areas in question.

Task specific Incentives/Disincentives: Satisfactory or greater CPARS rating/poor CPARS rating and/or reperformance of work at contractor's expense.

Specific Task Requirements:

• • • •

- Any UXO, DMM and MC encountered during this effort shall be processed in accordance with the approved work and safety plans.

- Hazardous, Toxic and Radiological Waste (HTRW) Disposal: The Contractor shall collect, secure, store,

and arrange for disposal of any HTRW generated as a result of field activities. The HW containers shall be staged, secured, labeled, sampled and analyzed (if required) IAW the approved work plan. The Contractor shall recommend appropriate disposal actions for all waste items. The Contractor shall perform the HW disposal in a timely manner.

2.8.1 <u>Task 8.1.</u> Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring (Optional). If awarded, the Confractor shall provide LTM for an additional (2nd overall) year on a quarterly basis.

3.8.2 <u>Task 8.2</u>, <u>Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring (Optional)</u>. If awarded, the Contractor shall provide LTM for an additional (3rd overall) year on a quarterly basis.

3.3.3 <u>Task 8.3</u>, <u>Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring (Optional)</u>. If awarded, the Contractor shall provide LTM for an additional (4th overall) year on a semi-annual basis.

Montori onu

3.9 Task 9, Performance of the Five Year Review (Optional). This is a Firm Fixed Price task.

Objective:

1. 1. 1.

- If awarded, the Contractor shall provide an additional (5th overall) year of LTM for the site and perform

monitoring of the ground water and management of the installed cap on a semi-annual basis.

- If awarded, the Contractor shall perform the regulatory-required Five Year Review. This review shall include presentation and analysis of the five years of annual monitoring and maintenance activities and will include accellings, presentations, report preparation/ revision/ response to comments and recommendations for the future of the site.

- The Contractor shall prepare, submit and gain acceptance of the Five Year Review report which shall certify

that all items identified in the Work Plans and the LTM Plan have been completed.

Performance Standard:

- Field work, data quantity and quality, and analysis of said data provides the results required to meet approved plans and be acceptable to the regulators.

- Demonstrate that the work was performed in accordance with the applicable laws, regulations, and guidance

discuments;

Perform the field sampling activities in accordance with the accepted Work Plans (prepared previously)/

1.TM Plan.

Proper processing and disposition of any UXO, DMM and MC encountered in accordance with approved

Work Plan(s).

- Any Material Potentially Presenting an Explosive Hazard (MPPEH) and munitions debris processed in accordance with Chapter 14, EM 1110-1-4009 and Errata Sheet No. 2.

Meet the project DQOs.

- Prepare report documents in accordance with the DIDS, the WP/LTM Plan and all applicable Federal, State and local regulations.

AC

- Conduct the field activities in accordance with the accepted/approved LTM Plan. QC data submitted meets

1. Th Plan requirements. No more than 3 CARs for non-critical violations and/or 1 CAR for critical violations. No inpresolved Corrective Action Requests. All final data and QC tests/documentation submitted. Government QA acceptance QC tests/documentation gained. No Class "A" Safety, contractor at fault, violations during execution of with 1 non-explosive related Class D, accidents, or <2 non-explosive Class C accidents IAW AR 385-40. Major with a transitions, 1 non-explosive related safety violation. Minor safety violations, 2 safety violations. Zero letters of exprimand, grievances, or formal complaints.

Acceptance of all report documents (with two revisions) by the Project Team and regulators,

Measurement / Monitoring:

Period inspection/review of field work. Verify compliance with accepted LTM Plan and other Plans as required. Quality control tests/documentation submitted per the QASP for government review. Boundary precision will be determined by evaluation of the sampling footprint as it relates to the reported contaminated/

- Review of reports per guidance to verify that the minimum acceptable content has been provided.

Task specific Incentives/Disincentives: Satisfactory or greater CPARS rating/poor CPARS rating and/or reperformance of work at contractor's expense.

Specific Task Requirements:

- Any UXO, DMM and MC encountered during this effort shall be processed in accordance with the approved work and safety plans.

- Ilazardous, Toxic and Radiological Waste (HTRW) Disposal: The Contractor shall collect, secure, store.

and arrange for disposal of any HTRW generated as a result of field activities. The HW containers shall be staged, secured, labeled, sampled and analyzed (if required) IAW the approved work plan. The Contractor shall recommend appropriate disposal actions for all waste items. The Contractor shall perform the HW disposal in a timely manner.

3.60 (<u>fask 10) Project Management</u>. The Contractor shall manage the task order in accordance with the basic contract statement of work. All project management associated with the task order, with the exception of the direct technical oversight of the work described in the preceding tasks, shall be accounted for in this task.

A. SUBMITTALS.

Even though draft and draft final submittals are requested, the term "draft" shall not reflect upon the quality of the submittal being provided by the Contractor. Submittals shall include all supporting materials including supporting dama whether electronic or hardcopy. Submittals not meeting the requirements of referenced guidance or Data Item Descriptions or missing supporting data may be rejected and revised by the contractor at the contractor's own expense.

4. i The Contractor shall deliver the specified number of copies shown in Table 4.2 of each report listed in Table 4-1 to the tollowing addresses (addresses to be verified by Contractor):

engy '		(- N)	- Ar							
.1			2 MTC	1	•					
	•	Deli	Urry	IONDER						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ORDER FOR S	UPPL	IESORS	ERVICE	ES				PAGELOF 40
	LOUTRACT/PURCH ORDER/	2. DULIVENC UNDERICA	LL NO.	3. DATE OF OR	DERICALL	KEQJPU	RCH. REQUE	ST NO.		LIORITY
\mathcal{C}		0005		<i>מאאאג</i> דנירני 2011 Nov 23	נס זיי	5)R (01325	4257			
- []		DH WRIZDY	7. 10	NINISTERED	BY (If other	- than 6)	CODE			
	CENNC CI 4020 URIVERSITY SOUARE HUNTSYILLE AL 35810-1822		s	EE ITEM	6				8. L	DESTINATION
									(S	eo Schadula If o ther
	9 CONTRACTOR COI SHAW ENVIRONMENTAL & IM HAME WILLIAM WINKLER AND 312 OIREGTORS DR NOORESS KHOXYILLE TN 37025-4705	DE BX202 FRASTRUCTURE INC		FACILITY [\$202	10.DEL //17) SEE S 12.DISC Net20 02	IVER TO POD TIMMOD) C HEDUL E	2 2 2	n(c) j ,:	MAILX IF BUSIKESS IE SMALL SMALL DISAD YANTAG II WOMEN-OW NED
						13. NA	LIL INVOIC	ESTOTHE	ADDRESS	IN BLOCK
	12 SILIP TO COD US ANY ENGINEERING & SUPPORT CO NO CONTACT SPECIFIED CEHNC.CT 4820 UNIVERSITY SOUARE HUNTSVILLE AL 35816-1822	E W912DY	15. P.A. US ARI US ARI 5722 IN WILLING	YMENT WILL MY ENG & SUP MY CORPS OF I TEGRITY DRIV GTON TN 38054	L BE NIADI CENTER - FI ENGRS FINA E -SODS	BY C NANCE C NCE C TR	CODE 95414 DFFIC	5	р Го В Го В Го В Го	MARRALL CKAGESAND APERS WITH ENTIFICATION SUBBERSIN OCKSIAND 2.
	16. DELIVERY/X This delivery TYPE CALL Anti-Accepta OF FURCHASE Reference yo Promish the ACCEPTA ORDERA AND CON Jingust E ← I IAC AND CON MAME OF CONTRACTOR DITING to X is marked, supplier nutsi 17. ACCOGNTING AND APPROPRIATION	ardericall is loaved on inetho or quote dated biller ing on terms increased hi NCK. THE CONTRACT SIT NAY PREVIOUSI DIT for SET FORTO, Market Control SIGN Sign Accuptance and ret TION DAT A/LOCAL U	COLINE REF TOR HE Y HAVE AND A ATURE unn the SE-	Echi Iseniy vi in REAY ACCEP DEEN OR IS GREES TO PE M S following numb	TS THE OF NOW MOIN RFORM TH Store of copies	FER REI IFIED. SI E SANE Ann (TY)	PRESENTED UBJECT TO MUCAN PED NAME	D BY THEN ALL OF TH ALL OF TH ALL OF TH AND THT LI	UNIDERE TE TERNI AUTORNI Man E	D PURCSIASE S S DATE SIGNED (NTTHIMMOD)
	See Schadule 13. ITEM NO. 19. SCH	EDULE OF SUPPLIES S	SERVICE	55	20. QUAN ORDE	TITY RED/	21. UNIT	י זיואט .22	RICE	23. AMOUNT
					ACCEI	TED				
- 	' ul is austile secapied by the Garagement is som ausments ar Jared, indicate by X. If different, ent ausments ar Jared, indicate by X. If different, ent	SEE SCHEDULE	IN OF A	nered Nered	2 Contract		114D 44	25 26	TOTAL	15,460,010 5.4
	231. OUANTITY IN COLUMN 20 HAS DESPECTED RECEIVED	A COBPTED, AND CO CONTRACT ENCEPT	NFORM ASNO	ISTOTHE		/				
	SIGRATURE OF AUTHORIZED GO	VERNMENT REPRESEN	ינדגזיא	YE c.	DATE	עס) C	PRINTED I OVERNNIEI	NAME AND IT REPRESI	TITLE O	F AUT HORIZED E
,	MAILING ADORESS OF AUT HORI	LED GOVERNMENT RE	PRESE	NTATIVE 2	8. SHEP NO.	29	DO VQUC	HER NO. 30	ITIALS	
1	TELEPHONENUMBER S. E-MA	IL ADDRESS			PARTI. FINAL	AL 32	2. PAID BY	3)	. AMOUN DIRECT F	T VERIFIED
	D. I Certify this account is correct - D. TE . SIGNATURE AND T - TTEMMODI	and proper for paym of LE OF CERTIFYING	ent. OFFICE	R	COMPL PARTI	ETE		31	, CHECK	NUMBER
	T DECRIVED AT 38. RECEIVER	D 11 Y	ATE RE	CEIVED 4	U.TOTAL	11	S'R ACCO	נו סא דאט	2. SUR YOU	CHER NO.

ENCL 5

1				OR:	der fo	RSUPP	LIES OR	SERVIC	ES				PAGELOF 40
1. CONT A GIO, W9121	1877-50-D-00 1971-50-D-00 1971-50	11 ORDI	ER/	2. DEI. 0005	IVERY ORDE	ER/ CALL NO.	3. DATE OF C (YYYYMMM 2011 Nov	DRDER/CALL (D/) 23	4. REQ J	PURCH. REQU	ESTNO.	3,	PRIORITY'
6. ISSL	ED 65		C	DDE W	91207	7. A	DMINISTERI	ED BY (If ath	er than	<i>4)</i> COD	Е		
US ARÀ CEHNC 4820 UI HUNTS	MÝ ENGINEE SOL NIVERSITY S VILLE AL 354	ERING A SQUARE 816-1823	L SUPPORT C	CENTER			SEE (TE	M 6				. 8.	DELIVERY FOB X DEST INATION OTHER
	•												
9, CUN NAME AND ADDRE	TRACTOR SHAW EN WILLIAM 312 DIRE SS KHOXVILI	NVIRON WINKLI COTORS	(10) IMENTAL & IN ER DR 7923-4705	DE 8X2	202 RUCTURE, IN	1C	FACILIT Y	8×202	10.0 SEE 12.D Ne(3)	DELIVER TO FO YI'I'IMMADDJ SCHEDULE ISCOUNTTERI Days	В РО IN Т В' 45	Y (Dale)	MARK IF BUSINESS SMALL SMALL DISADVANTAC WOMEN-OWNE
									IJ. I See	MAIL IN YOU	CESTO T	HE ADDRES	SS IN BLOCK
14. SH11	P. T.O.		COL	DE W91	2DY	15. PA	YMENT W	ILLBEMAD	EBY	CODE 964	45		
US ARM NO COM CEHNC 4820 UN HUNTSV	AY SHOWEE HACT SPEC OT HVERSITY S VILLE AL 358	RING & IFIED QUARE 16-1822	SUPPORTC	EN TER		US AF US AF 5722 MILLIN	MY ENG & SI MY CORPS C NTEGRITY DF IGTON TH 380	UP CENTER - 1 DF ENGRS FIN RIVE DS4-500S	FINANC	E OFFIC		Р 11 В 1	MARKALL ACKAGESAND PAPERSWITH DENTIFICATION NUMBERSIN LOCKSIAND 2.
16, '	DELIVER	Y/ X	This deliver	y nider/es	ll is issued an	another Gover	nmentageney or	r in accordance w	ith and :	nibject to ternis a	nd condition	is afaboye num	nburul contract.
Т ҮРЕ ОЕ	PURCHAS	KE.	Rafarence ye	ur quote	dated								·····
			ACCEPT, ORDER A AND CON		HE CONT AY PREVIO NS SET FOR	RACTOR HI DUSLY HAV RTH, AND A	EREBY ACC E BEEN OR I GREESTO	EPTSTHEO ISNOW MOI PERFORM T	FFER F DIFIED HE SAI	REPRESENTE , SUBJECT T ME.	D BY TH O ALL OF	E NUMBER THE TERN	ED PURCHASE AS
- N A 	ME OF COI	N'T RAC arked, s	TOR upplier must	t sigu Ac	ceptance ar	SIGNAT UR	E following nu	m ber of copie	T :s:	YPED NAM	E AND TI	TLE	DATE SIONE
	ME OF COT Ids bas is m OUNTING	NTRAC arked, s AND A	TOR upplier must PPROPRIA	t sign Ac	sceptance ar PATA/LOC	SIGNATUR nd return the ALUSE	E following nu	nı ber of copie	т :s:	YPED NAM	E AND TI	T L E	DATE SIONE (YYYYMMMDD)
NA IT 11 17. ACCI See S 18. JT EA	ME OF COT Ids box is m OUNTING Schedule MINO	N'T RAC arked, s AND A	TOR upplier must PPROPRIA 19, SCH	EDULE	OF SUPPL	SIGNATUR nd return the AL USE IES/SERVIC	E following nu	nuber of copie	T ST NTITY ERED/ EPTED	21. UNIT	22. UNI	T LE T PRICE	23. AMOUNT
NA IT 11 17. ACCI See 1 18. IT EA	MEOFCOI Nisbasism OUNTING Schedule	N'T RA C arked, s AND A	TOR upplier must PPROPRIA	EDULE	OF SUP PL	SIGNATUR ad return the ALUSE IES/SERVIC	E following nu ES	nı ber of copie 20. QUA ORDI ACCE	T NTITY SRED/ SPTED	21. UNIT	22. UNI	T LE	23. AMOUNT
NA IT IT II I7. ACCI See S I8. IT EA	MIE OF COT Ids box is m DUNTING Schedule MINO	NTRAC arked, s AND A	TOR upplier must PPROPRIA (9, SCH	EDULE	OF SUP PL E SCHED	SIGNATUR ad return the ALUSE IES/SERVIC DULE STATES OF 2	E following nu ES	20. QUA1 ORDE ACCE	T NT IT Y ERED/ EPTED	21. UNIT	22. UNI	T LE T PRICE	23. AM OUNT
N ∧ If 11 If 11 If 1	ME OF COI his box is m OUNTING Schedule MINO.	NTRAC arked, s ANDA the Gove te by X. (TOR upplier must PPROPRIA (9, SCH (9, SCH) comment is sam fullforent, cur	E Sign A of TION D EDULE SE Crass Cracture	E SCHED	SIGNATUR Id return the ALUSE IES/SERVIC	E following nu ES	niber of copie	T SS: NT IT Y ERED/ EPTED	21. UNIT	22. UNI	T LE	23. AM OUNT
• Jf 11 17, ACC: See 1 18, JT EX • Jf quarter quantity a: quantity a: quantity a: quantity a: quantity a: quantity a: quantity a: 18, ST	MIE OF COI his box is m OUNTING Schedule MINO.	Ihe Gove in the G	TOR upplier must PPROPRIA 19, SCH urnment in sum ardered and e. MN 20 HA EIVED	EDULE EDULE SE SE SEEN SREEN ACCE CONT	E SCHED PL PL PL PL PL PL PL PL PL PL PL PL PL	SIGNATUR Id return the ALUSE IES/ SER VIC ULE STATES OF 7 D CONFORM	E following nu EES WERLON WERLON	niber of copie	T NT IT Y SRED/ SP TED	21. UNIT	22. UNI'	T LE T PRICE 25. TOTAL 26. DIFFERENCE	DATE SIGNE (17777888000) 23. AMOUNT 25,460,010.54 ES
NA 11 11 17, ACC: See 1 18, JTEA * Ifquo	MIE OF COI Ids box is m DUNT ING Schedule MINO Schedule Schedu	Ine Gove ine Gove ie by X. (gnun(i)y COLU REC AUT HO	TOR supplier must PPROPRIA 19, SCH semment is sam if different, our ardered and o MN 20 HA EIVED ORIZED GO	EDULE EDULE SE or metad active SHEEN ACCE CONT VERNM	ESCHED OF SUPPL ESCHED PL: PTEL: PTED: PTED: AN RACT EXC IENT REPF	SIGNATUR Id return the ALUSE IES/SERVIC ULE STATES OF 7 D CONFORM CEPTAS NO RESENTATI	E following nu EES WERICA MSTOTHE TED VE	альег о f соріе 20. QUA О RD А ССЕ Сомтгас с. DATE (тугуммм	T SST SRED/ SPTED TING /	21. UNIT	22. UNI ICER NAME A NT REPR 3	T LE T PRICE <u>25. TOTAL</u> 26. DIFFERENCE ND TITLE (ESENTATI)	DATE SIGNE (TYYTMMMDD) 23. AMOUNT 23. AMOUNT 55,460,010.54 ES OF AUT HORIZED VE
NA 11 11 17, ACC See (18, ITEN 4 If quarter quantum quantum 27a, Q1 18, SIGN A 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 7 8 6 7 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	ME OF COI Ids box is m DUNTING Schedule MINO. Schedule MINO. Schedule	Inte Government	TOR supplier must PPROPRIA 19, SCH semment in sam If different, entr ardered and e. MN 20 HA EIVED CRIZED GO AUT HORIZ	EDULE EDULE SE SE SE SEEN SREEN ACCE CONT VERNM	E SCHED OF SUP PL E SCHED 24. URITED TEL: ENDIL: EN	SIGNATUR Id return the ALUSE IES/SERVIC DULE STATES OF 7 D CONFOR RESENTATI T REPRESE	E following nu EES WERLOA MSTOTHE ITED IVE	альег о f соріє 20. QUA О RDF АССЕ сомтяас с. DATE (ТУГУМММ 28. SHIP NC	TING /	21. UNIT	22. UNI 22. UNI ICER NAME A NT REPR 3 CHER NO.	T LE T PRICE 25. TOTAL 26. DIFFERENCE ESENTATIV 30. INITIALS	DATE SIGNE (TYYTMMMDD) 23. AMOUNT 23. AMOUNT 55,460,010,54 ES OF AUT HORIZED VE
NA 117, ACC: See : 18, JTEA 4 [[quare- quantus a: quantus a:	MIE OF COI MIS DOX IS M DUNT ING Schedule MINO Schedule Schedule MINO Schedule	Ine Gove AND A Ine Gove Ine South International Internatio	TOR supplier must PPROPRIA 19, SCH 19, SCH different, enu- ardered and end MN 20 HA EIVED ORIZED GO AUT HORIZ g. E-MA	E SIGN AC TION D EDULE SE SEEN ACCE CONT VERNM ZED GO	PTED, AN RACT EXC	SIGNATUR Id return the ALUSE IES/SERVIC ULE STATES OF 7 D CONFOR CEPT AS NO RESENTATI	E following nu EES WERICA MSTOTHE DTED VE	CONTRAC C. DATE (YYYYMMM 28. SHIP NC PART FINAL	TING /	21. UNIT ORDERING OFF d. PRINTED GOVERNME 29. DO VOUG 32. PAID BY	22. UNI 22. UNI ICER NAME A NT REPR) CHER NO.	T LE T PRICE 2.5. TOTAL 2.6. DIFFERENCE ESENTATIV 3.0. INITIALS 3.3. AMOUI CORRECT	DATE SIGNE. (TYYTMMMDD) 23. AMOUNT 23. AMOUNT 25,460,010.54 25. 25. 25. 25. 25. 25. 25. 25. 25. 25.
N A 11 11 11 17, ACC: See: 18, ITEN 4 (fquine-in quantle at quantle at quantle at quantle at quantle at quantle at quantle at 18, SIGN A 5, SIGN A 1, SIGN A 1, SIGN A 1, TEN 1, TEN	ME OF COI hts box is m OUNTING. Schedule M NO. Schedule M NO. Schedule Schedule M NO. Schedule S	Ine Gove ine Gove ine Gove ine by X. (gnon(1)y i COLU REC AUTHO ESS OF IM BER COUNT	TOR supplier must PPROPRIA 19. SCH 19. SCH intervent is sum ordered and of MN 20 HA EIVED ORIZED GO AUT HORIZ Is correct IRE AND 71	E SIGN AG TION D EDULE SE or and or and a SREEN ACCE CONT VERNM ZED GO	VERNMEN	SIGNATUR Id return the ALUSE IES/SERVIC DULE STATES OF 7 D CONFORM CEPT AS NO RESENTATI T REPRESE ayment. ING OFFICE	E following nu TES WERLOA MSTOTHE DTED VE ER	20. QUA ORDE ACCE с. DATE (УУУУМИМ 28. SHIP NC PART FINAL 31. PAYME	TING /	21. UNIT 21. UNIT 0RDERING OFF d. PRINTED GOVERNME 29, DO VOUG 32. PAID BY	22. UNI 22. UNI ICER NAME A NT REPR 3 CHER NO.	T LE T PRICE 25, TOTAL 26, DIFFERENCE ESENTATIV 30, INITIALS 33, AMOUI CORRECT 34, CHECK	DATE SIGNE (TYYTMMMID) 23. AMOUNT 23. AMOUNT 23. 460,010,54 es OF AUT HORIZED VE
NA 11 11 11 17, ACC: See: 18, ITEN 4 If quantum and quantum and	ME OF COI Ids box is m OUNTING. Schedule M NO. Schedule M Schedule M Schedule M Schedule M NO. Schedule M NO. Sch	Ine Gove Ine Go	IT OR supplier must PPROPRIA 19. SCH 19. SCH intervent is sum of different, eur ardered and e MN 20 HA EIVED ORIZED GO AUT HORIZ g. E-MA Is correct IRE AND TH	EDULE EDULE SE or and streen STEEN ACCE CONT VERNM ZED GO	PERNMEN VERNMEN	SIGNATUR Id return the ALUSE IES/SERVIC ULE STATES OF 7 D CONFORM CEPT AS NO RESENTATI T REPRESE AYM ent. ING OFFICE	E following nu TES WERLOA MSTOTHE DTED VE ER	20. QUA ORDE ACCE CONTRAC CONTRAC C. DATE (YYYYMMM 28. SHIP NC 28. SHIP NC D PART FINAL 31. PAYME COMP PART FINAL	TING /	21. UNIT 21. UNIT ORDERING OFF d. PRINTED GOVERNME 29, DO VOUG J2. PAID BY	22. UNI 22. UNI ICER NAME A NT REPR 3 CHER NO.	T LE T PRICE 2.5. TOTAL 2.6. DIFFERENCE SOLUTION 3.0. INITIALS 3.3. AMOUN CORRECT 3.4. CHECK 3.5. BILL O	DATE SIGNE. (TYYTMMMDD) 23. AMOUNT 23. AMOUNT 23. AMOUNT 23. AMOUNT 23. AMOUNT 23. AMOUNT 25.460,010.54 ES 25.450,010.54 ES 25.550,010.54 ES 25.550,010.540,010.540 ES 25.550,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010.540,010,010,010,010,010,010,010,010,010,0

.... · ...

410	<u>}</u>				•			
i 		Section A - Solicitation/Contract Form	,					
	A WARD NARRATIVE Tisk Order 0005, which contains Firm Fixed Price (FFP) and Fixed Unit Price (FUP) tasks, is being issued to Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. for the Remedial Action at Seneca Army Depot Activity (SEDA) Open Detonation Ground in Romulus, New York in accordance with the Performance Work Statement entitled Remedial Action Seneca Army Depot Activity (SEDA) Open Detonation Ground in Romulus, New York, dated 11 August 2011.							
11 		The Period of Performance for this Task Order is 24 months from th	ie NTP or	Date of Awa	rd.			
		The terms and conditions of the basic contract, W912DY-10-D-001 or conflict.	4, takes p	recedence in t	he case of any a	mbiguity		
		US Department of Labor Wage Determination Number 2005-2381, with project task order.	Revision	11 dated June	17, 2011 shall l	be used		
•••••		The following Task Listing reflects funding allocation:	۰.					
		Seneca ADA OB/OD Grounds	Remedia					
		Task, Title, Type	Qty	Unit	Price	Funded		
		BASICTASKS						
: 		Task 4. Preparation of Work Plans and Designs (FFP)	1.0	LS	\$360,199.55	\$360,199.5		
1	:	Task 2, Field Sampling Activities (FFP/FUP).	•					
		Task 2a.1 (Formerly Task 2a.1 and 2a.3). The Contractor shall geophysically map the 500-1000 foot radius area (40.6 acres). The Contractor shall delineate all areas which exhibit metallic saturation, whereby individual anomalies 550m V are not distinguishable. The Contractor's work shall include construction support while this work is on-going.	58.6	Acres	\$3,568.98	\$209,142.44		
	-	<u>Tack 2a.2 (Formerly Task 2a.4)</u> . The Contractor shall excavate those areas exhibiting metallic saturation to a depth of 6 inches, pushing or transporting the excavated soils to within the 0-500 foot radius area and regrading these with the existing OD hill material. The regraded material shall be maintained within the 0-500 foot radius area as necessary. The Contractor's work shall include construction support while earth work is on-going. For the purposes of estimation, the Contractor shall assume that 20 acres of this overall area will exhibit saturation.	.20	Acres	\$24,336.56	\$486,731.20		
		<u>Fask 2a.3 (Formerly Task 2b.1 and 2b.2)</u> . The Contractor shall perform a surface sweep of the existing OD hill material for potential MPPEH. The Contractor shall remove all MPPEH in the regraded OD hill material. For the purposes of estimation, the Contractor shall assume that this will amount to 50 anomalies per acre or 900 anomalies.	• 900	Anomalies	\$76.60	\$68,938.31		
		Task 2a.4 (Formerly Task 2a.5). The Contractor shall geophysically re- map the portions of the 500-1000 foot radius area which were considered saturated and which were excavated to a depth of 6 inches. For the purposes of estimation, the Contractor shall assume that 20 acres of this overall area will require re-mapping. The Contractor's work shall include	20	Aures	\$911.82	\$18,236.46		
		construction support while this work is on-going.						

Seneca ADA OB/OD Ground	s Remedia	l Action		
Task, Title, Type	Qty	Unit	Price	Funded
<u>Task 3c</u> . Area of 0-1000 foot radius for the existing OD Hill. The Contractor shall mag, flag and prosecute identified targets in wooded or severely overgrown or sloped terrain in this area. For purposes of estimation, the cost for this task shall be based upon 700 anomalies per acre and an FUP cost per additional anomaly given as well	9,800	Anomalies	\$28.42	\$278,564.32
<u>Task 2a</u> . Open Burning Tray. The Contractor shall close the Open Burning Tray IAW the approved work plan	1.0	LS	\$82,556,23	\$82,556.23
Task 3. Environmental Sampling & Analysis (Optional): (FFP/FUP)	2	EA/SDG	\$57,740.48	\$115,480.96
Tust 4. Remedial Action Report (FFP)	1.0	LS	\$54,324.63	\$5,4,324.63
Task 5. Installation of an Engineered Cap (FFP)	1.0	LS	\$2,655,220.43	\$2,655,220.43
Taut o. Preparation of a Long Term Monitoring Plan	1.0	LS	\$23,333.12	\$23,333.12
Tark 7. Performance of Long Term Monitoring	1.0	LS	\$160,509.05	\$160,509.05
Tiesk 10. Project Management	1.0	LS	\$290,313.02	\$290,313.02
OPTIONAL TASKS				
Task 8. Performance of Additional Long Term Monitoring (Optional)				
<u>Tesk 8.1.</u> Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring (Optional). If awarded, the Centractor shall provide LTM for an additional (P [*] (wer.dl) year on a quarterly basis.	1.0	- LS	\$99,875.46	
Task 8.2, Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring (Optional). If awarded, the Contractor shall provide LTM for an additional (3rd overall) year on a quarterly basis.	. 1.0	LS	\$98,282.29	
Task 8.3. Performance of An Additional Year of Long Term Monitoring (Optional). If awarded, the Contractor shall provide LTM for an additional (All overall) year on a semi-annual basis.	1,0	LS	\$49,663.35	
Task 9. Performance of Five Year Review (Optional).	1.0	LS ·	\$76,255,29	
			Total Funded	\$5,460,010.54

The following Payment Milestone Schedule is acceptable for use on this project task order:

Payment Milestone Schedule					
Pinal Submittals	Upon government acceptance				
Field Work	For defined units and activities completed and QA review and acceptance				
Meetings After completion of meetings with government acceptance of meeting minutes					

 \mathbb{R}^{\times}_{+} . a is 9352 B

: [

.



MAX NET AMT \$5,460,010.54

\$5,460,010.54

ACRN AA CIN: W31RYO132548570001

Section B - Supplies or Services and Prices

	ITEM NO	SUPPLIES/SERVICES	MAX QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	• •	MAX	AMOUNT
	0002	•	2	Each	. \$0.00			\$0.00 NC
		Contractor Manpower Re	porting		40100			\$0.00 MC
1 · · N3011		FFP	. 0					
		This CLIN is used for the	pricing of the colle	ction and repo	orting of Contractor			
		Manpower Reporting data	as described in Se	ction C. Repo	rting period will be the			
	· .	period of performance not	to exceed twelve n	nonths ending	30 September of each			
	•	Government Fiscal Year a	nd must be reported	d by 31 Octob	er of each calendar			
		year.						
		FOB: Destination					· ·	
		MILSTRIP: W31RYO132	54857					
	•	PURCHASE REQUEST N	UMBER: W31RY	013254857				
				,				
	2		•			,		
					MAX			\$0.00

NET AMT

. •

.

. .

· · · ·

.

ENCLOSURE 6

FINAL

2011 LONG-TERM MONITORING ANNUAL REPORT

FOR THE OPEN BURNING GROUNDS SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY, ROMULUS, NEW YORK

Prepared for:

U.S. ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, ENGINEERING AND SUPPORT CENTER, HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA

and

SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY ROMULUS, NEW YORK

Prepared by:

PARSONS

100 High Street Boston, MA 02110

Contract Number W912DY-08-D-0003 Task Order No. 0008 EPA Site ID# NY0213820830 NY Site ID# 8-50-006

. . .

1

i.

.....

May 2013

ENCL 6

6.0 LONG-TERM MONITORING CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions can be made based on the results of the sixth round of LTM at the OB Grounds:

- Residual lead and copper concentrations remaining in the soils have not impacted groundwater at, or in the immediate vicinity of, the Site above the applicable action levels.
- The integrity of the vegetated soil cover overlying interred contaminated soils at the Site was intact and there was no evidence that terrestrial wildlife are exposed or will be exposed to the lead-contaminated soils interred below the 9-inch soil cover.
- The washout area noted during in Grid Cell L7 in (identified as L8 in 2008 Report) during the February and May 2008 inspections and in the August 2010 inspection was observed again during the 2011 soil cover inspection. As discussed in Section 4.2 the washout area is outside of the areas where contaminated soils were interred beneath clean soil; this area therefore will not be repaired by the Army at this time. If subsequent inspections suggest that this area is becoming larger, the Army will evaluate the need for a permanent repair.
- An approximately 21-ft long area of minor erosion was observed in Grid Cell K6, outside of the area where lead-contaminated soil is interred beneath clean soil. Grid Cell K6 is located adjacent to Grid Cell J6, which is part of the soil cover, and therefore the condition of this location will be reassessed during the next inspection event to determine if corrective measures are needed.
- The Army will continue to monitor soil cover erosion, and will note any instance of cover erosion or exposed native or interred soil.
- Based on evaluation of the groundwater data and the results of the cover inspection, there is no evidence to suggest that the OB Grounds may be contributing to the degradation of sediment quality in Reeder Creek.

• The Army will continue to inspect Reeder Creek for evidence of sediment deposition and if it is observed, a sediment sampling and analysis program plan will be prepared, submitted for approval, and implemented for Reeder Creek at locations adjacent to the OB Grounds.

Based on the result of the LTM events conducted at the OB Grounds, the Army recommends continuing the monitoring frequency of once per year. As presented and summarized above, available monitoring data shows no evidence of lead or copper in the groundwater above the cleanup goals subsequent to the completion of the remedial action for the Site. These findings are consistent with the groundwater analytical results obtained during the remedial investigation stage (1990s) of work at the Site, indicating that there is no evidence of groundwater quality deterioration over approximately 15 years. Further, the annual inspections of the soil cover have shown minimal evidence of erosion or animal breaching of the

	ORDER FOR S	SUPP <u>I</u>	IES OR S	ERVIC	ES			Į	AGE 1 OF	58
F. CONTRACT/PURCH, ORDER/ A GREEMENT NO. W912DY-09-D-0062.	2. DELIVERY ORDER/ C	KLĽ NO.	3. DATE OF ORD (YYYYWWUDD 2016 Mai 30	ER'CALL	4.REQ, PI	JRCH_REQUES	TNO.	ر بر ₋ ی	RIORITY	
6. ISSUED BY US ARMY ENGINEERING & SUPPOR CEHNO-CT 4820 UNIVERSITY SOUARE HUNTSVILLE AL 36816-1822	CODE W912DY I CENTER	7. A.D DIRE ATEN 256-8 HUN1	DMINIST ERED GTORATE OF OC MICHELLE BLAN 95-2531 ISVILLE AL 38810	BY ((foin) In Tractin CKMON	er thσn δj G • HNC	CODE	W 912DY	8. E	ELIVERY F X DESTIN OTHER.	OB. ATION fother)
9. CONTRACTOR PARSONS GOVERNMENT MICHELLE SMITH MID 100 W MALNUT ST ADDRESS PASADENA CA 91124-0001	CODE: 18VK6 SERVICES INC.		FACILITY		10: DE (12) SEE S 12, DIS Net 30 D	LIVER TO FOB TYMMADD). ICHEDULE COUNT TERMS	Р О І Ņ.Т В.Ұ	(D'ale)]'[.)	MARK IF BUSJ SMALL SMALL DISA D.VA WOMEN-0	NTAGE
					13. M. See It	AIL INVOICE	STOTH	E ADDRESS	IN BLOCK	
4. SHIP TO C SEE SCHEDULE SEE SCHEDULE SEE SCHEDULE SEE SCHEDULE	ODE W912DY	US AR US AR 3722 H MILLIN	LYMENT WILL MY ENG & SUP MY CORPS.OF I NTEGRITY DRIVI GTON TN 38084	BE MAD CENTER - I ENGRS FIN E	E BY FINANCE ANCE CT	CODE 96414 OFFIC R.	5	PA P ID 7 BL	MARKALI CKAGES A APERS WI ENTIFICAT NUMBERS I O CKS I AN	IND TH IO N IO 2,
16. DELIVERY X This deli	very ord mestl is issued on anoth	her Goven	nmentagency or in	accocdance-	Aith and su	ject.to-lenns and	d condition	t all the sve as the la	tred coniraci;	
OF PURCHASE Reintene	e your quate deted	herein. RE	IF:							
PORSCALL OU UN NAME OF CONTRACTOR If this box is marked, supplier m 7, ACCOUNTING AND APPROPR See Schedule	SIGI	NATUR MATUR sturn the USE	E foilowing.numb	er of copie		J TYLE	AND TH	ED, 1/ 30/16	DAYES DAYES ISYNYMM	GNED INDO)
				ORD: ACC	ERED! EPTED	21UNIT	22. יואט	PRICE	23. AMO	UNT
	SEE SCHEDUL	E DE OF	MIERICA							
lf gnantily zecepted by the Gavarumantis : iantity ordered, indicate by N. If different; iantity accepted below quantity ordered at	LINE TOLKO (ENTER TOLKO (ENTER TOLKO (ENTER)	DY.RICH	ARDJ.1090040	282 ONE ONE	oned by MULLADT. and S. Governmer UTYROLARD 100 10130 15:0953-05 CTING + 0	BOWDINGCOPIL CHARLES ALE PRODUCTION CONTRACTOR REDERING OP:FI	Cer:	25. TOTAL 26, Difference	\$637;95	183
AN QUANTITY IN COLUMN 20 F	ACCEPTED, AND CONTRACT EXCEP	ONFOR	MSTOTHE DTED							
SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED	GOVERNMENT REPRESE	ENT-AT.	JVE ¢.	DATE	d tooj (. PRINTED 30 VERNMEI	NAME A	ND TITLE (ESENTATIV	FAUTHOR E	UZED
MAILING ADDRESS OF AUTHO	RIZED GOVERNMENT R	EP RESI	NTATIVE 2	SHIP NO	D_ 2	9. DO VOUC	HER NO.	3.0. INIT IÄL S		
TELEPHONE NUMBER g. E-	MAIL ADDRESS			PART FINA	ΊΛL. ³	2PAID BY		33. AMOUN CORRECT	T VERIFIE FOR	D
Lertify this account is corre	ct and proper for paym	nent.	3 F R:	PAYME	NT			34. CHECK	NUMBER	
YYYMMMDD)	THE OF CENTIFYING			P'ART FINA	LAL.			35. BILL O	FLADING	10.
RECEIVED AT	7ED BY 39. D	ATE RI	ECEIVED 41	CONTAL	INERS	I. S/R ACCO	UNT NO	42. ŞR VO	UCHER NO.	
5 Form 1155 DEC 2001			D.D.G.WOMD F			6 m 6				

·

W912DY-09-D-0062 0023 Page 2 of 58

Section A - Solicitation/Contract Form

AWARD NARRATIVE

Task Order 0023, which contains Firm Fixed-Price (FFP) tasks, is being issued to Parsons Government Services, Inc for Remedial Action at Seneca Army Depot Activity, Romulus, NY, EPA Site ID# NY0213820830, NY Site ID# 8-50-006 in accordance with Performance Work Statement Revision 2, dated March 24, 2016.

The period of performance is date of award through March 30, 2018.

US Department of Labor Wage Determination Number 15-2381, Revision 1, dated March 1, 2016 shall be used with project task order.

The Terms and Conditions of the basic contract, W912DY-09-D-0062 takes precedence in the case of any ambiguity or conflict.

This task order is awarded in the amount of \$1,211,190.20 of which \$637,951.83 is being funded at the time of award.

Task	Description	Туре	Amount	Total]
1	UFP-QAPP and QASP	FFP	7,063.20	7,063.20]
2	GIS	FFP	3,908.96	3,908.96]
2a	Optional, Additional GIS per FY	FFP	1,525.90]
3	Long Term Monitoring of The OB Grounds	FFP			
3a	(FY17) First Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	21,453.84	21,453.84	6
3Ъ	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	21,457.76		
3c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	21,461.68		
3d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	21,465.59		
3e	Optional, (FY21) Fifth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	21,469.51]
4	Long Term Monitoring of the Fire Training and Demonstration Pad Area	FFP]
4a	(FY17) First Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	26,049.47	26,049.47]
4b	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	26,080.17		
4c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	26,110.87]
4d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	26,141.57]
4e	Optional, (FY21) Fifth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	26,172.27		
5	Long Term Monitoring of the Ash Landfill Operable Unit	FFP			
5a	(FY17) First Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	51,594.03	51,594.03]
5Ъ	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	51,686.28]
5c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	51,778.54		
5d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	51,870.79		
5e	Optional, (FY21) Fifth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	51,963.04]
6	Ash Landfill Operable Unit Biowall Recharge	FFP	440,038.65	440,038.65]
7	Long Term Monitoring of the Deactivation Furnaces Operable Unit	FFP			· .
7a	(FY17) First Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	23,146.49	23,146.49].
7b	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	23,178.47		
7c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	23,210.46		
7d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	23,242.44		
7e	Optional, (FY21) Fifth Annual Groundwater Monitoring	FFP	23,274.43		
8	Monitoring of LUCs at Various Sites	FFP			
8a	(FY17) First Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	17,934.42	17,934.42	

W912DY-09-D-0062 0023 Page 3 of 58

8b	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	17,934.42	. 1	
8c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	17,934.42		
8d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	17,934.42		
9	Monitoring of LUCs at Various Munition Sites	FFP			
9a	(FY17) First Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	5,895.00	5,895.00	
9Ь	Optional, (FY18) Second Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	5,895.28		
9c	Optional, (FY19) Third Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	5,895.28		
9d	Optional, (FY20) Fourth Annual Monitoring Event	FFP	5,895.28		
10	Five-year Review	FFP	27,488.41	27,488.41	6
11	Community Relations Support	FFP	13,379.36	13,379.36	€-
lla	Optional, Additional Meetings	FUP	8,646.02		
12	Optional, Administrative Record	FFP	1,013.48		
	Totals		\$1,211,190.20	\$637,951.83	

.

ESCALATION RATES

Constant Year (FY17) Dollars

The CTC estimates shall be reported on a current cost basis (unadjusted for inflation). The following factors should be used to bring previous year costs to the current year.

Base Fiscal Year	Escalation Rate*
FY12	1.0897
FY13	1.0736
FY14	1.0578
FY15	1.0463
FY16	1.0338

* Rates based on FY18 Joint Inflation Calculator (weighted index) - 9 Mar 2017

Encl

65

ESTIMATOR EXPERIENCE

化子子 医结束结束 被 的 肥于 化分子的 计输入分析 化消化剂 化化化化化 建氯化化化物 化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化化	그는 사람은 영화적으로 통해준 수가 있는 것이 같은 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 많은 것이 것이 것을 받았다.
ESTIMATOR NAME: Randall Battaglia	POSITION: Project Manager
LOCATION: USACE NY Seneca Proj. Ofc	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE: 31 years
EMAIL: Randy.W.Battaglia@usace.army.mil	PHONE NUMBER: 607-869-1532
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

DESCRIPTION: (Insert description of experience here, such as educational background, training, etc.) B.S. Chemical Engineering, 1982; Certified Project Manager, 2007

<u>Work Experience</u>: <u>Project Manager</u>, USACE, 1995-Present: Prepare and manage Life-Cycle Cost for HTRW projects; executes the COE project management business process & establishing a project management plan with a project development team consisting of interdisciplinary, regional or other agencies teams to execute & ensure all projects meet customer, budgetary, safety, scope and schedule requirements during the life cycle of the project, under changing management parameters. Represents the Army as an Alternate for the installation manager in all customer/sponsor, congressional, public contacts, including public meetings, organizations, property transfers with the state, EPA, county, & independent organizations interested in the projects. Served also as the BRAC Environmental Coordinator, 2016-Present.

Environmental Coordinator, Seneca Army Depot, 1985-1995; performed all program management, cost estimation, budget regulatory, permitting, and other management for the environmental program at the active Seneca Army Depot for hazardous waste, TSDF, air, wetlands, CERCLA, RCRA, engineering projects, etc.

Process Engineer, IEC Electronics, 1983-1985 Process engineering for production, product development, personnel, process & Quality

<u>Relevant Continuing Education</u>: Network Systems Analysis; Project Management for Military Projects & HTRW projects; Environmental Auditing; Economic Assessment; Various Project Management & environmental remediation courses; Cost Estimating

SITE TYPE REVIEWED: Insert s	ite number(s) at which experie	ence	gained for each site type to the max	imum extent possible.				
SITE TYPE	SITE NUMBER	SI	TE TYPE	SITENUMBER				
Above Ground Storage Tank	SEAD 5,59,71		Open Burn	SEAD 23, 24, 006-R-01, 003-R-01, 007-R-01				
Burn Area	SEAD 24,45,25,26		Plating Shop					
Chemical Disposal	SEAD 13,72,4		POL (Petroleum/Lubricant Lines	SEAD 9				
Contaminated Buildings	SEAD 12, 16,17, 3		Radioactive Waste Area	SEAD 012,48,72, 63, NRC License closeout				
Contaminated Fill	SEAD 3, 9,4		Sewage Treatment Plant	SEAD 20,21				
Contaminated Groundwater	SEAD 025,006,001-R-01, 023,064B&D,041		Small Arms Range	SEAD 57, 46, 120B,122A,122B				
Contaminated Sediments	SEAD 4, 3,		Soil Contamination After Tank Removal	SEAD 59,				
Contaminated Soil Piles	SEAD 5		Spill Site Area	SEAD 122				
Dip Tank			Storage Area	SEAD 123				
Disposal Pit/Dry Well			Surface Disposal Area					
Explosive Ordnance Disposal Area	SEAD 23, 24, 006-R-01, 003-R-01, 007-R-01		Training and Maneuver Area					
Fire/Crash Training Area	SEAD 025,026		Underground Storage Tank	SEAD 27				
Firing Range			Underground Tank Farm					
Incinerator	SEAD 006, 001-R-01,019, 018		Unexploded Munitions/Ordnance	SEAD 115				
Industrial Discharge			Wash rack					
Landfill	SEAD 006, 064 A,B&D, 011,		Waste Lines					
Maintenance Yard	SEAD 122		Waste Treatment Plant	SEAD				
Oil Water Separator	SEAD 27							



US Army Corps of Engineers.

Randall Battaglia

Certificate of Completion

has successfully completed

Environmental Liability (EL)/Cost to Complete (CTC) Training

Jan 18, 2017 - Web/Audio Teleconference

ander M

Sandi Zebrowski, F.E. Director, USACE Environmental and Munitions Center of Expertise,

FUDS Training Services fudstraining@usace.army.mil

ESTIMATOR EXPERIENCE

T

Maintenance Yard Oil Water Separator

ESTIMATOR NAME: Bill Milla	r	POSIT	ION: Environmental Support, CA	LIBRE				
LOCATION: Army BRAC, Arlin	ngton, VA	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE: 31						
EMAIL: william.w.millar.ctr@a	rmy.mil	PHON	E NUMBER: 703-545-2493					
DESCRIPTION: (Insert descripti 1983: BA Environmental Science, 1988: MS, Geology, University of 1986-2001: Environmental Consul SNR, Mittelhauser Corp., Certified Consultants) for public sector and p remediation projects, and undergro 2001 – 2008: Plexus Scientific, Al treat systems. Under contract to the contract to the USACE worked at t Depot in Nevada on groundwater m 2008 – Present: CALIBRE, Alexar environmental work plans, technica VOAAP, Chattanooga, TN (2009-2 Office (2013 – Present). BRAC Pr 2011), and RBAAP (2013 – Presen Professional Geologist Licensed in Specific environmental related train 1992: Environmental Site Assessm 1989 HAZWOPER (40 hrs), 1990 2009 –2017: Environmental Liabili	on of experience here, such University of Virginia Georgia ting for various environmer Engineering & Testing, Gil orivate clients in California und/above ground storage ta exandria, VA: Worked at n e USACE Louisville worked he Sacramento Army Depot nonitoring and remediation. ndria, VA government cost of al reviews and project manage 2015); FTSH, Fort Sheridan, operty Conveyance KSAAP t). Currently providing Env California, Virginia and Illi ning: nent and Remediation Certif – 2017 Annual HAZWOPE ties Training 2009-2014:	as educ ntal con les Eng and Uta ank spe umerou d on va on the estimate gement , IL (20 0 (2008- rironme nois. ication, R Refr RACE	cational background, training, etc.) npanies (McCrone Environmental Se ineering, CAPE Environmental Mana th. Work included cost estimating fo cifications cost estimating and projec is BRAC facilities performing review rious FUDS sites in Illinois, Indiana, groundwater pump & treat system, a es and/or cost to complete estimates a at the following locations: ALAAP (13-2015). Review of CTC estimates -2009), NECD (2009-2010), FTG (20 ental Support under contract to the Ar University of California, Irvine esher Training R and AEDBR Refresher Training	rvices, Crosby & Overton, agement, JBR Environmental r environmental investigation, it over sight. vs of groundwater pump and Ohio and Kentucky. Under nd at the Hawthorne Army as well as developed BRAC Childersburg, AL (2009-2015); for the various sites BRAC 2009-2012), FTMP (2009- my BRAC Office.				
CITE TYPE DEVIEWED. I				imum autort possible				
SITE TYPE REVIEWED: Insert	site number(s) at which exp	Serience		SITE NUMBER				
Above Ground Storage Tank	CAPE-1996		Open Burn	SITE NONIDER				
Burn Area	ALAAP-16		Plating Shop	C&O 1990				
Chemical Disposal	ALAAP		POL (Petroleum/Lubricant Lines	CAPE-1996, VAAP-36				
Contaminated Buildings	CAPE, and McCrone,		Radioactive Waste Area					
Contaminated Fill	ALAAP, & FTSH		Sewage Treatment Plant					
Contaminated Groundwater	ALAAP-34, VOAAP AOC 6		Small Arms Range	JBR-2000				
Contaminated Sediments	ALAAP-24, ALAAP-26 ALAAP-09	,	Soil Contamination After Tank Removal	CAPE-1996				
Contaminated Soil Piles	Plexus 2007		Spill Site Area	C&O 1990				
Dip Tank	SNR		Storage Area					
			Storugerneu	C&O 1990				
Disposal Pit/Dry Well			Surface Disposal Area	C&O 1990 SNR, ALAAP				
Disposal Pit/Dry Well Explosive Ordnance Disposal Area			Surface Disposal Area Training and Maneuver Area	C&O 1990 SNR, ALAAP				
Disposal Pit/Dry Well Explosive Ordnance Disposal Area Fire/Crash Training Area			Surface Disposal Area Training and Maneuver Area Underground Storage Tank	C&O 1990 SNR, ALAAP CAPE-1996				
Disposal Pit/Dry Well Explosive Ordnance Disposal Area Fire/Crash Training Area Firing Range			Surface Disposal Area Training and Maneuver Area Underground Storage Tank Underground Tank Farm	C&O 1990 SNR, ALAAP CAPE-1996 CAPE-1996, SAEP				
Disposal Pit/Dry Well Explosive Ordnance Disposal Area Fire/Crash Training Area Firing Range Incinerator			Surface Disposal Area Training and Maneuver Area Underground Storage Tank Underground Tank Farm Unexploded Munitions/Ordnance	C&O 1990 SNR, ALAAP CAPE-1996 CAPE-1996, SAEP FTSH-64				
Disposal Pit/Dry WellExplosive Ordnance Disposal AreaFire/Crash Training AreaFiring RangeIncineratorIndustrial Discharge	SNR		Surface Disposal Area Training and Maneuver Area Underground Storage Tank Underground Tank Farm Unexploded Munitions/Ordnance Wash rack	C&O 1990 SNR, ALAAP CAPE-1996 CAPE-1996, SAEP FTSH-64				

Waste Treatment Plant

٦

Estimate Summary Table Site # SEAD-006-R-01

Site Number	Phase	CTC Subtotal (\$K)	Estimate Type	Assumption	Basis of Assumption	Basis of Assumption Document Name	Location of Basis of Assumption Document
				Long Term Monitoring Plan Preparations FY12 \$23,333.12 escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 = \$25,426.10	Contract Costs for LTM Plan	Contract #: W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 0005, 23 November 2011	HNC 1600 University Square Huntsville Al Attached
				Install 6 and Monitor 12 GW wells quarterly for 1 st year. FY12 \$160,509.05 escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 = \$174,906.71	Contract Costs for one year of groundwater monitoring	Contract #: W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 0005, 23 November 2011	HNC 1600 University Square Huntsville Al Attached
	RA(O)	1,927	EE & Contract	Groundwater monitoring will go on semiannually for 30 years (2017-2045) \$49,663.35 x 29 events = \$1,440,237.15	DoD guidance is 30 years or monitoring for indefinite period	The DoDM 4715.20, DERP Management, March 9, 2012 required CTC estimates for RA(O) or LTM phases that are expected to continue indefinitely should include a finite period of 30 years.	HNC 1600 University Square Huntsville Al Attached
SEAD 006-R-01				Groundwater monitoring cost estimate from FY12 \$1,440,237.15 x 1.0897 = \$1,569,426.42	Escalation of groundwater monitoring costs	Contract #: W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 0005, 23 November 2011	HNC 1600 University Square Huntsville Al Attached
				Owner Support for RA 11% of total LTM Cost \$184.50 x 851 hours = \$157,009.50	Engineering Estimate (EE), Owner Cost at 11%	EE - Oversight Estimate	HNC 1600 University Square Huntsville Al Attached
				Five Year Reviews of 30 years \$27,488.41	Contract including Five Year Review.	W912DY-09-D-0023, 30 March 2016	USACE, NY 5786 State Route 96 Romulus, NY 14541 Attached
	LTM	351	351 EE & Contract	Escalate from FY16 to FY17 \$27488.41 x 1.0338 = \$28,417.52	Escalation	FY17 Environmental Cleanup Data Calls, 03 April 2017	Attached
	LIM			30 years for remediation \$28,417.52 x 6 events = \$170,505.11	DoD guidance is 30 years or monitoring for indefinite period	The DoDM 4715.20, DERP Management, March 9, 2012 required CTC estimates for RA(O) or LTM phases that are expected to continue indefinitely should include a finite period of 30 years.	Attached

Estimate Summary Table Site # SEAD-006-R-01

Site Number	Phase	CTC Subtotal (\$K)	Estimate Type	Assumption	Basis of Assumption	Basis of Assumption Document Name	Location of Basis of Assumption Document
				COE Oversight of Contract 11% of total LTM Cost \$184.50 x 980 = \$180,810.00	Engineering Estimate	EE - Oversight Estimate	USACE NY 5786 State Route 96 Romulus, NY 14541 Attached
				Well abandonment and site closeout, source out of date, cost estimate to be determined.	No current source	Need a valid source of cost estimate.	TBD
Total cost to complete	0	2,278					
Does the CT estimate inc work throug closure? (Ye	FC lude gh site es/No)	No					

Seneca Army Depot Cost Estimate

Site Closeout and Well Abandonment

SEAD 006-R-01

		UNIT COST (ESCALATION	FY1	6 Estimate=	FY17 Escalation	FY17 Estimate		
TASK	UNITS	FY11)	NO. units	Amount	FACTOR	Am	t x Esc	Factor	≃FY16 X Esc		BASIS/DOCUMENTATION
WELL ABANDONMENT	LS	\$ 5,223.00	12	\$ 62,676.00	1.0666	\$	66,850.22	1.0338	\$	69,109.76	W912DY-08-D-0003, TASK ORDER 0008, FY11; 6 wells @ \$31,398= \$5,223
Five Year Reviews	LS	\$ 27,488.41	6	\$ 164,930.46	1	\$	164,930.46	1.0338	\$	170,505.11	
Closeout Report	LS	\$ 18,206.00			1.0666	\$	19,419.00	1.0338	\$	20,075.36	
			FY17 Labor						1		
Assembly No.	Assembly Description		Rate	HRS							
33220101	Senior Project Manager		\$ 110.73	10					\$	1,107.30	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220102	Project Manager		\$ 101.83	40					\$	4,073.20	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220105	Project Engineer		\$ 70.33	80					\$	5,626.40	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220106	Staff Engineer		\$ 92.60	80					\$	7,408.00	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220108	Project Scientist (Geologist)		\$ 76.57	80					\$	6,125.60	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220110	QA/QC Officer		\$ 72.61	80					\$	5,808.80	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220112	Field Technician		\$ 46.94	80					\$	3,755.20	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
									\$	293,594.73	_

ENCL 9

2017

Phase	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Outyears	СТС
RA(O)	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	1121	
RA (oversight)			157							
LTM										
LTM wells and plan					200					
FIVE YEAR REVIEW					28				153	
WELL										
ABANDONMENT										
AND CLOSEOUT									171	
	56	56	213	56	284	56	56	56	1445	2278



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT 600 ARMY PENTAGON WASHINGTON, DC 20310-0600

APR 03 2017

DAIM-IS

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2017 Environmental Cleanup Data Calls

1. Headquarters Army Environmental System (HQAES) is the Army's database of record for the Fiscal Year (FY) 17 data calls. The transition to HQAES, which is a Systems, Applications, and Products based solution, will ultimately change the way the Army reviews and validates environmental data; however, until system stabilization is achieved, the cleanup program will continue to operate using a Spring and Fall data call.

2. HQAES originally went live in May 16 using FY11 data that was migrated from the legacy systems, which include the Army Environmental Database Restoration and Army Environmental Database Compliance Cleanup systems. Data Support Teams are working to assist installations with their FY17 updates by initially transitioning the data from the legacy systems to HQAES. Installation visits by the Data Support Team will continue through May 17. Installations are not required to recreate their FY12, FY13, FY14, FY15, or FY16 data sets in HQAES.

3. The Spring 2017 data call reporting period end date is 31 Mar 17, and to the extent possible, installations will update their cost-to-complete estimates, cost requirements spread, phase schedules and the programmed funding spread prior to 5 May 17. Enclosures 1-9 of this memorandum provides detailed instructions, data call schedule, escalation rates, professional labor categories and rates, Department of Defense area cost factor, memorandum for record template, peer review checklist, supervisory review checklist, and HQAES specific contacts for technical, reporting and program management assistance.

4. The point of contact for this action is Mr. Bryan Frey, 571-256-9733; e-mail: bryan.m.frey.civ@mail.mil.

RUTMA

ROBERT L. MENIST Colonel, GS Acting Director, Installation Services

9 Encls

DISTRIBUTION: (see next page) DAIM-IS

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2017 Environmental Cleanup Data Calls

DISTRIBUTION: CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMANDER U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

U.S. ARMY INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND

U.S. ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL COMMAND

CF

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

ESCALATION RATES

Constant Year (FY17) Dollars

The CTC estimates shall be reported on a current cost basis (unadjusted for inflation). The following factors should be used to bring previous year costs to the current year.

Base Fiscal Year	Escalation Rate*
FY12	1.0897
FY13	1.0736
FY14	1.0578
FY15	1.0463
FY16	1.0338

* Rates based on FY18 Joint Inflation Calculator (weighted index) - 9 Mar 2017

PEER REVIEW CHECKLIST

Installation Name: Seneca Army Depot

Review Date: 27 September 2017 Total Number of Sites Reviewed: 27

Use this checklist to assess the reasonableness of the installation's estimates, appropriate methodology, and to document peer review. Reviewer should also use the OACSIM Memorandums entitled, *Corrective Action Procedures for Achieving Audit Readiness - 24 Dec 2015, FY16 Audit Testing Corrective Action Procedures - 23 Sep 2016*, and the OACSIM annual data call memo as guides.

1. Are sound estimating methodology and reasonable assumptions used? Does the database of record capture and document the assumptions used to develop the CTC? Does the information in the database of record match the information in the MFR and EST?

YES / NO Comments: The data in HQAES is being fine-tuned to match the MFRs, but

is a work in progress. MFRs and HQAES do not match currently.

2. Does cost-to-complete (CTC) packages contain supporting documentation that is clear, traceable, and defendable? (use Corrective Action Procedures for Achieving Audit Readiness Memo - 24 Dec 2015, FY16 Audit Testing Corrective Action Procedures - 23 Sep 2016, and OACSIM annual data call memos)

YES / NO Comments:

3. Did the estimator compare prior year to the current year estimates and address unresolved comments from the previous data call QC review? Did the assumptions used to determine the selected site remedial actions in the previous data call change? Changes to assumptions may result in a change to the cost estimate. Comments are required if there is a 10% material change or change amount of \$25,000 in costs from previous data call. Were the QC comments from the previous data call addressed?

YES / NO Comments:

4. Does the estimate include all relevant phases and costs to complete the cleanup? Project completion may not require all phases. To ensure proper consideration and show that no phases are missing, provide explanation in comments if RA, RA-O, CMI-O, CMI-O, or LTM phases are not included in the estimate.

YES / NO	Comments:	

5. Does the estimator have the proper qualifications and required training (see CTC Guidance section 5.3) to compile/generate the estimate? Ensure the Estimators Experience Form documenting proper qualifications and required training is part of the supporting documentation for the estimator. *Note: The Peer Reviewer should also submit an EEF to substantiate their training.*

YES / NO	Comments:
----------	-----------

6. Is there an adequate audit trail? Are necessary memos for record included to document assumptions for cost estimates made early in the remediation process where more complete remedial investigation, feasibility study, or other engineering cost estimates may not be available? Can the peer reviewer recreate the estimate based on the supplied supporting documentation?

YES	/ NO	Comments:	

7. Is there adequate documentation to support the underlying assumptions used to develop the estimate? Were outlined procedures in the CTC Guidance followed? Are appropriate documents (MFR, EST, EEF's, all supporting documentation) included in the database of record?

YES / NO Comments:
8. Is the estimate maintained in the current year cost? Is there a material change? Is the material change calculation contained in the MFR? Note: annotation of the MFR is required even if there is no material change.

YE	YES / NO Comments:								
9.	Are proper and consistent rounding techniques used for the estimates? Round to the penny for all intermediate (sub-phase) steps. Round to the thousand at the phase level. If there are multiple phases, then sum the rounded phases to get to the total estimate value.								

YES / NO	Comments:

10. Are proper and consistent escalation factors used to bring past unexecuted phases up to current year dollars? The CTC package should also include a copy of the annual datacall memo from OACSIM issued latest by first week in March beginning of each year.

YES / NO Comments:

11. Are the estimated figures on the CTC, MFR, EST, and within the database of record all match for a particular phase? If the figures do not match, is there an explanation in the MFR for the discrepancy?

YES		Comments:	The data	a in HQ	AES is	being	fine-tuned	to m	natch	the l	MFRs,	but

is a work in progress. MFRs and HQAES do not match currently.

"I have reviewed the supporting documentation; for estimating methodology, facts, and assumptions are appropriate for the site cost and the documentation properly and completely supports the estimate".

Reviewer's Signature 09

MILLAR.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.13914603 Digitally signed by MILLAR.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.1391460309 DN: c=US, 0=U.S. Government, 0u=DoD, 0u=PKi, 0u=CONTRACTOR, cn=MILLAR.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.1391460309 Date: 2017.09.27 12:37:04 -04'00'

Estimate Summary Table Site # SEAD-006-R-01

Site Number	Phase	CTC Subtotal (\$K)	Estimate Type	Assumption	Basis of Assumption	Basis of Assumption Document Name	Location of Basis of Assumption Document
	RA(O)	1,569	Contract	Optional Task 6,7,8.1,8.3 30 years for remediation	Contract Costs \$49,663.35 x 29 events = \$1,440,237 rounded to (\$1,440K) DoD guidance is 30 years. \$1440K x 1.0897 = \$1569K	Contract #: W912DY-10-D- 0014-0005 The DoDM 4715.20, DERP Management, March 9, 2012 required CTC estimates for RA(O) or LTM phases that are expected to continue indefinitely should include a finite period of 30 years.	HNC 1600 University Square Huntsville Al
	RA	157		Oversight of field work	Owner Cost at 11%	Oversight Estimate	
	LTM	181	IGE	Engineering Estimate	Engineering Estimate \$180,810 rounded to \$181K		USACE, NY 5786 State Route 96 Romulus, NY 14541
SEAD 006-R-01	LTM	200	IGE		\$ 25,426.10 +174,906.71= \$200, 331.81	LTM plan prep, encl5, Install 6 wells, Source 5	
	LTM	171	IGE	COE Oversight of Contract 30 years for remediation Escalation from 2016	Engineering Estimate \$27,448 x 6 5YRs x 1.0338= \$170,505.11 \$170,505 rounded to \$171K.	Well Closure and five year review costs The DoDM 4715.20, DERP Management, March 9, 2012 required CTC estimates for RA(O) or LTM phases that are expected to continue indefinitely should include a finite period of 30 years. USAEC ACSIM FY17 Data Call Memo, 3 April 2017	USACE NY 5786 State Route 96 Romulus, NY 14541
	<u> </u>						
Total cost to comple	te	2,278					
Does the CTC estimate include work through site closure? (Yes/No)		yes					

SEAD - 006-R-01

2017

Phase	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Outyears	СТС
LTM	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53		424
RA(O)			50	50	50	50	50	50	1321	1621
RA OVERSIGHT COST	ľ		157							157
LTM (OVERSIGHT										
COST)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	157	181
FIVE YEAR REVIEW					58					58
WELL ABANDONMENT										
AND CLOSEOUT									294	294
	56	56	263	106	164	106	106	106	1772	2311

.

Seneca Army Depot Cost Estimate

Site Closeout and Well Abandonment

SEAD 006-R-01

		UNIT COST (ESCALATION	FY1	6 Estimate=	FY17 Escalation	FY:	17 Estimate	
TASK	UNITS	FY11)	NO. units	Amount	FACTOR	Am	t x Esc	Factor	≃F	Y16 X Esc	BASIS/DOCUMENTATION
											W912DY-08-D-0003, TASK
											ORDER 0008, FY11; 6 wells @
WELL ABANDONMENT	LS	\$ 5,223.00	12	\$ 62,676.00	1.0666	\$	66,850.22	1.0338	\$	69,109.76	\$31,398= \$5,223
	1										
Five Year Reviews	LS	\$ 27,488.41	6	\$ 164,930.46	1	\$	164,930.46	1.0338	\$	170,505.11	
Closeout Report	LS	\$ 18,206.00			1.0666	\$	19,419.00	1.0338	\$	20,075.36	
			FY17 Labor								
Assembly No.	Assembly Description		Rate	HRS							
33220101	Senior Project Manager		\$ 110.73	10					\$	1,107.30	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220102	Project Manager		\$ 101.83	40					\$	4,073.20	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220105	Project Engineer		\$ 70.33	80					\$	5,626.40	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220106	Staff Engineer		\$ 92.60	80					\$	7,408.00	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220108	Project Scientist (Geologist)		\$ 76.57	80					\$	6,125.60	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220110	QA/QC Officer		\$ 72.61	80					\$	5,808.80	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
33220112	Field Technician		\$ 46.94	80					\$	3,755.20	FY17 Data Call Memorandum
									¢	293 594 73	

\$ 293,594.73

٩

ENCL 9

X OUI-R-01

503-R-01

006-K-01

25

Coor Sal 17

36760.1105

- 1181 ,1045 • 1100

36760.1001 1017

. 1625

. 1069

009

70

- 1009

006

ÓZ

- 1006

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management BRAC Division Seneca Army Depot, Seneca, NY

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

27 September 2017

SUBJECT: Environmental Liabilities for site SEAD-006-R-01 (HQAES WBS# 36760.1100) RCRA Closure of the OB/OD Grounds (alias SEAD-115 [not listed in HQAES], SEAD 45 [Demolition Area HQAES WBS# 36760.1045]) at Seneca Army Depot

This memorandum serves as formal documentation of the information used to develop the Cost-To-Complete (CTC) estimate for site SEAD-006-R-01 during the 2017 data call. This site also encompasses SEAD-023 (OB Grounds) (not listed in HQAES). Estimators experience is documented on the Estimator Experience Form, enclosure 7, per the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) Handbook Technical Release 2.

Well abandonment and site closeout costs were previously covered in a contract from FY11 (W912DY-08-D-0003, Task Order 0008). The contract is out of date and not used for cost estimating. The cost for well abandonment and site closeout will require a new contract or an engineering estimate, until a valid cost estimate is available the cost is to be determined.

The SEAD-23 monitoring program, which was initiated in 2007 under this project, will be carried under the RI/FS phase until completion of the remediation. A zero dollar CTC has been prepared for SEAD-23. It is assumed six additional wells will be installed at SEAD 006-R-01 for additional GW monitoring at the site as part of a LTM plan. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 5, 23 November 2011, (Enclosure 5) provides the cost of the Long Term Monitoring Plan, well installation, first year monitoring cost, and out-year monitoring cost. The cost for the GW monitoring during the RI/FS phase for SEAD 23 is provided by contract W912DY-09-D-0062 Delivery Order 0023 task 0003a, 30 March 2016. (Enclosure 6) and the requirement for testing is established in the ROD for the OB Grounds (Enclosure 2). It is assumed that after the completion of the remediation, monitoring GW for SEAD-006-R-01 will require sampling at a guarterly interval for the first year and then semi-annually in subsequent years for cap inspection and effectiveness. It is further assumed that the monitoring efforts at SEAD 23 will continue as part of the overall project (Enclosure 6). After the remediation is completed the monitoring will be carried out under the LTM phase. Due to EPA's disagreement with the planned IRA to include a cap, and due to the Army's agreement with Land Use Controls for munitions sites, the FS will be finalized and a ROD signed for the final remediation. It is assumed that the final remediation will be accomplished with funding provided in prior years. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 5, 23 November 2011, Enclosure 5, was terminated for convenience. Funding remains for the final remediation. This included the contract cost for the cap alternative. It was

assumed the first 5 year review will occur in 2021, this may need to be in 2026 given ROD signature and completion of remediation in 2019. The Owner Support for RA is S&A for the remedial action, which was postponed due to the ROD. This cost is shown in FY19.

1. Site History: The Army destroyed ammunition by detonation and open burning at this site, which was in operation from 1948 through 1998. The OB ground consists of elevated burning trays. The site is in the northwest portion of the installation and covers 364 acres. The investigation of this site revealed contamination consisting of ordnance and explosives (OE) and heavy metals. This is a RCRA interim permitted site. This site also encompasses SEAD-023 (not listed in HQAES), OB Grounds, where a CERCLA remediation was completed in 2003.

2. Current Site Status:

- a. The cleanup strategy includes the ongoing removal of all munitions potentially posing an explosive hazard from the outer perimeter of the site at approximately 2500 feet, inwardly to the proposed 8 acre landfill cap. The work from 2500 feet to 1000 feet is underway through a Removal Action. The preferred FS Alternative has been to consolidate all soil that contains hazardous toxic or radiological waste (HTRW) contamination will be placed under the cap. The cap will comply with State Regulatory standards. Soil under the cap will not have ordnance removed prior to the capping.
- b. Groundwater will require annual testing until results demonstrate cleanup criteria.
- c. EPA raised numerous concerns on materials potentially presenting an explosive hazard (MPPEH) and disagrees with the cap alternative. A large amount of the <1000 feet radius was geophysically mapped and MPPEH removed. EPA has disagreed with the cap only alternative and has taken the position of removal of one foot and geophysics to three feet below this point on the entire site similar to the Umatilla site (\$47M). The Army position is surface sweep is adequate for this site for the known future use of restricted access conservation. Higher level discussions are occurring and other alternatives are being considered. To address EPA's concerns, final remediation alternatives are to be evaluated using MMR LUCs, the Open Burning Grounds ROD as a precedent for HTRW soils (only), cap with slurry wall, mechanical separation, and soil stabilization.

3. Exit Strategy:

LTM includes Cap Maintenance, GW monitoring, LUCs, Five-Year reviews, and site closeout effort. MMR LUCs will be critical to final agreement on remediation.

For cost estimating purposes, the LTM duration as indicated in the phase schedule extends only to the end of the second five-year review; however, LTM is anticipated to continue in perpetuity.

4. Enclosures:

1. Draft Final Feasibility Study Report for Open Detonation Grounds Munitions Response Action, Parsons, April 2013

- 2. Final Record of Decision Former Open Burning Grounds Site, January 1999
- 3. Final Long Term Monitoring Plan for Open Burning Grounds, January 2007
- 4. Performance Work Statement for Contract W912DY-10-D-0014, DO 0005, 23 November 2011
- 5. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014, Delivery Order 0005, DTD 23 November 2011
- Final 2011 Long Term Monitoring Annual Report for the Open Burning Grounds, May 2013; Contract W912DS-09-D-0062 TO 0023, 30 March 2016; Escalation Rates.
- 7. Estimator's Experience Sheet, Environmental Liabilities training
- 8. Estimate Summary Table
- 9. Engineering Estimate for Site Closeout and Well Abandonment

5. Engineering Estimate Assumptions:

Site Closeout Documentation (LTM):

- 1. Site Closeout is moderate complexity
- 2. Kick-off, review and regulatory meetings
- 3. Work Plans and reports all default values
- 4. Documents will be stored for 30 years

The cost estimate for site closeout documentation is out of date, the cost to complete is to be determined.

Well abandonment (LTM):

- 1. Number of wells: 12
- 2. Well depth: 15 feet
- 3. Well diameter: 2 inches
- 4. Formation type: Unconsolidated
- 5. Method: Overdrill/excavation

The cost estimate for well abandonment is out of date, the cost to complete is to be determined.

Five year MPPEH & CERCLA review

- 1. Review cycles (SEAD 006-R-01 and SEAD 23 combined)
- 2. Five year review cycle starts 2016 for SEAD 23
- 3. Five year review cycle starts 2021 for SEAD 006-R-01 and SEAD 23 combined
- 4. Site is moderate complexity
- 5. Reports, reviews, interviews and site inspections include all default parameters
- 6. MEC review included

7. Cost Summary SEAD-006-R-01 (SEAD-115/45)

Remedial Action (Operations) (RA(O)):

Long Term Monitoring Plan preparation (enclosure 5); FY12 \$23,333.12 escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 =	\$25,426.10
Install 6 and Monitor 12 GW wells quarterly 1 st year, 2016 (source 5); FY12 \$160,509.05 escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 =	\$174,906.71
For years 2017-2045, Monitor 12 GW wells, semiannually x 29 years (source 5); FY12 \$49,663.35 x 29 years x escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 =	\$1,569,426.42
Owner Support for RA (Source 4) 11% of total LTM Cost \$184.50 x 851 Hours =	\$157,009.50
Subtotal RA(O) = or \$1,927K	\$1,926,768.74
Long Term Monitoring (LTM):	
Six five-year reviews for SEAD-23 and SEAD-006-R-01 (W912DY-09-D-0023, 30 March 2016) 27,488.41 x 1.0338 (escalate to FY17) = \$28,417.52 x 6 events =	\$170,505.11
Well abandonment and site closeout (no current estimate)	TBD
Owner Support for GW Monitoring (Source 4) 11% of total LTM Cost \$184.50 x 980 Hours =	\$180,810.00
Subtotal LTM: or \$351K	\$351,315.11
Total Cost or \$2,278K	\$2,278,083.84

Material Change: The CTC for FY16 was \$2,093K the CTC for FY17 is \$2,278K. The calculated percentage change was 5.3%. No material change.

Material Change = absolute value of (indexed prior year CTC – current CTC – current obligations)/indexed prior year CTC

MC = ((2,093 * 1.0338) - 2,278 - 0) / (2,093 * 1.0338) = 5.3%

Prepared by: Randall Battaglia	BATTAGLIA.RANDALL.W.1228 816724	Digitally signed by BATTAGLIA.RANDALL.W.1228816724 DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=USA, cn=BATTAGLIA.RANDALL.W.1228816724 Date: 2017.09.27 16:18:30 -04'00'		
Cost Estimator	Signature	Date		

Reviewed by: Erin Mauer Cost Estimate Reviewer

Signature

Date

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management BRAC Division Seneca Army Depot, Seneca, NY

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

03 August 2017

SUBJECT: Environmental Liabilities for site SEAD-006-R-01 (HQAES WBS# 36760.1100) RCRA Closure of the OB/OD Grounds (alias SEAD-115 [not listed in HQAES], SEAD 45 [Demolition Area HQAES WBS# 36760.1045]) at Seneca Army Depot

This memorandum serves as formal documentation of the information used to develop the Cost-To-Complete (CTC) estimate for site SEAD-006-R-01 during the 2017 data call. This site also encompasses SEAD-023 (OB Grounds) (not listed in HQAES). Estimators experience is documented on the Estimator Experience Form, enclosure 7, per the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) Handbook Technical Release 2.

Well abandonment and site closeout costs were previously covered in a contract from FY11 (W912DY-08-D-0003, Task Order 0008). The contract is out of date and not used for cost estimating. The cost for well abandonment and site closeout will require a new contract or an engineering estimate, until a valid cost estimate is available the cost is to be determined.

The SEAD-23 monitoring program, which was initiated in 2007 under this project, will be carried under the RI/FS phase until completion of the remediation. A zero dollar CTC has been prepared for SEAD-23. It is assumed six additional wells will be installed at SEAD 006-R-01 for additional GW monitoring at the site as part of a LTM plan. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 5, 23 November 2011, (Enclosure 5) provides the cost of the Long Term Monitoring Plan, well installation, first year monitoring cost, and out-year monitoring cost. The cost for the GW monitoring during the RI/FS phase for SEAD 23 is provided by contract W912DY-09-D-0062 Delivery Order 0023 task 0003a, 30 March 2016. (Enclosure 6) and the requirement for testing is established in the ROD for the OB Grounds (Enclosure 2). It is assumed that after the completion of the remediation, monitoring GW for SEAD-006-R-01 will require sampling at a quarterly interval for the first year and then semi-annually in subsequent years for cap inspection and effectiveness. It is further assumed that the monitoring efforts at SEAD 23 will continue as part of the overall project (Enclosure 6). After the remediation is completed the monitoring will be carried out under the LTM phase. Due to EPA's disagreement with the planned IRA to include a cap, and due to the Army's agreement with Land Use Controls for munitions sites, the FS will be finalized and a ROD signed for the final remediation. It is assumed that the final remediation will be accomplished with funding provided in prior years. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 5, 23 November 2011, Enclosure 5, was terminated for convenience. Funding remains for the final remediation. This included the contract cost for the cap alternative. It was

assumed the first 5 year review will occur in 2021, this may need to be in 2026 given ROD signature and completion of remediation in 2019. The Owner Support for RA is S&A for the remedial action, which was postponed due to the ROD. This cost is shown in FY19.

1. Site History: The Army destroyed ammunition by detonation and open burning at this site, which was in operation from 1948 through 1998. The OB ground consists of elevated burning trays. The site is in the northwest portion of the installation and covers 364 acres. The investigation of this site revealed contamination consisting of ordnance and explosives (OE) and heavy metals. This is a RCRA interim permitted site. This site also encompasses SEAD-023 (not listed in HQAES), OB Grounds, where a CERCLA remediation was completed in 2003.

2. Current Site Status:

- a. The cleanup strategy includes the ongoing removal of all munitions potentially posing an explosive hazard from the outer perimeter of the site at approximately 2500 feet, inwardly to the proposed 8 acre landfill cap. The work from 2500 feet to 1000 feet is underway through a Removal Action. The preferred FS Alternative has been to consolidate all soil that contains hazardous toxic or radiological waste (HTRW) contamination will be placed under the cap. The cap will comply with State Regulatory standards. Soil under the cap will not have ordnance removed prior to the capping.
- b. Groundwater will require annual testing until results demonstrate cleanup criteria.
- c. EPA raised numerous concerns on materials potentially presenting an explosive hazard (MPPEH) and disagrees with the cap alternative. A large amount of the <1000 feet radius was geophysically mapped and MPPEH removed. EPA has disagreed with the cap only alternative and has taken the position of removal of one foot and geophysics to three feet below this point on the entire site similar to the Umatilla site (\$47M). The Army position is surface sweep is adequate for this site for the known future use of restricted access conservation. Higher level discussions are occurring and other alternatives are being considered. To address EPA's concerns, final remediation alternatives are to be evaluated using MMR LUCs, the Open Burning Grounds ROD as a precedent for HTRW soils (only), cap with slurry wall, mechanical separation, and soil stabilization.</p>

3. Exit Strategy:

LTM includes Cap Maintenance, GW monitoring, LUCs, Five-Year reviews, and site closeout effort. MMR LUCs will be critical to final agreement on remediation.

For cost estimating purposes, the LTM duration as indicated in the phase schedule extends only to the end of the second five-year review; however, LTM is anticipated to continue in perpetuity.

4. Enclosures:

1. Draft Final Feasibility Study Report for Open Detonation Grounds Munitions Response Action, Parsons, April 2013

- 2. Final Record of Decision Former Open Burning Grounds Site, January 1999
- 3. Final Long Term Monitoring Plan for Open Burning Grounds, January 2007
- 4. Performance Work Statement for Contract W912DY-10-D-0014, DO 0005, 23 November 2011
- 5. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014, Delivery Order 0005, DTD 23 November 2011
- Final 2011 Long Term Monitoring Annual Report for the Open Burning Grounds, May 2013; Contract W912DS-09-D-0062 TO 0023, 30 March 2016; Escalation Rates.
- 7. Estimator's Experience Sheet, Environmental Liabilities training
- 8. Estimate Summary Table
- 9. Engineering Estimate for Site Closeout and Well Abandonment

5. Engineering Estimate Assumptions:

Site Closeout Documentation (LTM):

- 1. Site Closeout is moderate complexity
- 2. Kick-off, review and regulatory meetings
- 3. Work Plans and reports all default values
- 4. Documents will be stored for 30 years

The cost estimate for site closeout documentation is out of date, the cost to complete is to be determined.

Well abandonment (LTM):

- 1. Number of wells: 12
- 2. Well depth: 15 feet
- 3. Well diameter: 2 inches
- 4. Formation type: Unconsolidated
- 5. Method: Overdrill/excavation

The cost estimate for well abandonment is out of date, the cost to complete is to be determined.

Five year MPPEH & CERCLA review

- 1. Review cycles (SEAD 006-R-01 and SEAD 23 combined)
- 2. Five year review cycle starts 2016 for SEAD 23
- 3. Five year review cycle starts 2021 for SEAD 006-R-01 and SEAD 23 combined
- 4. Site is moderate complexity
- 5. Reports, reviews, interviews and site inspections include all default parameters
- 6. MEC review included
- 7. Cost Summary SEAD-006-R-01 (SEAD-115/45)

Remedial Action (Operations) (RA(O)):

Long Term Monitoring Plan preparation (enclosure 5); FY12 \$23,333.12 escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 =	\$25,426.10
Install 6 and Monitor 12 GW wells quarterly 1 st year, 2016 (source 5); FY12 \$160,509.05 escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 =	\$174,906.71
For years 2017-2045, Monitor 12 GW wells, semiannually x 29 years (source 5); FY12 \$49,663.35 x 29 years x escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 =	\$1,569,426.42
Owner Support for RA (Source 4) 11% of total LTM Cost \$184.50 x 851 Hours =	\$157,009.50
Subtotal RA(O) = or \$1,927K	\$1,926,768.74
Long Term Monitoring (LTM):	
Six five-year reviews for SEAD-23 and SEAD-006-R-01 (W912DY-09-D-0023, 30 March 2016) 27,488.41 x 1.0338 (escalate to FY17) = \$28,417.52 x 6 events =	\$170,505.11
Well abandonment and site closeout (no current estimate)	TBD
Owner Support for GW Monitoring (Source 4) 11% of total LTM Cost \$184.50 x 980 Hours =	\$180,810.00
Subtotal LTM: or \$351K	\$351,315.11
Total Cost or \$2,278K	\$2,278,083.84

Material Change: The CTC for FY16 was \$2,093K the CTC for FY17 is \$2,278K. The calculated percentage change was 5.3%. No material change.

Material Change = absolute value of (indexed prior year CTC – current CTC – current obligations)/indexed prior year CTC

MC = ((2,093 * 1.0338) - 2,278 - 0) / (2,093 * 1.0338) = 5.3%

Prepared by: Randall Batta	aglia	
Cost Estimator	Signature	Date
Reviewed by: Bill Millar	MILLAR.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.139146 0309	Digitally signed by MILLAR.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.1391460309 DN: ceUS, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=CONTRACTOR, cn=MILLARWINISTON.SR.1391460309 Date: 2017.09.27 12:37:47 -04'00'
Cost Estimate Reviewer	Signature	Date

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management BRAC Division Seneca Army Depot, Seneca, NY

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

03 August 2017

SUBJECT: Environmental Liabilities for site SEAD-006-R-01 (HQAES WBS# 36760.1100) RCRA Closure of the OB/OD Grounds (alias SEAD-115 [not listed in HQAES], SEAD 45 [Demolition Area HQAES WBS# 36760.1045]) at Seneca Army Depot

This memorandum serves as formal documentation of the information used to develop the Cost-To-Complete (CTC) estimate for site SEAD-006-R-01 during the 2017 data call. This site also encompasses SEAD-023 (OB Grounds) (not listed in HQAES). Estimators experience is documented on the Estimator Experience Form, enclosure 7, per the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) Handbook Technical Release 2.

Well abandonment and site closeout costs were previously covered in a contract from FY11 (W912DY-08-D-0003, Task Order 0008). The contract is out of date and not used for cost estimating. The cost for well abandonment and site closeout will require a new contract or an engineering estimate, until a valid cost estimate is available the cost is to be determined.

The SEAD-23 monitoring program, which was initiated in 2007 under this project, will be carried under the RI/FS phase until completion of the remediation. A zero dollar CTC has been prepared for SEAD-23. It is assumed six additional wells will be installed at SEAD 006-R-01 for additional GW monitoring at the site as part of a LTM plan. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 5, 23 November 2011, (Enclosure 5) provides the cost of the Long Term Monitoring Plan, well installation, first year monitoring cost, and out-year monitoring cost. The cost for the GW monitoring during the RI/FS phase for SEAD 23 is provided by contract W912DY-09-D-0062 Delivery Order 0023 task 0003a, 30 March 2016. (Enclosure 6) and the requirement for testing is established in the ROD for the OB Grounds (Enclosure 2). It is assumed that after the completion of the remediation, monitoring GW for SEAD-006-R-01 will require sampling at a guarterly interval for the first year and then semi-annually in subsequent years for cap inspection and effectiveness. It is further assumed that the monitoring efforts at SEAD 23 will continue as part of the overall project (Enclosure 6). After the remediation is completed the monitoring will be carried out under the LTM phase. Due to EPA's disagreement with the planned IRA to include a cap, and due to the Army's agreement with Land Use Controls for munitions sites, the FS will be finalized and a ROD signed for the final remediation. It is assumed that the final remediation will be accomplished with funding provided in prior years. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014 Delivery Order 5, 23 November 2011, Enclosure 5, was terminated for convenience. Funding remains for the final remediation. This included the contract cost for the cap alternative. It was

assumed the first 5 year review will occur in 2021, this may need to be in 2026 given ROD signature and completion of remediation in 2019. The Owner Support for RA is S&A for the remedial action, which was postponed due to the ROD. This cost is shown in FY19.

1. Site History: The Army destroyed ammunition by detonation and open burning at this site, which was in operation from 1948 through 1998. The OB ground consists of elevated burning trays. The site is in the northwest portion of the installation and covers 364 acres. The investigation of this site revealed contamination consisting of ordnance and explosives (OE) and heavy metals. This is a RCRA interim permitted site. This site also encompasses SEAD-023 (not listed in HQAES), OB Grounds, where a CERCLA remediation was completed in 2003.

2. Current Site Status:

- a. The cleanup strategy includes the ongoing removal of all munitions potentially posing an explosive hazard from the outer perimeter of the site at approximately 2500 feet, inwardly to the proposed 8 acre landfill cap. The work from 2500 feet to 1000 feet is underway through a Removal Action. The preferred FS Alternative has been to consolidate all soil that contains hazardous toxic or radiological waste (HTRW) contamination will be placed under the cap. The cap will comply with State Regulatory standards. Soil under the cap will not have ordnance removed prior to the capping.
- b. Groundwater will require annual testing until results demonstrate cleanup criteria.
- c. EPA raised numerous concerns on materials potentially presenting an explosive hazard (MPPEH) and disagrees with the cap alternative. A large amount of the <1000 feet radius was geophysically mapped and MPPEH removed. EPA has disagreed with the cap only alternative and has taken the position of removal of one foot and geophysics to three feet below this point on the entire site similar to the Umatilla site (\$47M). The Army position is surface sweep is adequate for this site for the known future use of restricted access conservation. Higher level discussions are occurring and other alternatives are being considered. To address EPA's concerns, final remediation alternatives are to be evaluated using MMR LUCs, the Open Burning Grounds ROD as a precedent for HTRW soils (only), cap with slurry wall, mechanical separation, and soil stabilization.</p>

3. Exit Strategy:

LTM includes Cap Maintenance, GW monitoring, LUCs, Five-Year reviews, and site closeout effort. MMR LUCs will be critical to final agreement on remediation.

For cost estimating purposes, the LTM duration as indicated in the phase schedule extends only to the end of the second five-year review; however, LTM is anticipated to continue in perpetuity.

4. Enclosures:

1. Draft Final Feasibility Study Report for Open Detonation Grounds Munitions Response Action, Parsons, April 2013

- 2. Final Record of Decision Former Open Burning Grounds Site, January 1999
- 3. Final Long Term Monitoring Plan for Open Burning Grounds, January 2007
- 4. Performance Work Statement for Contract W912DY-10-D-0014, DO 0005, 23 November 2011
- 5. Contract W912DY-10-D-0014, Delivery Order 0005, DTD 23 November 2011
- Final 2011 Long Term Monitoring Annual Report for the Open Burning Grounds, May 2013; Contract W912DS-09-D-0062 TO 0023, 30 March 2016; Escalation Rates.
- 7. Estimator's Experience Sheet, Environmental Liabilities training
- 8. Estimate Summary Table
- 9. Engineering Estimate for Site Closeout and Well Abandonment

5. Engineering Estimate Assumptions:

Site Closeout Documentation (LTM):

- 1. Site Closeout is moderate complexity
- 2. Kick-off, review and regulatory meetings
- 3. Work Plans and reports all default values
- 4. Documents will be stored for 30 years

The cost estimate for site closeout documentation is out of date, the cost to complete is to be determined.

Well abandonment (LTM):

- 1. Number of wells: 12
- 2. Well depth: 15 feet
- 3. Well diameter: 2 inches
- 4. Formation type: Unconsolidated
- 5. Method: Overdrill/excavation

The cost estimate for well abandonment is out of date, the cost to complete is to be determined.

Five year MPPEH & CERCLA review

- 1. Review cycles (SEAD 006-R-01 and SEAD 23 combined)
- 2. Five year review cycle starts 2016 for SEAD 23
- 3. Five year review cycle starts 2021 for SEAD 006-R-01 and SEAD 23 combined
- 4. Site is moderate complexity
- 5. Reports, reviews, interviews and site inspections include all default parameters
- 6. MEC review included

7. Cost Summary SEAD-006-R-01 (SEAD-115/45)

Environmental Liabilities for site SEAD-006-R-01 RCRA Closure of the OB/OD Grounds (alias SEAD-115) at Seneca Army Depot Remedial Action (Operations) (RA(O)): Long Term Monitoring Plan preparation (enclosure 5); \$25,426.10 FY12 \$23,333.12 escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 = Install 6 and Monitor 12 GW wells guarterly 1st year, 2016 (source 5); FY12 \$160,509.05 escalated to FY17 x 1.0897 = \$174,906.71 For years 2017-2045, Monitor 12 GW wells, semiannually x 29 years (source 5); FY12 \$49,663.35 x 29 years x escalated to FY17 x \$1,569,426.42 1.0897 =15, 1679 Owner Support for RA (Source 4) 1926 157 11% of total LTM Cost \$184.50 x 851 Hours = 18/36 \$157,009.50 1679 \$1,926,768.74 Subtotal RA(O) = or \$1,927K Long Term Monitoring (LTM): Six five-year reviews for SEAD-23 and SEAD-006-R-01 (W912DY-09-D-0023, 30 March 2016) 293,466.87 27,488.41 x 1.0338 (escalate to FY17) = \$28,417.52 x 6 events = \$170,505.11 471312 48911.14 Well abandonment and site closeout (no current estimate) TBD Owner Support for GW Monitoring (Source 4) X 11% of total LTM Cost 147. \$184.50 x 980 Hours = \$180,810.00 150,72 Subtotal LTM: \$351,315.11 or \$351K \$2,278,083.84 **Total Cost** or \$2,278K

Material Change: The CTC for FY16 was \$2,093K the CTC for FY17 is \$2,278K. The calculated percentage change was 5.3%. No material change.

Material Change = absolute value of (indexed prior year CTC – current CTC – current obligations)/indexed prior year CTC

MC = ((2,093 * 1.0338) - 2,278 - 0) / (2,093 * 1.0338) = 5.3%

Prepared by: Randall Batta	iglia	
Cost Estimator	Signature	Date
Reviewed by: Bill Millar	MILLAR.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.139146 0309	Digitally signed by MILLAR.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.1391460309 DN: ceUS, o=US. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=CONTRACTOR, cn=MILLAR.WILLIAM.WINSTON.SR.1391460309 Date: 2017.09.27 12:37:47 -04'00'
Cost Estimate Reviewer	Signature	Date

FORM 4 - VISUAL INSPECTIONS

Team Member Name:		: Date:
Installation Name:	·····	: Installation Code:
Area:	: Parcel:	; Facility No.
Facility Name:	; Map ID:	; Coordinates:
Address:	* **	······································
Area/Facility Use: (Undeveloped, Agri	culture, Housing, R	ecreation, Commercial, Utilities, Light Industrial
Heavy Industrial, Other:); Acreas	ge: ;
Associated IRP Site, SWMU, or OU?	Y/N/U; If yes, Site	e ID(s):
Area/Facility contact name/title:		; Phone:;
·		
Escort Information:		
Name:	; Organization:	; Title:;
Role/Responsibility:	4	; Phone:;
Period for which the person would have	e specific and detail	led knowledge of the area or facility in question:
· · ·		· · ·
Inspection Information:		
Methods used to observe area or facility	ty: (Air, Auto, Walk,	Onsite, Remote:)
Inspection Complete? Y/N If no, expla	in:	
Setting:		
Adjoining land use (show on map):		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
. · · ·	•	
Roads without outlets? Y/N ; Describ	e use:	•
Wetlands, Streams, Springs/seeps?: Y/	N (delineate on map	o as W, S, SS, respectively);
Surface Cover: (Vegetation, Manmade	; Туре:);
1.4		
Construction:		
Structure: (Metal frame, Wood frame,	Concrete);	
Siding (Metal, Wood, Concrete, PVC,	Other);
Flooring Material: (Wood, Concrete, C	Ceramic, Vinyl);	
Roofing Material: (Composition, Sheet	Metal, Tar, Tiles, S	Slate, Cedar Shake, Rubberized, Fiberglass)
Insulation Material: (Fiberglass, Foam	ı, Unknown)	
Facility Utilities:		

Page 1 of 2

Heating/Ventilation/Cooling (HVAC) System: (Oil/forced air, Gas/forced air, Electrical, Steam, Hot water); HVAC Power: (Gas, Oil, Coal, Electric); Backup Power Supply? Y/N; Boiler Room? Y/N; Exhaust System? Y/N

Use History:

Describe in Table I-2 additional information regarding the use history of this area or facility discovered during the visual inspection that was not already described during interviews.

FORM 4 - VISUAL INSPECTIONS (continued)

Installation Code:; Area:;	; Parcel:; Facility No:
Team Member Name:	; Date:

FEATURES (Circle each form used, Use the appropriate form listed below.) STORAGE TANKS: ASTs, USTs, Oil/Water Separators FORM VI: HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES AND/OR PETROLEUM PRODUCTS USED OR FORM V2: GENERATED, AND THEIR STORAGE AND DISPOSAL (except for USTs and ASTs). POTENTIAL RELEASES: As indicated by stains, pools, stressed vegetation, odors, burned FORM V3: areas, illicit dumping and other uncontrolled waste. WASTE WATER: Occurrence and disposition, including storm water, cooling water, waste FORM V4: water from processes, facility floors, oil-water separators, sumps, dry wells, etc. FORM V5: PIPELINES TRANSFORMERS: inventory, including capacitors. FORM V6: PONDS: Including infiltration ponds, waste water treatment reservoirs, etc. FORM V7: AIR EMISSIONS: Including incinerators, boilers, process, or laboratory exhaust. FORM V8: POTENTIAL ASBESTOS CONTAINING MATERIALS FORM V9: FORM V10: WELLS: Including drinking water, process water, agricultural, monitoring, injection, oil, and gas.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Frame Number Compass View Subject

•

.