



FAX

To: Dave Cobrain 505 476 6030

From: Tony Hurst: (303 388 8613)

RE: Monthly Reports: CV-97-0206 (D.N.M) Albuquerque v. Sparton Technology, Inc.

Date	No of Pages	Month
2/9/15	(4 total)	Attached is the January 2015 Monthly Report
2/7/15	(4 total)	Attached is the February 2015 Monthly Report
	(total)	Attached is the March 2015 Monthly Report
	(total)	Attached is the April 2015 Monthly Report
	(total)	Attached is the May 2015 Monthly Report
	(total)	Attached is the June 2015 Monthly Report
	(total)	Attached is the July 2015 Monthly Report
	(total)	Attached is the August 2015 Monthly Report
	(total)	Attached is the September 2015 Monthly Report
	(total)	Attached is the October 2015 Monthly Report
	(total)	Attached is the November 2015 Monthly Report
	(total)	Attached is the December 2015 Monthly Report

Please call me at 719-649-1944 if you have any questions

Thanks

Tony Hurst

Project Coordinator for Sparton Technology, Inc.

HURST ENGINEERING SERVICES
1022 Monaco St Pkwy* Denver, CO 80220
Email: tonyhurst@q.com

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT
For month ending February 28th, 2014

CV-97-0206 (D.N.M)
Albuquerque v. Sparton Technology, Inc.
03/07/15

Tasks Completed:

- A. Groundwater Monitoring Plan
- Continued to evaluate Monitoring Wells replacement needs.
 - Conducted the 1st Quarter 2015 round of water-level and water-quality monitoring between February 3-5 and February 6-17, respectively.
 - Prepared and submitted to the agencies the Semi-Annual Progress Report for the Third and Fourth Quarter 2014.
- B. Public Involvement Plan
-
- C. Deep Flow Zone System
-
- D. Assessment of Aquifer Restoration
-
- E. Offsite-Containment System
- Collected the monthly influent and effluent samples, and measured the water level in the infiltration gallery piezometer
 - Copies of the updated maintenance schedule and operation manual for the system were printed and filed at the treatment building for the system and with Easterling Consultants.
 - Filed the monthly discharge report with the Office of the State Engineer as required under Permit-RG-69659.
 - The system ran 100.00 % of the time and pumped 11,838,300 gallons (an average of 304.9 gpm). There was no outages.
- F. Source Containment System
- Collected the monthly influent and effluent samples from the treatment system.
 - Operated the chromium removal unit throughout the operating period of the system. Continued to route 70% (35 gpm) of the pumped water through the unit and blend it with the remainder of the pumped water to meet the New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission (NMWQCC) chromium standard of 0.050 mg/L in the effluent discharged into the ponds.
 - Replaced the first tank from the chromium removal unit on February 9th
 - Replaced the pretreatment filter for the chromium removal unit on February 2nd, 19th, and 23rd

HURST ENGINEERING SERVICES

1022 Monaco St Pkwy* Denver, CO 80220

Email: tonyhurst@q.com

- Continued weekly chromium sampling of (a) the influent to the first tank of the chromium removal system; (b) mid-tank; (c) the effluent from the second tank; and (d) the effluent from the air-stripper. All samples of the effluent from the air-stripper were at or below the NMWQCC chromium standard of 0.050 mg/L. A possible cause of exceedances in the effluent chromium concentrations that were observed in November 2014 is the potential accumulation of chromium containing sediments in the air stripper. This possibility was investigated by taking a sample from the lowest tray of the air stripper which visually indicated the presence of sediment. The result (0.27 mg/L of total chromium) indicated that this was indeed the cause of occasional exceedances.
- Conducted the monthly sampling of pond monitoring well MW-17. To investigate whether sediment accumulation in the well affected chromium concentrations, samples were collected under three different conditions using double check valve bailers lowered to the mid-point of the saturated screen interval: (a) a relatively "undisturbed" sample was collected prior to purging the well; (b) a second sample was collected after purging the well, and (c) a third sample was collected a day after the purging of the well. All samples were analyzed for total and dissolved chromium and the results from the three sampling methods were the following: (a) before purging the well: total chromium at 0.045 mg/L and dissolved chromium at 0.038 mg/L; (b) after purging the well: total chromium at 0.067 mg/L and dissolved chromium at 0.040 mg/L; and (c) a day after purging the well: total chromium at 0.050 mg/L and dissolved chromium at 0.039 mg/L. The results indicate that sediments in the well contain chromium and affect total chromium concentration in samples from the well. While the dissolved chromium concentration is essentially the same for all three samples, the lowest total chromium concentration was in the "undisturbed" sample and the highest in the most disturbed sample obtained after purging.
- Copies of the updated maintenance schedule and operation manual for the system were printed and filed at the treatment building for the system and with Easterling Consultants.
- Filed the monthly discharge report with the Office of the State Engineer as required under Permit-RG-73531.
- Prepared the 2014 Annual Report on Air Emissions from the air stripper and submitted it to the Air Quality Division of the City of Albuquerque Environmental Health Department, as required by the Authority-to-Construct Permit #1203.
- The system ran 99.35 % of the time and pumped 1,915,200 gallons (an average of 49.2gpm). There was four outages totaling 4 hours, 14 minutes.
 - o On 2/9 for 24 minutes for a tank exchange.
 - o On 2/17 for 3 hours 27 minutes for stripper maintenance and sediment sampling.
 - o On 2/19 for 14 minutes for a filter replacement.
 - o On 2/23 for 9 minutes for a filter replacement.

G. Other

HURST ENGINEERING SERVICES

1022 Monaco St Pkwy* Denver, CO 80220

Email: tonyhurst@q.com

Tasks Planned:

- H. Groundwater Monitoring Plan
 - Continue to evaluate Monitoring Wells replacement needs.

- I. Public Involvement Plan
 - Upon approval by the agencies, the 2013 Fact Sheet will be distributed to residents above the plume and along the pipeline to the gallery.

- J. Deep Flow Zone System
 -

- K. Assessment of Aquifer Restoration
 -

- L. Offsite-Containment System
 - The monthly influent and effluent samples will be collected, and the water level will be measured in the infiltration gallery piezometer.
 - The required discharge report will be filed with the Office of the State Engineer.

- M. Source Containment System
 - The monthly influent and effluent samples will be collected.
 - The required discharge report will be filed with the Office of the State Engineer.
 - Weekly chromium sampling of (a) the influent to the first tank of the chromium removal system; (b) mid-tank; (c) the effluent from the second tank; and (d) the effluent from the air-stripper will continue.
 - The first tank of the chromium removal unit will be replaced on March 2nd and 23rd
 - The pretreatment filter will be replaced on March 16th
 - Another filter will be installed after the air stripper to eliminate occasional chromium exceedances in the effluent discharged into the ponds.
 - Monthly monitoring of chromium concentrations in pond monitoring well MW-17 will continue; however, based on the results of the sampling conducted in February, Sparton will request the approval New Mexico Environment Department to analyze samples from this and the other two pond monitoring wells for dissolved rather than total chromium, iron, and manganese.

- N. Other
 -

- O. Problems Encountered or Anticipated:
 -

By:

Tony Hurst
Project Coordinator for Sparton.

Cc: By fax to Mr. Chuck Hendrickson (EPA: 214-665-7263)
Mr. Dave Cobrain (NMED: 505-476-6030)

Phone and Fax: (303) 388-8613 • Cell: (719) 649-1944

Jacobs, Julie, NMENV

From: Lyssy, Gregory <lyssy.gregory@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2015 7:04 AM
To: Tan, Lu L SPL; lloyd.e.godard@usace.army.mil; Jacobs, Julie, NMENV; Patricia Y. DeLaO; Ostermann, Monique M SPD; Phaneuf, Mark J SPA; Domme, Henry SPA
Subject: RE: Draft TPP Memorandum for Kirtland Demolition Bombing Range

Good morning Kirtland Malpais DBR Team:

The EPA has reviewed the Draft TPP Memorandum, dated February 24, 2015, and concurs with the Memo with the following comments.

- 1) Page 1 of the Memo discusses the scope of the RI/FS, but does not discuss the purpose. Please add language for the purpose of the RI/FS. It can be something as simple as providing the necessary information to develop the PP and DD to ensure the safety of human health and the environment, or a more detailed description.
- 2) Page 4 of the Memo states that an RI Report will be prepared, but does not say that a FS Report will be completed. It is discussed later in the document, but for consistency, it should also be included on Page 4.
- 3) Please revise the attendance list to include the participants who attended via conference call.
- 4) The geology at the Site is problematic for determining that all HE bombs have been located and rendered harmless. Multiple lines of evidence are necessary to ensure public safety.
- 5) I agree with the NMED comments listed below.

If you have any questions, please feel to call or email me.

Greg J. Lyssy

U.S. EPA
Senior Project Manager
New Mexico - Federal Facilities Section (6PD-F)
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75202
Phone - 214.665.8317
Cell Phone - 214.543.4415
lyssy.gregory@epa.gov

From: Jacobs, Julie, NMENV [mailto:julie.jacobs@state.nm.us]
Sent: Wednesday, March 04, 2015 4:06 PM
To: Patricia Y. DeLaO; Ostermann, Monique M SPD; Phaneuf, Mark J SPA; Domme, Henry SPA; Lyssy, Gregory
Cc: Tan, Lu L SPL; lloyd.e.godard@usace.army.mil
Subject: RE: Draft TPP Memorandum for Kirtland Demolition Bombing Range

Lu,

NMED concurs with the Draft TPP Memo Dated February 2015. Thank you for the quick submission of the Memo.

One note...Table 1 Proposed DQOs and Technical Approach Summary for Remedial Investigation Item #5 states "If an area is classified as an NCMU, then it is not MEC-contaminated and may be recommended for no further action ..."
NMED does not concur with this statement and will not agree to a determination of No Further Action at any area within the entire MRA. The proposed RI is not comprehensive enough to ensure that no MEC remains on site. The transects are too wide, the terrain too rough, the potential for hidden/unseen MEC remaining at the site is too great, and the potential hazard posed by the MEC is too great. Therefore NMED will not agree to any NFA areas at this site.