

**FINAL  
TNRCC PSTD LPST SITE CLOSURE REQUEST FORM**

**FORMER BUILDING 2093 GAS STATION,  
KELLY AFB, TEXAS**

**AETC Contract No. F41689-96-D-0710  
Order No. 5015**

**Prepared for**

**AIR FORCE CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EXCELLENCE  
TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER DIVISION  
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS**

**and**

**SA-ALC/EMRO  
KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS**

**July 1998**

**Prepared by**

**PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.  
1700 Broadway, Suite 900  
Denver, Colorado 80209**

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
**Approved for Public Release**  
**Distribution Unlimited**

**20000906 138**

**Walton, Norman**

---

**From:** Hansen, Jerry E, Mr, HQAFCEE [Jerry.Hansen@HQAFCEE.brooks.af.mil]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 08, 2000 10:16 AM

**To:** 'nwalton@dtic.mil'

**Subject:** Distribution statement for AFCEE/ERT reports

Norman, This is a followup to our phone call. The eight boxes of reports you received from us are all for unlimited distribution. If you have any questions, you can contact me at DSN 240-4353.

08/08/2000

**FINAL**  
**TNRCC PSTD LPST SITE CLOSURE REQUEST FORM**

**FORMER BUILDING 2093 GAS STATION,  
KELLY AFB, TEXAS**

**AETC Contract No. F41689-96-D-0710  
Order No. 5015**

**Prepared for**

**AIR FORCE CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EXCELLENCE  
TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER DIVISION  
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS**

**and**

**SA-ALC/EMRO  
KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS**

**July 1998**

**Prepared by**

**PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.  
1700 Broadway, Suite 900  
Denver, Colorado 80209**

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
PETROLEUM STORAGE TANK DIVISION

LPST SITE CLOSURE REQUEST FORM

This form is to be used to request closure for Leaking Petroleum Storage Tank (LPST) cases. The soil and groundwater cleanup goals must be met prior to submitting this form. These cleanup goals should be derived from either:

- the TWC *Guidance Manual for LPST Cleanups in Texas*, January 1990 so long as these goals were achieved prior to November 8, 1995, or
- the TNRCC *Risk-Based Corrective Action for Leaking Storage Tank Sites* document, January 1994 (RG-36).

Submission of this Site Closure Request constitutes certification by the Responsible Party, Corrective Action Specialist (CAS), and Corrective Action Project Manager (CAPM) that all necessary corrective actions have been completed and final closure of the subject site is appropriate at this time. By signing this Site Closure Request, the Responsible Party, CAS, and CAPM acknowledges that no further corrective actions, with the exception of activities subsequently approved by the TNRCC, will be eligible for reimbursement after the RP's signature date. Although costs for activities such as groundwater monitoring or remediation system operation and maintenance may have been approved for an annual period, these activities should cease upon submission of the Site Closure Request as these activities will not be considered eligible for reimbursement beyond the date of the Site Closure Request. Additionally, any costs relating to site assessment or other corrective action activities will not be eligible for reimbursement if the activities are conducted after the date of the Site Closure Request, unless specifically approved by the TNRCC. If, upon review by the TNRCC, the TNRCC concurs that the site meets the conditions for final closure, the costs for closure activities necessary to restore the site to its original condition will be reviewed and approved as appropriate. If the TNRCC determines that the site does not meet the conditions for final closure, the TNRCC will request a workplan and cost proposal for the next appropriate corrective action activity necessary to proceed towards final closure unless appropriate activities have previously been approved. The only type of proposal that should be attached to the Site Closure Request is for site closure costs. Any proposals attached to the Site Closure Request for activities other than site closure will not be processed and will be withdrawn from consideration.

If any of the following apply, the site is not ready for closure and this form should not be submitted:

- The appropriate LPST cleanup goals have not been met (a proposal for the next appropriate step should be submitted instead);
- Phase-separated hydrocarbons (> 0.1 feet) currently exist at the site;
- The contaminant plume is increasing in size; or
- All wastes and other material generated from the site have not been properly disposed;

Do not use this form:

- if the release was not from a regulated underground or aboveground storage tank;
- for tank removal-from-service activities not associated with an LPST site (use the *Release Determination Report Form* (TNRCC-0621) or other appropriate format);
- for situations where the second set of confirmation samples collected during tank removal-from-service activities confirms suitability for closure (use the *Release Determination Report Form* (TNRCC-0621) or other appropriate format); or
- for shutdown of remediation systems or for plugging of monitor wells when site closure is not yet appropriate.

If asked to initiate additional activities, submit a workplan and preapproval request for those activities on sites eligible for reimbursement. Please review the document entitled *Preapproval for Corrective Action Activities* (RG-111) for procedures on preapproval requests and the other PST guidance pamphlets and rules for additional information on LPST sites.

Complete all blanks and check "yes" or "no" for all inquiries. **IF A COMPLETED ASSESSMENT REPORT FORM (TNRCC-0562) WAS PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED, YOU DO NOT NEED TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS WITHIN THE DARK OUTLINED AREAS UNLESS THE INFORMATION HAS CHANGED.** If the question is not applicable to this site, indicate with N/A. If the answer to the question is unknown, please indicate. If space for supplemental information is needed, insert numbered footnote and provide brief supporting discussion in Section VI, Justification for Closure.

# SITE CLOSURE REQUEST FORM

## I. GENERAL INFORMATION

LPST ID No.: 93205

Facility ID No.: 0038825

Responsible Party: Department of the Air Force

Responsible Party Address: HQ AFMC, Kelly AFB City: San Antonio State: TX Zip: 78241

Facility Name: Building 2093, Kelly AFB, TX

Facility Street Address: 305 Tinker Dr.

Facility City: San Antonio, Texas County: Bexar

What is the current use of site? (indicate all that apply):

Residence<sup>1</sup>  School or Day Care center  Commercial/Industrial<sup>1</sup>  Recreational  Agricultural

What is the anticipated future use of the site? (indicate all that apply):

Residence<sup>1</sup>  School or Day Care center  Commercial/Industrial<sup>1</sup>  Recreational  Agricultural

Adjacent property use (indicate all that apply):

Residence<sup>1</sup>  School or Day Care Center  Commercial/Industrial<sup>1</sup>  Recreational  Agricultural

Distance to nearest off-site residence from property line: >0.5 miles.

Distance to nearest school or day care center from property line: >0.5 miles.

## II. CLOSURE SCREENING INFORMATION

Based on the *Limited Site Assessment Report* form or the *Risk-Based Assessment Report Form* (TNRCC-0562), the site is currently a **Priority** 4.1 site. If the site priority has changed, list the other priorities that previously pertained to this site:

Yes  No Have non-aqueous phase liquids (NAPL) ever been present at this site (including tankpit observation wells)? If yes, is NAPL present now (thickness  $\geq 0.1$  feet)? <sup>1</sup> Yes <sup>1</sup> No Current thickness: \_\_\_\_\_ ft. If NAPL is currently present, stop here and do not submit this form for case closure. Initiate or continue activities necessary for the removal of all recoverable NAPL at the site.

Yes  No Were all soils, recovered contaminated groundwater, and any phase-separated hydrocarbons properly disposed of, treated, recycled or reused in accordance with TNRCC requirements? If No, stop here and do not submit this form. Provide a proposal (if the site is eligible for reimbursement) to properly dispose or otherwise manage the wastes/materials or, if the site is not eligible for reimbursement, provide documentation of proper disposition of the wastes.

Yes  No Do contaminant concentrations show a consistent decreasing or low static trend? If No, is the contaminant plume increasing in size?  Yes  No If Yes, stop here, do not submit this form, and initiate activities to control plume migration.

<sup>1</sup> See definition in 30 TAC 334.202

### III. RELEASE ABATEMENT/REMEDIATION

Date Release Discovered: June 27, 1989

Substance(s) released: (check all that apply)  Gasoline  Alcohol-blended fuel (Type and percentage of alcohol: \_\_\_\_\_)  
 Diesel  Used Oil <sup>1</sup> Jet Fuel (type: \_\_\_\_\_)  Aviation Gasoline  Other: (be specific) \_\_\_\_\_

Source of Release (specify all that apply):

Spills/overfills  Piping leaks  Dispenser leaks  Tank corrosion <sup>1</sup> Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Yes  No Has a receptor survey been conducted?  
 Yes  No Has a water well inventory been conducted?

Yes  No Have vapor impacts to buildings or utility lines ever been associated with this release? If Yes, specify the measures taken to abate the impact and indicate the latest date that an impact was noted:  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Yes  No Have subsurface utilities ever been affected with NAPL or vapors by this release? If Yes, indicate the latest date that an impact was noted: \_\_\_\_\_

If not already provided in *Release Determination Report Form* (TNRCC-0621), or if the information has changed since submittal of the *Release Determination Report*, indicate number of tanks currently and formerly located at this site (attach pages as necessary):

	<u>Type (UST/AST)</u>	<u>Product Type</u>	<u>Size (approx. gal)</u>	
Current:	N/A	_____	_____	
	_____	_____	_____	
	_____	_____	_____	
	_____	_____	_____	
	_____	_____	_____	
Former:	UST	gasoline	10,000	<u>Date Removed from Service</u> 1991
	UST	gasoline	10,000	1991
	UST	gasoline	10,000	1991
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____

Yes  No If the tanks were permanently removed from service, were native soil samples collected from beneath the tanks and the entire length of the piping? If No, explain why not:  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Yes  No Was a new UST system installed? If Yes, indicate the date, number of tanks and their contents:  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Yes  No Are there any open excavations at the site? If Yes, state size, location, purpose, and status for each of the excavations: \_\_\_\_\_

Type(s) of soil remediation and time periods the remediation method was operational (indicate all that apply):

- Excavation 2/6/95 to 4/21/95 (dates), and  
<sup>1</sup> Aboveground Bioremediation/Aeration \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ (dates), or  
<sup>1</sup> Thermal Treatment \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ (dates), or  
<sup>1</sup> Disposal 3/27/95 to 4/14/95 (dates).  
 Soil Vapor Extraction \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ (dates).  
 In-Situ Bioremediation \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ (dates).  
 None

III. RELEASE ABATEMENT/REMEDATION (Continued)

Type(s) of groundwater remediation and time periods the remediation method was operational (*indicate all that apply*): N/A

Groundwater Pump and Treat \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ (*dates*)

Air Sparging/SVE \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ (*dates*)

In-Situ Bioremediation \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ (*dates*)

Other: \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ (*dates*)

None

Yes  No Were copies of all receipts and manifests to document disposition of all wastes submitted to the TNRCC? If No, attach copies to this form.

Measured total volume of NAPL recovered: N/A gallons.

Estimated total volume of soil treated/removed: 2,715 cubic yards (*exclude soil cuttings removed from borings*).

Estimated total volume of groundwater treated/removed: N/A gallons (*if known*).

Estimated pounds of hydrocarbons removed or treated from soil (*if known*): Not available

Estimated pounds of hydrocarbons removed or treated from groundwater (*if known*): Not available

Estimated percent of total contaminants removed or treated (*if known*): Not available

#### IV. SOIL DATA VALIDATION

Are there now affected surface soils (contamination exceeding health-based target concentrations) present within 2 feet below the ground surface?  Yes  No  Unknown

Type of surface cover over affected surface soil area:

Paved [ Asphalt or  Concrete] Percent of affected soils covered? 100  Unpaved

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Is there public access to the uncovered affected surface soil area?  Yes  No

Total number of borings: 19 (including those completed as monitor wells)

Yes  No Was the vertical and horizontal extent of soil impacts defined (to the more stringent of health-based target or groundwater protective soil concentrations horizontally and to groundwater or nondetect vertically) by the borings?

Yes  No Are shallow (0-15 feet below ground surface) soils affected (contaminant levels exceed health-based target concentrations) on adjacent properties (including right-of-way properties).

Yes  No Were all soil sample collection, handling, transport, and analytical procedures conducted in accordance with TNRCC and EPA requirements? If No, provide justification: \_\_\_\_\_

#### MAXIMUM SOIL CONCENTRATION LEVELS

Soil Contaminants	Sample Date	Sample Location	Depth (in feet below ground surface)	Analytical Method	Maximum Concentration* (mg/kg)	Target Cleanup Goals** (indicate source of target cleanup goals: 1990 or 1994 [Plan A or B] guidance) <sup>a/</sup>
Benzene	4/14/95	G95001203	20	USEPA 8020	2.7	0.74
Toluene	4/14/95	G95001203	20	USEPA 8020	32	503
Ethylbenzene	4/14/95	G95001203	20	USEPA 8020	14	835
Total Xylenes	4/14/95	G95001203	20	USEPA 8020	66	968
Total BTEX	4/14/95	G95001203	20	USEPA 8020	115	--
TPH	4/14/95	G95001203	20	USEPA 418.1	31	--
Other Total Lead	4/14/95	G95001203	20	USEPA 7420	23	NA (400) <sup>b/</sup>
Other						

\* Enter maximum soil analytical results for soils remaining beneath the site (take into account all available data, including information obtained during the release determination (tank removal from service, minimal site assessment, etc)).

\*\* If Plan A cleanup goals were used, provide the potential groundwater beneficial use category and a justification of how it was determined in Section VI.

1990 cleanup goals may be used only if all activities necessary to meet those goals were completed by November 8, 1995.

a/ Category II Plan A Groundwater Protective (mg/kg), TNRCC, 1994.

b/ NA (400) = TNRCC criteria not available. A screening level of 400 mg/kg is presented based on Revised Interim Soil Lead Guidance for CERCLA Site and RCRA Corrective Action Facilities (USEPA, 1994)

### V. GROUNDWATER DATA VALIDATION

Is groundwater at the site impacted?  Yes  No

Did the assessment document that groundwater was not impacted?  Yes  No If No or unsure, provide justification for not determining whether there is a groundwater impact: N/A

Total number of monitoring wells installed: 12

Will any of the remaining wells be used in the future?  Yes  No If Yes, specify exactly which well(s) will be used: \_\_\_\_\_

#### REQUESTED KELLY AIR FORCE BASE INPUT

If No, they must be plugged in accordance with 30 TAC Chapter 338 after obtaining approval for site closure. Do not plug the wells until you receive concurrence on site closure. Costs of well plugging may be allowable for reimbursement if all eligibility requirements are met and if the wells were installed under the direction of the TNRCC specifically to address the confirmed release at the site. Provide a proposal with this form (if the site is eligible for reimbursement) for costs of the well plugging.

Measured total dissolved solids (TDS) concentration in groundwater: 660-1,140 mg/l. From which monitor well(s) was/were the sample(s) collected? KY024 MW010; MW009; MW008; MW004; MW007; MW011; MW006

Measured groundwater yield at the site: 216 gallons/day (as determined from well adequately screened in the impacted aquifer).  Not determined.

Measured groundwater depth at the site ranges between 5 and 37 feet below the top of well casing.

Time period of groundwater monitoring at the site (dates): 9/89 to 11/97.

Total number of groundwater monitoring events: 14

What type of aquifer is impacted? (unconfined, confined, semi-confined): unconfined

Distance from maximum plume concentration point to nearest existing downgradient well location (not monitor well): >0.5 mile direction (Input ">0.5 mile" if there is no well within 0.5 mile downgradient)

Are any water supply wells impacted or immediately threatened?  Yes  No

If Yes, specify type of well:  Drinking water  Non-drinking water

Are there any existing water wells located within the area of impacted groundwater?  Yes  No

If Yes, specify type of well:  Drinking water  Non-drinking water

Has surface water been affected?  Yes  No

Will the groundwater contaminants likely discharge to a surface water body?  Yes  No

What is the potential impact of affected groundwater discharge on surface water?

Current impact  Discharges within 500 ft.  Discharges within 500 to 0.25 miles

No potential impact

Yes  No Were groundwater sample collection, handling, transport, and analytical procedures conducted and documented in accordance with TNRCC requirements? If no, provide justification: \_\_\_\_\_

**V. GROUNDWATER DATA VALIDATION (Continued)**

Yes  No Is the extent of groundwater contamination defined (to MCL concentrations)? If No, provide justification for not defining the plume: \_\_\_\_\_

Yes  No Have groundwater impacts from this release been detected on adjacent properties? If No, is off-site migration probable?  Yes  No Is there documentation that off-site migration has **not** occurred (sample results from off-site sampling point)?  Yes  No

Yes  No Was the static groundwater level above the top of the well screen in any monitor wells during any of the last 4 monitoring events? If Yes, provide a statement of validity regarding these samples:  
The low permeability of the soils preclude MWs screened across the water table from producing an adequate amount of water for sample collection. When samples were able to be collected in these wells, the shallow contaminant concentrations were relatively low compared to the deeper wells (Brown and Root, 1993).

Yes  No Have groundwater samples from all monitor wells met the target cleanup goals for the last four consecutive sampling events?

**MAXIMUM GROUNDWATER CONCENTRATIONS**

Groundwater Contaminants	Sample Date	Sample Location	Laboratory Method	Maximum Concentration* (mg/l)	Target Cleanup Goals** (indicate source of target cleanup goals: 1990 or 1994 [Plan A or B] guidance) <sup>a/</sup>
Benzene	11/13/97	KY024 MW004	USEPA 8020	2.200	0.0294
Toluene	3/18/97	KY024 MW004	USEPA 8020	0.080	7.3
Ethylbenzene	11/13/97	KY024 MW004	USEPA 8020	0.4	3.65
Total Xylenes	11/13/97	KY024 MW004	USEPA 8020	0.18	73
Total BTEX	11/13/97	KY024 MW004	USEPA 8020	2.81	--
TPH	--	--	--	--	--
Other Lead (total)	11/13/97	KY024 MW004	USEPA 7421	0.0076	NA <sup>b/</sup>
Other MTBE	11/13/97	KY024 MW004	USEPA 8020	3.3	NA

\* Enter maximum groundwater analytical results from the most recent 12 months of monitoring.

\*\* 1990 cleanup goals may be used only if all activities necessary to meet those goals were completed by November 8, 1995.

<sup>a/</sup> Category II Plan A Groundwater Concentration (mg/L) (TNRCC, 1994).

<sup>b/</sup> NA = TNRCC criteria not available.



**VII. REPORT PREPARATION**

Based on the results of the site investigation and the additional information presented herein, I certify that the site investigation activities performed either by me, or under my direct supervision, including subcontracted work, were conducted in accordance with accepted industry standards/practices and further, that all such tasks were conducted in compliance with applicable TNRCC published rules, guidelines and the laws of the State of Texas. I have reviewed the information included within this report, and consider it to be complete, accurate and representative of the conditions discovered during the site investigation. I acknowledge that if I intentionally or knowingly make false statements, representations, or certifications in this report, I may be subject to administrative, civil, and/or criminal penalties. **I certify that the site has met all requirements for closure and that closure is appropriate.**

Project Manager: Brian Vanderglas CAPM No.: 00758 Expiration date: 8/10/98

Company: Parsons Engineering Science, Inc.

Address: 800 Centre Park Dr., Suite 200 City: Austin State: TX Zip: 78754

Telephone No.: (512) 719-6000 Fax No.: (512) 719-6099

Signature: Brian Vanderglas Date: 7/16/98

By my signature affixed below, I certify that I am the duly authorized representative of the Correction Action Specialist named and that I have personally reviewed the site investigation results and other relevant information presented herein and considered them to be in accordance with accepted standards/practices and in compliance with the applicable TNRCC published rules, guidelines and the laws of the State of Texas. Further, that the information presented herein is considered complete, accurate and representative of the conditions discovered during the site investigation. I acknowledge that if I intentionally or knowingly make false statements, representations, or certifications in this report, I may be subject to administrative, civil, and/or criminal penalties. **I certify that the site has met all requirements for closure and that closure is appropriate.**

Corrective Action Specialist: Brian Vanderglas CAS No.: 00101 Expiration date: 10/16/98

Company: Parsons Engineering Science, Inc.

Address: 800 Centre Park Dr., Suite 200 City: Austin State: TX Zip: 78754

Telephone No.: (512) 719-6000 Fax No.: (512) 719-6099

Signature: Brian Vanderglas Date: 7/16/98

By my signature affixed below, I certify that I have reviewed this report for accuracy and completeness of information regarding points of contact and the facility and storage tank system history and status. I acknowledge that if I intentionally or knowingly make false statements, representations, or certifications in this report related to the contact information, and the facility and storage tank system history and status information, I may be subject to administrative, civil, and/or criminal penalties. I attest that I have reviewed this report for accuracy and completeness. I understand that I am responsible for addressing this matter. **I certify that the site has met all requirements for closure and that closure is appropriate.**

Name of Responsible Party contact: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM IF NOT PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED:**

- A site map illustrating the locations of the entire UST and/or AST system (including piping, dispensers, observation wells, etc.), all soil borings and monitoring wells and all other samplinifests or other waste receipts, and any other documents necessary for case closure.

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**JUSTIFICATION FOR CLOSURE**

**SECTION VI  
TNRCC PSTD LPST *SITE CLOSURE REQUEST FORM***

**FINAL**

**JUSTIFICATION FOR CLOSURE FOR  
FORMER BUILDING 2093 GAS STATION,  
KELLY AFB, TEXAS**

**AETC Contract No. F41689-96-D-0710  
Order No. 5015**

**Prepared for**

**AIR FORCE CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EXCELLENCE  
TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER DIVISION  
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS**

**and**

**SA-ALC/EMRO  
KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS**

**July 1998**

**Prepared by**

**PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.  
1700 Broadway, Suite 900  
Denver, Colorado 80209**

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A	Site Layout
Exhibit B	Soil Gas Results (11/97)
Exhibit C	Groundwater Elevation (1/6/98)
Exhibit D	Aquifer Properties (11/97)
Exhibit E	Benzene in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit F	BTEX in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit G	MTBE in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit H	Total Lead in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit I	Dissolved Oxygen in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit J	Reduction/Oxidation Potential in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit K	Nitrate Plus Nitrite as Nitrogen in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit L	Ammonia as Nitrogen in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit M	Ferrous Iron in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit N	Sulfate in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit O	Methane in Groundwater (11/97)
Exhibit P	Expressed Assimilative Capacity
Exhibit Q	BIOSCREEN® Model
Exhibit R	Soil Boring Logs and Monitor Well Construction Diagrams

## SECTION VI

Justification for closure based on the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (TNRCC) Interoffice Memorandum *Process for Closure Evaluation of Petroleum Hydrocarbon LPST Sites Exceeding Target Concentrations* (February, 1997) is provide herein. This documentation fulfills the requirements of Section VI of the TNRCC Petroleum Storage Tank Division (PSTD) LPST *Site Closure Request Form* (TNRCC-0028). The work is being performed by Parsons Engineering Science, Inc. (Parsons ES) for the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, Technology Transfer Division (AFCEE/ERT), under Air Education and Training Command (AETC) Contract No. F41689-96-D-0710, Order No. 5015. This report is being submitted in lieu of a TNRCC Plan A Report because the existing data supports closure as presented in Section VI.

Historic site documents which aid in this justification include:

- *Texas Water Commission Product Storage Tanks Final Site Closure Report* (Ogden, 1995);
- *Texas Water Commission Limited Site Assessment Report Form* (EA, 1995); and
- Numerous annual groundwater monitoring reports.

### REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

The Former Building 2093 site is currently regulated by the Petroleum Storage Tank (PST) Division of the TNRCC. The TNRCC designation for this site is LPST ID No. 93205. Published guidance entitled *Risk-Based Corrective Action for Leaking Underground Storage Tank (UST) Sites* (TNRCC, 1994) contains information regarding the risk-based corrective action process and the establishment of remediation targets for sites regulated by the PST Division. Additional guidance regarding case closure criteria at low-risk leaking UST sites became available in February 1997 (TNRCC, 1997). In summary, the guidance indicates that site closure is appropriate if the following criteria are met:

1. The groundwater contaminant plume is stable or declining in magnitude and/or size. Plume stability can be demonstrated by at least four groundwater monitoring events. In addition, natural attenuation indicators can be used to demonstrate trends suggesting natural attenuation is occurring and is likely to continue to occur which would lead to declining contaminant concentrations. This is detailed in the TNRCC Interoffice Memorandum *Interim Guidance: Monitoring Natural Attenuation for Verification of Groundwater Plume Stability* (April, 1997); and
2. Current or future exposure potential is low such as typical Priority 4.1 and 4.2 sites. This can be demonstrated by developing a conceptual site model which details the potential for current and future exposures. To aid in this closure process, the TNRCC has developed a series of decision flow charts which should be used by owner/operators to evaluate groundwater and

exposure pathways. Institutional controls can be used to restrict exposure potential (e.g., no groundwater utilization) and still proceed to closure. These have been included as Figures 1 through 3. Each has been annotated with site-specific justification which leads the site to closure.

If the above two criteria can be met, closure of the site may be obtained by completing a *Leaking Petroleum Storage Tank (LPST) Closure Request Form* (TNRCC, 1996).

## ADDITIONAL SITE INFORMATION

Information regarding the site which has not been submitted previously to the TNRCC is included as Exhibits A through Q. This work was performed as part of an AFCEE demonstration project evaluating risk-based investigation and closure of low-risk sites. The work was performed in accordance with the *Final Work Plan for the Risk-Based Investigation and Closure of the Former Building 2093 Gas Station, Kelly Air Force Base, Texas* (Parsons ES, 1997). The data gathered during this demonstration is used to augment data previously collected at Former Building 2093 to support closure. Data collection activities included:

- The installation of additional groundwater monitoring wells (KY024MW068, KY024MW069, and KY024MW070) and collection of geochemical and contaminant data from these wells and selected preexisting site monitoring wells;
- Soil sampling to support the natural attenuation evaluation of the dissolved groundwater plume (total organic carbon measurements);
- Soil gas sampling in the immediate vicinity of Building 2075; and
- Collection of site-specific hydraulic conductivity data (slug tests).

## EXPOSURE POTENTIAL

Based on the Conceptual Site Model (CSM) for Former Building 2093, air, soil, and shallow groundwater represent the potentially affected physical media at the Former Building 2093 Gas Station. Surface water, while occasionally present as storm water runoff in the shallow drainage swales, is not thought to have been affected by site petroleum contamination. The subsurface location of historic fuel releases, the excavation of surface and subsurface source area soils, and the depth to groundwater as compared to the shallow drainage swale depth, has prevented surface water from being impacted.

Kelly AFB is currently undergoing Base closure activities. Base personnel continue to work at the site, but it is assumed that the Former Building 2093 site will continue to be used for industrial/commercial activities in the future. Based on foreseeable future site activities, no change is expected in potential receptors at the site. Surrounding off-base land use is primarily commercial; however, some agricultural and/or residential land use is present south of Military Drive and south of the Base.

Based on these land use assumptions, commercial worker populations and construction worker populations are the only current or foreseeable future onsite human receptors. Due to the occasional shallow depth to groundwater (5 to 10 feet bgs), construction or maintenance workers performing intrusive site activities could be exposed to impacted groundwater, subsurface soils, and to air potentially affected by chemicals volatilizing from subsurface media. In addition, workers performing nonintrusive tasks at the site or located within the new Building 2075 could be exposed to volatile organics from the subsurface soil gas. However, maximum detected benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX) concentrations in soil and groundwater are below TNRCC (1997) target concentrations for construction worker exposures. To address possible vapor inhalation by construction workers, one soil gas sample was collected from the area adjacent to Building 2093 (approximately 2 to 3 feet bgs) at the location of the most contaminated remaining soils (i.e., worst case scenario) (Exhibit B). Soil gas concentrations of BTEX were at least two orders-of-magnitude below OSHA time-weighted average (TWA) Permissible Exposure Levels (PELs) developed to be protective of on-site workers (NIOSH, 1994). Although this exposure pathway is potentially complete, the data indicate that exposure risk is minimal.

No exposure pathways to current off site receptors are believed to be completed, nor are future off site receptor pathways likely to be completed. Water supply wells which are located within 0.5 mile of the site are screened in the Edwards Aquifer approximately 1,000 feet bgs, and are adequately protected from the impacted shallow aquifer by the large thickness of low-permeability sediments separating the two zones (Navarro Clay approximately 400 feet thick).

Although numerous plant and wildlife species could be occupying areas on and near Kelly AFB, the absence of exposure pathways (e.g., no surface water impact and no shallow soils exposure due to pavement cover) indicates that no ecological receptors are likely to be exposed to contaminants.

Based on this evaluation of current and future receptors, the potential risk of exposure is minimal. This is also illustrated in the TNRCC decision flow charts which have been annotated with site-specific information (Figures 1 through 3).

## **PLUME STABILITY**

Fourteen rounds of groundwater sampling has been completed at Former Building 2093 between September 1989 and November 1997. The previous groundwater sampling events have indicated a contaminant plume which is not increasing in areal extent and is exhibiting a low static trend (i.e., groundwater concentrations not increasing significantly). Two monitoring wells near the source area (KY024MW004 and KY024MW010) have consistently exhibited benzene concentrations above TNRCC Plan A Category II groundwater criteria. The most recent groundwater sampling event verifies the previous data (Exhibits E). In addition, natural attenuation parameters collected during the most recent field event exhibit trends associated with a plume which is being naturally degraded (Exhibits I through O). Because the source has been removed (i.e., excavation of contaminated soils), this degradation will continue to decrease the concentrations of dissolved contaminants. In addition, assimilative capacity calculations provide in Exhibit P suggest that the shallow aquifer has the

biological capacity to attenuate the existing contamination (see Exhibit P for explanation of assimilative capacity). In addition, the low permeability soil present at Former Building 2093 (Exhibit D - Aquifer Test Data) has minimized plume migration away from the source area. These observations are supported by BIOSCREEN® Modeling (Exhibit Q) which was performed to evaluate contaminant (specifically benzene) migration. Modeling results indicate that benzene will not migrate past the most downgradient well (KY024MW070) at levels above TNRCC criteria. In addition, the model indicates that benzene concentrations should fall below TNRCC criteria within 10 years.

## CONCLUSION


Given the low potential for current or future exposure to site contaminants, the historical groundwater data which indicates a contaminant plume that is not increasing in areal extent, and the strong geochemical evidence that natural attenuation is occurring at the site, Former Building 2093 is a candidate for immediate closure according to TNRCC guidance. Given the fact that dissolved benzene concentrations in groundwater remain above TNRCC Plan A Category II criteria near the source area, Kelly AFB proposes to restrict use of the shallow groundwater at the site.

**FIGURE 1**



**FIGURE 2**

**FIGURE 2**  
**GROUNDWATER PATHWAYS**  
**FORMER BUILDING 2093**  
**KELLY AFB, TEXAS**  
**GROUNDWATER DEPTH  $\leq$  15 FEET, OR WITHIN TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION DEPTH**  
*(Criteria For Figure 1 Must Also Be Met)*




Reference:  
 \*\* Parsons ES, 1998



**FIGURE 3**

**FIGURE 3**  
**SOILS PATHWAYS**  
**FORMER BUILDING 2093**  
**KELLY AFB, TEXAS**  
**EVALUATE ALL THREE PATHWAYS**



Reference:  
 \* EA, 1995  
 \*\*\* Ogden, 1995



## Validation Flags


The following definitions provide explanations of the USEPA (1994a and 1994b) qualifiers assigned to analytical results during data validation. The data qualifiers described were applied to both inorganic and organic results.

- U - The analyte was analyzed for and is not present above the practical quantitation limit (PQL).
- J - The analyte was analyzed for and was positively identified, but the associated numerical value may not be consistent with the amount actually present in the environmental sample. The data should be considered as a basis for decision-making and are usable for many purposes.
- J1 - The analyte is qualified as an estimated value solely because it is greater than the method detection limit (MDL) and less than the PQL indicating no laboratory quality issues.
- UJ - The analyte analyzed for was not present above the reported PQL. The associated numerical value may not accurately or precisely represent the concentration necessary to detect the analyte in the sample.
- R - The data are rejected as unusable for all purposes. This analyte was analyzed for, but the presence or absence of the analyte was not verified. Resampling and reanalysis are necessary to confirm the presence or absence of the analyte.

**EXHIBIT A**  
**SITE LAYOUT**

**LEGEND**

- Previously Existing Monitoring Well
- ⊕ New Monitoring Well
- Soil Gas Sampling Location
- ══ Road
- > Drainage Swale With Flow Direction
- x— Fence




**EXHIBIT A**

**SITE LAYOUT**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
 Former Building 2093  
 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

PARSONS  
 ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.  
 Denver, Colorado



**EXHIBIT B**

**SOIL GAS RESULTS (11/97)**


**LEGEND**

KY024SV071 Soil Gas Sampling Location  
 Analyte Concentration (ug/L)  
 ND = Not Detected  
 TVH = Total Volatile Hydrocarbons  
 (C5+ Hydrocarbons)  
 Referenced to Gasoline

● Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
 ◊ New Monitoring Well

— Road

--- Drainage Swale With Flow Direction  
 - - - Fence




**EXHIBIT B**

**SOIL GAS RESULTS  
 (11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
 Former Building 2093  
 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

PARSONS  
 ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.  
 Denver, Colorado



**EXHIBIT C**

**GROUNDWATER ELEVATION (1/6/98)**

**LEGEND**

- Previously Existing Monitoring Well
- ◐ New Monitoring Well
- Soil Gas Sampling Location
- Line of Equal Groundwater Surface Elevation (feet msl) Dashed Where Inferred
- ➔ Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
- Road
- - - Drainage Swale With Flow Direction
- Fence




**EXHIBIT C**

**GROUNDWATER ELEVATION  
(1/6/98)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
Former Building 2093  
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**

Denver, Colorado




**EXHIBIT D**

**AQUIFER PROPERTIES (11/97)**

**LEGEND**

- Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
k = Hydraulic Conductivity from Slug Test
- ◐ New Monitoring Well
- Soil Gas Sampling Location
- Road
- Drainage Swale With Flow Direction
- - - Fence



**EXHIBIT D**  
**AQUIFER**  
**PROPERTIES**  
**(11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
 Former Building 2093  
 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS**  
**ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**  
 Denver, Colorado

CLIENT: AFCEE

COMPANY: Parsons Engineering Science

LOCATION: Kelly AFB - Building 2093

PROJECT: 731854


### FALLING HEAD - KY024MW004

DATA SET:  
FH1KY004.DAT  
01/26/98

AQUIFER MODEL:  
Unconfined  
SOLUTION METHOD:  
Bower-Rice

TEST DATA:  
 $H_0 = 3.557$  ft  
 $r_c = 0.0833$  ft  
 $r_w = 0.3333$  ft  
 $L = 10.$  ft  
 $b = 28.52$  ft  
 $H = 28.52$  ft

PARAMETER ESTIMATES:  
 $K = 0.0003432$  ft/min  
 $y_0 = 2.434$  ft



AQTESOLV



CLIENT: AFCEE

COMPANY: Parsons Engineering Science

LOCATION: Kelly AFB - Building 2093

PROJECT: 731854


### RISING HEAD TEST - KY024MW004

DATA SET:  
RH1KY004.DAT  
01/26/98

AQUIFER MODEL:  
Unconfined  
SOLUTION METHOD:  
Bouwer-Rice

TEST DATA:  
 $H_0 = 2.675$  ft  
 $r_c = 0.0833$  ft  
 $r_w = 0.3333$  ft  
 $L = 10.$  ft  
 $b = 28.52$  ft  
 $H = 28.52$  ft

PARAMETER ESTIMATES:  
 $K = 0.000237$  ft/min  
 $y_0 = 2.443$  ft



AQTESOLU




CLIENT: AFCEE

COMPANY: PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE

LOCATION: KELLY AFB

PROJECT: 731854

### RISING HEAD TEST - KY024MW007



DATA SET:  
RH1KY007.DAT  
01/26/98

AQUIFER MODEL:  
Unconfined  
SOLUTION METHOD:  
Bouwer-Rice

TEST DATA:  
 $H_0 = 1.241$  ft  
 $r_c = 0.0833$  ft  
 $r_w = 0.3333$  ft  
 $L = 5.15$  ft  
 $b = 5.15$  ft  
 $H = 5.15$  ft

PARAMETER ESTIMATES:  
 $K = 0.0001273$  ft/min  
 $y_0 = 0.5703$  ft

AQTESOLU




CLIENT: AFCEE

COMPANY: PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE

LOCATION: KELLY AFB

PROJECT: 731854

### RISING HEAD TEST #2 - KY024MW007



DATA SET:  
RHZKY007.DAT  
01/26/98

AQUIFER MODEL:  
Unconfined  
SOLUTION METHOD:  
Bower-Rice

TEST DATA:  
H<sub>0</sub> = 1.441 ft  
r<sub>c</sub> = 0.0833 ft  
r<sub>w</sub> = 0.3333 ft  
L = 5.15 ft  
b = 5.15 ft  
H = 5.15 ft

PARAMETER ESTIMATES:  
K = 0.0002209 ft/min  
y<sub>0</sub> = 0.6169 ft

AQTESOLV



CLIENT: AFCEE

COMPANY: PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE

LOCATION: KELLY AFB

PROJECT: 731845


### RISING HEAD TEST - SS043MW014

DATA SET:  
RH1KY014.DAT  
01/26/98

AQUIFER MODEL:  
Unconfined  
SOLUTION METHOD:  
Bower-Rice

TEST DATA:  
H0 = 1.612 ft  
rc = 0.0833 ft  
rw = 0.3333 ft  
L = 20. ft  
b = 33.24 ft  
H = 33.24 ft

PARAMETER ESTIMATES:  
K = 0.0001581 ft/min  
y0 = 1.468 ft



AQTESOLU




CLIENT: AFCEE

COMPANY: Parsons Engineering Science

LOCATION: Kelly AFB - Building 2093

PROJECT: 731854

### Falling Head (Modified) - SS043MW014



DATA SET:  
KY014MOD.DAT  
01/26/98

AQUIFER MODEL:  
Unconfined  
SOLUTION METHOD:  
Bouwer-Rice

TEST DATA:  
H0 = 2.377 ft  
rc = 0.0833 ft  
rw = 0.3333 ft  
L = 20. ft  
b = 33.24 ft  
H = 33.24 ft

PARAMETER ESTIMATES:  
K = 0.0001595 ft/min  
y0 = 2.079 ft

AQTESOLU



**EXHIBIT E**

**BENZENE IN GROUNDWATER (11/97)**

**LEGEND**


 KY024MW004  
 Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
 Benzene Concentration (ug/L) Data Qualifier  
 (Field Duplicate Concentration)  
 NA = Not Analyzed


 New Monitoring Well




 Soil Gas Sampling Location


 Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction


 Road


 Drainage Swale With Flow Direction  

 Fence



**EXHIBIT E**

**BENZENE IN GROUNDWATER**  
**(11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
Former Building 2093  
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**  
Denver, Colorado

**EXHIBIT F**

**BTEX IN GROUNDWATER (11/97)**

**LEGEND**

- KY024MW004  
● 2807 (2946)  
Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
BTEX Concentration (ug/L)  
(Field Duplicate Concentration)  
NA = Not Analyzed
- New Monitoring Well
- Soil Gas Sampling Location
- ➔ Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
- Road
- Drainage Swale With Flow Direction
- Fence




**EXHIBIT F**

**BTEX IN GROUNDWATER  
(11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
Former Building 2093  
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**

Denver, Colorado



**EXHIBIT G**

**MTBE IN GROUNDWATER (11/97)**

**LEGEND**

KY024MW004  
 ○ 3300  
 (3300)  
 Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
 MTBE Concentration (ug/L) Data Qualifier  
 (Field Duplicate Concentration)  
 NA = Not Analyzed

○ New Monitoring Well



● Soil Gas Sampling Location

➔ Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction

— Road

--- Drainage Swale With Flow Direction

- - - Fence



**EXHIBIT G**

**MTBE IN GROUNDWATER  
(11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
 Former Building 2093  
 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**

Denver, Colorado

**EXHIBIT H**

**TOTAL LEAD IN GROUNDWATER (11/97)**

**LEGEND**

KY024MW004  
 3300 (3300)  
 Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
 Lead Concentration (mg/L) Data Qualifier  
 (Field Duplicate Concentration)  
 NA = Not Analyzed


●  
 New Monitoring Well

●  
 Soil Gas Sampling Location

➔  
 Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction

—  
 Road

—  
 Drainage Swale With Flow Direction  
 Fence




**EXHIBIT H**

**TOTAL LEAD  
 IN GROUNDWATER  
 (11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
 Former Building 2093  
 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
 ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**

Denver, Colorado



**EXHIBIT I**

**DISSOLVED OXYGEN IN GROUNDWATER (11/97)**

**LEGEND**

Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
 Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)  
 NA = Not Analyzed

○ KY024MW004  
 1.68

New Monitoring Well


● Soil Gas Sampling Location

➔ Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction

— Road

- - - Drainage Swale With Flow Direction

⋯ Fence




**EXHIBIT I**

**DISSOLVED OXYGEN  
 IN GROUNDWATER  
 (11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
 Former Building 2093  
 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
 ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**

Denver, Colorado










**EXHIBIT J**

**REDUCTION/OXIDATION POTENTIAL IN GROUNDWATER  
(11/97)**

**LEGEND**


Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
Reduction/Oxidation Potential (mV)  
NA = Not Analyzed

-  KY024MW004  
-114.1
-  New Monitoring Well
-  Soil Gas Sampling Location
-  Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
-  Road
-  Drainage Swale With Flow Direction
-  Fence

**EXHIBIT J**  
**REDUCTION/OXIDATION  
POTENTIAL  
IN GROUNDWATER  
(11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
Former Building 2093  
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**  
Denver, Colorado




**EXHIBIT K**

**NITRATE PLUS NITRITE AS NITROGEN IN GROUNDWATER  
(11/97)**

**LEGEND**

- KY024MW004  
Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
N Concentration (mg/L) Data Qualifier  
(Field Duplicate Concentration)  
NA = Not Analyzed
- New Monitoring Well
- Soil Gas Sampling Location
- Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
- Road
- Drainage Swale With Flow Direction
- Fence



**EXHIBIT K**

**NITRATE PLUS NITRITE  
AS NITROGEN  
IN GROUNDWATER  
(11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
Former Building 2093  
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**

Denver, Colorado

**EXHIBIT L**

**AMMONIA AS NITROGEN IN GROUNDWATER (11/97)**

**LEGEND**


 KY024MW004  
 7.7  
 Ammonia-N Concentration (ppm)  
 NA = Not Analyzed

 New Monitoring Well



 Soil Gas Sampling Location

 Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction

 Road

 Drainage Swale With Flow Direction

 Fence




**EXHIBIT L**

**AMMONIA AS NITROGEN  
IN GROUNDWATER  
(11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
 Former Building 2093  
 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**  
 Denver, Colorado




**EXHIBIT M**

**FERROUS IRON IN GROUNDWATER (11/97)**

**LEGEND**

- KY024MW004  
7.7  
Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
Ferrous Iron Concentration (mg/L)  
NA = Not Analyzed
- New Monitoring Well
- Soil Gas Sampling Location
- ➔ Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction
- Road
- - - Drainage Swale With Flow Direction
- Fence




**EXHIBIT M**

**FERROUS IRON  
IN GROUNDWATER  
(11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
Former Building 2093  
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**

Denver, Colorado




**EXHIBIT N**

**SULFATE IN GROUNDWATER (11/97)**


**LEGEND**

 KY024MW004  
 Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
 Sulfate Concentration (mg/L)  
 NA = Not Analyzed



 New Monitoring Well

 Soil Gas Sampling Location

 Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction

 Road

 Drainage Swale With Flow Direction  
 Fence



**EXHIBIT N**  
**SULFATE**  
**IN GROUNDWATER**  
**(11/197)**  
 Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
 Former Building 2093  
 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas  
**PARSONS**  
**ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**  
 Denver, Colorado

**EXHIBIT O**

**METHANE IN GROUNDWATER (11/97)**

**LEGEND**

KY024MW004  
 Previously Existing Monitoring Well  
 Methane Concentration (ug/L) Data Qualifier  
 (Field Duplicate Concentration)  
 NA = Not Analyzed


● 2200  
 (2300)

○ New Monitoring Well  
 ● Soil Gas Sampling Location

↑ Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction

— Road

- - - Drainage Swale With Flow Direction  
 - - - Fence



**EXHIBIT O**

**METHANE IN GROUNDWATER  
(11/97)**

Risk-Based Approach to Remediation  
 Former Building 2093  
 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas

**PARSONS  
ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.**

Denver, Colorado

**EXHIBIT P**

**EXPRESSED ASSIMILATIVE CAPACITY**

## EXHIBIT P

### Expressed Assimilative Capacity

Mass-balance relationships can be used to determine how much contaminant mass can be degraded by each of the redox reactions that microorganisms might use to make free energy available for cell maintenance and production. The stoichiometric relationship between the contaminant and the electron acceptor can be used to estimate the expressed assimilative capacity of the groundwater. Once the redox reactions operating at these sites were defined, it is possible to estimate theoretically how much contaminant mass can be assimilated or oxidized by available electron acceptors. This analysis provides a basis for determining the potential for continued contaminant mass reduction in saturated media at the site.

A closed system with 2 liters of water can be used to help visualize the physical meaning of assimilative capacity. Assume that the first liter contains no fuel hydrocarbons, but it contains fuel degrading microorganisms and has an assimilative capacity (i.e., electron acceptors) of exactly "x"  $\mu\text{g}$  of fuel hydrocarbons based on stoichiometry. The second liter has no assimilative capacity; however, it contains fuel hydrocarbons. As long as these 2 liters of water are kept separate, biodegradation of the fuel hydrocarbons will not occur. If these 2 liters are combined in a closed system, biodegradation will commence and continue until the fuel hydrocarbons are depleted, the electron acceptors are depleted, or the environment becomes acutely toxic to the fuel degrading microorganisms. Assuming a nonlethal environment, if fewer than "x"  $\mu\text{g}$  of fuel hydrocarbons were in the second liter, all of the fuel hydrocarbons would eventually degrade given a sufficient time; likewise, if greater than "x"  $\mu\text{g}$  of fuel hydrocarbons were in the second liter of water, only "x"  $\mu\text{g}$  of fuel hydrocarbons would ultimately degrade.

The November 1997 groundwater samples were analyzed for a number geochemical parameter. Site groundwater data for DO suggest that natural attenuation of hydrocarbons in the shallow aquifer is occurring by aerobic biodegradation. In addition, data for nitrate/nitrite, ferrous iron, sulfate, and methane suggest that anaerobic degradation via denitrification, iron reduction, sulfate reduction, and methanogenesis is occurring. The occurrence of the process is evidenced by the depletion of electron acceptors (oxygen, nitrate, and sulfate) in the plume area and the production of metabolic byproducts of biodegradation reactions (ferrous iron and methane) Geochemical parameters for site groundwater are discussed in the following sections. On the basis of the stoichiometry of the various biodegradation reactions and observed differences between background and plume electron acceptor concentrations, the expressed assimilative capacity of groundwater at Former Building 2093 is at least 12,270  $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$  for BTEX or 12,490  $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$  for benzene alone (Table P.1).

**TABLE P.1**  
**EXPRESSED ASSIMILATIVE CAPACITY OF SITE GROUNDWATER**  
 FORMER BUILDING 2093  
 KELLY AFB, TEXAS

Electron Acceptor or Process	Expressed BTEX Assimilative Capacity ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Expressed Benzene Assimilative Capacity ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )
Aerobic Respiration	950	970
Denitrification	130	130
Iron Reduction	340	340
Sulfate Reduction	7,450	7,610
Methanogenesis	3,400	3,440
Expressed Assimilative Capacity	12,270	12,490
Maximum BTEX Concentration (11/97)	2,800	-
Maximum Benzene Concentration (11/97)	-	2,200

The groundwater beneath Former Building 2093 is an open system, which continually receives additional electron receptors from upgradient and from the percolation of precipitation. This means that the assimilative capacity is not fixed as it is in a closed system, and therefore cannot be compared directly to contaminant concentrations in the groundwater. Rather, the expressed assimilative capacity of groundwater is intended to serve as a qualitative tool. The expressed assimilative capacity at this site is greater than the highest total BTEX concentration measured in November 1997 (2,800  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) and the highest benzene concentration measured in November 1997 (2,200  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ). The fate of BTEX in groundwater and the potential impact on receptors is dependent on the relationship between the kinetics of biodegradation and the solute transport velocity (Chappelle, 1994). Due to the low hydraulic conductivity of the clayey soils underlying the site and the resulting low solute transport velocity (estimated to be approximately 21 feet per year), there should be ample time for the fuel hydrocarbons dissolved in groundwater to substantially biodegrade prior to impacting any potential receptors. Additionally, the expressed assimilative capacity is greater than the highest measured total BTEX concentration measured since 1995 (5,788  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ). This significant expressed assimilative capacity is a strong indicator that biodegradation is occurring and is sufficient to limit migration of the contaminant plume.

**EXHIBIT Q**

**BIOSCREEN® MODEL**

## **EXHIBIT Q**

### **BIOSCREEN® MODEL**

#### **Q.1 MODEL DESCRIPTION**

Bioscreen® is a screening model which simulates remediation by natural attenuation of dissolved hydrocarbons at petroleum fuel release sites (Newell *et al*, 1996). The software is based on the Domenico (1987) analytical solute transport model and is designed to simulate advection, dispersion, adsorption, and aerobic decay as well as anaerobic reactions that have been shown to be the dominant biodegradation processes at many petroleum release sites. Bioscreen® includes three different model types:

- 1) Solute transport without decay;
- 2) Solute transport with biodegradation modeled as a first-order decay process (simple, lumped parameter approach); and
- 3) Solute transport with biodegradation modeled as an “instantaneous” biodegradation reaction.

The first model is appropriate for predicting the movement of conservative (non-degrading) solutes such as chloride. The only attenuation mechanisms simulated are dispersion in the longitudinal, transverse, and vertical directions and adsorption of the contaminant to the soil matrix.

With the second model, the solute degradation rate is proportional to the solute concentration. This is a conventional method for simulating biodegradation in dissolved hydrocarbon plumes. With this method, dispersion, sorption, and biodegradation parameters are lumped together in a single calibration parameter. The

first-order decay model does not account for site-specific information such as the availability of electron acceptors. In addition, it does not assume any biodegradation of dissolved constituents in the source zone. In other words, this model assumes biodegradation starts immediately downgradient of the source.

First-order expressions may not be accurate for describing natural attenuation processes. Biodegradation of organic contaminants in groundwater is more difficult to quantify using a first-order decay equation because electron acceptor limitations are not considered. A more accurate prediction of biodegradation effects may be realized by incorporating the instantaneous reaction equation into a transport model. This is because the instantaneous reaction model uses site-specific data, including representative concentrations of electron acceptors such as dissolved oxygen, nitrate, and sulfate and biodegradation by-products such as ferrous iron and methane.

At almost all petroleum release sites, biodegradation is present and can be verified by demonstrating the consumption of aerobic and anaerobic electron acceptors. Therefore, results from the No Biodegradation model are intended only to be used for comparison purposes and to demonstrate the effects of biodegradation on plume migration. The Instantaneous Reaction model is recommended either alone or in addition to the First-Order Decay model for most sites where site-specific electron acceptor and biodegradation by-product data is available (Newell *et al*, 1996).

## **Q.2 MODELING OBJECTIVES**

The Bioscreen® modeling was performed for the former Building 2093 site to accomplish the following two objectives:

- To estimate the maximum migration distance of the benzene plume from the source area over time; and
- To estimate how long the maximum benzene concentration in the plume will exceed its groundwater quality standard.

Because the site is dominated by methane production (see Exhibits O and P), it was assumed that benzene will degrade last and that the dissolved material at the edge of the plume is primarily benzene (Newell *et al*, 1996). In addition, benzene is the only BTEX compound that is present in groundwater at concentrations above the TNRCC Plan A target groundwater concentration of 29.4 µg/L. Therefore, benzene was the contaminant modeled.

### **Q.3 CONCEPTUAL MODEL DESIGN AND LIMITING ASSUMPTIONS**

Bioscreen has the following limitations:

1. As an analytical model, Bioscreen® assumes simple, uniform groundwater flow conditions; and
2. As a screening tool, Bioscreen only approximates the more complicated processes that occur in the field.

Because the model is not capable of simulating a complicated flow regime, the hydraulic model input parameters were based on field data collected from the primary contaminant migration pathway at the site (i.e., in the vicinity of KY024MW004).

### **Q.4 INITIAL MODEL INPUT DATA**

Input data for the Bioscreen® model are used to calculate groundwater velocity, aquifer dispersivity, a contaminant retardation coefficient, a contaminant decay coefficient, dissolved contaminant concentrations in the source area, a half-life of the contaminant source, and the dimensions of the source zone. Each of these input values is described in more detail below and summarized in Table Q.1.

#### **Q.4.1 Groundwater Velocity**

The advective groundwater velocity beneath the site is based on site specific hydraulic conductivity and hydraulic gradient data and an estimated effective porosity of 5 percent based on published values for clay and silty clay (Spitz and Moreno,

1996). The hydraulic conductivity value used in the model ( $1.5 \times 10^{-4}$  cm/sec) is the highest value calculated from slug test data collected downgradient from the source area in November 1997. The high value used would tend to overestimate plume migration. The hydraulic gradient value used in the model (0.01 ft/ft) is derived from the groundwater elevation data collected in November 1997. The value of advective groundwater velocity calculated by Bioscreen® is 31 ft/yr.

#### **Q.4.2 Dispersivity**

Dispersion refers to the process whereby a plume will spread out in a longitudinal direction (along the direction of groundwater flow), transversely (perpendicular to groundwater flow), and vertically downward due to mechanical mixing and chemical diffusion in the aquifer. The longitudinal, transverse, and vertical dispersivities used in the model are calculated by Bioscreen® from a maximum estimated plume length of 300 feet.

#### **Q.4.3 Retardation**

Retardation of benzene relative to the advective velocity of the groundwater occurs when benzene molecules are sorbed to organic carbon, silt, or clay particles in the aquifer matrix. Increasing the retardation coefficient decreases the contaminant migration velocity relative to the advective groundwater velocity, causing the contaminant to be biodegraded to a greater degree along a given travel path. A retardation coefficient was estimated for the site based on accepted values from literature (Newell *et al.*, 1996). Because TOC was not detected in site soils, an estimated fraction organic carbon value was used to calculate the retardation coefficient used in the Bioscreen model. Using a fraction organic carbon of 0.0002, an estimated soil bulk density of 1.7 kg/L, and a partition coefficient for benzene of 79 L/kg

(Wiedemeier *et al*, 1996), a retardation coefficient of 1.54 was calculated for benzene at the site.

#### **Q.4.4 First-Order Decay Coefficient**

Bioscreen® uses the first-order decay coefficient to simulate biodegradation of dissolved contaminants after they have migrated downgradient from the source area. The first-order decay coefficient equals the half-life of the contaminant divided by 0.693. The half-life of benzene published in literature typically ranges from 0.02 to 2 years (Newell *et al*, 1996). The method of Buschek and Alcantar (1995) was used to calculate a first-order decay rate from site-specific data. Using data from both November 1992 and November 1997, a decay rate of 0.002 day<sup>-1</sup> (0.6 year<sup>-1</sup>) was calculated for benzene at the site. This decay rate corresponds to a half-life of 0.95 years.

#### **Q.4.5 Instantaneous Reaction Data**

The instantaneous reaction model in Bioscreen uses field data for certain electron acceptors to calculate a biodegradation rate. The input data include the change in dissolved oxygen, nitrate, and sulfate concentrations between the source area of the plume and an upgradient, background area and the observed ferrous iron and methane concentrations in the source area of the plume. Assuming that the biodegradation of benzene has produced 25 percent of the reaction by-products (and the biodegradation of toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes the other 75 percent), the November 1997 geochemical concentration differences between upgradient and source areas, described above, were divided by four prior to use in the instantaneous reaction model.

#### **Q.4.6 Source Area Dimensions and Concentrations**

Bioscreen® assumes a source represented by a vertical plane perpendicular to groundwater flow. The cross-sectional area of the vertical plane was estimated from

the benzene data collected in November 1997. The maximum benzene concentration in the source area was conservatively estimated to be 5,000 µg/L. The thickness of the dissolved plume was estimated to be 20 feet based on previously collected soil and groundwater data.

#### **Q.4.7 Source Half-Life**

Bioscreen® incorporates an approximation for a declining source concentration over time. The declining source term assumes that the mass of contaminant in the source area dissolves slowly as fresh groundwater passes through, and that the change in source zone concentration can be approximated as a first-order decay process. The model will compute an estimated source half-life given the estimated mass of contaminant present in the source area. Since the contaminated soil was excavated early in 1995, it was assumed that little residual contamination remains to act as a source of continuing groundwater contamination. Assuming 2000 cubic feet of contaminated soil remains that has a concentration of 0.1 mg/kg of benzene, the dissolvable mass of benzene in the source area is approximately 0.01 kg.

#### **Q.5 Model Results**

The model was run for 5, 10, and 15 years from 1997 to determine the maximum plume extent and benzene concentrations. Results of the model run are shown on Attachment Q.2. The year 2002 graph of the concentration vs. distance from the source area for the instantaneous reaction model indicates that dissolved benzene will no longer be detected at the site. The first-order decay model results indicate that the maximum dissolved benzene concentration on site will be approximately 186 µg/L located 105 feet from the source area. The first-order decay graph for the year 2007 prediction indicates that the maximum dissolved benzene concentration at the site will be 14 µg/L located 210 feet downgradient from the source. First-order decay results

for the year 2012 indicate that benzene will no longer be detectable above Texas state standards.

#### **Q.7 CONCLUSION**

Results of the Bioscreen model indicate that the maximum migration distance of dissolved benzene from the source area will be approximately 300 feet. Results also indicate that site concentrations of benzene will be below groundwater quality standards before the year 2012.

# BIOSCREEN Natural Attenuation Decision Support System

Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence

Version 1.4

Kelly AFB  
B2093  
Run Name

## Data Input Instructions:

- Enter value directly, or calculate by filling in grey cells below. (To restore formulas, hit button below)
- Data used directly in model. Value calculated by model. (Don't enter any data)

**1. HYDROGEOLOGY**

Seepage Velocity\* Vs (ft/yr)  or  (cm/sec)

Hydraulic Conductivity K (ft/ft)  or  (-)

Hydraulic Gradient I (-)

Porosity n (-)

**2. DISPERSION**

Longitudinal Dispersion\* alpha x (ft)  (ft)

Transverse Dispersion\* alpha y (ft)  (ft)

Vertical Dispersion\* alpha z (ft)  (ft)

Estimated Plume Length Lp (ft)  (ft)

**3. ADSORPTION**

Retardation Factor\* R (-)  (-) or  (kg/l)

Soil Bulk Density rho (kg/l)  (kg/l)

Partition Coefficient Koc (L/kg)  (-)

Fraction Organic Carbon foc (-)

**4. BIODEGRADATION**

1st Order Decay Coeff\* lambda (per yr)  (per yr) or  (year)

Solute Half-Life t-half (year)

or Instantaneous Reaction Model

Delta Oxygen\* DO (mg/L)  (mg/L)

Delta Nitrate\* NO3 (mg/L)  (mg/L)

Observed Ferrous Iron\* Fe2+ (mg/L)  (mg/L)

Delta Sulfate\* SO4 (mg/L)  (mg/L)

Observed Methane\* CH4 (mg/L)  (mg/L)

**5. GENERAL**

Modeled Area Length\* (ft)  (ft)

Modeled Area Width\* (ft)  (ft)

Simulation Time\* (yr)  (yr)

**6. SOURCE DATA**

Source Thickness in Sat. Zone\* (ft)  (ft)

Source Zones:

Width* (ft)	Cont. (mg/L)*
10	0.05
10	0.5
20	5
10	0.5
10	0.05

Source Half-life (see Help):  (yr)

Inst. React.  1st Order



Soluble Mass  (kg)

In Source NAPL, Soil

**7. FIELD DATA FOR COMPARISON**

Concentration (mg/L)  35 70 105 140 175 210 245 280 315 350

Dist. from Source (ft)



## 8. CHOOSE TYPE OF OUTPUT TO SEE:

**RUN CENTERLINE**

View Output

**RUN ARRAY**

View Output

**Help**

Recalculate This Sheet


Paste Example Dataset

Restore Formulas for Vs, Dispersivities, R, lambda, other

**DISSOLVED HYDROCARBON CONCENTRATION ALONG PLUME CENTERLINE (mg/L at Z=0)**

Distance from Source (ft)

TYPE OF MODEL	0	35	70	105	140	175	210	245	280	315	350
No Degradation	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.082	0.485	0.164	0.040	0.007	0.001	0.000	0.000
1st Order Decay	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.186	0.060	0.016	0.003	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
Inst. Reaction	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Field Data from Site											



Time:

5 Years

Calculate Next Timestep  
 Animate Previous Timestep

Return to Input


Recalculate This Sheet

DISSOLVED HYDROCARBON CONCENTRATION ALONG PLUME CENTERLINE (mg/L at Z=0)

Distance from Source (ft)

TYPE OF MODEL	0	35	70	105	140	175	210	245	280	315	350
No Degradation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.775	0.456	0.234	0.102	0.038
1st Order Decay	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.005	0.002	0.001	0.000
Inst. Reaction	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Field Data from Site											

1st Order Decay    
  Instantaneous Reaction    
  No Degradation    
  Field Data from Site




Time:

**DISSOLVED HYDROCARBON CONCENTRATION ALONG PLUME CENTERLINE (mg/L at Z=0)**

TYPE OF MODEL	Distance from Source (ft)										
	0	35	70	105	140	175	210	245	280	315	350
No Degradation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.629	0.413
1st Order Decay	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000
Inst. Reaction	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Field Data from Site											

1st Order Decay    
  Instantaneous Reaction    
  No Degradation    
  Field Data from Site



Time:

15 Years

**EXHIBIT R**

**SOIL BORING LOGS AND MONITOR WELL CONSTRUCTION  
DIAGRAMS**

# LOG OF BORING KY024MW068

Kelly Air Force Base  
 San Antonio, Texas

JOB NUMBER : 731854.07000  
 CLIENT : KELLY AFB  
 DATE : 11/16/1997  
 DRILLING METHOD : HSA

DRILLING AGENCY : USACE  
 INSPECTOR : KEN McCLESKEY  
 NORTHING : 558,366.75  
 EASTING : 2,128,406.75

Depth in feet	GRAPHIC	USCS	DESCRIPTION	PID ppmv	KY024MW068 ELEV: 724.28	Well Construction Information
0		GW	asphalt	0.0		Surface Elevation : 724.60 ft. msl TOC Elevation : 724.28 ft. msl Casing Material : PVC Casing Interval : 0 - 27 ft. bgs. Screen Material : preslotted PVC Screen Interval : 27 - 42 ft. bgs. Screen Slot Size : 0.010 in. Seal Material : Bentonite Seal Interval : 23 - 25 ft. bgs. Filter Pack : 20/40 Silica Sand Filter Pack Interval: 25 - 43 ft. bgs. Total Well Depth : 42 ft. bgs. Well Diameter : 2 in. Total Boring Depth: 43 ft. bgs. Borehole Diam. : 8 in.
0.0			SAND & GRAVEL, medium dense, dry to moist	0.0		
		GC	GRAVEL, medium dense, limestone and chert, dry to moist, up to 3" diameter, some cobbles, angular to subrounded, slightly clayey to very clayey, slightly sandy			
8.0			SHALE, weathered, soft, dry to moist, yellow-brown to gray, blocky structure, slightly silty to silty, Fe-oxide staining, caliched to very caliched 5.5' to 25', highly weathered 5.5' to 10'	8.0		
10						
			thicker silty lenses 24'	2.1		
20				0.0		
				3.1	23	
				9.2	25	
				2.5	27	
30				5.9		
				2.0		
40				0.0	42	
Total depth = 43 ft.						

**NOTES**

Soil samples for PID screening and lithology identification were collected from the auger flights at two foot intervals during drilling.

# LOG OF BORING KY024MW069

(Page 1 of 1)

Kelly Air Force Base  
 San Antonio, Texas

JOB NUMBER : 731854.07000  
 CLIENT : KELLY AFB  
 DATE : 11/17/1997  
 DRILLING METHOD : HSA

DRILLING AGENCY : USACE  
 INSPECTOR : KEN McCLESKEY  
 NORTHING : 558,312.80  
 EASTING : 2,128,371.66

Depth in feet	GRAPHIC	USCS	DESCRIPTION	PID ppmv	KY024MW069 ELEV: 725.88	Well Construction Information
0		CL	CLAY, low plasticity, soft to firm, dry to moist, dark brown, slightly sandy, silty, slightly gravelly	0.0		<p>Surface Elevation : 726.16 ft. msl.                      TOC Elevation : 725.88 ft. msl.                      Casing Material : PVC                      Casing Interval : 0 - 27 ft. bgs.                      Screen Material : preslotted PVC                      Screen Interval : 27 - 42 ft. bgs.                      Screen Slot Size : 0.010 in.                      Seal Material : Bentonite                      Seal Interval : 23 - 25 ft. bgs.                      Filter Pack : 20/40 Silica Sand                      Filter Pack Interval : 25 - 43 ft. bgs.                      Total Well Depth : 42 ft. bgs.                      Well Diameter : 2 in.                      Total Boring Depth: 43 ft. bgs.                      Borehole Diam. : 8 in.</p> <p><b>NOTES</b>                      Soil samples for PID screening and lithology identification were collected from the auger flights at two foot intervals during drilling.</p>
		SC	SAND, loose to medium dense, fine to medium grain, moist, red, slightly clayey	0.0		
		GC	GRAVEL, medium dense, limestone and chert, dry to moist, some cobbles, angular to subrounded, clayey to very clayey, slightly sandy	0.0		
10			SHALE, weathered, soft, dry to moist, yellow-brown to gray, blocky structure, slightly silty to silty, caliched to very caliched 5.3' to 15',  thicker silty lenses below 24.2'	0.0		
20						
30						
40						
Total depth = 43 ft.				0.0		





# LOG OF BORING KY024MW070

(Page 1 of 1)

Kelly Air Force Base  
 San Antonio, Texas

JOB NUMBER : 731854.07000  
 CLIENT : KELLY AFB  
 DATE : 11/14/1997  
 DRILLING METHOD : HSA

DRILLING AGENCY : USACE  
 INSPECTOR : KEN McCLESKEY  
 NORTHING : 558,290.14  
 EASTING : 2,128,554.82

Depth in feet	GRAPHIC	USCS	DESCRIPTION	PID ppmv	KY024MW070 ELEV: 721.38	Well Construction Information
0		CL	CLAY, medium plastic, firm, dry to moist, dark brown, slightly sandy, slightly silty, slightly gravelly, slightly caliche, Fe-oxide staining @ 4.5'	0.0		Surface Elevation : 721.82 ft. msl. TOC Elevation : 721.38 ft. msl. Casing Material : PVC Casing Interval : 0 - 27 ft. bgs. Screen Material : preslotted PVC Screen Interval : 27 - 42 ft. bgs. Screen Slot Size : 0.010 in. Seal Material : Bentonite Seal Interval : 23 - 25 ft. bgs. Filter Pack : 20/40 Silica Sand Filter Pack Interval: 25 - 43 ft. bgs. Total Well Depth : 42 ft. bgs. Well Diameter : 2 in. Total Boring Depth: 43 ft. bgs. Borehole Diam. : 8 in.
0		GW	GRAVEL, loose to medium dense, limestone and chert, dry, angular to subangular, up to 3" diameter, slightly sandy, silty, clayey, some cobbles	0.0		
10			SHALE, highly weathered, soft, dry to moist, yellow-brown to gray, slightly silty to silty, Fe-oxide staining, caliche to very caliche, dendrites, scattered silty lenses (Fe-oxide stained)  vague blocky structure 9.2' to 16.5' caliche to very caliche 9.2' to 19' good blocky structure 16.5' to 43.0'  thicker silty lenses 24' to 43'	0.0		
40				0.0		<b>NOTES</b> Soil samples for PID screening and lithology identification were collected from the auger flights at two foot intervals during drilling.
			Total depth = 43 ft.			