

Agency Discussion of Swanson River P&S Yard  
Chevron Swanson River Unit P&S Yard / 203721236

---

Date/Time: December 10, 2019 / 1:00 PM  
Place: ADEC Offices, Soldotna, AK  
Next Meeting: TBD  
Attendees: Peter Campbell, ADEC  
Sharon Yarawsky, BLM  
Lynnda Kahn, USFWS  
Kegan Boyer, Chevron  
Craig Wilson, Stantec  
Absentees: None  
Distribution: Attendees

---

The following is a list of items discussed.

**Item:**

**Action:**

**Sampling**

There was no objection to removing PAH from the wetlands sampling protocol.

The 2020 work plan will reflect the discussions.

There was no objection to modifying the sampling plan to utilize EPA Method 8260 in lieu of EPA Method 8021 for groundwater sampling.

General consensus was that Chevron consider expanding the data set within the landfarm area to better define the residual groundwater impacts in that area.

The consensus was that the agencies were in agreement with proposed recommendations to reduce the amount of routine sampling at the site.

**Air Sparge System**

There was some concern that shutting down wells AS-1 to AS-3 could push groundwater to the north within the air sparge area. Additional water level monitoring will be required if the wells in question are shut down, to determine if there is groundwater movement.

Add water level monitoring if north end air sparge wells are shut down.

Looking towards the future of the air sparge area, breaching of the east wall (sheet pile / slurry wall) and installation of a biowall or permeable reactive barrier may be needed following cessation of air sparge system.

**Wetlands**

[Type the action text]

ADEC indicated that one of the primary drivers for the site is now the TAH and TAQH exceedances in the surface water in the wetlands area. These occur only during the summer.

It was discussed that remedial options in the wetlands are limited since the peat

**Item:**

**Action:**

won't readily give up the xylene and the anaerobic conditions would preferentially allow for oxygen absorption in other areas before oxidizing the xylene contamination.

Any physical work completed in the downgradient wetlands area should probably be executed in winter to take advantage of the frozen ground and low water levels, though dewatering may be required in advance.

ADEC indicated a concern that there could still be source mass in the wetlands or the forested area (outside the slurry wall) and indicated that remedial action would be required in this area. All agencies were in agreement with this. Excavation was discussed as one potential remedial option, but USFWS requested that other alternatives be evaluated and that we should provide a likelihood of success and an indication of what surface impacts would look like for each remedial option. Excavation, if pursued, would need to be completed in winter and any peat material removed would have to be replaced with replacement peat from another area. Pete also indicated the ADEC 'objects' to the presence of impacts in surface water in the wetlands as the impacts are not attenuating and wetlands are ideal for absorbing contaminants.

**Landfarm Area**

Pete and Lynnda both indicated that revegetation of the landfarm area would be needed and mentioned that it should occur in a reasonably short timeframe.

None at this time.  
(See actions under  
"Sampling")

**Slurry Wall**

There was discussion of breaching part of the eastern end of the slurry wall and replacing it with a section of biowall in order to increase groundwater flow and reduce iron leachate issues. With respect to the concept of breaching the downgradient portion of the slurry wall:

None at this time.

- Additional monitoring would be required downgradient to evaluate the effects of the increased groundwater flow; there is some concern that additional xylene impacts could migrate downgradient from the landfarm area
- The GTS may need to be restarted to dewater a portion of the landfarm area before breaching the slurry wall
- Lynnda was also concerned that remediation in the wetlands area could be ineffective if impacts continue to migrate from upgradient areas.

**Biowall Proposal**

ADEC indicated concern with how a biowall installation would affect the wetlands, indicating that the hydrologic effects of the action would need to be considered before this option would be approved.

None at this time.

ADEC and USFWS both agreed that the current project focus should be on the wetlands area and would likely not endorse installation of a biowall until a path

**Item:**

**Action:**

forward has been determined for wetlands. ADEC is not in agreement with monitored natural attenuation as an approach to the wetlands.

**Future Activities / Site Closure**

None at this time.

USFWS indicated that final site restoration would likely need to be to pre-impact condition.

All regulators agreed that leaving the slurry wall in place post-closure is acceptable if there is some provision for breaching select locations to allow for resumption of natural groundwater flow through the area.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

**Stantec Consulting Services Inc.**

**Craig Wilson**  
Principal

Phone: 907 266 1128  
craig.wilson@stantec.com

c. Michael Zidek, Stantec  
Tom Madsen, Stantec

DRAFT