452-44

INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT

QUARTERLY REPORT

FOR

SENECA ARMY DEPOT

Submitted to

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION II

AND

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

by

THE ENGINEERING/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION OF SENECA ARMY DEPOT (SEAD), DIRECTORATE OF ENGINEERING AND HOUSING (DEH)

QTR 10/22/92 - 12/20/92

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SENECA ARMY DEPOT
ROMULUS, NEW YORK 14541-5001

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF
SDSSE-HE (200-1a)

MEMORANDUM FOR

Ms. Carla Struble, Project Manager, Federal Facilities Section, Room 2930, Region 2, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, NY 10278

Mr. Kamal Gupta, Project Manager, Federal Projects Section, Bureau of Eastern Remedial Action, Division of Hazardous Remediation, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, 50 Wolf Road, Albany, NY 12233-7010

Subject: Quarterly Report

1. The emphasis of this quarterly report is on the events occurring between October 22, 1992 and December 20, 1992.

2. In accordance with para 26.1 of the soon to be finalized Interagency Agreement (IAG) between the Army, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and New York State Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), the following quarterly report is submitted:

a. Minutes From Formal Meetings Held During the Reporting Period.

There were no Project Manager or Technical Review Committee (TRC) meetings held during the reporting period. The next Project Manager's meeting has been scheduled for the morning of January 21, 1993. The third meeting of the Technical Review Committee will be held the afternoon of January 21, 1993.

b. Milestones Met On Schedule, Explanation of Milestones Not Met on Schedule.

(1) IAG Milestones:

The Commissioner of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation signed Seneca Army Depot's (hereafter referred to as Seneca) IAG in early December. The IAG was then forwarded to the New York State Department of Law for review and signature before advancing to the USEPA.

(2) Ash Landfill Operable Unit (OU) Milestones:

(a) Phase II Workplan Approved, Fieldwork Starts -

During the reporting period, Seneca received NYSDEC and USEPA approval to conduct a Phase II Remedial Investigation (RI) at the Ash Landfill Operable Unit. A field activity report summarizing the work completed during the first month of fieldwork is contained in Appendix 1.0.

In November, the Army and USEPA held a teleconference to resolve USEPA comments on an Addendum to the Ash Landfill RI/FS Workplan. This Addendum, which was submitted to USEPA and NYSDEC during the previous reporting period, described all fieldwork to be conducted during the second phase of investigation at the Ash Landfill. The second phase of investigation is being conducted in order to close data gaps identified in the Phase I investigation. The Phase II Addendum was designed to incorporate all regulatory comments on the Phase I report.

The USEPA comments on the Phase II Workplan Addendum, that were discussed in the November teleconference, concerned:

- Consideration of cross-contamination between bedrock layers during deep bedrock corings.
- Screening overburden wells in both glacial till and weathered shale based on differences in hydrologic conductivity in weathered shale versus till.
- The value of using headspace screening of competent bedrock wells to determine the need for deeper bedrock wells.
- Conducting additional borings to define Volatile Organic contamination in a suspected source area within the Ash Landfill Operable Unit.
- Installation of a second off-post Groundwater monitoring cluster along the southwestern edge of the contaminate plume.

At the conclusion of the Phase II teleconference, all of the above mentioned USEPA Phase II Workplan concerns were resolved. Following the teleconference, revisions to the Phase II Workplan were issued to all parties by Engineering Science, Inc. (ES), and a formal notice of Workplan approval was received at Seneca from USEPA. The finalized RI/FS Workplan was then scheduled to be placed into the Administrative Record for public review and inspection.

Several of the USEPA work changes required modifications to the existing Ash Landfill RI/FS contract. Project Management at the Huntsville Division made significant progress in finalizing the required contract modification during the reporting period.

Table 1.0 summarizes the Ash Landfill milestones occurring during the reporting period.

TABLE 1.0
Ash Landfill RI/FS Milestones

DATE	ASH LANDFILL RI/FS MILESTONES
28 SEP 1992	Phase II RI/FS Workplan Addendum is shipped to NYSDEC and USEPA for review.
7 OCT 1992	Seneca receives Phase II RI/FS Workplan Addendum approval letter from NYSDEC.
10 NOV 1992	Seneca receives USEPA comments on Phase II RI/FS Workplan Addendum.
18 NOV 1992	Army's contractor, Engineering Science, Inc. (ES), provided written response to comments for USEPA Phase II Workplan comments. These responses were distributed to all parties.
18 NOV 1992	Teleconference held between Army and regulatory agencies in order to resolve USEPA Phase II Workplan comments.
19 NOV 1992	Seneca receives USEPA approval for Phase II RI/FS Workplan Addendum; i.e. USEPA concerns were adequately addressed in 18 NOV 92 teleconference.
20 NOV 1992	ACE - Huntsville Division awards contract delivery order for a Phase II RI/FS at the Ash Landfill site. The award, in the amount of $1,056,816, went to Engineering Science, Inc. (ES).
20 NOV 1992	Engineering Science issues final Addendum to the Ash Landfill RI/FS Workplan to all parties.
30 NOV 1992	Contractor mobilization at the Ash Landfill starts.
6 DEC 1992	Fieldwork startup.
15 Jan 1993	Scheduled date for the addition of the final Phase II Workplan to the Draft Ash Landfill Administrative Record files.

(3) Open Burning (OB) Grounds RI/FS Milestones:

(a) Workplan Approved, Fieldwork Starts -

During the reporting period, Seneca received NYSDEC and USEPA approval to conduct a Phase II RI at the OB Grounds Operating Unit. A field activity report summarizing the work completed in the field to date is contained in Appendix 2.0.

In December, the Army and USEPA held a teleconference to resolve USEPA comments on an Addendum to the OB Grounds Workplan. This Addendum described all fieldwork to be conducted during the second phase of investigation at the OB Grounds site. USEPA comments on the Phase II Workplan concerned the number and location of Phase II Groundwater monitoring wells, conducting additional boarings at burning pad "C" and conducting aquatic biota assessments within an intermittent ditch during the spring, when water is flowing within the ditch.

At the conclusion of the Phase II teleconference, all USEPA concerns were resolved.

Table 2.0 provides a summary of the OB Grounds milestones occurring during the reporting period.

TABLE 2.0
OB GROUNDS RI/FS Milestones

DATE	OB GROUNDS RI/FS MILESTONE
15 OCT 1992	Phase II OB Grounds RI/FS Workplan Addendum is delivered to NYSDEC
26 OCT 1992	Phase II OB Grounds RI/FS Workplan Addendum is sent to USEPA.
16 NOV 1992	Seneca receives comments from NYSDEC and NYS Department of Health on the Phase II OB Grounds RI/FS Workplan Addendum.
20 NOV 1992	ACE - Huntsville Division awards contract delivery order for a Phase II RI/FS at the OB Grounds site. The award, in the amount of $1,094,170, went to Engineering Science, Inc. (ES).
25 NOV 1992	Seneca receives USEPA Phase II Ri/FS Workplan Addendum comments concurrent with Workplan approval.
30 NOV 1992	Contractor mobilization starts.
2 DEC 1992	Fieldwork starts.
10 DEC 1992	Teleconference held between Army and USEPA to clarify the three (3) USEPA Phase II Workplan comments.
TBD	Engineering Science (ES) issues final Addendum to the OB Grounds RI/FS Workplan.
TBD	Final OB Grounds RI/FS Workplan added to Draft OB Grounds Administrative Record Files.

TBD - To be determined in next reporting report.

(4) Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) Investigation Milestones:

During the reporting period, the Huntsville Division made significant progress toward finalizing a draft Statement of Work (SOW) for the upgrade of the SWMU Classification Report (SCR). This SOW is being prepared in coordination with Seneca and will be designed to incorporate regulatory recommendations provided during SCR negotiations held in September 1992.

(5) CERCLA Site Investigation (SI) Milestones:

(a) Workplan for Investigating Ten (10) AOC's -

The Army received USEPA comments on a Workplan for conducting CERCLA Site Investigations (SI's) at the highest priority AOC's in October 1992. Seneca anticipates that all regulatory comments will be resolved and Workplan approval achieved during the winter months; this will allow for an early spring fieldwork start date.

Table 3-0 summarizes recent progress made toward investigation of the highest priority AOC's, subject to SI's.

TABLE 3-0

DATE	TEN AOC SI MILESTONES
9 JUN 1992	Seneca mailed Draft SI Workplan for the investigation of ten (10) Areas of Concern (AOC's) to NYSDEC and USEPA.
22 JUL 1992	Seneca receives NYSDEC comments on the SI Workplan for investigating ten (10) AOC's.
27 OCT 1992	Seneca receives USEPA comments (20 pages) on the SI Workplan for investigation of ten (10) AOC's.
28 OCT 1992	Huntsville Division awards contract delivery order for a CERCLA Site Investigation at seven (7) high priority AOC's. The award, in the amount of $705,903, went to Engineering Science, Inc. (ES).
28 OCT 1992	Huntsville Division awards contract delivery order for a CERCLA Site Investigation of three (3) moderate priority AOC's. The award, in the amount of $298,304, went to Engineering Science, Inc. (ES).
30 NOV 1992	Seneca, the Huntsville Division and Engineering Science hold a teleconference to discuss regulatory comments on the CERCLA SI Workplan for investigation of ten (10) AOC's.
13 JAN 1992	Scheduled day for resolution of regulatory comments on the CERCLA SI Workplan for investigation of ten (10) AOC's.

(b) Workplan for Investigating Fifteen (15) AOC's -

The delivery order for developing a Workplan to investigate a second group of AOC's was awarded to Engineering Science, Inc. (ES) on November 20, 1992. This contract was in the amount of $177,491.

(6) Milestones Occurring at Individual Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs):

(a) SWMU -45 Milestones -

The detonation of explosives at the Open Detonation (OD) site, or SWMU-45, continued during the reporting period. Between October 22, 1992 and December 15, 1992, four (4) Open Detonation events were conducted. The Installation Compatibility Use Zone (ICUZ) committee convened several times during the reporting period.

(b) SWMU-30 Milestones; Building 118 Underground Storage Tank -

In compliance with applicable NYS Environmental Conservation law, Seneca's in-house tank removal team removed the Building 118 waste oil storage tank on December 1, 1992. The removal effort was coordinated with the NYSDEC Region 8 Division of Spill Prevention, Response and Remediation (Telephone 716-226-2466). Upon removing the tank, the tank was discovered to have maintained its original integrity. Photographs of the tank and surrounding soils were taken.

(c) SWMU-29; Building 732 Underground Waste Oil Tank -

This tank was tightness tested on September 23, 1992. Seneca has been verbally notified, by the contractor performing the testing, that the integrity of the tank is secure. Results of the testing, however, are pending.

During the September 21, 1992 SWMU Classification Report (SCR) negotiations, the NYSDEC and USEPA agreed to classify SWMU-29 as a "no action" unit provided acceptable tank testing results. Tank results will be expeditiously sent to NYSDEC and USEPA, after receipt at Seneca, and incorporated into the SCR update.

(d) SWMU-15; Building 2207 - Abandoned Solid Waste Incinerator -

The tank removal projects at Building 2207 were postponed due to the inability of the Baltimore District of the Army Corps of Engineers to award the contract. It is anticipated that the project will be readvertised in January 1993.

(e) SWMU-10; Present Scrap Wood Site -

On October 24, 1992, a fire training exercise was conducted at the present scrap wood site. This burn was conducted in coordination with the NYSDEC Region 8 Division of Air Resources. Following the burn, large volumes of ash and soil were removed.

Two hundred and fifty-four (254) tons of ash and soil were removed on November 12, 1992 from SWMU-10. It is estimated that an additional one hundred (100) tons of ash/soil mixture remain. The removal was conducted by Waste Management, Inc., of Syracuse, NY. Currently, Seneca has no immediate plans for removal of the remaining ash/soil mixture. Prior to disposal of the ash in a secure landfill, composite samples were taken by Waste Management, Inc. and analyzed using the Toxicity Characteristic Leachate Procedure (TCLP). These results will be included in the SWMU Classification update for this unit.

c. Inspections, Reports, Audits and Administrative Information.

(1) REPORTS:

RCS 1383, the A-106 Report -

During the last reporting period, Seneca submitted updated 1383 reports to HQ DESCOM. These 1383's were rejected by DESCOM with instructions to revise and resubmit the reports. The revisions involved the splitting and archiving of many IRP projects. Seneca submitted corrected 1383 reports for these projects on December 3, 1992. The revisions also involved submitting separate 1383's for Support and Administrative (S&A) costs associated with individual projects.

(2) FUNDING STATUS:

On December 18, 1992, Seneca received, from HQ DESCOM, a Draft Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA) Workplan for review and comment. This data call included a Draft DERA line item Workplan dated November 17, 1992. Seneca was tasked to comment on the Workplan as soon as possible. Comments were provided to HQ DESCOM on December 23, 1992.

Table 4-0 summarizes the budget for Seneca's IRP program for Fiscal Year 1993. The estimated project costs in this budget reflect delivery orders that have been awarded in the first quarter of FY-93 and projected contract modification costs. Estimated project costs are subject to change.

d. Permit Status, as Applicable.

There was no change in Seneca Army Depot's RCRA facility permit status during the reporting period.

e. Personnel Staffing Status.

(1) CHANGE IN STAFF NUMBERS:

There were no changes in Seneca's environmental management staff during the reporting period.

(2) TRAINING:

Representatives from the Depot's Engineering/Environmental Management Division, DEH, attended IRP related workshops during the reporting period. Mr. Thomas Enroth and Mr. James Miller attended RCS-1383 training in Sacramento, CA.

f. Laboratory Deliverables.

No laboratory deliverables were received during the reporting period.

TABLE 4-0
SEAD FY-93 IRP COSTS SUMMARIZED

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	EXECUTING AGENCY	RCS-1383 PROJECT NUMBER	ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS $	DERA LINE ITEM PS	ABOVE CUT LINE ?
CERCLA Site Investigations at Seven (7) High Priority AOC's	CEHND	SE0091F006	706,000.	I	YES
S&A - CERCLA Site Investigation at Seven (7) High Priority AOC's	CEHND	SE0092F030	62,000.	I	YES
CERCLA Site Investigations at Three (3) Moderate Priority AOC's	CEHND	SE0091F006	299,000.	I	YES
S&A - CERCLA Site Investigations at Three (3) Moderate Priority AOC's	CEHND	SE0092F030	22,000.	I	YES
SWMU Classification Report (SCR) Update and Finalization	CEHND	SE0090F003	TBD	TBD	TBD
S&A - SWMU Classification Report (SCR) Update and Finalization	CEHND	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Phase II RI Fieldwork, RI/FS Report, and Preparation of Final ROD at Ash Landfill Site	CEHND	SE0092F003	1,275,000.	I	YES
S&A - Phase II RI Fieldwork, RI/FS Report, and Preparation of Final ROD at Ash Landfill Site	CEHND	SE0092F004	105,000.	I	YES
Phase II RI Fieldwork, RI/FS Report and Preparation of Final ROD at OB Grounds Site	CEHND	SE0092F011	1,200,000.	I	YES
S&A - Phase II RI Fieldwork,RI/FS Report, and Preparation of Final ROD at OB Grounds Site	CEHND	SE0092F012	117,000.	I	YES

TABLE 4-0
SEAD FY-93 IRP COSTS SUMMARIZED

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	EXECUTING AGENCY	RCS-1383 PROJECT NUMBER	ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS $	DERA LINE ITEM PS	ABOVE CUT LINE ?
Installation of Comprehensive Ground-water Monitoring Program at Ash Landfill and OB Grounds Sites	CEHND	SE-SW-29	1,076,000.	I	YES
S&A - Installation of Comprehensive Ground-water Monitoring Program at Ash Landfill and OB Grounds Sites	CEHND	SE0092F029	80,000.	I	YES
Preparation of Workplan to Conduct CERCLA Site Investigations at 15 Moderate and Low Priority AOC's	CEHND	SE0092F032	178,000.	I	YES
S&A - Preparation of Workplan to Conduct CERCLA Site Investigations at 15 Moderate and Low Priority AOC's	CEHND	SE0092F031	15,000.	I	YES
Interim Remedial Action at Ash Landfill Operable Unit	TBD	SE0092F006	500,000.	V	YES
S&A - Interim Remedial Action at Ash Landfill Operable Unit	TBD	SE0092F005	30,000.	TBD	YES
Design and Removal of Five (5) DERA Eligible Tanks	CENAB	SE0090S001	220,000.	I	YES*
S&A - Design and Removal of Five (5) DERA Eligible Tanks	CENAB	NA	18,000.	I	YES*
Archeological Survey at IAG Covered DERPMIS Sites	CEHND	SE0090S005	TBD	TBD	TBD
S&A Archeological Survey at IAG Covered DERPMIS Sites	CEHND	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
OB/OD Grounds Escorts	SEAD	SE0090S008	100,000.	V	YES

QTR 10/22/92 → 12/20/92

TABLE 4-0
SEAD FY-93 IRP COSTS SUMMARIZED

EXECUTING AGENCY	: US Army Corps of Engineers Division or District responsible for administering SEAD's IRP contracts
1383 NUMBER	: Represents the assigned RCS 1383 number for the project as identified in SEAD's December 3, 1992 1383 submission to HQDESCOM. SEAD's December 3, 1992 submission involved the "splitting up" and subsequent archiving of numerous projects.
ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS	: Represents recent cost estimates by the US Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Division and Seneca Army Depot based on awarded contract dollars and anticipated contract modification costs
LINE ITEM PS CODE	: DERA workplan priority code; The Category "I" includes those projects that remained unfunded through FY-92, but received supplemental funding in October of 1992. These projects must be awarded by the end of the first quarter of FY-93 or they will revert to a priority code based on merit. The Category "V" is the priority code representative of projects at installations with no IAG. The category "c" refers to underground storage tank removal projects.
ABOVE CUT LINE	: Indicates if the project was listed as funded in the December 3, 1992 Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA) Line Item Workplan.
CEHND	: US Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Division.
CENAB	: US Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District.
TBD	: To Be Determined.

* CENAB obligation of money for the removal of five DERA eligible tanks is unlikely prior to the end of first quarter FY-93. In this event, the project will revert to a Workplan PS code "c", which falls below the workplan funding cut line.

g. Public Participation.

(1) COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN (CRP) MILESTONES:

Seneca received the Draft-Final Community Relations Plan (CRP) from the Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency (USATHAMA) on October 19, 1992. The CRP was sent express mail to USEPA and NYSDEC on November 9, 1992.

(2) ASH LANDFILL ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD MILESTONES:

No additions to the Ash Landfill Administrative Record occurred during the reporting period.

(3) OB GROUNDS ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD MILESTONES:

No additions to the OB Grounds Administrative Record were made during the reporting period.

(4) RIGHTS OF ENTRY UPDATE:

Seneca, in coordination with the Huntsville Division and the New York District of the Corps of Engineers, made significant progress toward obtaining access to land parcels located outside the legal boundaries of Seneca Army Depot. Access was required for installation of two well clusters proposed in the Ash Landfill Phase II Workplan.

3. POC is James Miller at (607) 869-1450.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Gary W. Kittell

Encls

GARY W. KITTELL
Director of Engineering and Housing

CF:

Legal Office, Seneca

Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Division, ATTN: CEHND-PE-E (Mr. K. Healy), P.O. Box 1600, Huntsville, AL 35807

Mr. Michael Duchesneau, P.E., Chas. T. Main, Inc., Prudential Center, Boston, Massachusetts 02199

Commander, U.S. Army Depot Systems Command, ATTN: AMSDS-IN-E (Mr. J. Biernacki), Chambersburg, PA 17201-4170

APPENDIX 1.0

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Prudential Center • Boston, Massachusetts 02199 • (617) 859-2000 • Fax: (617) 859-2575

December 21, 1991
720447-1016

Mr. Michael Stahl
CEHND-PM-E
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Division
106 Wynn Drive
Huntsville, Alabama 35807

SUBJECT: Seneca Army Depot, Ash Landfill Field Monthly Report

Dear Mr. Stahl:

This monthly field report describes the recent field activities conducted in December associated with the remedial investigation currently underway at the Ash Landfill. The activities are being conducted in full compliance with the requirements of the Engineering-Science (ES) Phase 2 workplan addendum and the addendum letter of November 1992.

Field mobilization commenced on November 30, 1992. The tasks associated with mobilization included installation of the field trailer, shipping of equipment and supplies to the site, a health and safety briefing and management of subcontractors.

Field sampling began the week of December 6, 1992. Soil borings were performed at the Non-Combustible Fill Landfill (NCFL) and the Ash Landfill. A total of nine soil borings were completed, four at the Ash Landfill and five at the NCFL. Surface water and sediment sampling was completed at six locations throughout the site. Land surveying was completed at both landfills to locate former geophysical anomalies at the Ash landfill and to identify 5 test pit locations at the NCFL. The surveyor also laid out the geophysical baselines for the future VLF survey. Additionally, an upgradient overburden monitoring well was installed. All samples were shipped overnight to the contract laboratory Aquatec, Inc. of South Burlington, VT. Additionally, a portion of these samples, 10%, were collected in duplicate and shipped, overnight, to MRD for analysis.

During the borings at the NCFL the drilling team encountered a soil sample which was "pinkish", possibly implying the presence of explosive material. Since no UXO support was present because it was the Ash Landfill the drilling crew abandoned the hole and performed the boring next to this location. However, the "pinkish" sample was collected and shipped overnight to Aquatec, Inc. Upon conferring with Kevin Healy, it was decided that this sample would be analyzed for all NYSDEC CLP parameter with the exception that herbicides would be replaced with explosives.

On December 8 & 9, Mr. Kamal Gupta from NYSDEC performed a field inspection at this site. All indications are that he was pleased with the work being performed and had no concerns.

Very truly yours,

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Michael Duchesneau
Project Manager

Response Requested _Yes _x_No
Date Requested _____

MD/cmf/D#7

cc: Mr. Kevin Healy
Mr. Randall Battaglia
Mr. Tim Toplisek
Mr. K. Hoddinott
CEMRD-EP-C
Mr. Kauffman

APPENDIX 2.0

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Environmental Center • Boston, Massachusetts 02199 • (617) 859-2000 • Fax: (617) 859-2575

December 21, 1991
720446-1016

Mr. Michael Stahl
CEHND-PM-E
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Division
106 Wynn Drive
Huntsville, Alabama 35807

SUBJECT: Seneca Army Depot, Open Burning (OB) Grounds Field Monthly Report

Dear Mr. Stahl:

This monthly field report describes the recent field activities conducted in December associated with the remedial investigation currently underway at the OB Grounds. The activities are being conducted in full compliance with the requirements of the Engineering-Science (ES) Phase 2 workplan addendum and the addendum letter of November 1992.

Field mobilization commenced on November 30, 1992. The tasks associated with mobilization included installation of the field trailer, shipping of equipment and supplies to the site, a health and safety briefing and management of subcontractors.

Field sampling began on December 2, 1992. The first task performed was surface water and sediment sampling. A total of 13 locations were sampled during December. One field team, comprised of two ES personnel, performed this task supported by a UXB unexploded ordnance specialist. All samples were shipped, overnight, to the contract laboratory Aquatec, Inc. of South Burlington, VT. Additionally, a portion of these samples, 10%, were collected in duplicate and shipped, overnight, to MRD for analysis.

While the surface water and sediment sampling team was executing this task, another ES sampling team performed berm sampling with support from UXB. Samples were collected using a backhoe from the middle of the berms. As with the surface water and sediment samples, the collected soil samples were shipped overnight to Aquatec, Inc. This effort continued into the week of the 7th. A total of 28 soil samples was collected from the berms surrounding the nine burning pads. Upon completion of the berm sampling the ES team began sampling of the low-lying hill on the southern side of the site. The procedure for the low-lying hill sampling was similar to the method utilized for the berm sampling. A total of 23 low-lying hill soil samples were collected during December. During the week of December 7th the downwind soil sampling was also completed. A total of 11 soil samples were collected and sent overnight to Aquatec. One split sample from these 11 was also sent to MRD for analysis.

During December the surveyor was also on-site. The surveyor was used to identify the downwind soil sample locations and to familiarize themselves with the site and the subsequent surveying to be performed.

During December it was apparent that the photogrammetric survey performed during Phase 1 has inadequately mapped the full extent of the low-lying hill. Visual observations confirmed that the low-lying hill extends further to the east than is shown on the site maps that were prepared as part of Phase 1 investigation. I have discussed this issue with Kevin Healy and am awaiting a decision as to how to proceed. Also during the December field work UXB personnel identified a "Burn Kettle" that is present adjacent to a small structure on the western side of the site. This "Burn Kettle" is situated within a small drainage and is directly upgradient of one of the Phase 2 surface water and sediment sampling locations. A future discussion on this issue should be conducted to determine if additional field sampling is warranted.

Very truly yours,

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Michael Duchesneau
Project Manager

Response Requested _Yes _x_No
Date Requested _____

MD/cmf/D#7

cc: Mr. Kevin Healy
Mr. Randall Battaglia
Mr. Tim Toplisek
Mr. K. Hoddinott
CEMRD-EP-C
Mr. Kauffman

INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT

QUARTERLY REPORT

FOR

SENECA ARMY DEPOT

Submitted to

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION II

AND

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

by

THE ENGINEERING/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION OF SENECA ARMY DEPOT
(SEAD), DIRECTORATE OF ENGINEERING AND HOUSING (DEH)

SDSSE-HE (200-1a)

MEMORANDUM FOR

Ms. Carla Struble, Project Manager, Federal Facilities Section, Room 2930, Region 2, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, NY 10278

Mr. Kamal Gupta, Project Manager, Federal Projects Section, Bureau of Eastern Remedial Action, Division of Hazardous Remediation, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, 50 Wolf Road, Albany, NY 12233-7010

Subject: Quarterly Report

1. The emphasis of this quarterly report is on the events occurring between April 5, 1993 and July 3, 1993.

2. In accordance with para 26.1 of the Interagency Agreement (IAG) between the Army, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and New York State Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), the following quarterly report is submitted:

a. Minutes From Formal Meetings Held During the Reporting Period.

On June 9, 1993 the fifth meeting of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) was held at the Seneca Army Depot (SEAD's) offers Club. This conference call was proceeded by a quarterly meeting of the projects managers. Minutes for this quarters TRC meeting are enclosed as appendix 1.0.

b. Milestones Met On Schedule, Explanation of Milestones Not Met on Schedule.

(1) IAG Milestones:

(a) Progress Toward Schedule 5.0 approval -

During the reporting period, the Army and regulatory agency held a phone conference to resolve all issues relating to restoration schedules developed by Seneca and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Division (Huntsville). Pursuant to section 14 of the IAG, SEAD is required to promulgate a schedule for the completion of work at identified operable units and for the finalization of primary deliverables (i.e specific reports). Following submittal of this schedule, a conference call was held between the Army and regulatory agencies. Based on the resolutions reached during this conference call, SEAD revised and resubmitted schedules to all parties. Subsequently, Seneca received correspondence from the NYSDEC indicating New York States acceptance of the revised schedule. Prior to the close of the reporting period, the USEPA informed Seneca that the Armys schedule is fundamentally acceptable, and that only minor changes are required. Table 1.0 summarizes milestones relating to schedule finalization.

Table 1.0

IAG MILESTONE
SEAD Submits Draft Schedule 5.0 to regulatory agencies
Conference call (formal consultation per IAG § 17) held to resolve scheduling issues.
SEAD submits revised schedule 5.0 to regulatory agencies
SEAD receives written correspondence from NYSDEC approving schedule 5.0.
SEAD receives written correspondence from USEPA approving schedule 5.0.

(2) Ash Landfill RI/FS Milestones:

A report prepared by Engineering Science (ES), Inc., describing field activities at the Ash Landfill site during the reporting period is enclosed as appendix 2.0.

(3) Open Burning (OB) Grounds RI/FS Milestones:

A report prepared by Engineering Science (ES), Inc., describing field activities at the Open Burning Grounds (OB) site during the reporting period is enclosed as appendix 3.0.

(4) Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) Investigation Milestones:

The Huntsville Division has made significant progress in preparing a sampling plan for twelve (12) SWMU's requiring limited investigation. This sampling will be performed for SEAD by Huntsville under contract with Engineering Science (ES) Inc.,.

(7) Milestones Occurring at Individual Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs):

c. Inspections, Reports, and Audits and Administrative Information.

(1) Installation Action Plan (IAP) Revisions

During the reporting period, the Huntsville Division and Seneca completed revisions the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) Installation Action Plan (IAP). In 1992, Seneca Army Depot was one of numerous installations that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for the Environment, Safety and Occupational Health (DASA(ESOH)), requested to prepare a IAP.

(2) FY-94 Obligation Plan Prepared -

(3) Funding Status:

d. Permit Status as Applicable.

There was no change in Seneca Army Depot's RCRA facility permit status during the reporting period.

e. Personnel Staffing Status.

(1) SEAD Staffing Update-

Effective the July 15, 1993 Seneca Army Depot will undergo a change in command. The Depots current Commanding officer, Colonel James B. Cross, will be replaced by Lieutenant Colonel Roy. E. Johnson. Colonel Cross has played an active role in the IRP at SEAD, serving as the Technical Review Committee (TRC) chair since the committees conception. Transparent with the change of command, Lieutenant Colonel Johnson will assume the title of TRC chairmen.

SDSSE-HE (200-1a)
Subject: Quarterly Report

The Seneca Army Depot Directorate of Engineering and Housing (DEH) underwent staffing changes during the reporting period. The Director, Gary W. Kittel, will be leaving the Depot effective July 17, 1993. Mr. Kittell will assume the title of Physical Science Plant Director at the State University of NY, Upstate Medical Center, Syracuse NY. Mr. Kittell has served as the Executive Secretary of the TRC and played a active role in program management decision making. Mr. Kittels oversight of Seneca Army Depots IRP program will be missed.

The Armys Alternate Remedial Project Manager, Mr. James Miller, transferred to the Navy Security Group Activity-Winter Harbor (NSGAWH) Maine, effective July 9, 1993. Mr. Miller will assume the position of Environmental Coordinator at NSGAWH. Mr. Thomas Enroth, of the SEAD environmental office, will replace Mr. Miller as the alternate Remedial Project manager. Mr. Enroth has been a environmental engineer at SEAD for the last five years.

Seneca's environmental staff will remain at a staffing level of five full time employees. Mr. Mike Stoffka, a depot employee for the last six years, accepted a vacant Environmental Protection Specialist position within Seneca's environmental management branch. Mr. Stoffka will monitor the Depots natural resources and solid waste programs.

(2) Training:

Representatives from the Depot's Engineering/Environmental Management Division attended various IRP related workshops during the reporting period. Mr. Battaglia attended the "DERP Progress in Restoration" Conference in Denver, Colorado. The DERP training workshop included discussions on DOD/Department of the Army (DA) guidance, contracting, work plan prioritization, the 1383 process, and the role of the major Army commands in program execution. In June, Mr. Miller attended a two week environmental coordinators course in Fort Lee, VA..

f. Public Participation update

(1) Ash Landfill Administrative Record Milestones:

Seneca Army Depot has made numerous additions to the Ash Landfill Administrative Record File during the reporting period. The revised Draft Index to the Ash Landfill Administrative Record File is enclosed as Appendix 3.0.

(2) OB Grounds Administrative Record Milestones:

The Draft Index for the OB Grounds Administrative Record File is enclosed with this report as Appendix 4.0.

SDSSE-HE (200-1a)
Subject: Quarterly Report

2. POC is Thomas Enroth at (607) 869-1450.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Stephen M. Absolom
Facilities Engineer

Encls

CF:

Legal Office, SEAD

Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Division, ATTN: CEHND-PE-E (Mr. K. Healy), P.O. Box 1600, Huntsville, AL 35807

Mr. Michael Duchesneau, P.E., Chas. T. Main, Inc., Prudential Center, Boston, Massachusetts 02199

Commander, U.S. Army Depot Systems Command, ATTN: AMSDS-IN-E (Mr. J. Bernacki), Chambersburg, PA 17201-4170

APPENDIX 1.0

Minutes for

the fifth meeting of the

Technical Review Committee (TRC)

THE FOURTH TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

HELD ON: June 9th, 1993

HELD AT: Seneca Army Depot
Romulus, New York

REPORTED BY: PATRICIA A. NELK

MR. KITTELL: Good afternoon. My name is Gary Kittell. I am the director of engineering at the Seneca Army Depot. I would like to welcome you to the fourth technical review committee meeting, which is aimed at monitoring and deciding the most effective clean up methods for the sites at Seneca Army Depot.

Colonel Cross, I believe, will be here. Some of you probably don't know him. But folks from Albany are meeting with local representatives at Willard over the economic future of the area and how Seneca Army Depot might play a part in that but I do expect him to come by.

I would like after I get done to have each person introduce themselves and announce what office they are with. Quite a few of the folks are regulars. I have seen them before. And then we will get on with the site briefings by the Corps of Engineers and then folks from Engineering Science will tell you what progress has been made as far as what actual work has been made in the field.

Mr. Miller, soon to depart, will talk

about the technical review committee charter and how we might get that finalized.

Randy will talk about the preliminary site characterization report and our information repository. We'll take questions and answers and then we will talk about the agenda for the next meeting.

So if each person would please identify themselves so that Trisha can get that down, I would appreciate it.

MR. HEALY: I am Kevin Healy from Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Michael Duchesneau from Engineering Science in Boston.

MR. MARINNE: Paul Marinne (phonetic), Engineering Science in Boston.

MR. BATTAGLIA: I am Randy Battaglia. I am the project manager.

MR. ENROTH: Thomas Enroth, environmental engineer, Seneca Army Depot.

MR. KATZ: Steve Katz, EPA, Region II.

MS. STRUBLE: Carla Struble, EPA, Region II.

MR. ABSOLOM: I am Steve Absolom from the New York State DOH.

MR. CHEN: Marsden Chen.

MR. GUPTA: Kamal Gupta.

MR. DOMBROWSKI: Brian Dombrowski from Seneca County Health.

MS. SWEET: Mary Beth Sweet, Seneca Pure Waters.

MR. MILLER: Jim Miller from Seneca Army Depot.

MR. SCOTT: Robert Scott, State DEC.

MS. KANE: Joy Kane, U.S. Army Environmental Center.

MR. STAFFORD: Ken Stafford, supervisor of the Town of Varick.

MR. COOL: Bill Cool, committeeman for the Town of Varick.

MR. NOLL: I am not a representative. Joseph Noll (phonetic).

MS. RAFFERTY: Bonnie Rafferty, State Health Department, Bureau of Environmental Exposure.

MR. GARRETTY: Dan Garretty (phonetic) from the State Health Department. Also with the Bureau of Environmental Exposure Investigation.

MS. PEACHY: Mary Jane Peachy (phonetic)

with the Department of Environmental Conservation out of Avon.

MS. VERA: Linda Vera, DEC as a citizen participation specialist.

MR. KITTELL: Okay. Kevin Healy.

MR. HEALY: All right. As always I am going to give you an update. For the second meeting in a row we have representatives from Engineering Science here who will give you more in-depth. I am going to give you pretty much an administrative overview.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Kevin, could you please move the tripod there? Thank you.

MR. HEALY: Is that better?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Perfect.

MR. HEALY: First as always we are going to discuss the ash landfill and open burning grounds. Those are the RI/FS on the main portion of the work that's been done.

Last time we walked we had finished the Phase I and we were in the process of doing the contracting of the procurement action of the Phase II. That's now all been completed. We have completed all of the Phase II work at the OB grounds. The ash landfill was delayed

somewhat because of bad weather. We just recently -- actually as of this morning finished off the final well that was intended and from there on we will be sampling in the next few weeks. And then it will take about another four, five days to get the analytical results back. In approximately two months time we will be able to put it altogether or start putting it altogether in a report format with some conclusions and recommendations for completion. Then from there we will go ahead and put together a RI report along with a feasibility study. And we expect to be able to finalize both of those by the spring of '94. And following that the record of decision, which will lay out the recommendations for final remediation. And that will be expected or we should expect that one by late 1994. So we have a lot to look forward to in the next couple of months.

The next order of business as always is the solid waste management discussion. First will be the high priority areas of concerns; that is the areas that we have decided in the

past have the greatest potential for needing additional work. And this just for your benefit a list. Also I noticed in the packages that some of the sheets are a little messed up as far as order goes from what I have right here so bear with me. They are all in there. Just in a different order. The first one, these are the areas of high priority. And that is pretty much for your reference. All right. Here is an update on the work that is being done. We are performing site investigations at those 10 areas. The work plan revisions are coming close to a completion. We have had some regulatory review and we are now revising or making final revisions to work plans. We expect to have the work plan completely done by July of 1993. Following that we will actually be out in the field initiating the field work and we hope to have that initiated by September of '93. We need to finish off the work plan and I need to get my act together and get a contract in place so we can start. And we expect to be able to do that by September of '93. All right. I am

sorry. On the first 10 the contract has already been awarded. We need to modify it based on changes that were made by the regulators.

MR. KITTELL: May I?

MR. HEALY: Sure.

MR. KITTELL: We have taken a fair amount of pains with the work plans on these site investigations because of two reasons. If we go out and investigate one of these sites and as a result of the work done conclude that no more needs to be done, everyone has to be in agreement that the work plan was properly prepared and the work plan did show that nothing more needs to be done, there is no contamination. Also from the Army's point of view, we want to insure if something is found that it is valid and everybody agrees that there is something there that needs further study. There is tremendous expense involved in taking it to the steps beyond this initial site investigation.

MR. HEALY: Okay. All right. Now, we will talk about the second order of business.

And when it comes to site investigations, and that is the moderate priority sites, for your benefit there is a sheet in there that shows which sites those are. As far as updating the status of the work goes, the second 15 lag in the initial 10 by a couple of months. So we are right now in the process of preparing the work plan as opposed to the first where we are trying to work the plan up. We expect to complete the draft of the work plan by July of '93. Following that it is required that the regulatory folks review it and give us comments. We hope to revise the work plan and hope to have all the process done by the late summer of '93 and we hope to be able to initiate all the work sites by the fall of '93.

MR. KITTELL: There are funds available now slated for Seneca Army Depot to actually do this field work, too.

MR. HEALY: All right. And also I think it ended up in the front of your package but we have also included a glossary of terms as we were asked to do in the TRC. These are the main terms we use and an explanation

given and a definition given for your benefit and reference. All right. And then all of these -- I believe all of you have received a copy of the package. Take it home with you, have more of a chance to look at it. If it causes you to have any questions, then feel free to ask. And that is it for the administrative update.

I will now introduce Mr. Mike Duchesneau, who is from Engineering Science who is going to talk more in detail about the actual field work.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: What we have here are our maps that we prepared from the combination of both the Phase I and Phase II work that's been done to date. These are preliminary maps but yet I think I wanted to show you a good feel for where we stand and what we have done to date. I think the maps represent that as well as can be expected.

Just to provide an overview of the organization of the project here, we have the Corps of Engineers, the project manager here is identified as Mike Stahl. There has been a slight change recently in that Mike Stahl

has been replaced by Gary East but will still be involved in performing the same function as Mike Stahl was involved in. The technical manager is Kevin Healy, who has just spoken to you. We have Seneca Depot represented by Randy Battaglia and EPA Region II with Carla, also NYSDEC, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, represented by Kamal, myself as project manager for Engineering Science and support staff for Drilling Laboratory and UXO.

MR. HEALY: UXO standing for unexploded ordinances.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: The approach at the OB grounds was a two prong approach involving explosives, heavy metals, semi-volatile as well as volatile as well as PCBs and nitrate and pH. We employed a screening program. The last time we spoke I talked in depth about what that program was; to screen the soil samples that we collected in order to then select a group which would go for more extensive complete analysis. As part of this project, we needed unexploded ordinance support so we maintain a high degree of

safety and our people don't get hurt. These areas are still active areas for OB OD. We performed electromagnetic surveys to screen the areas for any potential pits or drums of that nature. We also performed ground penetrating radar services to a follow-up of the EM surveys to better define any anomalies for the EM. Then we used an electromagnet.

MR. KITTELL: It is like a manual sweeper.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: It detects any manual anomaly in the grounds. It is more sophisticated than the type that you see people using on the beach. It provides a hard copy out-put of the results of the electromagnet waves penetrating the soils. The areas that we are interested in were the burn pads. The burn pads -- maybe I should just move over this way. How is that? The burn pads, which are nine in number, which is where formally munitions were burned on the ground; the berm surrounding these pads and each pad had a berm to prevent material from migrating away from the pad; the low lying hill, which was a hill that runs pretty much

the entire length of the site; ground water monitoring wells, which you see located periodically, to monitor the quality of the ground water and also the direction of flow which flows to Reeder Creek. Reeder Creek is located over in this direction. Also of interest here is the open detonation mound. This is an OB OD facility. Burning was done here. Open detonation is performed here. We have also collected surface soils back further in this area to identify the potential for -- as materials were released during the burning process what was the potential for that material to then be re-deposited on the surface further downwind; surface water and sediments in both Reeder Creek and on the site.

There are several wetlands identified here as W's, W-8, for example, W-13. Basically, these are manmade wetlands as a result of the movement of the earth to build the pads. We have sampled those wetlands and the biota in the streams and the on site wetland. The results of all this data have been compiled. We have sent the samples to

the lab. We have received them back. They have finished the data evaluation to evaluate the quality of the data we have collected.

The next step in the progress and the phase of the program that we are in is to perform a risk assessment, a containment and transport analysis and also followed by a risk assessment and that is right where we are right now. You see a much broader picture of the OB OD site here; the OB site and OD site, Reeder Creek and how it flows out to the road. This identifies the areas of the surface water samples that we have collected not only on site and in the adjacent area of Reeder Creek but also downstream from the site. I might add that these lines here are the New York State Cordinant (phonetic) System, the entire facility. All the samples that we have collected, all the wells that we have installed are all in reference to the New York State Cordinant (phonetic) System so that they are clearly identified in space here.

We have provided you this just to show

you where the network of monitoring wells are installed on the site. We have two layers of monitoring wells. We have a layer of monitoring wells that are located in the overburden, which is approximately 10 to 15 feet thick. It is essentially what is called glacial. Glacial is an unsorted mixture of sand, silt, gravel, all pretty much swished together. When the glacier rolled over this area you get dense, compacted material. So what we have is that layer of soil called the overburden overlying fractured bedrock, a zone of between two to five feet thick, weather bedrock, I should say, followed by shale. We have screened wells in the overburden. The majority of the wells are screened in the overburden. We also have a set of wells, couplets if you will, located adjacent to the overburden wells that are screened in this weather bedrock. We will have to identify whether or not vertical penetration of any potential contaminant has moved down into the weathered rock. What we have found to date is there is no difference between the pisametric (phonetic) head

between the wells that are screened in the weather bedrock and the wells that are screened in the overburden. Proving there is no vertical migration pathway, which is good news.

MR. CHEN: When you say pisametric (phonetic) --

MR. DUCHESNEAU: A pisametric (phonetic) head is the height of the evaluations of the well.

MR. CHEN: It is the same in all wells?

MR. DUCHESNEAU: The couplets and the screen of the overburden and the screen in the bedrock -- basically the water rises to the same level in the well implying that there is no difference in the head, pisametric (phonetic) head, that would cause water to want to flow vertically down. So what we are saying is water generally flows as a wall, if you will, towards Reeder Creek.

The Phase II program that we have processed involved sampling additional samples on the pad borings, additional soil sampling on the pads, on the grids -- grids being the areas in between the pads

designated as GB here on the map -- the berm excavations, which are excavations in the berm surrounding each of the pads, also the low lying hill and the burn kettle. The burn kettle was a new discovery that we hadn't identified in the first phase of work. It is basically identified as a small square in this area and apparently it was used many years ago to burn munitions, I guess. That is what we think.

MR. HEALY: Would you just explain why we went ahead with the Phase II? Why it was necessary?

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Phase II was a requirement. What we wanted to do in the Phase I is identify if there was potential for the presence of contaminants there and what those levels were and if there was a necessary step to go further into the investigation. From the Phase I information we looked at, it looked as though there was some heavy metals and some explosives in the soils and we wanted to better define the extent of some of those materials. Based on some geophysical analysis that we had

performed we identified grid spacings that were necessary and followed it up with the Phase II which was just, you know, a collection of additional samples to better define the X, Y areas of concern.

Surface water sediment sampling was performed. Same reason. We had some Phase I data, evaluated it and it appeared there was some potential for metals in the stream so we followed on to collect some additional samples to better define it.

A lot of these locations and the numbers were negotiated in the work plan with the regulatory folks. Ground water monitoring, we added additional wells based on comments from EPA and NYSDEC to better define radial flow and the potential for some of the down gradient locations from some of the pads that we were interested in knowing more about; if they had released any metals or explosives to the ground water.

Moving on to the ash landfill. We have completed all of the field work, other than sampling the ground water wells that we have installed. As of this morning, Paul and I

actually went and observed some of the wells and talked to the geologist who is installing the final well. That well is installed. It is just a bedrock well. So all of the wells have been installed. All of the soil samples that we are going to collect have been completed. The lab has all of the soils data. We have not sampled the ground water wells but that should be happening within a couple of weeks. At which time we will submit samples to the laboratory and within 35 to 40 days from that point we will receive the ground water samples and then begin the same process that we are beginning that we are at the OB grounds; that being contaminant interest and transport study and a risk assessment.

The areas to be investigated here are the non-combustible landfill over in this area, the ground water, surface water. And the areas that we are interested in are right in here. Again we have used screening tools, soil gas, geophysics, fracture trace analysis to locate some of the bedrock wells. We have also done geologic mapping to identify the

fractures to identify the best location to position our bedrock wells. The photo-lineament and the fracture trace analysis, as I mentioned, we performed to identify the location of the bedrock wells. We have -- we don't have them yet.

Maybe what I will do is back up and jump on the soil gas survey because that is what this overview here says or identifies. We performed soil gas in this area that we call the bend in the road. We have identified two areas that appear to have elevated VOC soil gas numbers. And based on the work that we have done and the follow-up bores that we did around the perimeters of these areas we think these two areas constitute the source of the ground water plume that is emanating towards off post. The technique that we used was a head space technique. We drove a split spoon into the sample, collected a spoon sample, removed the sample and put it in a jar and extracted a portion of the gas. And based on that information we were able to delineate the extent of these two areas. This is an identification of the borings that were

performed also, the test pits that were performed in the areas that we are interested in with the high VOC's and this ground water plume that we currently know to exist in that area. We have dashed these lines based on only the Phase I data because again we don't have Phase II data. We expect this plume to this line to probably bend a little bit more around this area in here.

MR. KITTELL: You did take quite a bit of -- or did do quite a bit of sampling off the post in areas that would be downstream of the direction of the plume, correct?

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Down in this area?

MR. KITTELL: Yes.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: We have installed wells right at the top of this plume to better define what the extent of this plume is. This plume has not reached any residences off post that we know and we have been sampling one in particular.

MR. KITTELL: I see some new faces here today. I think it is important that people know that this investigation is not strictly based on the property the Army owns. We have

permission and have been actively doing samples off the post so that we know the full extent of this plume.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What's the concentration of the plume and what type of contaminant are you referring to?

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Good question. The concentration on the plume depends on where you are in the plume.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What's the highest and lowest?

MR. DUCHESNEAU: The highest number we have to date is total volatiles 11.5 or 11.6 ppm and that is right around zero.

MR. KITTELL: Parts percent million?

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Parts per billion?

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Million. The contaminants that we are finding are basically TCE, trichloroethylene, and the breakdown products of TCE; that being DCE and some vinyl chloride, which are known breakdown products of TCE.

MR. KITTELL: The dotted line at the end of the plume --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Ten ppm.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Neither one of them are soluble with water.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Some of them are.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Not very much.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Not very much.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What's the vapor pressure of your DCE?

MR. DUCHESNEAU: I don't know.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Vinyl chloride is a polymer.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: This is not a polymer.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: In fact, it is one of the basic building blocks for your plastic industry because of its beautiful characteristic of leakages and it tends to link up with other items which become inert, same as your chlorine in that salt shaker. Once its leaked --

MR. DUCHESNEAU: We are not talking about that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: We are talking about elements and toxic materials. There is a toxic state of an element and there is an inert material. I would like to have you

make that clear when you refer to these contaminants.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Okay. We are talking about vinyl chloride. That is two -- we are talking about vinyl chloride and it is -- I don't know what the vapor pressure is off the top of my head. I know it is a very volatile compound. I believe at room temperature it is a gas. It is relatively low. Simply, TCE solubility is 1100 ppm. Vinyl chloride, I believe it is in the 900 ppm range. Generally in an environmental investigation you never find dissolved chlorinated solvents at those solubility limits. They are much, much less. Which is exactly what we are finding here. We are talking parts per billion. And only in the very center of the source area are we finding ppm, parts per million levels.

MR. HEALY: Paul, I believe you were obscured when you were pointing out the concentration down toward --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: At the toe, this lowest -- well, first east to the west is 104 parts per billion.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Is that total?

MR. DUCHESNEAU: That is total. Most of that -- I happen to know these wells in particular but most of those 104 is DCE. There is very little TCE and there is no vinyl chloride. It is all DCE. Where you find the vinyl chloride and the TCE is more up in this area here. Apparently, as things migrate through here they are degraded to the point where all you see is DCE at this toe over here.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I would like to make a comment. I grant you years ago we would have approved 1100 part per million. For your drug industry we used to have four grades. If I might go back, we used to have a commercial grade, a technical grade and an analytical grade and USP. Now, we have gone way up because of solid state devices and computers to go out to a gnat's eyebrow, which is beyond the commonsense of practicality I call it. You will find these things almost anywhere. If you look far enough, you would probably find some particles of gold because their

instrumentation is accurate today. We talk about toxic materials. I think we better confine ourselves to those areas that are really toxic.

MR. KITTELL: Sir, under this particular procedure that we are in we are not unilaterally allowed to decide what are or are not toxic levels. There are certain standards that have been established; health based standards for water purity based upon presumed long term exposure to these chemicals. It is a standard that we have to analyze and a standard that we have to clean up. As to part per billion, we have absolutely no choice to --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I certainly can. Can I give you the perimeters on toxicity? They are arbitrary. Can I make another comment?

MR. KITTELL: The purpose of this discussion and in this group is to not rule upon what scientific basis was written into the laws that we have to confirm to. We can't change those. The Army is duty bound to follow and clean up to the standards that have been set in the law.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I think you are going to go by recommendations from the group here. Let's not go on witch hunts. Let's be practical in what we tell them. You said there are funds available. How much?

MR. KITTELL: Funds, I believe, to do the site investigations. However, these gentlemen -- if you remember earlier in Mr. Duchesneau's opening statement -- will be preparing a risk analysis and a risk assessment. At that point they will go into the possible toxicity concentrations and possible receptors at each site. And I think at that point that would be the ideal time for the body to collectively debate the risk and cost associated with mitigating that risk.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: The question was brought up and I think you brought it up that there were funds available. Can you tell me the total of these funds?

MR. KITTELL: There is eleven million dollars.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: We have to burn it up.

MR. KITTELL: No, we don't. We are not at a stage where we are spending money for clean up and we are still defining the problems so that we can make an intelligent decision, informed decision on how much more money needs to be made or spent to effect clean up, if clean up is required.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I don't disagree with you on going through all these technical terms and using forms not generally common knowledge to the general public. I think you can narrow it all down to three points: What is the problem? Is there a problem? What we do about it and how we do it? That is all there is to it.

MR. KITTELL: I agree.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Are we in the first phase? Is there a problem?

MR. KITTELL: There certainly appears to be a problem.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: You are determining if there is a problem? Okay. Yes.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: I just might want to add a little bit about the bedrock investigation that we did seeing it is the

last item on the list here. We have drilled bedrock wells to, basically -- again as I was mentioning earlier -- to look at the potential for vertical migration at the site and we have completed those wells. We have four monitoring well clusters. The clusters include an overburden well, a shallow bedrock well and the competent bedrock. Call it zero -- for talking purposes at this point, zero data. The second rock well is screened from the zero to 20 feet and the third rock well is a deep rock well which is screened from 20 to some interval down to 100 feet. That interval is determined based on Packard tests that we performed. Packard tests are inflating two large balloons and pushing water between the two balloons to see how much water can be penetrated into the rock. We can determine the ability of the rock to transmit the water when we find the zone that has the highest ability to transmit the water. We have completed all that work also.

MR. HEALY: Let's just point out that the purpose for establishing what the permeability of the deeper rock is is to make

sure there is nothing in this higher aquifer which is contaminated that is migrating down to the deeper layer of water which is where the drinking water is coming from.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I want to point out the location of those. We have got one up here in the downgrading and three -- excuse me -- four located down near the toe of the plume.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: That is basically all I had to discuss. We will know a little bit more about some of the numbers and where we stand as far as the potential and the risk analysis the next time we meet because we are in the process of doing that now. Thanks.

MR. MILLER: To keep this rather short since the TRC charter is something that we have gone over before before the committee and it has been distributed in the past to all members and we have had some comments on it and today we are planning to discuss the second round of comments on this charter which were received by -- which were received from the EPA and New York State DEC. Seneca

has incorporated all these comments into the charter that you have in your handout section. Actually section five shows -- spells out the changes that were made. The provisions that are being deleted or moved are represented by the slash line through them. The material that has been added into the charter is the shaded area. This is in section five. The comments that we received from NYSDEC and EPA are included in your packet as well. We could run through the changes real quickly just to simplify it.

Section five, page one. The first item that we see deleted there is number three on the bottom. Since the time -- since actually the first of the year -- since that time we have signed our federal facilities interagency agreement. This is just bringing things up to current tense. So we have substituted language in the charter that shows the IAG has been signed.

Changes, we have numerous provisions in the charter which relate to disclaimers. This TRC Charter is by no means to act in lieu of the IAG or take precedence over the

Interagency Agreement that we have signed. These disclaimers -- we have actually created an entire section on disclaimers. It is pretty straightforward. It is on page two on section five.

Over on page three we have just added a header which talks about TRC membership. That was inadvertently deleted from the last version. Everyone has looked at it. Shaded area, "TRC members." We have updated the charter with a current list of members as of January 21st.

Really straightforward changes here. We are not making much of a change on page four. The normal meeting place for the TRC meetings will be the NCO Club, which you all know is being remodeled at the current time. That is why we are here right now.

Page five. Minor revision as far as the role of the chair of the TRC Committee. Just some basic words missing there. We have replaced in "C" on page five attenders with attendees.

Page six. This is language that the EPA has recommended that we include and we have

worked with them on that language and it is word-for-word as they wish that it be presented in the charter.

Page seven. A very similar change for New York State DEC responsibilities.

I guess the next somewhat significant change is on page eight where we talk about responsibilities. The one change that occurs here at the request of New York State DEC is that we make it explicitly clear that the New York State Department of Health representative will be assisting the New York State DEC representative in proposing any State health standard requirement, criteria or limitation as legally applicable. The previous language did not state the New York State Department of Health role was more to assist the DEC. Rather than prior to this the language indicated they would be speaking as an equal to the DEC in working matters regarding the clean up activities.

Everything else is quite straightforward here. These are really minor changes. We are hoping to have this document signed in the near future. This is, like I say, the

second round of comments on that and we are on our fourth TRC meeting. I hope that we can rap this up and have it signed within the next meeting.

MR. CHEN: Jim, in the draft that you just read, page 10, third item. If you compare that to the final copy on page six, it needs to be changed. In the draft copy page 10, the one you just read, item number three on the top of the page.

MR. MILLER: Page 10 I have as the signatore section.

MR. CHEN: "The provision of the IAG shall control" or is that on some other page?

MR. MILLER: I am not sure I am following. What is wrong?

MR. CHEN: This is the draft. You got that number three there and on the final --

MR. MILLER: Marsden has pointed out that some of the changes were not carried over into the final charter. We have illustrated the changes in section five but it has not been carried over into the final charter which is enclosed in section six. That will be corrected. If anyone else notes

something that should be changed or takes objection to, definitely get in contact with us.

MR. KITTELL: You are planning to send it out for signature when?

MR. MILLER: We can say 30 days. Does that seem reasonable?

MR. KITTELL: Will it go out in 30 days?

MR. MILLER: If in 30 days there is no further comments, we can send it out for signature. If you feel that it should be shorter --

MR. CHEN: I have seen this thing three or four times. Why don't we cut it shorter to two weeks?

MR. KITTELL: Does anybody have any problem with sending this thing out in two weeks for finalizing the signatures? Okay.

MR. MILLER: Excellent. Give the floor over to Randy Battaglia. He's going to talk about PSCR's.

MR. BATTAGLIA: For our new faces here today we have in the Willard Town Hall an administrative record and information repository that is available there as a

public record. And a lot of these documents when finalized are kept in the public record in Willard.

Currently down in the record we have work plans that detail all the work that is going on at these two sites. One part of the process is a draft preliminary site characterization report, which is a draft report that the regulators wanted that summarized in a preliminary form all this information that we have at the ash landfill and open burning grounds.

We are going -- we normally do not include draft reports in a public record until they become finalized because some of the information in those reports is subject to change.

The draft preliminary site contracts report or PSCR will be included down there. All we have in there is the work plan of what is to be done at the sites. The preliminary site characterization report will be used and included is the remedial investigation report which will probably be done this winter sometime after we get the Phase II

information.

There will not be a final draft -- final preliminary site characterization report. That information is simply going to be used in the remedial investigation report.

Other documents included in the public record will be the remedial investigation report, which will include the risk assessment which discusses the relative health and environmental risks of contaminants that are found and assesses how much risk there is for a particular site; that is included in the RI report; and also feasibility studies with respect to what kind of remediation will be done and which is the most cost effective remediation for a site; and also for the other areas of concern documentation that no contaminants have been found if there happened to be a no action site. All that information when finalized will be included in that public record.

And prior to doing a remediation there will be a preliminary remedial action plan that is used also for public comment. That is the time when the public actually can make

formal comments as far as being addressed in the remediation.

The reason we are putting the preliminary site characterization report in draft form is because technically we don't have any technical data in the repository. I am just announcing that we will put it down there and it will be available for the ash landfill and other opening burning sites.

The other areas we are concerned with will have a site investigation report for each representative area. We will summarize what is found at those areas. And any of those other areas that become no action sites have to be included in a record of decision, either a separate document or that maybe tied onto a record decision that is made regarding the ash landfill or burning ground site. Of course, if any of the other areas of concern need any further investigation, we will go onto the entire remedial investigation feasibility process.

Okay. That is all. I just wanted to announce those documents are going to be included in there.

MR. KITTELL: We are back to questions and answers. Before we do that I would like to introduce Colonel Cross for those of you who haven't met him before. Would you like to make a comment?

COLONEL CROSS: Since when have I ever turned down an opportunity like that. First of all, I would like to apologize for being a little late. We had two meetings going on at the same time. One of them is the community meeting that was called by the Governor of New York, Mario Cuomo, to get the State and the local agencies and people together to talk about the reuse of the facilities that Seneca has that would be under utilized. That meeting is going on at Willard as we speak. I was down there for the first half. I will finish the second half down here.

I do want to make some comments. I think the TRC is an extremely important outreach vehicle of the environmental program at Seneca. I think one of the big concerns in many people's minds is, "well, you are leaving. What's going to happen?" We have heard all types of things. The first thing

is, Seneca is not going to close. Seneca has been downsized. We will have slightly over 300 people left here. We will still have three main missions between conventional ammunitions and storage and maintenance of industrial plant equipment.

I will be replaced by an O-5, a lieutenant colonel commander who has been -- his name his Lieutenant Colonel Roy Johnson. He's coming out of the ammunition division and 82nd Airborne Division. He should arrive toward the end of this month for the change in command on the 15th of July of this year.

What is interesting about the Army is that the Army's commitment to the environment transcends whoever sits in the commander's position. The Army's commitment to environmental stewardship, appliance, restoration and preservation and conservation remains unchanged. When I leave, somebody else comes in. You will have somebody better to look at when you come back the next time; that will be the SEAD commanding officer, which means that Lieutenant Colonel Johnson will be the head.

What's been the impact of this? When we went into the RI/FS at the beginning -- keep in mind that we are talking about over 900 civilian positions shrinking down to about 300 positions -- we originally had an environmental staff of six individuals. We retained five of those six during the cut. So we cut the rest of the Depot by two-thirds and we only cut the environmental staff by one-sixth. And, of course, part of the rationale for that is the special weapons operation, the industrial plant equipment operations and generators and a lot of the hazardous waste and not so much the restore and restoration side of it but the daily operations and conservation. We are not generating as much as we used to. So the environmental staff was maintained. That happens to be a pet favorite of mine. I think everybody understands that a commander at an installation is legally and personally liable should they not support an environmental program. I don't know if everybody realizes that but that is what the lesson of Aberdeen was. Quite frankly, there

has been tremendous interest in this. My advice to my successor will be to become personally involved. It will be important for himself, the County of Seneca and the Depot.

The reports after the RI/FS remains unchanged. We have signed the IAG. It is operational for most intents and purposes. What you see will not show any significant change at all. Unless you drive on the north side of the Depot and you see the grass is 12, 16 inches higher. We are no longer mowing. That is the intent of what will be visible to you.

I am really gratified for the way the TRC has matured from the first meeting that we had in the NCO Club and the participation for all the players. I think it bodes well for doing the progress right. When you get many people looking at it from many different respectives, you generally get better solutions. I will shut up with that.

MR. KITTELL: Thank you very much. Questions and answers?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: It is Dick Durst from

Cornell Analytical Labs.

COLONEL CROSS: He was late for the same reason.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Colonel Cross had mentioned the fact how little of the Depot actually will be available for community use in terms of the land area and so on. I am just curious -- since the mission of ammunitions storage will continue -- how much of the burning of old ammunitions will go on and what impact will this have on the ongoing clearing of the facility as far as remediation efforts?

MR. KITTELL: The facility that we are clearing is more a campus like setting where most of the soldiers live in the North Depot that is becoming available. It is about 165 acres out of the 11,000.

As far as munition destruction, the place where we actually blow up ammunition versus the place where we burn it, which is located at the site but not on top of each other, there will be burning continuing on in the future. But the burning that we are doing is in accordance with RCRA. We

constructed a steel burning tray about as wide as this table and 40 feet long. The burning is conducted in a tray. The residue is vacuumed up. You don't have this problem about metals to be discovered by people 20 years later. There might be scheduling conflicts with the clean up in the burn pads if clean up is indicated but we are not using the burn pads actively now.

As far as the demolition goes, we have applied for a continued operating permit as a hazardous waste disposal site. Because when you blow up a bomb you are disposing of a hazardous waste. That will have to be operated and managed in that way. Under the RCRA law when you vacate the site you are bound to clean up the site.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Do you have specifications on the air pollution on those sites?

MR. KITTELL: We have a permit from the State of New York to open burn. There are regulations associated with that. Their studies have shown where we have been able to demonstrate that there is very little --

although I am not going to say there is none -- there is very, very little pollution that comes off. It is so energetic. And most of the reaction just results in energy.

As far as our final operating permit from RCRA, there are air model studies that have to be done. Stop me if I wander off here, folks. They demand from us air modeling standards and also modeling that says how much actual weight of pollutant goes up in the air when you do certain types of operations. Our final operating permit when it is granted will probably also regulate frequency and that sort of thing for air pollution considerations.

MR. BATTAGLIA: One of the concerns that the regional air people have in Avon was submissions of metals, heavy metals. At that time we did a review of the type of propellants that were open burning for disposal. It did not have the poundage of metals in them that they were concerned with. I presume that the heavy metals that we have contamination in or around the burn pads was from past burning. The burning of bulk

propellants which send a rocket out of a tank does not have the concentration of heavy metals in the propellants itself. There maybe a grain in the initiating part that initially ignites.

They were concerned -- I think this goes back to '88 when we started looking and finding information of what kind of chemicals is in the propellants for the regional air people. As Gary said, it is part of our permit application. To get a final we have to do a risk assessment where they monitor the type of air emissions and what type of health risks from those emissions.

One of the things that we have been talking about with the DEC just lately is what kind of alternatives there are for opening burn detonation. The Army is researching alternatives, such as recycling the propellant. I personally don't know how far along the Army is in doing that. I think feasibly -- I don't know how far they are in developing those processes. One of the things about the open burning, open detonation is the only way to -- we have

anti-tank rockets. They are not made to be taken apart and have the explosive destroyed some other way. The only thing you can do is detonate.

The Army has done studies at open burning and open detonation grounds across the country. In general they found little can be done. They have found some contamination at some burning areas. Quite commonly you find contamination at the burning areas.

Other things like fuses or bombs or artillery shells, the only way -- they weren't designed to be taken apart. I have heard that the Army is researching and doing things in developing new processes so they can be disposed of in other ways. I have no idea how far along the Army is in getting those things changed over. The trouble is everything that was in storage wasn't designed that way. There are cases whereby in routine inspections the quality assurance people will find munitions that might be corroded and so forth. And the only safe way to get rid of it is to take it to the demo

grounds and detonate it.

We have identified all the percentage of the chemicals in those ammunitions. That is being reviewed by the DEC for that part of the permit to be allowed to do that.

COLONEL CROSS: There are locations and there are processes to recycle ammunitions. Some of the materials -- some of them are so energetic you don't want to bother with them because it is more hazardous to do it. The problem with those is depending upon what kind of process you use you may end up -- in many cases you end up with more hazardous fluid streams coming out of the items rather than taking them out to a ground area where it doesn't migrate and you can pull it up later. That is the biggest problem they are having. It turns out it generates more hazardous waste than the traditional methods.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have a question for you. I am with the State DEC in the permit process. I am concerned about how long it takes to get through the current process and get a permit that relates to the opening burn area and open demo area. I realize the State

takes a long time. We are at fault. We are strict in the process. But when you mentioned cutting the staff from six to five, is there plans to decrease staff or is this cut going to delay the process further? That is what my concern would be.

MR. KITTELL: That is an excellent question. Let me tell you how we have tried to manage our way through that difficulty. We started out, maybe naively, when RCRA was started thinking we would be able to write our permits. The Army had all best intentions. They had blanket contracts that wrote permits for multiple sites across the country. We were caught up in a process where the environmental programs in various States matured. Parts of those programs were transferred over to the State's control or the States had their own regulations, own way of doing things. We seemed to be caught up -- not that there was any negative intent. We seemed to be caught up in our inability to make or hit a moving target as it appeared that the requirements changed. So we went through a series of many submissions of our

RCRA permit to the DEC folks. The different folks that were here. We thought we were getting close in the process and then it appeared as if things had reversed.

What we did at that point was we got together with the people -- the permit administrators at that time in Albany and explained our dilemma. They explained our dilemma, too. Because they thought we weren't doing a very good job in submitting the permits. We offered to hire the expertise that it takes. We were able to get the same folks -- a large firm that's represented here today -- to help us with the permit process. We were able to bring the administrative and technological capability together and put together a permit and pursue it.

I would say at this point right now with their assistance we are looking for action on the State's side to bring this thing to closure before we end up in another situation where human nature makes it difficult for us to perceive. There seems to be a fair amount of turnover in staffing and project managers

in all offices. And when a new person comes to the job and looks over something as complex as that, I know I would like to go back and look at it from square one. Human nature prevents progress. We are looking for some activity soon in getting an operating permit for our part B. We did the very same thing with the part X permit, which deals with the demo grounds. We did the same thing with the hazardous waste incinerator. This is the popping plant for the de-activation for small arms; where we shoot bullets off in a confined furnace. Not what is sometimes thought of as a hazardous waste incinerator. It is classified like that under the law. We do not have the staff but we have hired a consulting staff to make up for the loss. We would like to see things move along now.

COLONEL CROSS: I think the other side is certainly the TRC's principles, the mediation efforts. The other side of this is the day-to-day operations. We have to prevent future problems like our predecessor left us years ago and years ago. And with the reduction in two very major missions you

just reduce the amount of time and people that you need to track all of those day-to-day type things. That is the other side.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I hope it is not cut to four or three.

COLONEL CROSS: It is not going below five while I am here, I will tell you that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary, first of all, I would like to compliment Colonel Cross for his comments on the downsizing of the base instead of closing. That is a very significant statement in my mind. Number two, we are all here because we were all interested in the environment. Some are just private tax payers, some with a pecuniary interest. I think we are all interested in the environment and we would like to keep it in perspective. We would not want Seneca Army Depot to become a Love Canal. I could give you an hour in verse on that but I won't go into that.

Part per billion. Now, an article published last July on the Depot said cancer causing substances at Depot. Well, they

listed five parts per million as being the maximum toxic level and 10 part per billion were found. Let me tell you what it meant. Let me give you what a part per billion is. If you took one gallon of this toxic material, it means one gallon in a billion gallons. It would mean one gallon in twenty-three million eight hundred and nine thousand five hundred and twenty-three barrels of the stuff. Let's go a little farther. Each barrel by the way is a 42 gallon barrel. Suppose now we took that one part and broke it down to a drop. We can take that drop and break it down to 100 pieces. It would mean that we would have sixteen one-hundredths of a drop of material in every 42 gallon barrel. And I doubt that there is anybody in this room can clean a barrel to that purity and stake his life on it. So we talk about 100 parts per billion or 10 parts per billion. We are talking about numbers that are beyond comprehension to the general public and beyond toxicity.

I will tell you this. Whoever took these measurements, if you go out here and

take any booze bottle out there, you will find ketones and fuel oils. I don't know human toxicity but these are ingested everyday but we don't hold a big program and spend eleven billion dollars on a search to find out if the public is going to be harmed. Enough said. I quit.

MR. KITTELL: I appreciate your comments. I think I am going to build on them at the risk of boring everyone. You had the same problem when I started in this business. When I tried to, I was able finally to get parts per billion. Our water reservoir, which is probably four times the size of this building, holds 100,000 gallons of water. And I was able to conclude after a little hen scratching one tear drop in that reservoir is a part per billion.

Let's talk about toxicity and long term health effect. Think, if you will, how big a cigar or cigarette you would have to smoke to kill you there on the spot. However, science has proven that long term ingestion from smoke or smoking is a health hazard. And I think that is the problem that we are in here

now. I think what you are talking about -- some of the chemicals that we are talking about takes a large dose of that particular chemical to have an immediate toxic effect on the human body. But it is unclear in many cases with these chemicals what happens to the human body if you ingest them in water day in day out for a lifetime. I think that is where some of the confusion comes up with. Why we are worrying about parts per billion? And why we are chasing after a problem like this?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary, let me add another point. I spent a good part of my life in industry working with trichloroethy, acetone and some of the other items that were mentioned in the newspaper article. I appreciate the safety. There is no security on it.

First of all, let's not come to the conclusion we are going to live forever. Number two, on the heavy metal end of it we would have to shut down the State of Illinois. The people have dug wells there and the lead deposits are so heavy and they

are drinking this water and they have been all their life. If we were going to go and take contamination levels of it, we would find cities full of it. Let's go farther south, Dakota, their Badlands. I thought they were Badlands because of the indians and the cowboys. They are Badlands because of the chemical deposits. People live there and cows eat this grass and we use the wheat from there and whatnot. You know what it will do to your eyes and your nails and all of that? Gary, you don't have to smoke as many cigarettes either.

MR. CHEN: Sir, if I could just try to tell you something. I am from the State of New York Conservation Office. I hear what you are saying. I cannot --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I agree with you.

MR. CHEN: It is not a matter of containing. I think I hear you saying it is 104 parts per billion. There is a farm house further down. Is that farmer willing to drink that 104 parts per billion? I would say that one in a million persons is willing to drink that water. Maybe I am and you are

but the rest of us here are not. If we ignore that concentration of water, we are in fact saying to the United States this is a bunch of baloney. We cannot do that under the system that we live. And a lot of these concerns, as Gary said earlier, are based on health studies. A lot of the health studies are very conservative and say you have to drink so many quarts of water for your lifetime.

MR. KITTELL: We need to move this along. I will say, as long as you brought up the farm house, we are -- for those of you who are new here. Since we have found this problem we are testing the water at the farm house every quarter and sending those tests to all the people involved that have lived there. We know we are not effecting those folks at this time.

I also want to reiterate this process. When we go through it, it is a risk based process. There will be a risk analysis done of possibly the people that can be effected and that sort of thing. There is an economic part to that. That is how final remediation

will be determined publicly and risk and cost based.

MR. HEALY: I would just like to point out at the very first meeting I laid out the program that we are doing, the RI/FS process, what that is about. And just everything we are doing is legally mandated, the whole process; what we test to, what we test for and how we go about doing everything is legally mandated. So the Army is doing what the Army has been directed to do. It would be nice to cut down cost. It might be nice to cut down the scope of the cost but we have the EPA and NYSDEC telling us that you will do it this way.

MR. KITTELL: As Marsden pointed out, we are doing what the laws tell us.

We need to set another date. We have been developing these agendas ourselves. It would be nice to get a little feedback on the adequacy of the presentations. We would certainly like any possible agenda topics mailed to us within the -- we take them within a week or two of the next meeting. Of course, if they come late, that limits our

ability to address what will be discussed. So with that said how about a date?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: How about early October because that is the end of our fiscal year.

MR. KITTELL: It has been proposed that the next meeting be October. The entire government fiscal year ends in September. October would be a good time for you to talk about what we are able to get obligated for the end of the fiscal year and also to talk about what the '94 budget year holds. It would, I think, give the folks from Boston and Huntsville quite a bit to talk about, you think?

MR. HEALY: Yes.

MR. DUCHESNEAU: Early October?

MR. KITTELL: Yes. We may also at that time know a little bit more about the proposal that we have to perhaps start removing some of those materials at the ash landfill where we know we don't need to study further. So October. Would you like to pick a day and time?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Second Wednesday.

How does that sound? I don't know the date.

MR. CHEN: The second Wednesday is the 13, October.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: We had tried to stay to Thursdays because there are things that go on at the Depot.

MR. KITTELL: It is Wednesday, 13, October. We maybe back in the NCO Club; and if not, we will be down here. I guess that is a rap.

* * *

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Patricia Ann Nelk, hereby certify that I reported in stenotype shorthand the proceedings had on the 9th day of June, 1993, in the matter of the Technical Review Committee.

And that the foregoing transcript, herewith numbered pages 2 through 60, is a true, accurate and correct record of those stenotype shorthand notes to the best of my ability.

Patricia A. Nelk

Patricia Ann Nelk

DATED AT: Rochester, New York

this 3rd day of July, 1993.

APPENDIX 2.0

Ash Landfill field Activity Reports

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

[illegible] • Boston, Massachusetts [illegible] • (617) 8[illegible]300 • Fax (617) 859-2043

April 12, 1993

Mr. Gary East
CEHND-PM-E
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Division
106 Wynn Drive
Huntsville, AL 35805

SUBJECT: **Delivery Order K, Ash Landfill, March Monthly Field Report**

Dear Mr. East:

This monthly field report describes the activities, conducted in March, associated with the remedial investigation currently underway at the Ash Landfill. During January, ES completed the original SOW Phase 2 fieldwork. No activities have been performed at this site, other than quarterly groundwater monitoring, since this time pending approval to proceed with Contract Modification No. 2. Approval to proceed was obtained on or about March 29, 1993. Upon receipt of this letter ES began rescheduling subcontractors and preparing to mobilize. Subcontractors have been scheduled to begin field activities on April 19, 1993.

The first task to be performed will be a soil gas survey at a source area identified as the "bend in the road". This task, which has been added as part of the contract modification will begin on or about April 19, 1993. ES anticipates this task will require one week to perform. American Auger and Ditching Inc., a Small, Woman Owned Business, will provide drilling support.

Following this task, eight (8) soil borings will be performed, based upon the results of the soil gas survey, to define the boundary of the source areas. Four (4) of these borings have been added as part of the contract modification. This task is anticipated to require one-week to complete and should begin on or about April 26, 1993. American Auger and Ditching Inc. will remain on-site following the soil gas survey and complete the soil boring program.

During this week ES will also perform a Very Low Frequency (VLF) geophysical survey at the site to determine the location of bedrock fractures. This information will be utilized to determine the optimum location of bedrock monitoring wells.

Also during the week of April 26, 1993, a second drilling subcontractor, Maher Environmental Inc. will arrive on-site and begin the installation of the deep bedrock monitoring wells. The location of the well screen in the bedrock will be determined as a result of packer testing. Four (4) deep triple cased bedrock monitoring wells will be installed to a maximum depth of 100 feet. ES anticipates that this will require approximately one month to complete.

In addition to the four (4) deep bedrock monitoring wells, twelve (12) monitoring wells will be installed at the site. Four (4) of these monitoring wells will be double cased shallow bedrock monitoring wells. These bedrock wells will be installed within the upper 20 feet of competent bedrock. Eight (8) overburden monitoring wells will also be installed. These wells will be screened

within the till/weathered shale and will not penetrate into the competent bedrock. ES anticipates that each double cased bedrock monitoring well will require two (2) days to complete while the overburden monitoring wells will require one (1) day to complete. This work will be supported by American Auger and Ditching Inc. and should be completed within three (3) weeks, following the completion of the soil boring program.

Four (4) monitoring well clusters will be installed, each well cluster will consist of an overburden well, a shallow bedrock well and a deep bedrock well. The well clusters will be used to define the western extent of the plume and will provide information regarding vertical penetration into any existing bedrock aquifers.
The additional four (4), non-cluster, overburden wells will be located, based upon the pre-monitoring well installation tasks, such as the soil gas survey, to define the northern extent of the groundwater plume.

The drilling program should be completed by the first week in June. However, site reports from the depot indicate that the area is wet. This could mean a slowdown in progress due to drilling equipment becoming bogged down in the mire.

The activities which have been performed and which will be performed have and will be conducted in full compliance with the requirements of the EPA and NYSDEC approved Engineering-Science (ES) Phase 2 workplan addendum and the addendum letter of November 19, 1992.

The following summarizes the SOW field tasks were performed in December and in January:

SOW Task 1 The workplan addendum was completed in November,
SOW Task 2 Completed all 5 test pits in the Ash Landfill,
SOW Task 3 Completed all 5 test pits in the Non-Combustible Fill Landfill (NCFL),
SOW Task 4 Performed 4 of the required 8 soil borings in the Ash Landfill, 4 additional borings have been added as part of the modification,
SOW Task 5 Completed all 5 soil borings in the NCFL
SOW Task 6 None of the 8 overburden wells have been installed, one of these monitoring wells has been added as part of the contract modification,
SOW Task 7 Completed the Photo-Lineament Analysis,
SOW Task 8 Completed the Fracture Trace Analysis,
SOW Task 9 The seismic survey has not been started, since it will be deleted as part of the cost modification, instead, a Very Low Frequency (VL)F geophysical survey will be added,
SOW Task 10 The downhole geophysics has not started, since it will be deleted as part of the cost modification, instead, this task will be replaced with a soil gas survey,
SOW Task 11 The installation of bedrock wells has not started, since this task was amended as part of the cost modification. Four (4) bedrock monitoring well clusters will be installed, each cluster will included a shallow bedrock well and a deep bedrock well. One cluster, (i.e. a shallow and a deep bedrock well) has been added as part of the contract modification,
SOW Task 12 Sampling of the groundwater wells has not begun since additional wells will be installed as part of the cost modification,
SOW Task 13 Aquifer Characterization has not begun since all the monitoring wells are not installed,

SOW Task 14 All surface water/sediment samples have been collected,
SOW Task 15 Surveying has been performed for the test pits and the soil borings performed to date,
SOW Task 16 Soil sample data from the nine (9) existing soil borings and the surface water/sediment samples have been received from Aquatec Inc.,
SOW Task 17 No groundwater samples have been submitted to Aquatec Inc.

As a result of the first quarterly groundwater monitoring event, the groundwater sampling protocols were modified. These groundwater sampling protocols have been negotiated and finalized with EPA and NYSDEC during February and will be implemented for all groundwater sampling activities at this site.

If you have any questions regarding this or any other project, please, do not hesitate to call me at 617-859-2492.

Sincerely,

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Michael Duchesneau, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Mr. Kevin Healy, COE Huntsville
Mr. Randall Battaglia, SEAD
Mr. John Biernacki, DESCOM
Mr. K. Hoddinott, USAEHA
Ms. Wilson, CETHA-IR-S
CEMRD-EP-C

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Prudential Center • Boston, Massachusetts 02199 • (617) 859-2000 • Fax (617) 859-2043

May 10, 1993

Mr. Gary East
CEHND-PM-E
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Division
106 Wynn Drive
Huntsville, AL 35805

SUBJECT: **Delivery Order K, Ash Landfill, April Monthly Field Report**

Dear Mr. East:

This monthly field report describes the activities, conducted in April, associated with the remedial investigation currently underway at the Ash Landfill. The fieldwork is part of the contract modification required to complete the Phase 2 field program.

The first task performed was a soil gas survey at a source area identified as the "bend in the road". This task, which has been added as part of the contract modification began on April 19, 1993. This task required one week to perform. American Auger and Ditching Inc., a Small, Woman Owned Business, provided drilling support. The technique used to perform the soil gas survey was modified due to the abnormally high water table. The original technique involved gas extraction by inserting steel probes and applying a slight vacuum. This was identical to the technique successfully performed last November by ES. The initial attempts to extract gas using this technique was fruitless, since all the soil pore spaces were filled with water. An alternative technique was used, which required collection of split spoon soil samples. A soil sample, approximately 10 grams, from the split spoon was then placed in a 40 mL VOA vial. Following a small period of equilibrium, a headspace sample was then removed and analyzed with gas chromatography. The collected data indicated that the modified technique proved successful in delineating the extent of the source area. I have discussed the modification with both EPA and NYSDEC on April 22. Both agencies understood the field conditions and verbally accepted the modification. A follow-up letter was not required by these agencies.

In preparation of the drilling program, ES collected a water sample from a fire hydrant located near the Ash Landfill. This water was to be used during the installation of the bedrock wells to cool the core barrel and for use during the packer tests. The analytical data from this sample indicated the presence of Trihalomethanes (THM) in the water. THM are formed during the bromination and chlorination disinfection of drinking water. Total THM for this sample was 71 ppb, with chloroform at 29 ppb. Since chloroform had been detected previously at the site there was some concern with using this water. Further, NYSDEC has established a groundwater discharge limit for chloroform at 7 ppb. ES believes that this water is unacceptable for the intended use. In consultation with the COE and alternative source was identified, the nearby Lake Seneca. A sample of the lake was submitted to the MRD approved laboratory, PACE Inc., for quick turnaround. The results, obtained within 48 hours, failed to detect THM and therefore is satisfactory for use on this project.

Based upon the results of the soil gas survey, eight (8) soil borings were performed to define the boundary of the source areas. Four (4) of these borings have been added as part of the contract modification. This task required one-week to complete and began on April 26, 1993. American

Auger and Ditching Inc. remained on-site following the soil gas survey and completed the soil boring program. The borings were located around the perimeter of the areas identified by the soil gas survey as the source area.

During this week ES also performed a Very Low Frequency (VLF) geophysical survey at the site to determine the location of bedrock fractures. This information was not successful in identifying the presence of on-site fractures. Originally, ES had proposed that a seismic survey would be more effective, providing deeper penetration and a greater likelihood of detecting a bedrock fracture, however, EPA preferred VLF.

A second drilling subcontractor, Maher Environmental Inc. arrived on-site on May 5 to begin the installation of the deep bedrock monitoring wells. The location of the well screen in the bedrock will be determined as a result of packer testing. Four (4) deep, triple cased bedrock monitoring wells, will be installed to a maximum depth of 100 feet. The first task, which Maher began, was to install the outer 6" steel protective casing. Due to the deep mud, this drilling rig, which is a truck mounted rig, was able to install only one casing. The other locations were so muddy that the drilling contractor was unwilling to attempt to reach the location for fear that damage to the undercarriage of the rig will occur. Maher agreed that an All Terrain Vehicle (ATV) type rig will be required. This rig will be on-site beginning on May 17, 1993 to complete the installation of the deep bedrock wells.

In addition to the four (4) deep bedrock monitoring wells, twelve (12) monitoring wells will be installed at the site. Four (4) of these monitoring wells will be double cased shallow bedrock monitoring wells. These bedrock wells will be installed within the upper 20 feet of competent bedrock. Eight (8) overburden monitoring wells will also be installed. These wells will be screened within the till/weathered shale and will not penetrate into the competent bedrock. ES anticipates that each double cased bedrock monitoring well will require two (2) days to complete while the overburden monitoring wells will require one (1) day to complete. This work began on May 4,1993 and is being performed by American Auger and Ditching Inc. This work should be completed within three (3) weeks. American Auger and Ditching Inc. has a track, ATV on-site and have been successful in reaching the drilling locations. However, even with this type of rig the rig still becomes stuck but can be pulled out of the mud with the bulldozer.

The goal of this drilling program is the installation of four (4) monitoring well clusters, each well cluster will consist of an overburden well, a shallow bedrock well and a deep bedrock well. The well clusters will be used to define the western extent of the plume and will provide information regarding vertical penetration into any existing bedrock aquifers.

ES still anticipates that the drilling program will be completed by the first week in June. However, should additional delays occur due to drilling equipment becoming bogged down in the mire it will be unlikely that ES will be able to meet the June 26, 1993 groundwater sampling deadline.

The following summarizes the SOW field tasks were performed in December and in January:

SOW Task 1 The workplan addendum was completed in November.
SOW Task 2 Completed all 5 test pits in the Ash Landfill,
SOW Task 3 Completed all 5 test pits in the Non-Combustible Fill Landfill (NCFL),
SOW Task 4 Completed all 8 soil borings in the Ash Landfill, 4 additional borings had been added as part of the modification,

SOW Task 5 Completed all 5 soil borings in the NCFL,
SOW Task 6 Installed 6 of the 8 overburden wells have been installed, one of these monitoring wells has been added as part of the contract modification.
SOW Task 7 Completed the Photo-Lineament Analysis.
SOW Task 8 Completed the Fracture Trace Analysis.
SOW Task 9 The Very Low Frequency (VLF) geophysical survey has been completed.
SOW Task 10 The downhole geophysics has been deleted as part of the cost modification, instead, this task has been replaced with a soil gas survey, which has been completed.
SOW Task 11 The installation of bedrock wells has started. Four (4) bedrock monitoring well clusters will be installed, each cluster will included a shallow bedrock well and a deep bedrock well.
SOW Task 12 Sampling of the groundwater wells has not begun since all the wells have not been installed.
SOW Task 13 Aquifer Characterization has not begun since all the monitoring wells are not installed.
SOW Task 14 All surface water/sediment samples have been collected.
SOW Task 15 Surveying has been performed for the test pits and the soil borings performed to date.
SOW Task 16 Soil sample data from the nine (9) existing soil borings and the surface water/sediment samples have been received from Aquatec Inc.,
SOW Task 17 No groundwater samples have been submitted to Aquatec Inc.

As a result of the first quarterly groundwater monitoring event, the groundwater sampling protocols were modified. These groundwater sampling protocols have been negotiated and finalized with EPA and NYSDEC during February and will be implemented for all groundwater sampling activities at this site.

If you have any questions regarding this or any other project, please, do not hesitate to call me at 617-859-2492.

Sincerely,

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Michael Duchesneau, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Mr. Kevin Healy, COE Huntsville
Mr. Randall Battaglia, SEAD
Mr. John Biernacki, DESCOM
Mr. Kieth Hoddinott, USAEHA
Ms. Wilson, CETHA-IR-S
Commander, CEMRD-EP-C

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Prudential Center • Boston, Massachusetts 02199 • (617) 859-2000 • Fax. (617) 859-2043

June 30, 1993

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 | # of pages ▸ 4

To Jim Miller	From Mike Duchesneau
Co. SEAD	Co. Engineering-Science
Dept. Environmental	Phone # 617-859-2492
Fax # 607-869-1362	Fax # 617-859-2043

Mr. Gary East
CEHND-PM-E
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Division
106 Wynn Drive
Huntsville, AL 35805

SUBJECT: Delivery Order K, Ash Landfill, May Monthly Field Report

Dear Mr. East:

This monthly field report describes the activities, conducted in May, associated with the remedial investigation currently underway at the Ash Landfill. The fieldwork is part of the contract modification required to complete the Phase 2 field program.

All overburden monitoring wells have been installed. This work was completed in early May. A bulldozer was required to assist the installation of these wells due to the difficulty in moving through the muddy terrain.

A second drilling subcontractor, Maher Environmental Inc. arrived on-site on May 5 to begin the installation of the deep bedrock monitoring wells. Due to the deep mud, this drilling rig, which was a truck mounted rig, was able to install only one outer steel casing. The other locations were so muddy that the drilling contractor was unwilling to attempt to reach the location for fear that damage to the undercarriage of the rig would have occurred. Maher agreed that an All Terrain Vehicle (ATV) type rig would be required. This rig arrived on-site beginning on May 17, 1993 in order to complete the installation of the deep bedrock wells.

Two of the four bedrock monitoring wells were installed on-site and two were installed off-site in the field owned by Mr. Joseph Nagle. Each of the deep bedrock wells were installed in a cluster which included a shallow bedrock monitoring well and an overburden monitoring well. The four (4) deep, triple cased bedrock monitoring wells, were installed during the later portion of May and into early June. The installation of the wells was completed on June 9, 1993. The first task for the deep wells was the installation the outer 6" steel protective casing, which was set at least 2 feet into the competent shale bedrock. This outer steel casing sealed the monitoring well from the overburden. This process involved first placing a bentonite seal at the base of the 6" steel casing. Subsequently, a bentonite/cement grout was tremied down into the annular space around the 6" casing until it reached the ground surface. This was done to eliminate any potential for vertical migration of pollutants from the overburden and the weathered shale into the upper portions of the bedrock.

Once the bentonite/cement grout had hardened a minimum of 48 hours, the second 4" inner steel casing was installed within the outer 6" steel casing. This second steel casing was installed within a 20-foot drilled hole. A bentonite seal was placed at the based of the 4" casing. The steel casing was raised slightly, allowing a volclay bentonite grout to be pumped into the 4" drill casing and flow up into the annular space around the 4" steel casing until it reached the ground surface. Following the observation of the grout at the surface, thereby assuring a completely filled annular space, the 4" steel casing was lowered and set into the bentonite seal. This second casing sealed the upper 20 feet of competent bedrock from the deeper sections of the bedrock which will be cored. This was done to

prevent any potential for vertical migration through fractures in the upper 20 feet of the competent bedrock. Regional geological information indicated that the upper sections of the bedrock were likely the most fractured portions of the bedrock.

The investigation of the deeper portions of the bedrock proceeded by coring the next 20 feet of competent bedrock, i.e. in the rock below the base of the 4" steel casing, and performing a packer test to determine the hydraulic conductivity of that zone. If the packer test indicated that the hydraulic conductivity was greater than $1x10^{-6}$ cm/sec., then the well screen was set in that 20-foot zone. If, however, the hydraulic conductivity was less than this value then another 20-foot core was taken and the packer test was performed on this section. Rock Quality Designations (RQD) were determined for each section cored in addition to a visual inspection by the senior ES team geologist. This process continued until a hydraulic conductivity value greater than the 1x10-6 cm/sec. was obtained or 100 feet in competent bedrock was cored.

All four (4) deep bedrock monitoring well clusters were screened in the first 20' zone below the 4" casing. In three (3) of the four (4) well locations the hydraulic conductivity of this first zone was greater than $1x10^{-6}$ cm/sec and, therefore, by the criteria described earlier the well was screened in that interval. However, in the last well cluster, located off-site in the farmer's field, the hydraulic conductivity of all four 20-foot cored sections were less than $1x10^{-6}$ cm/sec. and, therefore, the hole was cored to the full 100 foot depth. In consultation with the COE, the well was screened in the first 20-foot zone below the 4" casing, in order to be consistent with the other screened intervals and because the most likely vertical migration pathway would be in the upper sections of the rock since it was generally the most fractured. As expected, this well is a poorly recharging well.

In addition to the four (4) deep bedrock monitoring wells, twelve (12) additional monitoring wells were installed at the site. Four (4) of these monitoring wells were double-cased shallow bedrock monitoring wells. These bedrock wells were installed within the upper 20 feet of competent bedrock. Eight (8) overburden monitoring wells were also installed. These wells were screened within the till/weathered shale and did not penetrate into the competent bedrock. The work on the shallow bedrock and overburden wells began on May 4, 1993 and was performed by American Auger and Ditching, Inc. This work was completed within three (3) weeks on May 20, 1993. American Auger and Ditching, Inc. also utilized a track mounted, ATV on-site in order to reach the drilling locations. However, even with this type of rig, the rig still became stuck and had to be pulled out of the mud with the bulldozer.

The goal of this drilling program was to install four (4) monitoring well clusters, each consisting of an overburden well, a shallow bedrock well and a deep bedrock well. The well clusters will be used to define the western extent of the plume and will provide information regarding vertical penetration into any existing bedrock aquifers.

The drilling program was completed during the first week in June 1993. ES still anticipates being able to meet the June 26, 1993 groundwater sampling startup deadline.

The following summarizes the SOW field tasks which have been performed through the last week in May:

SOW Task 1 The workplan addendum was completed in November.
SOW Task 2 Completed all 5 test pits in the Ash Landfill,

SOW Task 3 Completed all 5 test pits in the Non-Combustible Fill Landfill (NCFL),
SOW Task 4 Completed all 8 soil borings in the Ash Landfill; 4 additional borings were added as part of the modification,
SOW Task 5 Completed all 5 soil borings in the NCFL,
SOW Task 6 Installed all 8 overburden wells, one of these monitoring wells was added as part of the contract modification.
SOW Task 7 Completed the Photo-Lineament Analysis.
SOW Task 8 Completed the Fracture Trace Analysis.
SOW Task 9 The Very Low Frequency (VLF) geophysical survey was completed.
SOW Task 10 The downhole geophysics was deleted as part of the cost modification, instead, this task was replaced with a soil gas survey, which was completed.
SOW Task 11 The installation of bedrock wells was completed. Four (4) bedrock monitoring well clusters were installed, each cluster included a shallow bedrock well and a deep bedrock well.
SOW Task 12 Sampling of the groundwater wells has not begun since all the wells have not been developed.
SOW Task 13 Aquifer Characterization, including "Packer Tests" was completed as part of the bedrock well installation. Slug testing on the overburden and shallow bedrock wells has not been performed.
SOW Task 14 All surface water/sediment samples were collected.
SOW Task 15 Surveying was performed for the test pits, the soil borings and the monitoring well, but is not complete.
SOW Task 16 Soil sample data from all on-site soil borings and the surface water/sediment samples were received from Aquatec Inc.,
SOW Task 17 No groundwater samples have been submitted to Aquatec Inc.

The remaining work to be performed in the next month of fieldwork involves well development, well sampling, slug testing and measurement of the groundwater levels. This work is scheduled to occur during the next month.

If you have any questions regarding this or any other project, please, do not hesitate to call me at 617-859-2492.

Sincerely,

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Michael Duchesneau, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Mr. Kevin Healy, COE Huntsville
Mr. Randall Battaglia, SEAD
Mr. John Biernacki, DESCOM
Mr. Kieth Hoddinott, USAEHA
Ms. Wilson, CETHA-IR-S
Commander, CEMRD-EP-C

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Prudential Center • Boston, Massachusetts 02199 • (617) 859-2000 • Fax: (617) 859-2043

June 29, 1993

Mr. Gary East
CEHND-PM-E
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Division
106 Wynn Drive
Huntsville, AL 35805

SUBJECT: Delivery Order K, Ash Landfill, June Monthly Field Report

Dear Mr. East:

This monthly field report describes the activities, conducted in June, associated with the remedial investigation currently underway at the Ash Landfill. The fieldwork is part of the contract modification required to complete the Phase 2 field program.

All overburden, shallow and deep bedrock monitoring wells have been installed. This work was completed in May and early June. During the second week in June, the newly installed bedrock and overburden monitoring wells were developed. Generally, recharge rates were slow, which was consistent with the packer testing performed during the bedrock monitoring well installation.

The sampling of these monitoring wells began during the week of June 21, 1993 and is on-going. ES anticipates the work will continue for an additional three (3) weeks. Due to the timing of the events, both quarterly sampling and Phase 2 RI sampling are occurring simultaneously.

The following summarizes the SOW field tasks which have been performed through the third week in June:

SOW Task 1 The workplan addendum was completed in November, 1992.
SOW Task 2 Completed all 5 test pits in the Ash Landfill,
SOW Task 3 Completed all 5 test pits in the Non-Combustible Fill Landfill (NCFL),
SOW Task 4 Completed all 8 soil borings in the Ash Landfill, 4 additional borings had been added as part of the modification,
SOW Task 5 Completed all 5 soil borings in the NCFL,
SOW Task 6 Installed all 8 overburden wells, one of these monitoring wells has been added as part of the contract modification.
SOW Task 7 Completed the Photo-Lineament Analysis.
SOW Task 8 Completed the Fracture Trace Analysis.
SOW Task 9 The Very Low Frequency (VLF) geophysical survey has been completed.
SOW Task 10 The downhole geophysics has been deleted as part of the cost modification, instead, this task has been replaced with a soil gas survey, which has been completed.
SOW Task 11 The installation of bedrock wells is completed. Four (4) bedrock monitoring well clusters have been installed, each cluster included a shallow bedrock well and a deep bedrock well.
SOW Task 12 Sampling of the groundwater wells, including well development, has begun.
SOW Task 13 Aquifer Characterization, including "Packer Tests" has been completed as part of the bedrock well installation. Slug testing on the overburden and shallow bedrock wells will be performed in early July.

SOW Task 14 All surface water/sediment samples have been collected.
SOW Task 15 Surveying has been performed for the test pits, the soil borings and the monitoring well, but is not complete.
SOW Task 16 Soil sample data from all on-site soil borings and the surface water/sediment samples have been received from Aquatec Inc.,
SOW Task 17 Groundwater samples are being submitted to Aquatec Inc. but sampling is not complete.

If you have any questions regarding this or any other project, please, do not hesitate to call me at 617-859-2492.

Sincerely,

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Michael Duchesneau, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Mr. Kevin Healy, COE Huntsville
Mr. Randall Battaglia, SEAD
Mr. John Biernacki, DESCOM
Mr. Kieth Hoddinott, USAEHA
Ms. Wilson, CETHA-IR-S
Commander, CEMRD-EP-C

PARSONS MAIN, INC.

Prudential Center • Boston, Massachusetts 02199 • (617) 262-3200 • Fax: (617) 859-2575

July 17, 1992
720229-06000

Mr. Kevin Healy
CEHND-PM-E
U.S Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Division
106 Wynn Drive
Huntsville, Alabama 35807

SUBJECT: Ash Landfill Monthly Report

Dear Mr. Healy:

This monthly report describes the recent activities which have occurred at the Ash Landfill. As you recall, the Preliminary Site Characterization Summary Report (PSCR) was submitted on April 17, 1992. Comments were received by Parsons-Main from the Army on June 4, 1992, from NYSDEC on June 2, 1992 and from EPA Region 2 on June 9, 1992.

The responses to these comment will be incorporated into the future Draft Remedial Investigation (RI) report. Additionally and addendum to the existing approved workplan will be prepared which will include the EPA and NYSDEC recommendations for the Phase II Program. It is anticipated that following the Phase II fieldwork, the RI/FS will be prepared. The addendum to the workplan will describe all activities which is deemed necessary in order to respond to the comments. These activities may include the following items:

1. Additional monitoring wells and soil borings in order to better define the extent of the source area for VOCs at the northern portion of the Ash Landfill;

2. Installation of bedrock monitoring wells, both shallow and deep in order to determine the extent of groundwater impacts to the deeper portions of the bedrock aquifer;

3. Performance of seismic geophysical survey and a fracture trace analysis. These techniques will determine the presence of bedrock fractures and provide a basis for bedrock monitoring well locations and;

4. Bedrock coring, caliper logging, temperature logging and packer testing will be useful in determine the presence of fractures which are responsible for VOC migration and the placement of monitoring well screens.

Prior to finalizing the workplan Addendum, it would be helpful to arrange a conference call or meeting with EPA and NYSDEC to discuss their respective comments on the PSCR and how they relate to the Phase II field activities.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 617-859-2492.

Yours truly,

PARSONS MAIN, INC.

Michael Duchesneau

Michael Duchesneau
Project Manager

Response Requested _Yes X No
Date Requested _____

MD/cmf/D#8

APPENDIX 3.0

OB Grounds Monthly Field Activity Reports

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

... ...ter • Boston, Massachusetts 02199 • (617) 859-2000 • Fax (617) 859-2043

April 11, 1993

Mr. Gary East
CEHND-PM-E
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Division
106 Wynn Drive
Huntsville, AL 35805

SUBJECT: Delivery Order J, Open Burning Grounds, March Monthly Field Report

Dear Mr. East:

This letter is intended to update you regarding the current status of Delivery Order J, at the Seneca Army Depot (SEAD), located in Romulus, New York. This delivery order describes activities related to performing a CERCLA Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) at a former Open Burning (OB) ground. In January, ES completed the remaining fieldwork associated with the original Scope of Work (SOW) and ceased field operations since the additional fieldwork, negotiated with EPA and NYSDEC, involved out of scope work. Contract modification approval for Modification No.1 was required to begin the out of scope work. In order to avoid schedule delays, ES proceeded, at risk, with the out of scope fieldwork during the last week in February and the first week in March. ES received notification of the contract modification approval on March 29, 1993. The only remaining fieldtask is to perform a macroinvertibrate survey of the drainage swales that drain the site. EPA and NYSDEC had requested that this survey be performed during the spring thaw. This activity is planned within the next month.

The following describes the tasks which have been completed:

SOW Task 1	The workplan has been revised and approved, however, a modification to the groundwater sampling protocols was required following concerns over sample turbidity expressed by NYSDEC,
SOW Task 2	UXO site clearance has been completed,
SOW Task 3	All berm excavations have been completed,
SOW Task 4	Pad borings have been completed, including, the additional sixteen (16) surface borings which was performed as part of the contract modification,
SOW Task 5	All grid borings have been completed.
SOW Task 6	Low hill excavations and sampling has been completed including the additional twenty (20) samples and the four (4) additional borings which were performed around the "burn kettle". These twenty samples and the four borings were part of the contract modification.
SOW Task 7	All overburden wells have been installed,
SOW Task 8	All groundwater levels have been determined,
SOW Task 9	All surface water samples have been collected,
SOW Task 10	The biotic assessment has been delayed until spring as part of the workplan addendum negotiations with EPA and NYSDEC,

SOW Task 11 The runoff delineation has been performed,
SOW Task 12 All downwind soil samples have been collected,
SOW Task 13 All background borings have been performed,
SOW Task 14 Groundwater sampling has been completed,
SOW Task 15 Soil analyses data has been received from the subcontractor laboratory, Aquatec Inc., for all of the samples submitted,
SOW Task 16 All data from the groundwater samples have been received from the laboratory.

Validation of the field data has begun and should be completed within the next month. In general, the data appears to be consistent with the results from the Phase 1 program, which indicated that the pad berms contained the highest concentrations of both explosives and heavy metals. A preliminary review of the data indicates that the low-lying hill has not been severely impacted, the concentrations of lead and barium appear to be at or only slightly above background.

The downwind soil sampling did not detect the presence of explosives. Lead and barium concentrations were at levels consistent with background. Of note are the three (3) background samples collected from the roadside along Rt. 96A. Elevated concentrations of Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH), pthalates and heavy metals, including lead up to 200 ppm, were detected. This information is consistent with what would be expected from the residuals associated with internal combustion engines. ES believes that this data will be useful in establishing the upper range for background at this site.

Although turbidity in the groundwater samples were low, heavy metal concentrations in groundwater, i.e. lead, did exceed drinking water standards at a few wells. ES is currently analyzing and comparing the data to the background monitoring wells.

One surface water sample contained Trichloroethylene (TCE) at 17 ppb. This is unusual since VOCs have not been previously detected in soil or groundwater samples at the site.

Please feel free to contact me at 617-859-2492 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Michael Duchesneau

Michael Duchesneau,P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Mr. Kevin Healy, COE Huntsville
Mr. Randall Battaglia, SEAD
Mr. John Biernacki, DESCOM
Mr. K. Hoddinott, USAEHA
Ms. Wilson, CETHA-IR-S
CEMRD-EP-C

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Prudential Center • Boston, Massachusetts 02199 • (617) 859-2000 • Fax (617) 859-2043

May 10, 1993

Mr. Gary East
CEHND-PM-E
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Division
106 Wynn Drive
Huntsville, AL 35805

SUBJECT: **Delivery Order J, Open Burning Grounds, April Monthly Field Report**

Dear Mr. East:

This letter is intended to update you regarding the current status of Delivery Order J, at the Seneca Army Depot (SEAD), located in Romulus, New York. The fieldwork associated with this delivery order has been completed. The only remaining fieldtask is to perform a macroinvertibrate survey of the drainage swales that drain the site. EPA and NYSDEC had requested that this survey be performed during the spring thaw. No activity has been performed associated with this site during the month of April. This activity is planned within the next month.

The following describes the tasks which have been completed:

SOW Task 1	The workplan has been revised and approved, however, a modification to the groundwater sampling protocols was required following concerns over sample turbidity expressed by NYSDEC,
SOW Task 2	UXO site clearance has been completed,
SOW Task 3	All berm excavations have been completed,
SOW Task 4	Pad borings have been completed, including, the additional sixteen (16) surface borings which was performed as part of the contract modification,
SOW Task 5	All grid borings have been completed.
SOW Task 6	Low hill excavations and sampling has been completed including the additional twenty (20) samples and the four (4) additional borings which were performed around the "burn kettle". These twenty samples and the four borings were part of the contract modification.
SOW Task 7	All overburden wells have been installed,
SOW Task 8	All groundwater levels have been determined,
SOW Task 9	All surface water samples have been collected,
SOW Task 10	The biotic assessment has been delayed until spring as part of the workplan addendum negotiations with EPA and NYSDEC,
SOW Task 11	The runoff delineation has been performed,
SOW Task 12	All downwind soil samples have been collected,
SOW Task 13	All background borings have been performed,
SOW Task 14	Groundwater sampling has been completed,

SOW Task 15 Soil analyses data has been received from the subcontractor laboratory, Aquatec Inc., for all of the samples submitted,

SOW Task 16 All data from the groundwater samples have been received from the laboratory.

Validation of the field data has been completed. In general, the data appears to be consistent with the results from the Phase 1 program, which indicated that the pad berms contained the highest concentrations of both explosives and heavy metals.

A preliminary evaluation of the data was provided to you in the March Field Activity Letter.

Please feel free to contact me at 617-859-2492 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

Michael Duchesneau,P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Mr. Kevin Healy, COE Huntsville
Mr. Randall Battaglia, SEAD
Mr. John Biernacki, DESCOM
Mr. K. Hoddinott, USAEHA
Ms. Wilson, CETHA-IR-S
CEMRD-EP-C

PARSONS MAIN, INC.

Prudential Center • Boston, Massachusetts 02199 • (617) 262-3200 • Fax: (617) 859-2575

July 17, 1992
70229-06000

Mr. Kevin Healy
CEHND-PM-E
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Division
106 Wynn Drive
Huntsville, Alabama 35807

SUBJECT: OB Ground Monthly Report

Dear Mr. Healy:

This monthly report summarizes the status of the Open Burning Grounds (OB) project at the Seneca Army Depot in Romulus, New York. As you are aware, the Preliminary Site Characterization Summary (PSCR) Report was submitted to the USEPA and NYSDEC on April 24, 1992. This document describes the field activities which occurred during the months of October, November, December and January. All activites described in the approved workplan was performed. Analytical data was received during the months of January, February and March. The PSCR was prepared during the month of March and April. It was not possible to perform validate all the obtained data and submit the report on schedule. Data validation is currently underway and is mercifully close to completion. The data validated data reports will be sent to the USEPA and NYSDEC when finalized.

MAIN received Army comments on May 30, 1992, NYSDEC comments on June 18, 1992 and EPA Region 2 comments on June 23, 1992. MAIN is currently preparing a response letter in order to address these comments but will not incorporate these responses into a revised PSCR. Instead, these comments will be addressed in the Draft Remedial Investigation Report and the Phase 2 workplan addendum, which MAIN will submit to the regulatory authorities for approval, following a review by the Army. The Phase 2 workplan addendum will describe the additional fieldwork deemed appropriate in order to address any regulatory issues which may have arisen from the Phase 1 data. Although not yet finalized the following items appear to be required:

1) The second round of groundwater analyses will utilize EPA Method 524 for confirmation of the non-detects in the first round,

2) Additional soil sampling will be necessary , particulary with the berms. The Phase 1 data indicated the presence of explosives and heavy metals in the berms.

3) Additional background soil sampling will be required in order to provide a more reliable database for defining the background level of metals in soil.

4) EPA has indicated that additional monitoring wells may be required to better define the direction of groundwater flow.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 617-859-2492.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. T. MAIN, INC.

Michael Duchesneau
Project Manager

Response Requested _Yes _x_No
Date Requested _____

MD/cmf/D#7

APPENDIX 4.0

Draft Administrative Record File Index

For the

Ash Landfill Site

DRAFT INDEX FOR

THE

ASH LANDFILL ADMINISTRATIVE

RECORD FILE

PREPARED BY the Engineering and Environmental Management Division of Seneca Army Depot (SEAD), Directorate of Engineering and Housing (DEH), in coordination with the Installation Public Affairs and Legal Staffs.

The Administrative Record File for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit and the associated Draft Index to the Administrative Record File has been developed in accordance with the public participation requirements of Sections 113 and 117 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. §§9613 and 9617; Subpart I of the National Contingency Plan (NCP), 40 CFR 300.8; Final Guidance on Administrative Records for selecting CERCLA Response Actions, OSWER Directive #9833.3A-1; the Inter Agency Agreement (IAG) for Seneca Army Depot; and Army Regulation 200-1, Section 9-11.

INDEX DATE: 12 July 1993

ORGANIZATION OF THE INDEX

This index has been developed to assist both the lead agency and members of the public in locating and retrieving documents included in the Administrative Record File. This index also serves as an overview of the history of the response action at the site. The index is organized by subject according to the below listed categories:

Categories

ASH-01	Factual Information
ASH-02	Policy and Guidance
ASH-03	Public Participation
ASH-04	Other Party Information
ASH-05	Decision Documents
ASH-06	Other Information
ASH-07	Enforcement Documents

NOTE: Guidance Documents listed in a Bibliography to a document included in the Administrative Record File may not be listed in the Administrative Record File Index.

NOTE: Information relevant to more than one response decision may be placed in the record file for an initial response and incorporated, by reference, in the indexes of subsequent record files. For these cases, the document will not be physically included in both files.

NOTE: * Indicates that the document is maintained in the confidential portion of the Ash Landfill Record File located in Building 123, Seneca Army Depot, Romulus, New York 14541-5001. These files are considered confidential because they contain names and addresses of members of the general public. Disclosure of such information could result in a Privacy Act violation.

NOTE: ** Indicates that the file consists of one or more analytical laboratory reports. Upon request to the Seneca Army Depot's Public Affairs Officer, groundwater analysis results will be furnished to any interested parties for visual inspection at the Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, NY.

INDEX DATE: 12 July 1993

SHORT INDEX

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT NAME
ASH-01-001	Seneca Army Depot Burning Pit/Landfill Site Investigation Final Report (Draft).
ASH-01-002	Final Workplan Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Ash Landfill Area, Seneca Army Depot.
ASH-01-003	**Historical Groundwater Monitoring Data (1987 to 1991).
ASH-01-004	**Quarterly Ash Landfill Groundwater Monitoring Laboratory Report for March 1992.
ASH-01-005	Draft Ash Landfill Preliminary Site Characterization Summary Report, April 1992.
ASH-02-001	Sampling Guidelines and Protocols; Technological Background and Quality Control/Quality Assurance for NYSDEC Spill Response Program, March 1991.
ASH-02-002 SEE COMPENDIUM	Guidance for conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA/Interim
ASH-02-003 SEE COMPENDIUM	Data quality objectives for Remedial Response Activities (Volumes 1 & 2).
ASH-02-004	Division technical and administrative guidance memorandum policy regarding alteration of groundwater samples collected for metal analysis.
ASH-02-005	Superfund Technical Assistance Grants Guidance EPA/540/8-90/013.
ASH-02-006	Superfund Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Handbook OSWER Directive 9230.1-03.
ASH-03-001	Introductory cover letter addressed to the Supervisor of the Town of Romulus explaining the Administrative Record File (Transmittal Cover Letter).
ASH-03-002 *	Community Relations Plan (CRP) mailing list.
ASH-03-003	Published Notice of Availability of the Administrative Record File for the Ash Landfill Site, Seneca Army Depot.
ASH-03-004 *	List of Recipients receiving a copy of the Notice of Availability of Administrative Record File for the Ash Landfill Site, Seneca Army Depot.

INDEX DATE: 12 July 1993

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT NAME
ASH-03-005	Administrative Record Fact Sheet providing an introduction to the Administrative Record File for the public benefit.
ASH-03-006	Public announcement of Remedial Investigations at the Ash Landfill and Open Burning Grounds Areas (press release).
ASH-03-007 *	Minutes from a meeting on groundwater contamination between SEAD officials and landowners.
ASH-03-008	Information Repository Fact Sheet.
ASH-03-009	Press release announcing the establishment of the Administrative Record file for the Ash Landfill site and the Information Repository.
ASH-03-010 *	Consents for access to privately owned properties.
ASH-03-011 *	Minutes from a meeting on groundwater contamination between SEAD officials and tenants potentially effected by contamination.
ASH-03-012*	CRP mailing list (First Revision).
ASH-03-013	Handout for the July 28, 1992 TechnicaL Review Committee (TRC) meeting. TOPIC: CERCLA & SARA.
ASH-03-014	Handout for the July 28, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting. TOPIC: Public Participation.
ASH-03-015	Handout for the July 28, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting. TOPIC: General Handouts.
ASH-03-016	Handout for the October 15, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting.
ASH-03-017	TRC meeting transcript for July 28, 1992 meeting.
ASH-03-018*	Community Relations Plan (CRP) & Technical Review Committee (TRC) mailing lists; October 2, 1992.
ASH-03-019	Community Relations Plan (CRP) Seneca Army Depot, Romulus, New York; October 1992.
ASH-03-020	TRC meeting transcript for October 15, 1992 meeting
ASH-03-021	TRC meeting transcript for January 21, 1993 meeting
ASH-03-022	Handout for the January 21, 1993 Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting.
ASH-03-023	Handout for the June 9, 1993 Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting.

INDEX DATE: 12 July 1993

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT NAME
ASH-03-024	TRC meeting transcript for the June 9, 1993 Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting
ASH-06-001	Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit; Index date of March 16, 1992.
ASH-06-002	Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit; Index date of July 2, 1992.
ASH-06-003	IAG Quarterly Report for April 1992.
ASH-06-004	IAG Quarterly Report for July 1992.
ASH-06-005	IAG Quarterly Report for October 1992.
ASH-06-006	Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit; Index date of November 2, 1992.
ASH-06-007	Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit; Index date of February 10, 1993.
ASH-06-008	Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit; Index date of July 10, 1993.
ASH-07-001	Federal Facility Agreement Under CERCLA Section 120; February 1993.

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: FACTUAL INFORMATION (ASH-01)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-01-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: Seneca Army Depot Burning Pit/Landfill Site Investigation Final Report (Draft)

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: July 1989

AUTHOR: ICF Technology Incorporated

RECIPIENT(S): U.S. Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency (USATHAMA)

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-01-002

DOCUMENT TYPE: Plan

TITLE: Final Workplan Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Ash Landfill Area, Seneca Army Depot

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: October 1991

AUTHOR: Hunter Environmental Science and Engineering, Inc. (ESE), and amended by Chas. T. Main, Inc., October 1991.

RECIPIENT(S): U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Division

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: FACTUAL INFORMATION (ASH-01) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-01-003**

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: Compilation of Historical Groundwater (GW) Monitoring Data for various sampling events between August 1987 and December 1991 for the Ash Landfill Site (bound in three ring binders).

LOCATIONS: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001
(**All GW Monitoring Data, because of its voluminous nature, is shelved separately from the Building 123 Administrative Record Files.)

DOCUMENT DATE: Various

AUTHOR: Various Analytical Laboratories

RECIPIENT(S): Seneca Army Depot

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-01-004

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: Quarterly Groundwater (GW) Analysis Report for the Ash Landfill Site.

LOCATIONS: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001
(**All GW Monitoring Data, because of its voluminous nature, is shelved separately from the Building 123 Administrative Record Files.)

DOCUMENT DATE: March 26, 1992

AUTHOR: National Environmental Testing, Inc.

RECIPIENT(S): Seneca Army Depot

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: FACTUAL INFORMATION (ASH-01) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-01-005

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: Preliminary Site Characterization Report at the Ash Landfill.

LOCATIONS: 1. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001
2. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: April, 1992

AUTHOR: Engineering Science (ES), Inc., Boston MA.

RECIPIENT(S): Seneca Army Depot

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 10, 1993

DOCUMENT NUMBER:

DOCUMENT TYPE:

TITLE:

LOCATIONS:

DOCUMENT DATE:

AUTHOR:

RECIPIENT(S):

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE:

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: POLICY AND GUIDANCE (ASH-02)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-02-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidance

TITLE: Sampling Guidelines and Protocols; Technological Background and Quality Control/Quality Assurance for NYSDEC Spill Response Program, March 1991.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: March 1991

AUTHOR: NYSDEC

RECIPIENT(S): N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-02-002

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidance

TITLE: Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA/Interim Final

LOCATIONS: Available at the EPA Region II office at:
26 Federal Plaza, New York, New York 10278
(Compendium of Guidance Documents)

DOCUMENT DATE: October 1988

AUTHOR: USEPA

RECIPIENT(S): N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

INDEX DATE: 12 July 1993

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: POLICY AND GUIDANCE (ASH-02) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-02-003

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidance

TITLE: Data Quality Objectives for Remedial Response Activities (Volumes 1 & 2)

LOCATIONS: Available at the EPA Region II office at:
26 Federal Plaza, New York, New York 10278
(Compendium of Guidance Documents)

DOCUMENT DATE: March 1987

AUTHOR: USEPA

RECIPIENT(S): N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-02-004

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidance

TITLE: Division Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum Policy Regarding Alteration of Groundwater Samples Collected for Metals Analysis (HWR-88-4015)

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, BLDG. 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: September 30, 1988

AUTHOR: NYSDEC

RECIPIENT(S): N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: POLICY AND GUIDANCE (ASH-02) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-02-005

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidance

TITLE: Superfund Technical Assistance Grants Guidance.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, BLDG. 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: June 1990

AUTHOR: USEPA

RECIPIENT(S): N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-02-006

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidance

TITLE: Superfund Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Handbook OSWER Directive 9230.1-03 (w/application).

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, BLDG. 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: April 1990

AUTHOR: USEPA

RECIPIENT(S): N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

INDEX DATE: 12 July 1993

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Correspondence

TITLE: Introductory Cover Letter Addressed to the Supervisor of the Town of Romulus Explaining the Administrative Record File (Transmittal Cover Letter).

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: March 29, 1991

AUTHOR: Gary W. Kittell, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Raymond Zajac, Town Supervisor, Town of Romulus

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-002

DOCUMENT TYPE: Internal Memorandum

TITLE: Community Relations Plan Mailing List

LOCATION: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001 *

DOCUMENT DATE: March 16, 1992 (revised periodically)

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-003

DOCUMENT TYPE: Legal Document

TITLE: Published Legal Notice of the Availability of the Administrative Record File for the Ash Landfill Site, Seneca Army Depot (in The Finger Lake Times)

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: March 16, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Various, distribution list

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-004

DOCUMENT TYPE: Internal Memorandum

TITLE: List of Recipients Receiving a Copy of the Notice of Availability of the Administrative Record File for the Ash Landfill Site, Seneca Army Depot.

LOCATION: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001 *

DOCUMENT DATE: March 16, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-005

DOCUMENT TYPE: Internal Memorandum

TITLE: Administrative Record Fact Sheet Providing an Introduction to the Administrative Record File.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: March 16, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Various, distribution list

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-006

DOCUMENT TYPE: Press Release

TITLE: Public Announcement of the Commencement of Remedial Investigations at the Ash Landfill and Open Burning Grounds Site.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: November 20, 1991

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Various, distribution list

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-007

DOCUMENT TYPE: Correspondence

TITLE: Minutes of Meeting on Groundwater Contamination Between Seneca Army Depot Officials and a Landowner Potentially Effected by Contaminated Groundwater.

LOCATION: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001 *

DOCUMENT DATE: August 17, 1987

AUTHOR: Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-008

DOCUMENT TYPE: FACT SHEET

TITLE: Information Repository Fact Sheet

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: March 16, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Various, distribution list

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-009

DOCUMENT TYPE: Press Release

TITLE: Public Announcement of the Establishment of the Administrative Record File for the Ash Landfill and the Information Repository.

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: March 16, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Various, distribution list

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-010

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: Consent for Access to Privately Owned Properties

LOCATION: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001 *

DOCUMENT DATE: 23 APRIL 1991

AUTHOR: Gordon Orlow, Corps of Engineers, New York Division

RECIPIENT(S): Gary W. Kittell, Seneca Army Depot

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-011

DOCUMENT TYPE: Correspondence

TITLE: Minutes of Meeting on Groundwater Contamination Between Seneca Army Depot Officials and Tenants Potentially Effected by Contaminated Groundwater.

LOCATION: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001 *

DOCUMENT DATE: August 13, 1987

AUTHOR: Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: March 16, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-012

DOCUMENT TYPE: Internal Memorandum

TITLE: Community Relations Plan Mailing List (First Revision).

LOCATION: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001 *

DOCUMENT DATE: July 2, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-013

DOCUMENT TYPE: Fact Sheet

TITLE: Handout for the July 28, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting.
TOPIC: CERCLA & SARA.

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: July 28, 1992

AUTHOR: Kevin Healy, USACE-Huntsville Division

RECIPIENT(S): Released at TRC meeting.

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-014

DOCUMENT TYPE: Fact Sheet

TITLE: Handout for the July 28, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting.
TOPIC: Public Participation.

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: July 28, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Released at TRC meeting.

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-015

DOCUMENT TYPE: Fact Sheet

TITLE: Handout for the July 28, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting. TOPIC: General Handout.

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: July 28, 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, SEAD

RECIPIENT(S): Released at TRC meeting.

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-016

DOCUMENT TYPE: Fact Sheet

TITLE: Handout for the October 15, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting. TOPIC: Public Participation.

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: October 15, 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, SEAD

RECIPIENT(S): Released at TRC meeting.

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-017

DOCUMENT TYPE: Transcript

TITLE: TRC Transcript for July 28, 1992 Meeting.

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: July 28, 1992

AUTHOR: TIRO Service

RECIPIENT(S): TRC members.

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-018*

DOCUMENT TYPE: List

TITLE: Community Relations Plan (CRP) & Technical Review Committee (TRC) Mailing List; November 2, 1992.

LOCATION: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: November 2, 1992

AUTHOR: SEAD

RECIPIENT(S): N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-019

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: Community Relations Plan (CRP), Seneca Army Depot

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: October 1992

AUTHOR: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Toxic and Hazardous materials Agency

RECIPIENT(S): SEAD

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: February 10, 1993

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-020

DOCUMENT TYPE: Transcript

TITLE: TRC Meeting Transcript for October 15, 1992 Meeting

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: October 15, 1993

AUTHOR: Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Public/TRC meeting attendees

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-021

DOCUMENT TYPE : Transcript

TITLE: TRC meeting transcript for January 21, 1993.

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: January 21, 1993.

AUTHOR: Tiro Reporting Service

RECIPIENT(S): SEAD

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-022

DOCUMENT TYPE: Fact Sheet

TITLE: Handout for the January 21, 1993 TRC meeting

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: January 21, 1993

AUTHOR: Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Public/TRC meeting attendees

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ASH-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-023

DOCUMENT TYPE : Fact Sheet

TITLE: Handout for the June 9, 1993 TRC meeting.

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: June 9, 1993.

AUTHOR: Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT(S): Public/TRC attendees

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-03-024

DOCUMENT TYPE: Transcript

TITLE: TRC Meeting Transcript for June 9, 1993 Meeting

LOCATION: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: June 9, 1993

AUTHOR: Trio Reporting Service

RECIPIENT(S): SEAD

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: OTHER PARTY INFORMATION (ASH-04)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-04-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Other Party Information

TITLE:

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE:

AUTHOR:

RECIPIENT:

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: _____

DOCUMENT NUMBER:

DOCUMENT TYPE: Other Party Information

TITLE:

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE:

AUTHOR:

RECIPIENT:

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: _____

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: DECISION DOCUMENTS (ASH-05)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-05-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Decision Documents

TITLE:

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE:

AUTHOR:

RECIPIENT:

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: _____

DOCUMENT NUMBER:

DOCUMENT TYPE: Decision Documents

TITLE:

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE:

AUTHOR:

RECIPIENT:

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: _____

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: OTHER INFORMATION (ASH-06)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-06-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Index

TITLE: Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: March 16, 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-06-002

DOCUMENT TYPE: Index

TITLE: Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit (First Revision).

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: July 2, 1992

AUTHOR: Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

INDEX DATE: 12 July 1993

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: OTHER INFORMATION (ASH-06) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-06-003

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: IAG Quarterly Report for April 1992.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: April 10, 1992

AUTHOR: Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: USEPA Region II and NYSDEC

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-06-004

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: IAG Quarterly Report for July 2, 1992; Does not Include Attachment 7.0.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: July 2, 1992

AUTHOR: Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: USEPA Region II and NYSDEC

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: OTHER INFORMATION (ASH-06) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-06-005

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: IAG Quarterly Report for October 1992.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: October 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: USEPA Region II and NYSDEC

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-06-006

DOCUMENT TYPE: Index

TITLE: Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit (Second Revision).

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: November 2, 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: OTHER INFORMATION (ASH-06) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-06-007

DOCUMENT TYPE: Index

TITLE: Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit- Index Date February 10, 1993.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: February 10, 1993

AUTHOR: James Miller, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: USEPA Region II and NYSDEC

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-06-008

DOCUMENT TYPE: Index

TITLE: Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Ash Landfill Operable Unit for July 12, 1993.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: July 12, 1993.

AUTHOR: Thomas Enroth, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
ASH LANDFILL OPERABLE UNIT

CATEGORY: ENFORCEMENT DOCUMENTS (ASH-07)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: ASH-07-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Legal

TITLE: Federal Facilities Interagency Agreement

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York 14541-5001

DOCUMENT DATE: February 1993

AUTHOR: USEPA/NYSDEC/US Army

RECIPIENT: Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: February 10, 1993

DOCUMENT NUMBER:

DOCUMENT TYPE:

TITLE:

LOCATIONS:

DOCUMENT DATE:

AUTHOR:

RECIPIENT:

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE:

INDEX DATE: 12 July 1993

APPENDIX 5.0

Draft Administrative Record File Index

for the

OB Grounds Site

DRAFT INDEX FOR

THE

OPEN BURNING (OB) GROUNDS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE

PREPARED BY the Engineering and Environmental Management Division of Seneca Army Depot (SEAD), Directorate of Engineering and Housing (DEH), in coordination with the Installation Public Affairs and Legal Staffs.

The Administrative Record File for the Open Burning (OB) Grounds Operable Unit and the associated Draft Index to the Administrative Record File has been developed in accordance with the public participation requirements of Sections 113 and 117 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. §§9613 and 9617; Subpart I of the National Contingency Plan (NCP), 40 CFR 300.8; Final Guidance on Administrative Records for selecting CERCLA Response Actions, OSWER Directive #9833.3A-1; the Inter Agency Agreement (IAG) for Seneca Army Depot; and Army Regulation 200-1, Section 9-11.

INDEX DATE: 12 JULY 93

ORGANIZATION OF THE INDEX

This index has been developed to assist both the lead agency and members of the public in locating and retrieving documents included in the Administrative Record File. This Index also serves as an overview of the history of the response action at the site. The index is organized by subject according to the below listed categories:

CATEGORIES

OBG-01	Factual Information
OBG-02	Policy and Guidance
OBG-03	Public Participation
OBG-04	Other Party Information
OBG-05	Decision Documents
OBG-06	Other Information
OBG-07	Enforcement Documents

NOTE: Guidance Documents listed in a Bibliography to a document included in the Administrative Record File may not be listed in the Administrative Record File Index.

NOTE: Information relevant to more than one response decision may be placed in the record file for an initial response and incorporated by reference in the indexes of subsequent record files. For these cases, the document will not be physically included in both files.

NOTE: *Indicates that the document is maintained in the confidential portion of the OB Grounds Record File located in Building 123, Seneca Army Depot, Romulus, New York 14541-5001. These documents are considered confidential because they contain individual names and addresses of members of the general public. Disclosure of such information could result in a Privacy Act violation.

NOTE: ** Indicates that the file consists of one or more analytical laboratory reports. Upon request to Seneca Army Depot's Public Affairs Officer, groundwater monitoring analysis results will be furnished to any interested party for visual inspection at the Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York.

INDEX DATE: 12 JULY 93

SHORT INDEX

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT NAME
OBG-01-001	Final OB Grounds Workplan.
OBG-01-002	OB Grounds EPA Approval Letter.
OBG-01-003**	Compilation of Groundwater Monitoring Data.
OBG-01-004	Draft OB Grounds Preliminary Site Charactrerization Summary Report for April 1992.
OBG-02-001	Sampling Guidelines and Protocols; Technological Background and Quality Control/ Quality Assurance for NYSDEC Spill Response Program, March 1991.
OBG-02-002	Guidance for conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA/Interim
OBG-02-003	Data quality objectives for remedial response activities (Volumes 1 and 2).
OBG-02-004	Division Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum policy regarding alteration of groundwater samples collected for metal analysis (HWR-88-4015).
OBG-02-005	Superfund Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Guidance; EPA/540/8-90/013.
OBG-02-006	Superfund Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Handbook; OSWER Directive 9230.1-03.
OBG-03-001	Introductory cover letter addressed to the Supervisor of the Town of Romulus explaining the purpose of the Administrative Record File (transmittal cover letter).
ASH-03-002*	Community Relations Plan Mailing List; Revision 1.0.
ASH-03-003	Legal Notice announcing the Availability of the OB Grounds Administrative Record File to the public.
OBG-03-004*	List of recipients receiving a copy of the Notice of Availability of the OB Grounds Administrative Record Files.
OBG-03-005	OB Grounds Administrative Record Fact Sheet.
OBG-03-006	Press release announcing fieldwork at the OB Grounds and Ash Landfill Sites.
OBG-03-007	Press release announcing establishment of the OB Grounds Administrative Record File.
OBG-03-008	TRC handout for July 28, 1992 meeting; TOPIC: CERCLA & SARA.
OBG-03-009	TRC handout for July 28, 1992 meeting; TOPIC: Public Participation.

INDEX DATE: 12 JULY 93

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT NAME
OBG-03-010	TRC handout for July 28, 1992 meeting; TOPIC: General Handout.
OBG-03-011	Handout for October 15, 1992 TRC meeting.
OBG-03-012	Transcript for October 15, 1992 TRC meeting.
OBG-03-013	CRP & TRC mailing lists; November 2, 1992.
OBG-03-014	TRC Meeting Transcript for January 21, 1993 Meeting.
OBG-03-015	Handout for the January 21, 1993 TRC Meeting.
OBG-03-016	Handout for the June 9, 1993 TRC Meeting.
OBG-03-017	TRC Transcript for the June 9, 1993 Meeting.
OBG-03-018	Community Relatons Plan (CRP) Seneca Army Depot, Romulus, NY; October 1992.
OBG-06-001	Draft Administrative Record File Index for the OB Grounds Site (Dated July 2, 1992).
OBG-06-002	IAG Quarterly Report for April 1992.
OBG-06-003	IAG Quarterly Report for July 1992.
OBG-06-004	IAG Quarterly Report for October 1992.
OBG-06-005	Administrative Record File Index (Second Revision).
OBG-06-006	Administrative Record File Index (Third Revision).
OBG-07-001	Federal Facilities Agreement Under CERCLA Section 120; February 1993.

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING (OB) GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: FACTUAL INFORMATION (OBG-01)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-01-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: Final Architect-Engineer Services for Performing a Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study (RI/FS) at the Open Burning (OB) Grounds.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: November 1991. (The November 1991 OB Grounds Workplan is the August 1991 OB Grounds Workplan revised by addendums issued in October and November of 1991.)

AUTHOR: Chas. T. Main, Inc.

RECIPIENT: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville, AL

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-01-002

DOCUMENT TYPE: Correspondence

TITLE: OB Grounds Workplan Approval Letter

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: March 6, 1992

AUTHOR: USEPA

RECIPIENT: Randall W. Battaglia, Seneca Army Depot, Romulus

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING (OB) GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: FACTUAL INFORMATION (OBG-01) (continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-01-003

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: Compilation of Historical Groundwater (GW) Monitoring Data for Various Sampling Events Between October 1982 and April 1992 for the Open Burning (OB) Grounds Site (bound in three ring binders).

LOCATIONS: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York
NOTE: **All GW monitoring data, because of its voluminous nature, is shelved separate from the Building 123 Administrative Record File.

DOCUMENT DATE: Various

AUTHOR: Various Analytical Laboratories

RECIPIENT: Seneca Army Depot, Romulus, NY

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-01-004

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: Draft OB Grounds Preliminary Site Characterization Summary Report for April 1992.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: April 1992.

AUTHOR: Chas. T. Main, Inc.

RECIPIENT: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville, AL

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: POLICY AND GUIDANCE (OBG-02)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-02-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidance

TITLE: Sampling Guidelines and Protocols; Technological Background and Quality Control/Quality Assurance for NYSDEC Spill Response Program, March 1991.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York (SEE Ash Landfill Draft Administrative Record File at ASH-02-001)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (SEE Ash Landfill Draft Administrative Record File at ASH-02-001)

DOCUMENT DATE: March 1991

AUTHOR: NYSDEC

RECIPIENT: N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-02-002

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidelines

TITLE: Guidance for conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies under CERCLA/Interim Final

LOCATIONS: Available at the USEPA Region II Office at 26 Federal Plaza, New York, New York 10278 (Compendium of Guidance Documents)

DOCUMENT DATE: October 1988

AUTHOR: USEPA

RECIPIENT: N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: POLICY AND GUIDANCE (OBG-02)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-02-003

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidance

TITLE: Data Quality Objectives for Remedial Response Activities (Volumes 1 & 2)

LOCATIONS: Available at the USEPA Region II Office at 26 Federal Plaza, New York, New York 10278 (Compendium of Guidance Documents)

DOCUMENT DATE: March 1987

AUTHOR: USEPA

RECIPIENT: N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-02-004

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidelines

TITLE: Division Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum Policy regarding Alteration of Groundwater Samples Collected for metals Analysis (HWR-88-4015).

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-02-004)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-02-004)

DOCUMENT DATE: September 30, 1988

AUTHOR: NYSDEC

RECIPIENT: N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: POLICY AND GUIDANCE (OBG-02)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-02-005

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidance

TITLE: EPA Superfund Technical Assistance Grants (TAG) Guidance.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-02-005)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-02-005)

DOCUMENT DATE: June 1990

AUTHOR: USEPA

RECIPIENT: N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-02-006

DOCUMENT TYPE: Guidance

TITLE: Superfund Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Handbook; OSWER Directive 9230.1-03 (w/application).

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-02-006)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-02-006)

DOCUMENT DATE: April 1990

AUTHOR: USEPA

RECIPIENT: N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING (OB) GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (OBG-03)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Correspondence

TITLE: Introductory Cover Letter Addressed to the Supervisor of the Town of Romulus Explaining the Administrative Record File (Transmittal Cover Letter).

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: March 29, 1991

AUTHOR: Gary W. Kittell, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: Raymond Zajac, Town Supervisor, Town of Romulus

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-002

DOCUMENT TYPE: Internal Memorandum

TITLE: Community Relations Plan Mailing List; Revision 1.0.

LOCATIONS: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York
(NOTE: *)

DOCUMENT DATE: July 2, 1992 (revised periodically)

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (OBG-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-003

DOCUMENT TYPE: Legal Notice

TITLE: Published Legal Notice of the Availability of the Administrative Record File for the OB Grounds Site, Seneca Army Depot (in the Finger Lakes Times).

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: July 2, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: Various, Distribution List

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-004

DOCUMENT TYPE: Correspondence

TITLE: List of recipients receiving a copy of the Notice of Availability of the Administrative Record file for the OB Ground Site, Seneca Army Depot

LOCATIONS: Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: July 2, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (OBG-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-005

DOCUMENT TYPE: Memorandum

TITLE: Administrative Record Fact Sheet Providing an Introduction to the OB Grounds Administrative Record File.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: July 2, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: Distributed to those individuals on the July 2, 1992 Community Relations Plan mailing list.

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-006

DOCUMENT TYPE: Press Release

TITLE: Public Announcement of the Commencement of Remedial Investigations at the Ash Landfill and Open Burning (OB) Grounds Site.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, NY (SEE ASH-03-006)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (SEE ASH-03-006)

DOCUMENT DATE: November 20, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: Distributed to those individuals on the March 16, 1992 Community Relations Plan mailing list.

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (OBG-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-007

DOCUMENT TYPE: Press Release

TITLE: Public Announcement of the establishment of the OB Grounds Administrative Record File

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: July 2, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: Distributed to those individuals on the July 2, 1992 Community Relations Plan (CRP) mailing list.

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-008

DOCUMENT TYPE: Fact Sheet

TITLE: Handout for the July 28, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting. TOPIC: CERCLA & SARA.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-013)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-013)

DOCUMENT DATE: July 28, 1992

AUTHOR: Kevin Healy, USACE - Huntsville Division

RECIPIENT: Released at TRC meeting

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (OBG-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-009

DOCUMENT TYPE: Fact Sheet

TITLE: Handout for the July 28, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting.
TOPIC: Public Participation.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-014)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-014)

DOCUMENT DATE: July 28, 1992

AUTHOR: Jerry A. Whitaker, Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: Released at TRC meeting

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-010

DOCUMENT TYPE: Fact Sheet

TITLE: Handout for the July 28, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting.
TOPIC: General Handout.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-015)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-015)

DOCUMENT DATE: July 28, 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, SEAD

RECIPIENT: Released at TRC meeting

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (OBG-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-011

DOCUMENT TYPE: Fact Sheet

TITLE: Handout for the October 15, 1992 Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-016)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-016)

DOCUMENT DATE: October 15, 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, SEAD

RECIPIENT: Released at TRC meeting

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-012

DOCUMENT TYPE: Transcript

TITLE: TRC Transcript for July 28, 1992 Meeting.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-017)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-017)

DOCUMENT DATE: July 28, 1992

AUTHOR: TIRO Reporting Service

RECIPIENT: TRC members

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (OBG-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-013*

DOCUMENT TYPE: List

TITLE: Community Relations Plan (CRP) & Technical Review Committee (TRC) Mailing List; November 2, 1992.

LOCATIONS:1.Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-018)

DOCUMENT DATE: November 2, 1992

AUTHOR: SEAD

RECIPIENT: N/A

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-014

DOCUMENT TYPE: Transcript

TITLE: TRC Meeting Transcript for January 21, 1993.

LOCATIONS: 1.Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-021)
2. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York(See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-021)

DOCUMENT DATE: January 21, 1993.

AUTHOR: TRIO Reporting Services.

RECIPIENT: SEAD

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993.

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (OBG-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-015

DOCUMENT TYPE: Handout

TITLE: Handout for the January 21, 1993 TRC Meeting.

LOCATIONS: 1.Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-022)
2.Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York(See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-022)

DOCUMENT DATE: January 21, 1993.

AUTHOR: TRIO Reporting Services.

RECIPIENT: SEAD

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993.

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-016

DOCUMENT TYPE: Handout

TITLE: Handout for the June 09, 1993 TRC Meeting.

LOCATIONS: 1. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-023)
2. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York(See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-023)

DOCUMENT DATE: June 09, 1993.

AUTHOR: SEAD

RECIPIENT: TRC

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993.

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (OBG-03) (Continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-017

DOCUMENT TYPE: Transcript

TITLE: TRC Transcript for the June 9, 1993 TRC meeting.

LOCATIONS: 1.Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-024)
2.Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York(See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-024)

DOCUMENT DATE: June 9, 1993.

AUTHOR: TRIO Reporting Services.

RECIPIENT: SEAD

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993.

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-03-018

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: Community Relations Plan (CRP) Seneca Army Depot, Romulus NY.

LOCATIONS: 1. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-019)
2. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York(See Ash Landfill Administrative Record File at ASH-03-019)

DOCUMENT DATE: October, 1992.

AUTHOR: U.S. Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency (USATHAMA)

RECIPIENT: SEAD

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 12, 1993.

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: OTHER INFORMATION (OBG-06)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-06-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Index

TITLE: Draft Administrative Record File Index for the Open Burning (OB) Grounds Site.

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, New York
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: July 12, 1992

AUTHOR: James M. Miller, Seneca Army Depot, Romulus

RECIPIENT: Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-06-002

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: IAG Quarterly Report for April 1992

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, NY (SEE ASH-06-003)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (SEE ASH-06-003)

DOCUMENT DATE: April 10, 1992

AUTHOR: Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: USEPA Region II and the NYSDEC

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: OTHER INFORMATION (OBG-06) (continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-06-003

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: IAG Quarterly Report for July 1992

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, NY (SEE ASH-06-004)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (SEE ASH-06-004)

DOCUMENT DATE: July 2, 1992

AUTHOR: Seneca Army Depot

RECIPIENT: USEPA Region II and the NYSDEC

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: July 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-06-004

DOCUMENT TYPE: Report

TITLE: IAG Quarterly Report for October 1992

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, NY (SEE ASH-06-005)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (SEE ASH-06-005)

DOCUMENT DATE: October 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, SEAD

RECIPIENT: USEPA Region II and the NYSDEC

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: OTHER INFORMATION (OBG-06) (continued)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-06-005

DOCUMENT TYPE: Index

TITLE: Draft Administrative Record File Index for the OB Grounds Operable Unit (Second Revision)

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, NY
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: November 2, 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, Environmental Protection Specialist, SEAD

RECIPIENT: Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-06-006

DOCUMENT TYPE: Index

TITLE: Draft Administrative Record File Index for the OB Grounds Operable Unit (Third Revision)

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, NY
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York

DOCUMENT DATE: July 12, 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, Environmental Protection Specialist, SEAD

RECIPIENT: Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992

DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE
OPEN BURNING GROUNDS OPERABLE UNIT

SUBCATEGORY: Enforcement Documents (OBG-07)

DOCUMENT NUMBER: OBG-07-001

DOCUMENT TYPE: Legal

TITLE: Federal Facilities Interagency Agreement

LOCATIONS: 1. Romulus Town Hall, 1435 Prospect Street, Willard, NY (SEE ASH-07-001)
2. Seneca Army Depot, Building 123, Romulus, New York (SEE ASH-07-001)

DOCUMENT DATE: November 2, 1992

AUTHOR: James Miller, Environmental Protection Specialist, SEAD

RECIPIENT: Various

DATE DOCUMENT INCLUDED IN RECORD FILE: November 2, 1992