

From: Burchette.John@epamail.epa.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2009 12:13 PM
To: walt.j.bell@navy.mil; Staszak, Janna/VBO; Jones, Adrienne/VBO
Cc: kmdoran@deq.virginia.gov
Subject: St. J's Site 2 Remedy follow-up

Hey guys, at the last partnering meeting I was sort of surprised to hear we were only considering an active remedy in the above 10,000ppb part of the plume at site 2. I also had sent an email out last week regarding this issue. I started going through the MNA Guidance and it left me with a lot of unanswered questions. Number 1 being, do we have the data to support MNA will be an effective remedy at site 2? Is there anyway we could discuss during our Site 2 FS topic? Currently, I am not very comfortable with MNA in the "low concentration (10,000ppb) part of the plume. I think it would be helpful to show that either we have/ or have not collected that data suggested in the guidance and do a comparison.

<http://www.epa.gov/swerust1/directiv/d9200417.pdf> -Mainly Demonstrating Efficacy of MNA Through Site Characterization pg 13

-also take a look at the 3 tiered approach that is typically found to be acceptable. It doesn't seem that we are currently prepared to fulfill these ("historical gw monitoring that demonstrate a clear and meaningful trend"). Many of the site 2 wells have not been sampled multiple times and would provide the data necessary to determine whether MNA would be acceptable.

Please let me know your thoughts when you get the opportunity,

John Burchette(3HS11)

Remedial Project Manager

NPL/BRAC/Federal Facilities Branch

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1650 Arch Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029

Phone: 215.814.3378

Fax: 215.814.3025

Burchette.john@epa.gov