

# CORRECTIVE ACTION COMPLETION REPORT





3d Inf Div (Mech)

for the

Corrective Actions at the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia

# **Prepared for**



U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS SAVANNAH DISTRICT

Contract No. DACA21-02-D-0004 Delivery Order 0054

May 2008



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

#### **REVISED FINAL**

## CORRECTIVE ACTION COMPLETION REPORT FOR THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AT THE OLD PROPERTY DISPOSAL (PDO) YARD HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD, GEORGIA

REGULATORY AUTHORITY RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT 40 CFR 264, TITLE II, SUBPART C, SECTION 3004 42 USC 6901 ET SEQ.

Prepared for

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah District Under Contract Number DACA21-02-D-0004 Delivery Order 0054

Prepared by

Science Applications International Corporation 151 Lafayette Drive Oak Ridge, TN 37830

#### May 2008

The undersigned certifies that I am a qualified groundwater scientist who has received a baccalaureate or postgraduate degree in the natural sciences or engineering and have sufficient training and experience in groundwater hydrology and related fields, as demonstrated by state registration and completions of accredited university courses, to enable me to make sound professional judgments regarding groundwater monitoring and contaminant fate and transport. I further certify that this report was prepared by myself or by a subordinate working under my precise.

2851 FESSIONA Patricia A. Stoll, P.E. Project Manager SAIC

1

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

# CONTENTS

ACR	ONY	MS	v		
1.0	INTI	RODUCTION	1		
2.0	BAS	ELINE SAMPLING	2		
2.0	21	GROUNDWATER SAMPLING FOR TETRACHLOROETHENE	2		
	2.1	GROUNDWATER SAMPI ING FOR BENZENE	2		
	2.3	GROUNDWATER LEVEL MEASUREMENTS			
3.0	GEO-CLEANSE <sup>®</sup> TREATMENT FOR TETRACHLOROETHENE		3		
	3.1	CHEMICAL OXIDATION SYSTEM	3		
	3.2	INITIAL CHEMICAL INJECTION FIELD ACTIVITIES – FEBRUARY AND			
		MARCH 2001	4		
		3.2.1 Injection Point Installation	4		
		3.2.2 Injection Well Groundwater Sampling	4		
		3.2.3 Initial Chemical Injection	4		
		3.2.4 Initial 7-Day Post-Injection Monitoring	5		
	3.3	SUPPLEMENTAL CHEMICAL INJECTION FIELD ACTIVITIES – MAY AND	5		
		3.3.1 Additional Injection Point Installation			
		3.3.2 Supplemental Chemical Injection	5		
		3.3.2 Supplemental 7-Day Post-Injection Monitoring	6		
	3 /	SIX-MONTH POST-INIECTION MONITORING - SEPTEMBER 2001	0		
	3.4	POLISHING STEP CHEMICAL INJECTION FIELD ACTIVITIES DECEMBER	0		
	5.5	2001 THROUGH MARCH 2002	6		
		3.5.1 Additional Injection Point Installation	0		
		2.5.2 Polishing Step Chemical Injection	0		
		2.5.2 Polishing Step 7 Day Post Injection Monitoring	7		
	3.6	SUMMARY OF CHEMICAL INJECTION RESULTS	7		
4.0	MONITORED NATURAL ATTENUATION OF TETRACHLOROFTHENE 8				
	41	FIRST POST-CORRECTIVE-ACTION TETRACHLOROETHENE SAMPLING			
		EVENT – JANUARY 2003			
	4.2	SECOND POST-CORRECTIVE-ACTION TETRACHLOROETHENE			
		SAMPLING EVENT – JUNE 2003	9		
	43	THIRD POST-CORRECTIVE-ACTION TETRACHLOROETHENE SAMPLING			
		EVENT – JANUARY 2004			
	44	FOURTH POST-CORRECTIVE-ACTION TETRACHLOROETHENE			
		SAMPLING EVENT – OCTOBER 2004	9		
	4.5	CONFIRMATION TETRACHLOROETHENE SAMPLING EVENT – aPRIL 2005	10		
5.0	MONITORED NATURAL ATTENUATION OF BENZENE 1				
	5.1	FIRST BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – SEPTEMBER 2001	11		
	5.2	SECOND BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – MARCH 2002	11		
	5.3	THIRD BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – OCTOBER 2002	12		
	5.4	FOURTH BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – MARCH/APRIL 2003	12		
	5.5	FIFTH BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – OCTOBER 2003	12		

	5.6 SIXTH BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – MARCH 2004	
	5.7 SEVENTH BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – OCTOBER 2004	
	5.8 CONFIRMATION BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – APRIL 2005	14
6.0	ANALYSIS OF TRENDS	
	6.1 TETRACHLOROETHENE CONCENTRATIONS IN GROUNDWATER	14
	6.2 BENZENE CONCENTRATIONS IN GROUNDWATER	15
7.0	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
8.0	REFERENCES	

# List of Appendices

APPENDIX I: FIGURES	I-1
Figure 1. Site Location Map of the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield	I-3
Figure 2. Monitoring Well and Injection Well Location Map for the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield	I-4
Figure 3. Post-Corrective-Action PCE Groundwater Quality Map (April 2005) at the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield	I-5
Figure 4. Groundwater Potentiometric Surface Map (April 2005) at the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield	I-6
Figure 5. Benzene Groundwater Quality Map (April 2005) at the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield	I-7
Figure 6. Trend of PCE Concentrations at the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield	I-8
Figure 7. Trend of Benzene Concentrations at the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield	I-9
APPENDIX II: TABLES	II-1
Table 1. PCE Plume Sampling – Groundwater Analytical Results	II-3
Table 2. Benzene Plume Sampling – Groundwater Analytical Results	II-8
Table 3. Groundwater Elevations	II-11
Table 4. Well Construction Details	II-17
Table 5. Area of Groundwater Plumes Exceeding Remedial Levels	II-19
APPENDIX III: HISTORICAL GROUNDWATER QUALITY AND POTENTIOMETRIC	
SURFACE MAPS	III-1
APPENDIX IV: LABORATORY ANALYTICAL RESULTS	IV-1

# ACRONYMS

AMSL	above mean sea level
AST	aboveground storage tank
BGS	below ground surface
BTEX	benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylenes
CAP	Corrective Action Plan
GCI	Geo-Cleanse International, Inc.
GA EPD	Georgia Environmental Protection Division
HAAF	Hunter Army Airfield
IDW	investigation-derived waste
JP	jet propulsion
MCL	maximum contaminant level
MNA	monitored natural attenuation
PCE	tetrachloroethene
PDO	Old Property Disposal
RL	remedial level
TCE	trichloroethene
VOC	volatile organic compound

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

# **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This document represents the Corrective Action Completion Report for the corrective actions being conducted at the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard (HAA-12) at Hunter Army Airfield (HAAF), Georgia. The PDO Yard is located near the northwestern boundary of HAAF and has been used as a storage facility for used oil and off-specification jet propulsion (JP)-4 fuel, for scrap metal storage, and as a temporary (i.e., 90-day) storage facility for hazardous waste. The PDO Yard consists of a fenced parcel containing approximately 0.955 acre (Figure 1). Before 1998, the PDO Yard contained three aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) within a bermed area located in the southeastern corner of the fenced area. The ASTs were two 20,000-gal tanks for storage of used oil and one 18,000-gal tank for storage of off-specification JP-4. These tanks were removed in 1998 and replaced with three new ASTs set in a concrete-lined containment area on the northwestern side of the fenced PDO Yard area.

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facility investigation report (Metcalf & Eddy 1999) concluded that shallow groundwater at the PDO Yard was contaminated with benzene and tetrachloroethene (PCE) in two separate areas. Neither benzene nor PCE was detected in any of the deep monitoring wells at the site. Soil, sediment, and surface water were not considered media of concern. Upon evaluation of several remedial technologies, the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) (SAIC 2000) recommended monitored natural attenuation (MNA) for the benzene plume and Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> chemical oxidation treatment for the PCE plume. The Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GA EPD) approved the CAP in correspondence dated July 25, 2000.

As concluded in the First Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2001a), the initial chemical oxidation phase of the corrective action produced positive results by reducing the PCE concentrations in groundwater in the "source area"; however, the PCE concentrations in two downgradient wells located near the edge of the "residual area" continued to exceed the remedial level (RL) of 5  $\mu$ g/L. These two areas are shown in Figure 2. As a result of the First Corrective Action Progress Report, three additional injection wells were installed in the vicinity of MW1-22 and MW27, and a supplemental phase of Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> injection was conducted in the vicinity of these wells in May 2001. The Second Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2001b) concluded that a polishing step was necessary to further treat the PCE plume because the PCE concentrations in three wells continued to exceed the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L.

The First Corrective Action Progress Report discussed the results of the baseline sampling events for both plumes and described the installation and startup of the Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> chemical oxidation system for the treatment plume. The Second Corrective Action Progress Report discussed the supplemental chemical oxidation treatment activities that took place between March and September 2001 with respect to the PCE plume and the results of the first semiannual sampling event in September 2001 for the MNA of the benzene plume. The Third Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2002) discussed the polishing step for chemical oxidation treatment with respect to the PCE plume and the results of the second semiannual sampling event for the MNA of the benzene plume. The Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Corrective Action Progress Reports (SAIC 2003a, SAIC 2003b, SAIC 2004a, SAIC 2004b, SAIC 2005) discussed the semiannual sampling events for the MNA of the benzene plume and the post-corrective-action PCE sampling events. The results of the semiannual sampling for both the PCE plume and benzene plume presented in the Eighth Corrective Action Progress Report indicated that the RL for both constituents had been achieved in October 2004.

As indicated in the CAP, the purpose of the corrective action was to achieve RLs in groundwater at the site. For the PCE plume, the chemical oxidation corrective action would be complete upon attaining a

maximum PCE concentration in each well of 5  $\mu$ g/L. For the benzene plume, the MNA corrective action would be considered complete upon attaining a maximum benzene concentration in each well of 5  $\mu$ g/L. Since the RLs for both the PCE and benzene plumes were achieved in October 2004, the Eighth Corrective Action Progress Report recommended that confirmatory sampling of both plumes be conducted 6 months following the corrective action period.

This report documents the results of the confirmatory post-corrective-action PCE sampling event and the confirmatory sampling event for the MNA of the benzene plume. For convenience, all of the historical information from the corrective action is repeated in this document.

### 2.0 BASELINE SAMPLING

The baseline sampling for the PCE plume was conducted in August 2000, and the baseline sampling for the benzene plume was initially scheduled to be conducted following the treatment of the PCE plume. Following the baseline PCE sampling, however, it was determined that the baseline benzene sampling should be conducted before the PCE treatment in the event that there was any effect on the benzene plume; therefore, the baseline sampling for the benzene plume was conducted in October 2000.

#### 2.1 GROUNDWATER SAMPLING FOR TETRACHLOROETHENE

The seven shallow and three deep wells that monitor the PCE plume were sampled in August 2000 [i.e., baseline sampling event required by Section 5.2.2 of the CAP (SAIC 2000)] to aid in the design of the Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> system and to provide baseline data. PCE was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW02 (9.9  $\mu$ g/L), MW03 (1.9  $\mu$ g/L), MW05 (30.7  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-22 (12.7  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-24 (4  $\mu$ g/L), MW26 (26.9  $\mu$ g/L), and MW27 (28.8  $\mu$ g/L). PCE was not detected in the three deep wells, MW10, MW11, and MW28. Ethylbenzene, toluene, trichloroethene (TCE), and total xylenes were detected during the sampling event, but at concentrations below their respective RLs. The results of the baseline sampling for PCE are presented in Table 1. For reference, the figure for the PCE baseline sampling event is provided in Appendix III.

The area of PCE groundwater contamination in August 2000 covered approximately 19,450 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the ten wells sampled in August 2000, five shallow wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for PCE. The area of highest PCE contamination in groundwater was in the vicinity of wells MW05, MW26, and MW27.

#### 2.2 GROUNDWATER SAMPLING FOR BENZENE

The six shallow wells and one deep well that monitor the benzene plume were sampled in October 2000 [i.e., baseline sampling event required by Section 5.2.1 of the CAP (SAIC 2000)] to determine whether it was necessary to proceed with MNA. Benzene was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW01 ( $4.4 \mu g/L$ ), MW06 ( $46.7 \mu g/L$ ), MW1-23 ( $1.8 \mu g/L$ ), and MW1-25 ( $44.1 \mu g/L$ ). Benzene was not detected in two shallow wells, MW07 and MW08, and one deep well, MW09. Ethylbenzene, toluene, and total xylenes were also detected during the sampling event, but at concentrations below their respective RLs. The results of the baseline sampling for benzene are presented in Table 2. For reference, the figure for the benzene baseline sampling event is provided in Appendix III.

The area of benzene groundwater contamination in October 2000 covered approximately 9,600 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the seven wells sampled in October 2000, two shallow wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for benzene. The area of highest benzene contamination was in the vicinity of wells MW06 and MW1-25.

#### 2.3 GROUNDWATER LEVEL MEASUREMENTS

Groundwater elevations were measured in the monitoring wells on August 26, 2000, to determine the groundwater flow direction. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the August 2000 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III. In August 2000, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.0165 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 10.80 ft above mean sea level (AMSL).

# 3.0 GEO-CLEANSE<sup>®</sup> TREATMENT FOR TETRACHLOROETHENE

#### 3.1 CHEMICAL OXIDATION SYSTEM

Chemical oxidation using the patented Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> process was selected in the CAP for remediation of PCE in groundwater because it would effectively achieve the RL in the shortest period of time and with the least uncertainty. The conceptual Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> groundwater treatment system design provided in the CAP was based on initial estimates provided by Geo-Cleanse International, Inc. (GCI). Additional details on the treatment process are discussed in Section 5.2.2 of the CAP (SAIC 2000).

The initial Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> groundwater treatment system design was based on the baseline analytical sampling conducted in August 2000 and was provided by GCI. The contaminated groundwater plume extends over an irregularly shaped area about 200 ft wide and 100 ft long. The depth of the groundwater contamination is limited to predominantly the upper 20 ft of the shallow aquifer zone; no PCE has been detected in any deep wells at the site during any previous sampling event. The Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> system chemically oxidizes the groundwater by injection of Fenton's Reagent (hydrogen peroxide and a ferrous iron catalyst) into the subsurface at two separate injection levels [10 and 20 ft below ground surface (BGS)]. The treatment area is separated into two areas for the injector design and installation. The first area—which surrounds MW26, measures approximately 50 ft (southeast side)  $\times$  70 ft (northeast side)  $\times$  90 ft (northwest side)  $\times$  85 ft (south side), and includes the former rail bed, which is no longer present on-site—is defined as the "source area." The second area-which surrounds MW27, MW28, MW05, and MW10, measures approximately 90 ft (southeast side)  $\times$  70 ft (northeast side)  $\times$  200 ft (northwest side)  $\times$  160 ft (south side), includes the dirt road, and is bound on the northwest by Lamar Canal-is defined as the "residual area." The locations of these areas are shown in Figure 2. Because of the low concentrations and small mass of PCE reported in groundwater at the PDO Yard, the amount of 50% hydrogen peroxide required for groundwater treatment was not stoichiometrically controlled.

The initial design included the installation of 9 shallow and 20 deep injectors for a total of 29 injectors. For the source area treatment, GCI used five shallow injectors and eight deep injectors. For the residual area treatment, GCI used 4 shallow and 12 deep injectors. Shallow and deep injectors were screened from 9.5 to 12 ft and 17.5 to 20 ft BGS, respectively. Injector locations and depths proposed in the Sampling and Analysis Plan were adjusted based upon field conditions observed during injector installation. Three additional deep injectors were installed in May 2001 as part of the supplemental injection activities. Three

more shallow injectors were installed in December 2001 for the final polishing treatment. The locations of the 35 injectors are presented in Figure 2. The boring logs and well construction diagrams were provided in the first three Corrective Action Progress Reports (SAIC 2001a, SAIC 2001b, SAIC 2002).

# **3.2 INITIAL CHEMICAL INJECTION FIELD ACTIVITIES – FEBRUARY AND MARCH 2001**

#### **3.2.1** Injection Point Installation

On February 1 through 3, 2001, 29 injection wells (J1 through J29) were installed in the area of the highest PCE contamination in groundwater, as shown in Figure 2. These points were placed throughout the plume and completed as 1.25-in. carbon steel injection wells with 2.5 ft of 60-mesh stainless steel screen and flush-mount surface completions. Twenty of the injectors were screened from 17.5 to 20 ft BGS, while 9 of the injectors were screened from 9.5 to 12.0 ft BGS. Boring logs and well construction diagrams were provided in the First Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2001a). Well construction details are summarized in Table 4. Header piping from each injection well to the remediation trailer was installed above the ground surface.

#### 3.2.2 Injection Well Groundwater Sampling

During well installation on February 1 through 3, 2001, the 29 injection wells were sampled, and 15 of the samples were selected for laboratory analysis to aid in the final design of the Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> system. GCI used the results of the injection well sampling to help determine how much hydrogen peroxide and catalyst were to be injected into each well. PCE was detected in 14 of 15 samples at concentrations ranging from 0.77J to 15.1  $\mu$ g/L. The concentrations in eight injection wells exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L. 2-Butanone, 2-hexanone, 4-methyl-2-pentanone, acetone, chloroform, ethylbenzene, toluene, TCE, and total xylenes were also detected during the sampling event, but at concentrations below their respective maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). The results of the injection well sampling for PCE are presented in Table 1.

#### 3.2.3 Initial Chemical Injection

Field injection operations were conducted from March 8 through March 14, 2001. Approximately 3,125 gal of 50% hydrogen peroxide solution and approximately 7,400 gal of ferrous iron catalyst solution were injected into the 29 injection wells. The hydrogen peroxide and ferrous iron catalyst solutions were injected in accordance with an Underground Injection Well Notification Form for the PDO Yard that was approved by the GA EPD Underground Injection Control Program on March 5, 2001.

During the injection, GCI collected field measurements to ensure that the appropriate subsurface conditions were established for an efficient oxidation using Fenton's Reagent. GCI verified these conditions using groundwater quality measurements. The analysis of each of the monitored parameters [pH, alkalinity, dissolved chloride, dissolved iron, hydrogen peroxide, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs)] is summarized below.

Groundwater pH was monitored to ensure that appropriate pH conditions (pH of less than 6) were established. Throughout the Phase 1 injection, a pH of less than 6 was established and maintained. Alkalinity was monitored throughout the injection because of its effects on Fenton's Reagent treatment. Dissolved bicarbonate is an efficient hydroxyl free radical scavenger. Alkalinity started out at 60 mg/L and, thus, did not present a problem with pH buffering, as evidenced by the ability to maintain an optimal pH for the reaction.

Chloride was produced as an oxidation product of chlorinated hydrocarbons. Dissolved chloride concentrations began at a low range, approximately 10 mg/L, and increased during the injection to approximately 15 to 20 mg/L. The increase in chloride concentration was expected because of the concentrations of PCE present at the site. Dissolved iron is a catalyst for Fenton's Reagent. Iron was found in the groundwater at the site at concentrations of 3 mg/L or greater. Iron concentrations increased during the injection to create an environment in which the hydroxyl free radical could be established and maintained.

Hydrogen peroxide was monitored during the injection to ensure that reagents were distributed throughout the treatment area. A diluted concentration of hydrogen peroxide was found in the wells in the treatment area, indicating that an effective radius of influence had been established.

#### 3.2.4 Initial 7-Day Post-Injection Monitoring

On March 21, 2001, 7 days following the completion of the initial Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> injection activities, the seven shallow and three deep wells that monitor the PCE plume were sampled to evaluate the effectiveness of the Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> treatment. PCE was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW02 (0.56J  $\mu$ g/L), MW05 (3.4  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-22 (10.8  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-24 (1.5  $\mu$ g/L), MW26 (2.3  $\mu$ g/L), and MW27 (11.9  $\mu$ g/L). PCE was not detected in shallow well MW03 or deep wells MW10, MW11, and MW28. Carbon disulfide, ethylbenzene, toluene, and total xylenes were also detected during the sampling event, but at concentrations below their respective MCLs. The results of the 7-day post-injection sampling for PCE are presented in Table 1. For reference, the figure for the PCE 7-day post-injection sampling event is provided in Appendix III.

The area of PCE groundwater contamination exceeding the RL in March 2001 covered approximately 10,750 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the ten wells sampled in March 2001, two shallow wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for PCE. The area of highest PCE contamination in groundwater was in the vicinity of wells MW1-22 and MW27.

# 3.3 SUPPLEMENTAL CHEMICAL INJECTION FIELD ACTIVITIES – MAY AND JUNE 2001

As a result of the recommendations presented in the First Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2001a), three additional injection wells were installed in the vicinity of MW1-22 and MW27, and a supplemental phase of Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> injection was conducted in the vicinity of these wells.

#### **3.3.1** Additional Injection Point Installation

On May 3, 2001, three additional injection wells (J30 through J32) were installed in the vicinity of MW1-22 and MW27, as shown in Figure 2. These points were completed as 1.25-in. carbon steel injection wells with 2.5 ft of 60-mesh stainless steel screen with flush-mount surface completions. These injectors were screened from 18.4 to 20.9 ft BGS. Well construction details are presented in Table 4. Soil samples were collected for investigation-derived waste (IDW) disposal. Header piping from each injection well to the remediation trailer was installed above the ground surface.

#### 3.3.2 Supplemental Chemical Injection

Supplemental chemical injection operations were conducted from May 15 through May 17, 2001. The purpose of the second injection was to target areas that were close to or exceeded the cleanup criteria after the

initial injection. Approximately 3,378 gal (30,402 lb) of 50% hydrogen peroxide solution were injected at 13 locations—J12, J14, J15, J16, J17, J19, J20, J24, J25, J26, J30, J31, and J32. Also, approximately 448 gal (3,808 lb) of ferrous iron catalyst solution were injected into 9 monitoring wells—MW02, MW03, MW05, MW10, MW11, MW1-22, MW26, MW27, and MW28. Injection of catalyst into these wells was performed to enhance treatment in the targeted zones. The hydrogen peroxide and ferrous iron catalyst solutions were injected in accordance with an Underground Injection Well Notification Form for the PDO Yard that was amended to include the additional injectors and was approved by the GA EPD Underground Injection Control Program on May 9, 2001. During the injection operations, field measurements were taken of carbon dioxide levels, oxygen levels, and borehole volatile organic measurements of the off-gas.

#### 3.3.3 Supplemental 7-Day Post-Injection Monitoring

Following the supplemental field injection operations, wells MW1-22 and MW27 were to be re-sampled on May 23, 2001. PCE was detected in well MW27 at a concentration of 14.7  $\mu$ g/L. An obstruction was discovered in well MW1-22 at 10.81 ft below top of casing, and it was impossible to get sampling equipment down the well; therefore, it was not sampled. On June 5, 2001, well MW29 was installed adjacent to MW1-22, and the PCE concentration in well MW29 was 2.4  $\mu$ g/L.

#### 3.4 SIX-MONTH POST-INJECTION MONITORING – SEPTEMBER 2001

On September 6 and 7, 2001, 6 months following the completion of the initial Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> injection activities, the seven shallow and three deep wells that monitor the PCE plume were sampled to evaluate the effectiveness of the Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> treatment. PCE was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW02 ( $3.8 \mu g/L$ ), MW03 ( $1.3 \mu g/L$ ), MW05 ( $8.4 \mu g/L$ ), MW1-22/MW29 ( $4 \mu g/L$ ), MW1-24 ( $2 \mu g/L$ ), MW26 ( $10 \mu g/L$ ), and MW27 ( $15.8 \mu g/L$ ). PCE was not detected in deep wells MW10, MW11, and MW28. No other VOCs were analyzed for during the September 2001 sampling event. The results of the 6-month post-injection sampling for PCE are presented in Table 1. For reference, the figure for the PCE 6-month post-injection sampling event is provided in Appendix III.

The area of PCE groundwater contamination exceeding the RL in September 2001 covered approximately 13,000 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the ten wells sampled in September 2001, three shallow wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for PCE. The area of highest PCE contamination in groundwater was in the vicinity of wells MW05, MW26, and MW27.

#### 3.5 POLISHING STEP CHEMICAL INJECTION FIELD ACTIVITIES – DECEMBER 2001 THROUGH MARCH 2002

As a result of the recommendations presented in the Second Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2001b), three additional injection wells were installed in the vicinity of MW26, and a polishing step for the Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> injection was conducted in the vicinity of these wells.

#### 3.5.1 Additional Injection Point Installation

On December 4, 2001, three additional injection wells (J33 through J35) were installed in the vicinity of MW26, as shown in Figure 2. These points were completed as 1.25-in. carbon steel injection wells with 3.0 ft of 60-mesh stainless steel screen with flush-mount surface completions. These injectors were screened from 10.3 to 13.3 ft BGS. Well construction details are presented in Table 4. Soil samples were collected

for IDW disposal. Header piping from each injection well to the remediation trailer was installed above the ground surface.

#### 3.5.2 Polishing Step Chemical Injection

The polishing step of the chemical injection operations was conducted from February 25 through February 28, 2002. The purpose of the polishing step injection was to target areas that were close to or exceeded the cleanup criteria after the initial injection. Approximately 2,003 gal of 50% hydrogen peroxide solution were injected at 12 locations—J14, J15, J19, J20, J23, J28, J30, J31, J32, J33, J34, and J35. Also, approximately 2,304 gal of ferrous iron catalyst solution were injected into nine injection wells and six monitoring wells—J14, J15, J19, J23, J31, J32, J33, J34, and J35 and MW02, MW03, MW05, MW10, MW26, and MW27. Injection of catalyst into these wells was performed to enhance treatment in the targeted zones. During the injection operations, field measurements were taken of carbon dioxide levels, oxygen levels, and borehole volatile organic measurements of the off-gas.

#### 3.5.3 Polishing Step 7-Day Post-Injection Monitoring

On March 12, 2002, 7 days following the completion of the polishing step Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> injection activities, the seven shallow and three deep wells that monitor the PCE plume were sampled to evaluate the effectiveness of the Geo-Cleanse<sup>®</sup> treatment. PCE was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW02 (1.6  $\mu$ g/L), MW05 (0.74J  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-22/MW29 (1  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-24 (0.72J  $\mu$ g/L), MW26 (6  $\mu$ g/L), and MW27 (8  $\mu$ g/L). PCE was not detected in shallow well MW03 or deep wells MW10, MW11, and MW28. No other VOCs were analyzed for during the March 2002 sampling event. The results of the polishing step 7-day post-injection sampling for PCE are presented in Table 1. For reference, the figure for the PCE polishing step 7-day post-injection sampling event is provided in Appendix III.

The area of PCE groundwater contamination exceeding the RL in March 2002 covered approximately 5,000 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the ten wells sampled in March 2002, two shallow wells had concentrations of 6 and 8  $\mu$ g/L, respectively, which exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for PCE. The area of highest PCE contamination in groundwater was in the vicinity of wells MW26 and MW27.

#### 3.6 SUMMARY OF CHEMICAL INJECTION RESULTS

The oxidation of PCE using Fenton's Reagent is an exothermic reaction, and as the temperature increases in the groundwater, contamination that is sorbed to soil can be liberated into the groundwater, potentially causing concentrations to increase. After the completion of each of the phases of chemical injection, samples were obtained from the monitoring wells in the treatment area and sent to an off-site laboratory for VOC analysis. Following the initial injection, all the monitoring wells showed an overall decrease in VOC concentrations from their initial concentrations; however, the concentrations in several wells still exceeded the RLs. The sampling results following the supplemental injection and the 6-month post-injection period indicated that the PCE concentrations increased in a few wells. This finding is consistent with the mass destruction of the contaminant. The average pre-injection PCE contaminant concentrations in August 2000 were approximately 10.76  $\mu$ g/L, with a maximum concentration of 30.7  $\mu$ g/L. Following the polishing injection phase in February 2002, average PCE concentrations were reduced to 2.2  $\mu$ g/L, with a maximum concentration of 8  $\mu$ g/L. This finding indicates an overall contaminant reduction of 79.4%.

The goals of the treatment program were to reduce VOC contamination to below 5  $\mu$ g/L to meet GA EPD groundwater standards. Average PCE concentrations were reduced from 10.76 to 2.2  $\mu$ g/L, which is

below the cleanup criterion, although there were two monitoring wells with concentrations above 5  $\mu$ g/L. Overall, through the process monitoring parameters, GCI illustrated that the appropriate conditions for in situ chemical oxidation using Fenton's Reagent were established, and through the VOC analysis it showed that a substantial reduction in PCE concentrations could be accomplished. The process monitoring parameters also indicated that PCE destruction occurred on this site.

The Effectiveness Evaluation Report prepared by GCI was included in the Fourth Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2003a). The chemical oxidation corrective action has produced positive results by reducing the PCE concentrations in groundwater at the site and the area of the PCE plume. Even though the site has been injected with hydrogen peroxide and ferrous iron catalyst on three separate occasions, the PCE concentrations in two wells (i.e., MW26 and MW27) have continued to exceed the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L by a few micrograms per liter. Because the chemical oxidation has resulted in the destruction of PCE to concentrations slightly above the RL, it was recommended in the Third Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2002) that the plume be monitored semiannually until the PCE concentrations are below the RL.

### 4.0 MONITORED NATURAL ATTENUATION OF TETRACHLOROETHENE

The Third Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2002) recommended that ten wells (MW2, MW03, MW05, MW10, MW11, MW1-24, MW26, MW27, MW28, and MW1-22/MW29) be sampled on a semiannual basis in conjunction with the benzene plume sampling; however, because of limited funding, these wells were not sampled in conjunction with the October 2002 benzene sampling activities.

# 4.1 FIRST POST-CORRECTIVE-ACTION TETRACHLOROETHENE SAMPLING EVENT – JANUARY 2003

In January 2003, the first semiannual sampling event for the MNA of PCE following completion of in situ chemical oxidation was conducted. Seven shallow wells (MW02, MW03, MW05, MW1-24, MW26, MW27, and MW29) and three deep wells (MW10, MW11, and MW28) were sampled for PCE. PCE was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW02 ( $3 \mu g/L$ ), MW05 ( $3.1 \mu g/L$ ), MW26 ( $5.7 \mu g/L$ ), and MW27 ( $5.6 \mu g/L$ ). PCE was not detected in shallow wells MW03, MW1-24, and MW29 or deep wells MW10, MW11, and MW28. The results of the first semiannual sampling event for the MNA of PCE are presented in Table 1. For reference, the figure for the PCE semiannual post-corrective-action sampling event is provided in Appendix III.

The area of PCE groundwater contamination exceeding the RL in January 2003 covered approximately 5,250 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the ten wells sampled in January 2003, two shallow wells had concentrations that slightly exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for PCE. The area of highest PCE contamination was in the vicinity of wells MW26 and MW27.

In January 2003, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.029 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 11.02 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the January 2003 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 4.2 SECOND POST-CORRECTIVE-ACTION TETRACHLOROETHENE SAMPLING EVENT – JUNE 2003

On June 22, 2003, the second semiannual sampling event for the MNA of PCE following completion of in situ chemical oxidation was conducted. Seven shallow wells (MW02, MW03, MW05, MW1-24, MW26, MW27, and MW29) and three deep wells (MW10, MW11, and MW28) were sampled for PCE. PCE was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW02 (0.83J  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-24 (0.55J  $\mu$ g/L), MW26 (3.9  $\mu$ g/L), and MW27 (1.8  $\mu$ g/L). PCE was not detected in shallow wells MW03, MW05, and MW29 or deep wells MW10, MW11, and MW28. The results of the second semiannual sampling event for the MNA of PCE are presented in Table 1. For reference, the figure for the PCE semiannual post-corrective-action sampling event is provided in Appendix III.

Of the ten wells sampled in June 2003, none of the shallow or deep wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for PCE.

In June 2003, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.022 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 12.11 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the June 2003 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 4.3 THIRD POST-CORRECTIVE-ACTION TETRACHLOROETHENE SAMPLING EVENT – JANUARY 2004

On January 23 and 24, 2004, the third semiannual sampling event for the MNA of PCE following completion of in situ chemical oxidation was conducted. Seven shallow wells (MW02, MW03, MW05, MW1-24, MW26, MW27, and MW29) and three deep wells (MW10, MW11, and MW28) were sampled for PCE. PCE was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW02 ( $1.7 \mu g/L$ ), MW05 ( $6.1 \mu g/L$ ), MW1-24 ( $0.87J \mu g/L$ ), MW26 ( $4.9 \mu g/L$ ), and MW27 ( $3.1 \mu g/L$ ). PCE was not detected in shallow wells MW03 and MW29 or deep wells MW10, MW11, and MW28. The results of the third semiannual sampling event for the MNA of PCE are presented in Table 1. For reference, the figure for the PCE semiannual post-corrective-action sampling event is provided in Appendix III.

Of the ten wells sampled in January 2004, only shallow well MW05 (6.1  $\mu$ g/L) had a concentration that slightly exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for PCE.

In January 2004, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.018 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 10.12 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the January 2004 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 4.4 FOURTH POST-CORRECTIVE-ACTION TETRACHLOROETHENE SAMPLING EVENT – OCTOBER 2004

On October 18 and 19, 2004, the fourth semiannual sampling event for the MNA of PCE following completion of in situ chemical oxidation was conducted. Seven shallow wells (MW02, MW03, MW05, MW1-24, MW26, MW27, and MW29) were sampled for PCE. PCE has never been detected in the deep wells and, as recommended in the Seventh Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2004b), the three deep wells (MW10, MW11, and MW28) were not sampled during this monitoring event. PCE was

detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW02 (0.65J  $\mu$ g/L), MW26 (0.61J  $\mu$ g/L), and MW27 (2.7  $\mu$ g/L). PCE was not detected in shallow wells MW03, MW05, MW1-24, and MW29. The results of the fourth semiannual sampling event for the MNA of PCE are presented in Table 1. For reference, the figure for the PCE semiannual post-corrective-action sampling event is provided in Appendix III.

Of the seven wells sampled in October 2004, none of the wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for PCE.

In October 2004, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.027 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 11.47 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the October 2004 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 4.5 CONFIRMATION TETRACHLOROETHENE SAMPLING EVENT – APRIL 2005

On April 26 and 27, 2005, the confirmation sampling event for the MNA of PCE following completion of in situ chemical oxidation was conducted. Seven shallow wells (MW02, MW03, MW05, MW1-24, MW26, MW27, and MW29) were sampled for PCE. PCE has never been detected in the deep wells and, as recommended in the Seventh Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2004b), the three deep wells (MW10, MW11, and MW28) were not sampled during this monitoring event. PCE was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW02 (2.5  $\mu$ g/L), MW05 (2.9  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-24 (0.44J  $\mu$ g/L), MW26 (3.3  $\mu$ g/L), and MW27 (2.3  $\mu$ g/L). PCE was not detected in shallow wells MW03 and MW29. The results of the confirmation semiannual sampling event for the MNA of PCE are presented in Table 1 and Figure 3.

Of the seven wells sampled in April 2005, none of the wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of  $5 \mu g/L$  for PCE.

Groundwater elevations were measured in the monitoring wells on April 26, 2005, to determine the groundwater flow direction. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. The potentiometric surface map generated from the water level measurements is presented in Figure 4. In April 2005, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.025 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 11.58 ft AMSL.

The PCE concentrations have been monitored on a semiannual basis since the completion of the chemical oxidation injections in March 2002. During the semiannual monitoring events since March 2002, the PCE concentrations have remained in the vicinity of the RL (i.e.,  $2 \mu g/L$  above or below) and were below the RL in all wells in October 2004. In accordance with the requirements of the CAP, the Eighth Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2005) recommended that confirmation groundwater sampling be conducted 6 months following the achievement of the RL. As a result, the April 2005 event has confirmed that the PCE concentrations have remained below the RL.

# 5.0 MONITORED NATURAL ATTENUATION OF BENZENE

#### 5.1 FIRST BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – SEPTEMBER 2001

In September 2001, the first semiannual sampling event for the MNA of benzene was conducted. Six shallow wells (MW01, MW06, MW07, MW08, MW1-23, and MW1-25) and one deep well (MW09) were sampled for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX). Benzene was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW01 ( $5.1 \mu g/L$ ), MW06 ( $42 \mu g/L$ ), MW1-23 ( $0.58J \mu g/L$ ), and MW1-25 ( $29.7 \mu g/L$ ). Benzene was not detected in two shallow wells, MW07 and MW08, and one deep well, MW09. Ethylbenzene, toluene, and total xylenes were also detected during the sampling event, but at concentrations below their respective RLs. The results of the first semiannual sampling event for benzene are presented in Table 2. For reference, the figure for the September 2001 benzene groundwater quality map is provided in Appendix III.

The area of benzene groundwater contamination exceeding the RL in September 2001 covered approximately 10,100 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the seven wells sampled in September 2001, three shallow wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for benzene. The area of highest benzene contamination was in the vicinity of wells MW06 and MW1-25.

In September 2001, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.015 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 10.38 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the September 2001 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 5.2 SECOND BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – MARCH 2002

In March 2002, the second semiannual sampling event for the MNA of benzene was conducted. Six shallow wells (MW01, MW06, MW07, MW08, MW1-23, and MW1-25) and one deep well (MW09) were sampled for BTEX. Benzene was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW01 (12.8  $\mu$ g/L), MW06 (12.5  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-23 (1.53  $\mu$ g/L), and MW1-25 (18.7  $\mu$ g/L). Benzene was not detected in two shallow wells, MW07 and MW08, and one deep well, MW09. Ethylbenzene, toluene, and total xylenes were also detected during the sampling event, but at concentrations below their respective RLs. The results of the second semiannual sampling event for benzene are presented in Table 2. For reference, the figure for the March 2002 benzene groundwater quality map is provided in Appendix III.

The area of benzene groundwater contamination exceeding the RL in March 2002 covered approximately 8,600 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the seven wells sampled in March 2002, three shallow wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for benzene. The area of highest benzene contamination was in the vicinity of wells MW01, MW06, and MW1-25.

In March 2002, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.017 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 11.04 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the March 2002 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 5.3 THIRD BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – OCTOBER 2002

In October 2002, the third semiannual sampling event for the MNA of benzene was conducted. Six shallow wells (MW01, MW06, MW07, MW08, MW1-23, and MW1-25) and one deep well (MW09) were sampled for BTEX. Benzene was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW06 ( $6.7 \mu g/L$ ), MW1-23 ( $4.3 \mu g/L$ ), and MW1-25 ( $5.1 \mu g/L$ ). Benzene was not detected in three shallow wells, MW01, MW07, and MW08, and one deep well, MW09. Ethylbenzene and total xylenes were also detected during the sampling event, but at concentrations below their respective RLs. The results of the third semiannual sampling event for benzene are presented in Table 2. For reference, the figure for the October 2002 benzene groundwater quality map is provided in Appendix III.

The area of benzene groundwater contamination exceeding the RL in October 2002 covered approximately 975 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the seven wells sampled in October 2002, two shallow wells had concentrations that slightly exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for benzene. The area of highest benzene contamination was in the vicinity of wells MW06 and MW1-25.

In October 2002, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.029 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 11.54 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the October 2002 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 5.4 FOURTH BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – MARCH/APRIL 2003

In March 2003, the fourth semiannual sampling event for the MNA of benzene was conducted; however, there was a delay in the arrival of the samples at the analytical laboratory, and the arrival temperature exceeded 4°C. As a result, the wells were re-sampled on April 22, 2003, and those results are presented in this report. Six shallow wells (MW01, MW06, MW07, MW08, MW1-23, and MW1-25) and one deep well (MW09) were sampled for BTEX. Benzene was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW06 ( $6.2 \mu g/L$ ), MW1-23 ( $1.4 \mu g/L$ ), and MW1-25 ( $6.1 \mu g/L$ ). Benzene was not detected in three shallow wells, MW01, MW07 and MW08, and one deep well, MW09. Ethylbenzene, toluene, and total xylenes were not detected during the sampling event. The results of the fourth semiannual sampling event for benzene are presented in Table 2. For reference, the figure for the April 2003 benzene groundwater quality map is provided in Appendix III.

The area of benzene groundwater contamination exceeding the RL in April 2003 covered approximately 975 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the seven wells sampled in April 2003, two shallow wells had concentrations that slightly exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for benzene. The area of highest benzene contamination was in the vicinity of wells MW06 and MW1-25.

In March 2003 the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.031 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 12.71 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the March 2003 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 5.5 FIFTH BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – OCTOBER 2003

In October 2003, the fifth semiannual sampling event for the MNA of benzene was conducted. Six shallow wells (MW01, MW06, MW07, MW08, MW1-23, and MW1-25) and one deep well (MW09) were sampled

for BTEX. Benzene was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW01 (1.7  $\mu$ g/L), MW06 (4.6  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-23 (0.59J  $\mu$ g/L), and MW1-25 (7.7  $\mu$ g/L). Benzene was not detected in two shallow wells, MW07 and MW08, and one deep well, MW09. Ethylbenzene and total xylenes were not detected during the sampling event. Toluene was only detected at estimated concentrations below the undiluted reporting limit. The results of the fifth semiannual sampling event for benzene are presented in Table 2. For reference, the figure for the October 2003 benzene groundwater quality map is provided in Appendix III.

The area of benzene groundwater contamination exceeding the RL in October 2003 covered approximately 660 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the seven wells sampled in October 2003, one shallow well had a concentration that slightly exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for benzene. The area of highest benzene contamination was in the vicinity of wells MW06 and MW1-25.

In October 2003, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.019 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 10.33 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level evaluations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the October 2003 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 5.6 SIXTH BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – MARCH 2004

On March 23, 2004, the sixth semiannual sampling event for the MNA of benzene was conducted. Six shallow wells (MW01, MW06, MW07, MW08, MW1-23, and MW1-25) and one deep well (MW09) were sampled for BTEX. Benzene was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW01 ( $1.6 \mu g/L$ ), MW06 ( $4.4 \mu g/L$ ), MW1-23 ( $0.96J \mu g/L$ ), and MW1-25 ( $6.1 \mu g/L$ ). Benzene was not detected in two shallow wells, MW07 and MW08, and one deep well, MW09. Toluene was not detected during the sampling event. Ethylbenzene and total xylenes were only detected at estimated concentrations below their undiluted reporting limits. The results of the sixth semiannual sampling event for benzene are presented in Table 2. For reference, the figure for the March 2004 benzene groundwater quality map is provided in Appendix III.

The area of benzene groundwater contamination exceeding the RL in March 2004 covered approximately 660 ft<sup>2</sup>. Of the seven wells sampled in March 2004, one shallow well had a concentration that slightly exceeded the RL of  $5 \mu g/L$  for benzene (MW1-25 at 6.1  $\mu g/L$ ). The area of highest benzene contamination was in the vicinity of wells MW06 and MW1-25.

In March 2004, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.022 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 10.56 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the March 2004 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 5.7 SEVENTH BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – OCTOBER 2004

On October 18, 2004, the seventh semiannual sampling event for the MNA of benzene was conducted. Six shallow wells (MW01, MW06, MW07, MW08, MW1-23, and MW1-25) and one deep well (MW09) were sampled for BTEX. Benzene was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW06 (1.5  $\mu$ g/L), MW1-23 (1.7  $\mu$ g/L), and MW1-25 (0.73J  $\mu$ g/L). Benzene was not detected in three shallow wells, MW01, MW07 and MW08, and one deep well, MW09. Ethylbenzene and toluene were only detected at low concentrations (i.e., <2  $\mu$ g/L) or at estimated concentrations below their undiluted reporting limits. Total

xylenes were not detected during the sampling event. The results of the sixth semiannual sampling event for benzene are presented in Table 2. For reference, the figure for the October 2004 benzene groundwater quality map is provided in Appendix III.

Of the seven wells sampled in October 2004, none of the wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L for benzene.

In October 2004, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.027 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 11.47 ft AMSL. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. For reference, the October 2004 groundwater potentiometric surface map is provided in Appendix III.

#### 5.8 CONFIRMATION BENZENE SAMPLING EVENT – APRIL 2005

On April 26 and 27, 2005, the confirmation sampling event for the MNA of benzene was conducted. Six shallow wells (MW01, MW06, MW07, MW08, MW1-23, and MW1-25) and one deep well (MW09) were sampled for BTEX. Benzene was detected in groundwater samples from shallow wells MW01 ( $1.6 \mu g/L$ ), MW06 ( $4.1 \mu g/L$ ), MW1-23 ( $0.67J \mu g/L$ ), and MW1-25 ( $2.7 \mu g/L$ ). Benzene was not detected in two shallow wells, MW07 and MW08, and one deep well, MW09. Ethylbenzene was only detected at estimated concentrations below the undiluted reporting limits. Toluene and total xylenes were not detected during the sampling event. The results of the confirmation sampling event for benzene are presented in Table 2 and Figure 5.

Of the seven wells sampled in April 2005, none of the wells had concentrations that exceeded the RL of  $5 \mu g/L$  for benzene.

Groundwater elevations were measured in the monitoring wells on April 26, 2005, to determine the groundwater flow direction. A list of the wells and corresponding water level elevations is presented in Table 3. The potentiometric surface map generated from the water level measurements is presented in Figure 4. In April 2005, the groundwater flow direction was toward the northwest, the average groundwater gradient was approximately 0.025 ft/ft, and the average groundwater elevation was 11.58 ft AMSL.

The benzene concentrations have been monitored on a semiannual basis since the implementation of MNA in September 2001. The CAP required that the site be monitored for a minimum period of 2 years until the maximum concentration at the site was less that the RL. During the semiannual monitoring events since October 2002, the benzene concentrations have remained in the vicinity of the RL (i.e., 3 µg/L above or below) and were below the RL in all wells in October 2004. In accordance with the requirements of the CAP, the Eighth Corrective Action Progress Report (SAIC 2005) recommended that confirmation groundwater sampling be conducted 6 months following the achievement of the RL. As a result, the April 2005 event has confirmed that the benzene concentrations have remained below the RL.

## 6.0 ANALYSIS OF TRENDS

#### 6.1 TETRACHLOROETHENE CONCENTRATIONS IN GROUNDWATER

As described in the previous progress reports for the PDO Yard, the application of in situ chemical oxidation using Fenton's Reagent resulted in a reduction in PCE concentrations and decreased the area of

the plume. During the baseline sampling in August 2000, the area of the PCE plume was 19,450 ft<sup>2</sup> (Table 5), with a maximum PCE concentration of 30.07  $\mu$ g/L in MW05. Following the polishing step in March 2002, the area of the PCE plume was approximately 5,000 ft<sup>2</sup> (Table 5), with a maximum PCE concentration of 8  $\mu$ g/L in MW27, which represented a 74% reduction in the size of the plume area from the baseline sampling. In addition, a 72 to 100% reduction in the PCE concentrations has been observed in the various wells since the baseline sampling in August 2000. The trend in PCE concentrations associated with the corrective action activities is summarized in Figure 6.

During the semiannual post-corrective-action sampling, the PCE concentrations had continued to decline to the vicinity of the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L. In June 2003, the maximum PCE concentration was 3.9  $\mu$ g/L in well MW26. During the January 2004 sampling event, PCE concentrations increased, with a maximum concentration of 6.1  $\mu$ g/L in MW05. In October 2004, the maximum PCE concentration was 2.7  $\mu$ g/L in MW27. In April 2005, the maximum PCE concentration was 3.3  $\mu$ g/L in MW27.

#### 6.2 BENZENE CONCENTRATIONS IN GROUNDWATER

During the baseline sampling in October 2000, the area of the benzene plume was 9,600 ft<sup>2</sup> (Table 5), with a maximum benzene concentration of 46.7  $\mu$ g/L in MW06. The benzene concentrations steadily decreased during the semiannual sampling events until October 2002, as shown in Figure 7, with wells MW06 and MW1-25 having the highest benzene concentrations during each sampling event. Since October 2002, the area of the benzene plume exceeding 5  $\mu$ g/L has been fairly steady and in the range of 660 to 975 ft<sup>2</sup>, and the concentrations have been no more that 3  $\mu$ g/L above the RL. In March 2004, the maximum benzene concentration was 6.1  $\mu$ g/L in MW1-25. In October 2004, the maximum benzene concentration was 6.1  $\mu$ g/L in MW1-25. In October 2004, the maximum benzene concentration was 1.7  $\mu$ g/L in well MW1-23, which is located upgradient of the site within the Hazardous Waste Management Area. Within the plume, the maximum concentration was 1.5  $\mu$ g/L in MW06. In April 2005, the maximum benzene concentration was 4.1  $\mu$ g/L in well MW06.

### 7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The chemical oxidation corrective action has produced positive results by reducing the PCE concentrations in groundwater at the site and the area of the PCE plume. PCE concentrations decreased to below the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L during the October 2004 sampling event. Confirmatory sampling conducted in April 2005 indicated that the PCE concentrations remained below the RL. The objective of the corrective action has been met and the completion criteria (PCE concentrations less than 5  $\mu$ g/L) achieved, thus it is recommended that no further action be granted for the PCE plume.

MNA of the benzene plume has been conducted since September 2001. The benzene concentrations decreased to below the RL of 5  $\mu$ g/L during the October 2004 sampling event. Confirmatory sampling conducted in April 2005 indicated that the benzene concentrations remained below the RL. The objective of the corrective action has been met and the completion criteria (benzene concentrations less than 5  $\mu$ g/L) achieved, thus it is recommended that no further action be granted for the benzene plume.

Upon written confirmation from GA EPD concurring with the recommendation of this report to grant no further action for the entire site (i.e., both the PCE and benzene plumes), the groundwater monitoring system will be decommissioned in accordance with the requirements of the CAP. The injection wells and

groundwater monitoring wells will be plugged and abandoned by filling the casings with cement and bentonite grout mixture.

#### **8.0 REFERENCES**

- Metcalf & Eddy, Inc. 1999. Revised Final RCRA Facility Investigation Report, Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, September.
- SAIC (Science Applications International Corporation) 2000. Corrective Action Plan for the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, April.
- SAIC 2001a. First Corrective Action Progress Report for the Corrective Actions at the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, June.
- SAIC 2001b. Second Corrective Action Progress Report for the Corrective Actions at the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, December.
- SAIC 2002. Third Corrective Action Progress Report for the Corrective Actions at the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, August.
- SAIC 2003a. Fourth Corrective Action Progress Report for the Corrective Actions at the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, January.
- SAIC 2003b. Fifth Corrective Action Progress Report for the Corrective Actions at the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, August.
- SAIC 2004a. Sixth Corrective Action Progress Report for the Corrective Actions at the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, January.
- SAIC 2004b. Seventh Corrective Action Progress Report for the Corrective Actions at the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, August.
- SAIC 2005. Eighth Corrective Action Progress Report for the Corrective Actions at the Old Property Disposal (PDO) Yard at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, April.

# APPENDIX I FIGURES

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.



Figure 1. Site Location Map of the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield



Figure 2. Monitoring Well and Injection Well Location Map for the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield

4



Figure 3. Post-Corrective-Action PCE Groundwater Quality Map (April 2005) at the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield

I-S



Figure 4. Groundwater Potentiometric Surface Map (April 2005) at the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield

I-8



Figure 5. Benzene Groundwater Quality Map (April 2005) at the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield

**I-**7



Figure 6. Trend of PCE Concentrations at the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield



Figure 7. Trend of Benzene Concentrations at the PDO Yard, Hunter Army Airfield

I-9

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

## APPENDIX II TABLES

#### THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.
						Detecto	ed Volatil	e Organic (	Compound	s (µg/L)			
Sample Location	Sample ID	Date Sampled	PCE	TCE	Toluene	Ethylbenzene	Xylenes	2-Butanone	2-Hexanone	4-Methyl-2- pentanone	Acetone	Carbon Disulfide	Chloroform
		•			Baseline	PCE Samp	ling – Aug	gust 2000			•		
MW02	AP0212	08/28/00	9.9 =	0.35 J	0.48 J	0.48 J	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW03	AP0312	08/28/00	1.9 =	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW05	AP0512	08/28/00	30.7 =	0.55 J	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW10	AP1012	08/28/00	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW11	AP1112	08/28/00	1 U	1 U	1 U	0.19 J	0.5 J	5 U	5 U	5 U	6.9 U	5 U	1 U
MW1-22 <sup><i>a</i></sup>	AP2212	08/28/00	12.7 =	0.15 J	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW1-24	AP2412	08/28/00	4 =	0.21 J	1 U	0.17 J	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW26	AP2612	08/28/00	26.9 =	0.6 J	1 U	0.054 J	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW27	AP2712	08/28/00	28.8 =	0.64 J	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW28	AP2812	08/28/00	1 U	1 U	1 U	0.069 J	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
				Geo-Cl	eanse <sup>®</sup> Inj	ection Well	Installatio	n – Februa	ry 2001				
AP-J1	APJ112	02/01/01	5.8 =	1 U	0.45 J	1 U	3 U	1.8 J	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
AP-J2	APJ212	02/02/01	12.9 =	1 U	1.9 =	1 U	3 U	1.8 J	0.8 J	5 U	2.3 J	5 U	1 U
AP-J3	APJ312	02/02/01	11 =	0.45 J	1.2 =	1 U	3 U	2.2 J	1.6 U	5 U	2.8 J	5 U	1 U
AP-J7	APJ712	02/02/01	0.77 J	1 U	0.26 J	1 U	3 U	2.7 J	1.7 J	5 U	4.5 J	5 U	1 U
AP-J8	APJ812	02/02/01	1.9 =	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	2.3 J	1 J	5 U	2.3 J	5 U	1 U
AP-J12	APJB12	02/01/01	11.1 =	1 U	1.3 =	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	0.7 J	17.7 =	5 U	2.5 =
AP-J13	APJC12	02/01/01	1 U	1 U	1.3 =	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	2.3 J	5 U	0.27 J
AP-J14	APJD12	02/02/01	1.1 =	1 U	1.3 =	1 U	3 U	2.6 J	1.2 J	5 U	5 =	5 U	1 U
AP-J16	APJF12	02/02/01	4.2 =	1 U	0.83 J	1 U	3 U	1.9 J	5 U	5 U	1.7 J	5 U	1 U
AP-J17	APJG12	02/01/01	15.1 =	0.38 J	0.56 J	1 U	3 U	5.3 =	5 U	5 U	8.4 =	5 U	1 U
AP-J19	APJJ12	02/02/01	9.1 =	1 U	1.1 =	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	2.1 J	5 U	1 U
AP-J20	APJK12	02/02/01	2.7 =	1 U	0.76 J	1 U	3 U	1 J	5 U	5 U	2.2 J	5 U	1 U
AP-J24	APJR12	02/03/01	11.2 =	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	13.6 =	5 U	1.2 =
AP-J25	APJS12	02/02/01	1.9 =	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1.6 J	5 U	1 U
AP-J27	APJU12	02/02/01	9.3 =	0.85 J	0.23 J	0.28 J	0.5 J	1.3 J	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
R	emedial Le	vel	5	5	700	1 000	10 000						

<sup>a</sup>Well MW1-22 was damaged during chemical injection in May 2001, and MW29 was installed adjacent to MW1-22 in June 2001.

NOTES:

Bold values exceed remedial levels.

Data Qualifiers

PCE Tetrachloroethene. U

TCE

Indicates that the compound was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit. J

Indicates that the value for the compound was an estimated value.

Trichloroethene.

Indicates that the compound was detected at the concentration reported. =

				Detected Volatile Organic Compounds (µg/L)									
Sample Location	Sample ID	Date Sampled	PCE	TCE	Toluene	Ethylbenzene	Xylenes	2-Butanone	2-Hexanone	4-Methyl-2- pentanone	Acetone	Carbon Disulfide	Chloroform
				Initial 2	7-Day Post-	Geo-Cleans	e <sup>®</sup> Injectio	on – March	a 2001				
MW02	AP0222	03/21/01	0.56 J	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	48.6 U	6.2 =	1 U
MW03	AP0322	03/21/01	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	7.2 U	5 U	5 U	67.6 U	4.4 J	1 U
MW05	AP0522	03/21/01	3.4 =	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	51.8 U	48.2 =	1 U
MW10	AP1022	03/21/01	1 U	1 U	1.2 =	0.47 J	3.2 =	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW11	AP1122	03/21/01	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	0.41 J	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW1-22 <sup><i>a</i></sup>	AP2222	03/21/01	10.8 =	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
MW1-24	AP2422	03/21/01	1.5 =	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	2 J	1 U
MW26	AP2622	03/21/01	2.3 =	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	18.6 U	76.7 =	1 U
MW27	AP2722	03/21/01	11.9 =	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	7.4 U	5.7 =	1 U
MW28	AP2722	03/21/01	1 U	1 U	0.68 J	1 U	0.53 J	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	1 U
		•	Sı	upplementa	l 7-Day Po	st Geo-Clea	nse <sup>®</sup> Injec	tion – May	June 2001/				
MW27	AP2732	05/23/01	14.7 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW29	AP2912	06/07/01	2.4 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
			_	6-Mont	th Post-Geo	-Cleanse <sup>®</sup> I	njection –	September	2001		_		
MW02	AP0242	09/06/01	3.8 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW03	AP0342	09/06/01	1.3 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW05	AP0542	09/06/01	8.4 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW10	AP1042	09/06/01	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW11	AP1142	09/06/01	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-22/ MW29 <sup>a</sup>	AP2242	09/07/01	4 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-24	AP2442	09/07/01	2 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW26	AP2642	09/07/01	10 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW27	AP2742	09/06/01	15.8 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW28	AP2742	09/07/01	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Re	medial Lev	el	5	5	700	1.000	10 000						

"Well MW1-22 was damaged during chemical injection in May 2001, and MW29 was installed adjacent to MW1-22 in June 2001.

NOTES:

Data Qualifiers

Bold values exceed remedial levels. PCE Tetrachloroethene.

Indicates that the compound was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit. U

Trichloroethene.

J Indicates that the value for the compound was an estimated value. = Indicates that the compound was detected at the concentration reported.

TCE \* PCE was the only analyte analyzed.

				Detected Volatile Organic Compounds (µg/L)									
Sample Location	Sample ID	Date Sampled	PCE	TCE	Toluene	Ethylbenzene	Xylenes	2-Butanone	2-Hexanone	4-Methyl-2-	Acetone	Carbon Disulfide	Chloroform
			1	Polishing S	tep 7-Day	Post-Geo-Cl	eanse <sup>®</sup> Inj	jection – M	arch 2002				
MW02	AP0252	03/12/02	1.6 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW03	AP0352	03/12/02	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW05	AP0552	03/12/02	0.74 J	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW10	AP1052	03/12/02	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW11	AP1152	03/12/02	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-22/ MW29 <sup>a</sup>	AP2252	03/12/02	1 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-24	AP2452	03/12/02	0.72 J	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW26	AP2652	03/12/02	6 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW27	AP2752	03/12/02	8 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW28	AP2852	03/12/02	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
		•	-	First Post	t-Corrective	e-Action San	npling Ev	ent – Janud	<i>iry 2003</i>		•	•	
MW02	AP0272	01/23/03	3 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW03	AP0372	01/23/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW05	AP0572	01/23/03	3.1 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW10	AP1072	01/23/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW11	AP1172	01/23/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-22/ MW29 <sup>a</sup>	AP2972	01/23/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-24	AP2472	01/24/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW26	AP2672	01/23/03	5.7 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW27	AP2772	01/23/03	5.6 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW28	AP2872	01/23/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Re	medial Lev	el	5	5	700	1,000	10,000						

"Well MW1-22 was damaged during chemical injection in May 2001, and MW29 was installed adjacent to MW1-22 in June 2001.

Data Qualifiers

NOTES:

Bold values exceed remedial levels.

Indicates that the compound was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit. U

PCE Tetrachloroethene. TCE

Trichloroethene. \* PCE was the only analyte analyzed.

Indicates that the value for the compound was an estimated value. J

Indicates that the compound was detected at the concentration reported. =

				Detected Volatile Organic Compounds (µg/L)									
						Duuu		e organie	Compound	is (μg/L)			
Sample Location	Sample ID	Date Sampled	PCE	TCE	Toluene	Ethylbenzene	Xylenes	2-Butanone	2-Hexanone	4-Methyl-2- pentanone	Acetone	Carbon Disulfide	Chloroform
				Second F	Post-Correc	tive-Action S	Sampling .	Event – Ju	ne 2003				
MW02	AP0292	06/22/03	0.83 J	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW03	AP0392	06/22/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW05	AP0592	06/22/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW10	AP1092	06/22/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW11	AP1192	06/22/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-22/ MW29 <sup>a</sup>	AP2992	06/22/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-24	AP2492	06/22/03	0.55 J	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW26	AP2692	06/22/03	3.9 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW27	AP2792	06/22/03	1.8 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW28	AP2892	06/22/03	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
				Third Pos	t-Correctiv	e-Action Sa	mpling Ev	ent – Janu	ary 2004				
MW02	AP0202	01/24/04	1.7 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW03	AP0302	01/24/04	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW05	AP0502	01/24/04	6.1 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW10	AP1002	01/24/04	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW11	AP1102	01/24/04	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-22/ MW29 <sup>a</sup>	AP2902	01/24/04	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-24	AP2402	01/24/04	0.87 J	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW26	AP2602	01/24/04	4.9 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW27	AP2702	01/24/04	3.1 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW28	AP2802	01/24/04	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Re	medial Lev	el	5	5	700	1,000	10,000						_

"Well MW1-22 was damaged during chemical injection in May 2001, and MW29 was installed adjacent to MW1-22 in June 2001.

NOTES:

Bold values exceed remedial levels.

PCE Tetrachloroethene.

TCE Trichloroethene.

Indicates that the compound was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit. U

J

\* PCE was the only analyte analyzed.

Indicates that the value for the compound was an estimated value. Indicates that the compound was detected at the concentration reported.

=

Data Qualifiers

						Detect	ed Volatil	e Organic	Compound	ls (µg/L)			
Sample Location	Sample ID	Date Sampled	PCE	TCE	Toluene	Ethylbenzene	Xylenes	2-Butanone	2-Hexanone	4-Methyl-2- pentanone	Acetone	Carbon Disulfide	Chloroform
				Fourth Po	st-Correcti	ve-Action So	impling E	vent – Octo	ober 2004				
MW02	AP02B2	10/18/04	0.65 J	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW03	AP03B2	10/18/04	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW05	AP05B2	10/18/04	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-22/ MW29 <sup>a</sup>	AP29B2	10/18/04	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-24	AP24B2	10/18/04	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW26	AP26B2	10/19/04	0.61 J	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW27	AP27B2	10/18/04	2.7 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
				Fifth Pa	ost-Correct	ive-Action S	ampling E	vent – Apr	il 2005				
MW02	AP02C2	04/26/05	2.5 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW03	AP03C2	04/27/05	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW05	AP05C2	04/27/05	2.9 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-22/ MW29 <sup>a</sup>	AP29C2	04/26/05	1 U	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW1-24	AP24C2	04/27/05	0.44 J	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW26	AP26C2	04/27/05	3.3 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MW27	AP27C2	04/27/05	2.3 =	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Re	medial Lev	el	5	5	700	1,000	10,000						

"Well MW1-22 was damaged during chemical injection in May 2001, and MW29 was installed adjacent to MW1-22 in June 2001.

NOTES:

Data Qualifiers

PCE Tetrachloroethene. TCE Trichloroethene.

U Indicates that the compound was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit.

\* PCE was the only analyte analyzed.

Indicates that the value for the compound was an estimated value. J =

Indicates that the compound was detected at the concentration reported.

Sample Location	Sample ID	Date Sampled	Benzene (µg/L)	Toluene (ug/L)	Ethylbenzene (µg/L)	Xylenes (ug/L)
	Ba	iseline Benze	ene Sampling I	Event – Octob	er 2000	
MW01	AP0112	10/31/00	4.4 =	1 U	1.7 =	2.3 J
MW06	AP0612	10/31/00	46.7 =	1 U	6.6 =	3 U
MW07	AP0712	10/31/00	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U
MW08	AP0812	10/31/00	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U
MW09	AP0912	10/31/00	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U
MW1-23	AP2312	10/31/00	1.8 =	1 U	0.62 J	3 U
MW1-25	AP2512	10/31/00	44.1 =	0.73 J	15.7 =	17.3 =
	First Se	miannual Be	enzene Samplin	ng Event – Sep	otember 2001	
MW01	AP0142	09/07/01	5.1 =	1 U	1.8 =	0.95 J
MW06	AP0642	09/07/01	42 =	0.52 J	1.7 =	0.56 J
MW07	AP0742	09/07/01	1 U	0.81 J	0.23 J	0.72 J
MW08	AP0842	09/07/01	1 U	0.28 J	1 U	3 U
MW09	AP0942	09/07/01	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U
MW1-23	AP2342	09/06/01	0.58 J	0.30 J	1 U	3 U
MW1-25	AP2542	09/07/01	29.7 =	1 U	1.1 =	3 U
	Second S	emiannual I	Benzene Sampl	ing Event – M	larch 2002	
MW01	AP0152	03/12/02	12.8 =	0.36 J	14.9 =	10.8 =
MW06	AP0652	03/12/02	12.5 =	1 U	0.84 J	3 U
MW07	AP0752	03/12/02	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U
MW08	AP0852	03/12/02	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U
MW09	AP0952	03/12/02	1 U	1 U	1 U	3 U
MW1-23	AP2352	03/12/02	1.5 =	1 U	0.53 J	0.91 J
MW1-25	AP2552	03/12/02	18.7 =	1 U	1 =	3 U
R	emedial Lev	vel	5	700	1,000	10,000

Table 2. Benzene	e Plume Sampling -	- Groundwater	Analytical Results
Table 2. Denzen	s i fume Samping	Groundwater	1 Mary fical Itesuits

Bold values exceed remedial levels.

Data Qualifiers

U Indicates that the compound was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit.

J Indicates that the value for the compound was an estimated value.

= Indicates that the compound was detected at the concentration reported.

Sample Location	Sample ID	Date Sampled	Benzene (µg/L)	Toluene (µg/L)	Ethylbenzene (µg/L)	Xylenes (µg/L)
	Third Se	niannual Be	enzene Samplin	ng Event – Oc	tober 2002	
MW01	AP0162	10/18/02	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW06	AP0662	10/18/02	6.7 =	1 U	0.22 J	1 U
MW07	AP0762	10/18/02	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW08	AP0862	10/18/02	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW09	AP0962	10/19/02	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW1-23	AP2362	10/18/02	4.3 =	1 U	1.9 =	0.72 J
MW1-25	AP2562	10/19/02	5.1 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
	Fourth Se	miannual B	enzene Samplir	ng Event – Ma	arch/April 2003	
MW01	AP0172	04/22/03	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW06	AP0672	04/22/03	6.2 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW07	AP0772	04/22/03	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW08	AP0872	04/22/03	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW09	AP0972	04/22/03	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW1-23	AP2372	04/22/03	1.4 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW1-25	AP2572	04/22/03	6.1 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
	Fifth S	Semiannual I	Benzene Sampl	ing Event – O	ctober 2003	
MW01	AP0192	10/13/03	1.7 =	0.68 J	1 U	1 U
MW06	AP0692	10/13/03	4.6 =	0.52 J	1 U	1 U
MW07	AP0792	10/13/03	1 U	0.63 J	1 U	1 U
MW08	AP0892	10/13/03	1 U	0.78 J	1 U	1 U
MW09	AP0992	10/13/03	1 U	0.55 J	1 U	1 U
MW1-23	AP2392	10/14/03	0.59 J	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW1-25	AP2592	10/13/03	7.7 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
R	emedial Lev	/el	5	700	1,000	10,000

Table 2. Denzene Flume Sampling – Orbundwater Analytical Results (continued)
--

Bold values exceed remedial levels.

Data Qualifiers

U Indicates that the compound was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit.

J Indicates that the value for the compound was an estimated value.

= Indicates that the compound was detected at the concentration reported.

Sample Location	Sample ID	Date Sampled	Benzene	Toluene	Ethylbenzene	Xylenes
Location	Sixth S	Semiannual	Benzene Samp	ling Event – N	(µ <u>g</u> / <u>L)</u> March 2004	(µg/12)
MW01	AP01A2	03/23/04	1.6 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW06	AP06A2	03/23/04	4.4 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW07	AP07A2	03/23/04	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW08	AP08A2	03/23/04	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW09	AP0AA2	03/23/04	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW1-23	AP23A2	03/22/04	0.96 J	1 U	0.74 J	0.33 J
MW1-25	AP25A2	03/23/04	6.1 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
	Seventh	Semiannual	Benzene Samp	oling Event –	October 2004	
MW01	AP01B2	10/18/04	1 U	0.61 J	1 U	1 U
MW06	AP06B2	10/18/04	1.5 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW07	AP07B2	10/18/04	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW08	AP08B2	10/18/04	1 U	0.68 J	1 U	1 U
MW09	AP0AB2	10/18/04	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW1-23	AP23B2	10/18/04	1.7 =	1 U	1.7 =	1 U
MW1-25	AP25B2	10/18/04	0.73 J	1 U	1 U	1 U
	Eighth	h Semiannua	l Benzene Sam	pling Event –	April 2005	
MW01	AP01C2	04/26/05	1.6 =	1 U	0.37 J	1 U
MW06	AP06C2	04/27/05	4.1 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW07	AP07C2	04/27/05	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW08	AP08C2	04/27/05	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW09	AP0AC2	04/27/05	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
MW1-23	AP23C2	04/26/05	0.67 J	1 U	0.59 J	1 U
MW1-25	AP25C2	04/27/05	2.7 =	1 U	1 U	1 U
R	emedial Lev	/el	5	700	1,000	10,000

Bold values exceed remedial levels.

Data Qualifiers

U Indicates that the compound was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit.

J Indicates that the value for the compound was an estimated value.

= Indicates that the compound was detected at the concentration reported.

#### Table 3. Groundwater Elevations

	Date	Top of Casing Elevation	Depth of Screened Interval	Water Depth	Groundwater Elevation
Well Number	Measured	(ft AMSL)	(ff BGS)	(ff BTOC)	(ft AMSL)
1	00/20/00	<u>Au</u>	gust 2000	0.20	11.70
MW01	08/26/00	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	9.38	11.70
MW02	08/26/00	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	10.57	10.71
MW03	08/26/00	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	9.52	11.18
MW05	08/26/00	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	10.57	10.06
MW06	08/26/00	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	12.17	9.51
MW07	08/26/00	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	12.03	9.65
MW08	08/26/00	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	10.19	11.58
MW09	08/26/00	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	10.38	11.06
MW10	08/26/00	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	9.82	11.00
MW11	08/26/00	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	10.12	11.13
MW1-20	08/26/00	22.11	a	9.95	12.16
MW1-22	08/26/00	19.64	a	9.46	10.18
MW1-24	08/26/00	20.06	a	8.51	11.55
MW1-25	08/26/00	21.07	а	10.73	10.34
MW26	08/26/00	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	10.10	10.93
MW27	08/26/00	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	10.55	9.80
MW28	08/26/00	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	9.31	11.02
		Sept	ember 2001		
MW01	09/05/01	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	9.87	11.21
MW02	09/05/01	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	11.12	10.16
MW03	09/05/01	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	10.22	10.48
MW05	09/05/01	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	11.25	9.38
MW06	09/05/01	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	12.60	9.08
MW07	09/05/01	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	12.40	9.28
MW08	09/05/01	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	10.62	11.15
MW09	09/05/01	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	10.87	10.57
MW10	09/05/01	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	10.31	10.51
MW11	09/05/01	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	10.64	10.61
MW1-20	09/05/01	22.11	а	10.63	11.48
MW1-22	09/05/01	19.64	а	damaged	damaged
MW1-24	09/05/01	20.06	а	9.13	10.93
MW1-25	09/05/01	21.07	а	11.34	9.73
MW26	09/05/01	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	10.79	10.24
MW27	09/05/01	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	11.37	8.98
MW28	09/05/01	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	9.84	10.49
MW29	09/05/01	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	8.00	9.38

<sup>*a*</sup> Well construction information was not documented in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facility investigation report.

NOTES:

AMSL Above mean sea level.

BGS Below ground surface.

	Data	Top of Casing	Depth of Sereened Interval	Depth of Screened Interval Water Depth	
Well Number	Measured	(ft AMSL)	(ft BGS)	(ff BTOC)	(ft AMSL)
vv en rvumber	Wicasureu		urch 2002	(# 1100)	(It MINDL)
MW01	03/11/02	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	9.10	11.98
MW02	03/11/02	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	10.23	11.05
MW03	03/11/02	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	9.25	11.45
MW05	03/11/02	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	10.46	10.17
MW06	03/11/02	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	11.93	9.75
MW07	03/11/02	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	11.69	9.99
MW08	03/11/02	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	9.71	12.06
MW09	03/11/02	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	10.07	11.37
MW10	03/11/02	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	9.58	11.24
MW11	03/11/02	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	9.85	11.40
MW1-20	03/11/02	22.11	а	9.44	12.67
MW1-22	03/11/02	19.64	а	damaged	damaged
MW1-24	03/11/02	20.06	а	8.25	11.81
MW1-25	03/11/02	21.07	а	10.57	10.50
MW26	03/11/02	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	9.85	11.18
MW27	03/11/02	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	10.58	9.77
MW28	03/11/02	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	9.05	11.28
MW29	03/11/02	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	7.37	10.01
		Oct	tober 2002		
MW01	10/18/02	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	7.97	13.11
MW02	10/18/02	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	9.70	11.58
MW03	10/18/02	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	8.43	12.27
MW05	10/18/02	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	10.36	10.27
MW06	10/18/02	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	12.10	9.58
MW07	10/18/02	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	11.42	10.26
MW08	10/18/02	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	8.54	13.23
MW09	10/18/02	21.44	29.1-34.1	9.34	12.10
MW10	10/18/02	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	8.80	12.02
MW11	10/18/02	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	9.09	12.16
MW1-20	10/18/02	22.11	а	8.97	13.14
MW1-22	10/18/02	19.64	а	damaged	damaged
MW1-24	10/18/02	20.06	а	7.36	12.70
MW1-25	10/18/02	21.07	а	10.43	10.64
MW26	10/18/02	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	9.28	11.75
MW27	10/18/02	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	10.87	9.48
MW28	10/18/02	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	8.30	12.03
MW29	10/18/02	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	7.49	9.89

<sup>*a*</sup> Well construction information was not documented in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facility investigation report.

NOTES:

AMSL Above mean sea level.

BGS Below ground surface.

	Date	Top of Casing Elevation	Depth of Screened Interval	Water Depth	Groundwater Elevation		
Well Number	Measured	(ft AMSL)	(ft BGS)	(ft BTOC)	(ft AMSL)		
January 2003							
MW01	01/23/03	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	9.17	11.91		
MW02	01/23/03	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	10.6	10.68		
MW03	01/23/03	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	9.57	11.13		
MW05	01/23/03	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	10.97	9.66		
MW06	01/23/03	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	12.59	9.09		
MW07	01/23/03	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	12.16	9.52		
MW08	01/23/03	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	9.83	11.94		
MW09	01/23/03	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	9.79	11.65		
MW10	01/23/03	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	9.22	11.60		
MW11	01/23/03	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	9.54	11.71		
MW1-20	01/23/03	22.11	а	9.2	12.91		
MW1-22	01/23/03	19.64	а	damaged	damaged		
MW1-24	01/23/03	20.06	а	8.38	11.68		
MW1-25	01/23/03	21.07	а	11.02	10.05		
MW26	01/23/03	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	10.18	10.85		
MW27	01/23/03	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	11.25	9.10		
MW28	01/23/03	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	8.79	11.54		
MW29	01/23/03	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	7.97	9.41		
		M	arch 2003				
MW01	03/20/03	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	6.73	14.35		
MW02	03/20/03	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	8.78	12.50		
MW03	03/20/03	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	6.67	14.03		
MW05	03/20/03	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	9.53	11.10		
MW06	03/20/03	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	11.42	10.26		
MW07	03/20/03	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	10.82	10.86		
MW08	03/20/03	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	7.6	14.17		
MW09	03/20/03	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	8.79	12.65		
MW10	03/20/03	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	8.23	12.59		
MW11	03/20/03	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	8.54	12.71		
MW1-20	03/20/03	22.11	а	7.67	14.44		
MW1-22	03/20/03	19.64	а	damaged	damaged		
MW1-24	03/20/03	20.06	a	6.27	13.79		
MW1-25	03/20/03	21.07	a	9.68	11.39		
MW26	03/20/03	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	8.06	12.97		
MW27	03/20/03	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	9.9	10.45		
MW28	03/20/03	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	7.75	12.58		
MW29	03/20/03	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	5.23	12.15		

<sup>*a*</sup> Well construction information was not documented in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facility investigation report.

NOTES:

AMSL Above mean sea level.

BGS Below ground surface.

		Top of Casing	Depth of		Groundwater
	Date	Elevation	Screened Interval	Water Depth	Elevation
Well Number	Measured	(ft AMSL)	(ft BGS)	(ft BTOC)	(ft AMSL)
	1	Jı	une 2003		r
MW01	06/22/03	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	7.80	13.28
MW02	06/22/03	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	9.34	11.94
MW03	06/22/03	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	8.04	12.66
MW05	06/22/03	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	9.83	10.80
MW06	06/22/03	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	11.60	10.08
MW07	06/22/03	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	11.13	10.55
MW08	06/22/03	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	8.36	13.41
MW09	06/22/03	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	9.24	12.20
MW10	06/22/03	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	8.69	12.13
MW11	06/22/03	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	8.98	12.27
MW1-20	06/22/03	22.11	а	8.25	13.86
MW1-22	06/22/03	19.64	а	damaged	damaged
MW1-24	06/22/03	20.06	а	6.95	13.11
MW1-25	06/22/03	21.07	а	10.02	11.05
MW26	06/22/03	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	8.87	12.16
MW27	06/22/03	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	9.15	11.20
MW28	06/22/03	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	8.23	12.10
MW29	06/22/03	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	6.90	10.48
	•	Oct	tober 2003		
MW01	10/13/03	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	9.79	11.29
MW02	10/13/03	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	11.09	10.19
MW03	10/13/03	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	10.48	10.22
MW05	10/13/03	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	11.30	9.33
MW06	10/13/03	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	12.72	8.96
MW07	10/13/03	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	12.44	9.24
MW08	10/13/03	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	10.54	11.23
MW09	10/13/03	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	10.76	10.68
MW10	10/13/03	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	10.20	10.62
MW11	10/13/03	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	10.50	10.75
MW1-20	10/13/03	22.11	а	10.38	11.73
MW1-22	10/13/03	19.64	а	damaged	damaged
MW1-24	10/13/03	20.06	а	9.05	11.01
MW1-25	10/13/03	21.07	а	11.35	9.72
MW26	10/13/03	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	10.79	10.24
MW27	10/13/03	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	11.53	8.82
MW28	10/13/03	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	9.74	10.59
MW29	10/13/03	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	8.38	9.00

<sup>*a*</sup> Well construction information was not documented in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facility investigation report.

NOTES:

AMSL Above mean sea level.

BGS Below ground surface.

		Top of Casing	Depth of		Groundwater
	Date	Elevation	Screened Interval	Water Depth	Elevation
Well Number	Measured	(ft AMSL)	(ft BGS)	(ft BTOC)	(ft AMSL)
		Jan	uary 2004		1
MW01	01/23/04	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	10.22	10.86
MW02	01/23/04	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	11.39	9.89
MW03	01/23/04	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	10.55	10.15
MW05	01/23/04	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	11.56	9.07
MW06	01/23/04	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	13.08	8.60
MW07	01/23/04	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	12.84	8.84
MW08	01/23/04	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	10.96	10.81
MW09	01/23/04	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	10.76	10.68
MW10	01/23/04	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	10.22	10.60
MW11	01/23/04	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	10.52	10.73
MW1-20	01/23/04	22.11	а	10.58	11.53
MW1-22	01/23/04	19.64	а	damaged	damaged
MW1-24	01/23/04	20.06	а	9.40	10.66
MW1-25	01/23/04	21.07	а	11.63	9.44
MW26	01/23/04	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	11.05	9.98
MW27	01/23/04	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	11.76	8.59
MW28	01/23/04	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	9.73	10.60
MW29	01/23/04	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	8.58	8.80
		M	arch 2004		
MW01	03/23/04	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	9.56	11.52
MW02	03/23/04	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	10.92	10.36
MW03	03/23/04	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	9.97	10.73
MW05	03/24/04	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	11.21	9.42
MW06	03/24/04	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	12.85	8.83
MW07	03/24/04	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	12.52	9.16
MW08	03/24/04	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	10.24	11.53
MW09	03/24/04	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	10.4	11.04
MW10	03/24/04	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	9.84	10.98
MW11	03/24/04	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	10.15	11.1
MW1-20	03/24/04	22.11	а	10.41	11.7
MW1-22	03/23/04	19.64	а	damaged	damaged
MW1-24	03/23/04	20.06	a	8.83	11.23
MW1-25	03/24/04	21.07	а	11.29	9.78
MW26	03/24/04	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	10.55	10.48
MW27	03/24/04	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	11.21	9.14
MW28	03/24/04	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	9.36	10.97
MW29	03/24/04	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	8.28	9.1

<sup>*a*</sup> Well construction information was not documented in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facility investigation report.

NOTES:

AMSL Above mean sea level.

BGS Below ground surface.

	D (	Top of Casing	Depth of		Groundwater
W. U.N.	Date	Elevation	Screened Interval	Water Depth	Elevation
well Number	Measured	(IT AMSL)		(IT BIOC)	(IT AMSL)
N GIVA 1	10/10/04	Oct	tober 2004	0.00	10.00
MW01	10/18/04	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	8.09	12.99
MW02	10/18/04	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	9.74	11.54
MW03	10/18/04	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	8.34	12.36
MW05	10/18/04	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	10.33	10.30
MW06	10/18/04	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	12.08	9.60
MW07	10/18/04	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	11.48	10.20
MW08	10/18/04	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	8.68	13.09
MW09	10/18/04	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	9.52	11.92
MW10	10/18/04	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	8.97	11.85
MW11	10/18/04	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	9.26	11.99
MW1-20	10/18/04	22.11	а	9.33	12.78
MW1-22	10/18/04	19.64	а	damaged	damaged
MW1-24	10/18/04	20.06	а	7.52	12.54
MW1-25	10/18/04	21.07	а	10.41	10.66
MW26	10/18/04	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	9.24	11.79
MW27	10/18/04	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	10.83	9.52
MW28	10/18/04	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	8.52	11.81
MW29	10/18/04	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	7.33	10.05
		A	pril 2005		
MW01	04/26/05	21.08	2.0 - 12.0	8.68	12.40
MW02	04/26/05	21.28	3.0 - 13.0	9.95	11.33
MW03	04/26/05	20.7	2.0 - 12.0	8.81	11.89
MW05	04/26/05	20.63	6.0 - 16.0	10.33	10.30
MW06	04/26/05	21.68	5.5 - 15.5	12.06	9.62
MW07	04/26/05	21.68	4.0 - 14.0	9.29	12.39
MW08	04/26/05	21.77	3.0 - 13.0	not accessible	not accessible
MW09	04/26/05	21.44	29.1 - 34.1	9.57	11.87
MW10	04/26/05	20.82	26.0 - 31.0	9.00	11.82
MW11	04/26/05	21.25	29.0 - 34.0	9.31	11.94
MW1-20	04/26/05	22.11	а	8.90	13.21
MW1-22	04/26/05	19.64	а	damaged	damaged
MW1-24	04/26/05	20.06	а	7.93	12.13
MW1-25	04/26/05	21.07	а	10.42	10.65
MW26	04/26/05	21.03	5.0 - 15.0	9.55	11.48
MW27	04/26/05	20.35	5.0 - 15.0	10.54	9.81
MW28	04/26/05	20.33	34.6 - 44.6	8.54	11.79
MW29	04/26/05	17.38	4.8 - 14.8	7.42	9.96

<sup>*a*</sup> Well construction information was not documented in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facility investigation report.

NOTES:

AMSL Above mean sea level.

BGS Below ground surface.

Table 4.	Well	Construction	Details
----------	------	--------------	---------

		Boring	Screened		Coordinate	es (NAD 83)	Elevation (	NAVD 88)
Boring	Date	Depth	Interval				Ground	Top of
Number	Installed	(ft BGS)	(ft BGS)	Type of Completion	Northing	Easting	Surface	Casing
			Chem	ical Oxidation Injection H	Points			
J1	02/01/01	13.5	9.6 - 12.1	1.25-in. carbon steel	974188.3	740193.7	17.8	17.66
J2	02/01/01	21.0	17.8 - 20.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974219.2	740206.8	18.0	17.75
J3	02/01/01	13.0	9.6 - 12.1	1.25-in. carbon steel	974251.4	740218.9	18.4	18.07
J4	02/01/01	13.2	9.6 - 12.5	1.25-in. carbon steel	974230.2	740158.4	17.6	17.29
J5	02/01/01	13.0	9.4 - 12.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974268.2	740183.9	17.7	17.39
J6	02/03/01	13.0	9.6 - 12.5	1.25-in. carbon steel	974311.9	740199.6	18.2	17.56
J7	02/02/01	13.0	9.4 - 12.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974288.0	740159.3	18.3	17.92
J8	02/02/01	13.0	9.4 - 12.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974308.8	740172.4	18.2	17.71
J9	02/02/01	13.0	9.5 - 12.4	1.25-in. carbon steel	974308.4	740152.0	18.2	17.70
J10	02/03/01	13.0	9.5 - 12.4	1.25-in. carbon steel	974340.9	740175.8	18.2	17.48
J11	02/01/01	21.0	17.8 - 20.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974163.9	740179.1	17.3	17.01
J12	02/01/01	21.0	17.6 - 20.1	1.25-in. carbon steel	974179.9	740180.4	17.9	17.97
J13	02/01/01	21.2	17.5 - 20.0	1.25-in. carbon steel	974208.2	740202.3	17.9	17.64
J14	02/02/01	20.9	17.6 - 20.1	1.25-in. carbon steel	974205.4	740192.9	17.7	17.66
J15	02/02/01	21.1	17.1 - 20.1	1.25-in. carbon steel	974217.5	740166.5	17.4	17.05
J16	02/02/01	21.0	17.5 - 20.0	1.25-in. carbon steel	974239.5	740202.9	18.1	17.56
J17	02/01/01	21.0	17.6 - 20.5	1.25-in. carbon steel	974244.7	740178.8	17.7	16.74
J18	02/02/01	21.0	17.5 - 20.4	1.25-in. carbon steel	974245.9	740158.3	18.1	17.39
J19	02/02/01	20.8	17.7 - 20.2	1.25-in. carbon steel	974272.3	740199.6	17.9	17.48
J20	02/02/01	21.0	17.7 - 20.2	1.25-in. carbon steel	974267.4	740208.1	18.1	17.43
J21	02/02/01	21.0	17.7 - 20.2	1.25-in. carbon steel	974270.3	740226.1	18.3	17.87
J22	02/02/01	21.0	17.4 - 20.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974263.4	740155.2	18.2	17.88
J23	02/01/01	21.0	17.4 - 20.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974288.5	740185.9	17.9	17.57
J24	02/03/01	21.0	17.7 - 20.6	1.25-in. carbon steel	974301.2	740185.1	18.1	17.74
J25	02/02/01	21.0	17.4 - 20.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974287.3	740150.1	18.2	17.64
J26	02/02/01	21.0	17.4 - 20.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974299.0	740140.4	18.0	17.56
J27	02/02/01	21.3	17.8 - 20.7	1.25-in. carbon steel	974319.4	740164.8	18.3	17.73
J28	02/03/01	21.3	17.8 - 20.7	1.25-in. carbon steel	974331.5	740181.6	18.6	17.91
J29	02/02/01	21.0	17.4 - 20.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974327.8	740154.0	18.3	17.82
J30	05/03/01	22.0	18.4 - 20.9	1.25-in. carbon steel	974202.4	740174.7	17.3	16.80
J31	05/03/01	22.0	18.4 - 20.9	1.25-in. carbon steel	974154.9	740161.4	17.3	17.27
J32	05/03/01	22.0	18.4 - 20.9	1.25-in. carbon steel	974146.9	740147.4	17.3	16.61
J33	12/04/01	14.5	10.3 - 13.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974252.8	740189.6	17.8	17.55
J34	12/04/01	14.5	10.3 - 13.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974292.1	740145.9	18.0	17.79
J35	12/04/01	14.5	10.3 - 13.3	1.25-in. carbon steel	974311.2	740163.5	18.2	17.85

BGS Below ground surface.

		Boring	Screened		Coordinate	s (NAD 83)	Elevation (	NAVD 88)
Boring	Date	Depth	Interval				Ground	Top of
Number	Installed	(ft BGS)	(ft BGS)	Type of Completion	Northing	Easting	Surface	Casing
			Monitoring	Wells (used during correc	tive action)			
MW01	08/26/96	13.0	2.0 - 12.0	2-in. PVC (shallow)	974412.4	740177.9	18.3	21.08
MW02	08/26/96	14.0	3.0 - 13.0	2-in. PVC (shallow)	974323.3	740183.9	18.4	21.28
MW03	08/26/96	13.0	2.0 - 12.0	2-in. PVC (shallow)	974277.1	740136.3	18.0	20.7
MW05	07/21/98	16.5	6.0 - 16.0	2-in. PVC (shallow)	974259.8	740202.1	17.9	20.63
MW06	07/22/98	16.0	5.5 - 15.5	2-in. PVC (shallow)	974337.8	740270.3	18.8	21.68
MW07	07/23/98	14.5	4.0 - 14.0	2-in. PVC (shallow)	974418.2	740280.1	18.8	21.68
MW08	07/28/98	14.0	3.0 - 13.0	2-in. PVC (shallow)	974463.3	740211.8	18.7	21.77
MW09	07/29/98	35.0	29.1 - 34.1	2-in. PVC (deep)	974324.5	740263.0	18.6	21.44
MW10	07/22/98	32.0	26.0 - 31.0	2-in. PVC (deep)	974291.7	740205.4	18.0	20.82
MW11	07/23/98	35.0	29.0 - 34.0	2-in. PVC (deep)	974346.1	740161.6	18.3	21.25
MW1-20	а	а	а	2-in. PVC	974245.9	740061.3	18.3	22.11
MW1-22	а	а	а	2-in. PVC	974141.9	740157.7	17.3	19.64
MW1-24	а	а	а	2-in. PVC	974351.5	740149.6	18.3	20.06
MW1-25	а	а	а	2-in. PVC	974332.3	740257.0	18.6	21.07
MW26	07/19/00	15.0	5.0 - 15.0	2.25-in. carbon steel	974297.9	740161.0	18.3	21.03
MW27	07/19/00	15.0	5.0 - 15.0	2.25-in. carbon steel	974193.9	740183.5	17.5	20.35
MW28	07/19/00	45.0	34.6 - 44.6	2.25-in. carbon steel	974220.3	740196.3	17.9	20.33
MW29	06/05/01	16.0	4.8 - 14.8	2-in. PVC (shallow)	974146.4	740162.1	17.3	17.38

#### Table 4. Well Construction Details (continued)

<sup>a</sup> Well construction information was not documented in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facility investigation report.

NOTES: BGS PVC

BGS Below ground surface.

PVC Polyvinyl chloride.

	Area of PCE Plume Exceeding RL of 5 μg/L	Area of Benzene Plume Exceeding RL of 5 μg/L
Time	(ft <sup>2</sup> )	$(ft^2)$
May 1999	22,500	21,290
August 2000	19,450	
October 2000		9,600
March 2001	10,750	
September 2001	13,000	10,100
March 2002	5,000	8,600
October 2002		975
January 2003	5,250	
April 2003		975
June 2003	0	
October 2003		660
January 2004	3,800	
March 2004		660
October 2004	0	0
April 2005	0	0

#### Table 5. Area of Groundwater Plumes Exceeding Remedial Levels

NOTES:

PCE Tetrachloroethene.

RL Remedial level.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

## APPENDIX III HISTORICAL GROUNDWATER QUALITY AND POTENTIOMETRIC SURFACE MAPS

### THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

# PCE GROUNDWATER QUALITY MAPS

### THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

















I-S

## **BENZENE GROUNDWATER QUALITY MAPS**

### THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.
















**I-**7

# GROUNDWATER POTENTIOMETRIC SURFACE MAPS







III-27

















## APPENDIX IV LABORATORY ANALYTICAL RESULTS

# ANALYTICAL LABORATORY INFORMATION AND DATA VALIDATION CODES

#### STATE OF GEORGIA ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ACCREDITATION

Name of Laboratory:	General Engineering Laboratories, Inc.
Address:	P.O. Box 30712
	2040 Savage Road
	Charleston, SC 29407
Contact:	Bob Pullano
Telephone Number:	(843) 556-8171
Fax Number:	(843) 766-1178
Accrediting Authority:	State of South Carolina
Accreditation Number:	SC-10120001
Effective Date:	Extension granted while recertification in process. January 27, 2003
Expiration Date:	March 26, 2006
Accreditation Scope:	SDWA, CWA, RCRA, CERCLA
Accrediting Authority:	State of Florida
Accreditation Number:	E-87156
Effective Date:	July 1, 2001 (initial and reaccredited on July 1 each year there after)
Expiration Date:	June 30, 2006
Accreditation Scope:	SDWA, CWA, RCRA, CERCLA

#1

#2

## DATA VALIDATION REASON CODES

#### Organic, Inorganic, and Radiological Analytical Data

Holdi	ng Times	Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectroscopy Tuning
A 01	Extraction holding times were exceeded	B01 Mass calibration was in error even after applying
A01	Extraction holding times were exceeded.	bor Mass canoration was in error, even after apprying
A02	Extraction notding times were grossily exceeded.	expanded criteria.
A03	Analysis holding times were exceeded.	B02 Mass calibration was not performed every 12 nours.
A04	Analysis holding times were grossly exceeded.	B03 Mass calibration did not meet ion abundance
A05	Samples were not preserved properly.	criteria.
A06	Professional judgment was used to qualify the data.	B04 Professional judgment was used to qualify the data.
Initia	I/Continuing Calibration – Organics	Initial/Continuing Calibration – Inorganics
C01	Initial calibration relative response factor (RRF)	D01 Initial calibration verification (ICV) or continuing
	was <0.05.	calibration verification (CCV) was not performed
C02	Initial calibration relative standard deviation	for every analyte.
	(RSD) was >30%.	D02 ICV recovery was above the upper control limit.
C03	Initial calibration sequence was not followed as	D03 ICV recovery was below the lower control limit.
	required.	D04 CCV recovery was above the upper control limit.
C04	Continuing calibration RRF was <0.05.	D05 CCV recovery was below the lower control limit.
C05	Continuing calibration percent difference (%D)	D06 Standard curve was not established with the
005	was $>25\%$	minimum number of standards
C06	Continuing calibration was not performed at the	D07 Instrument was not calibrated daily or each time the
000	Continuing canoration was not performed at the	bo/ instrument was not canorated daily of each time the
007	required frequency.	Instrument was set up.
C0/	Resolution criteria were not met.	D08 Correlation coefficient was <0.995.
C08	Relative percent difference (RPD) criteria were	D09 Mid-range cyanide standard was not distilled.
	not met.	D10 Professional judgment was used to qualify the data.
C09	RSD criteria were not met.	
C10	Retention time of compounds was outside	
	windows.	
C11	Compounds were not adequately resolved.	
C12	Breakdown of endrin or	
	dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) was	
	>30%.	
C13	Combined breakdown of endrin/DDT was >30%.	
C14	Professional judgment was used to qualify the data.	
Induc	tively Coupled Plasma and Furnace	Blanks
	Requirements	F01 Sample data were qualified as a result of the method
E01	Interference check sample recovery was outside	blank
201	the control limit	F02 Sample data were qualified as a result of the field
E02	Duplicate injections were outside the control limit	hlank
E02	Post-digestion spike recovery was outside the	F03 Sample data were qualified as a result of the
105	control limit.	equipment rinsate.
E04	Method of standard additions (MSA) was required	F04 Sample data were qualified as a result of the trip
505	but not performed.	blank.
E05	MISA correlation coefficient was <0.995.	FUS Gross contamination exists.
E06	MSA spikes were not at the correct concentration.	F06 Concentration of the contaminant was detected at a
E07	Serial dilution criteria were not met.	level below the contract-required quantitation limit
E08	Professional judgment was used to qualify the data.	(CRQL).
		F07 Concentration of the contaminant was detected at a
		level less than the action limit, but greater than the
		CRQL.
		F08 Concentration of the contaminant was detected at a
		level that exceeds the action level.
		F09 No laboratory blanks were analyzed.
		F10 Blank had a negative value $>2$ times the instrument
		detection limit.
		F11 Blanks were not analyzed at required frequency.
		F12 Professional judgment was used to qualify the data
		1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -

## DATA VALIDATION REASON CODES

#### Organic, Inorganic, and Radiological Analytical Data (continued)

Surro	gate/Radiological Chemical Recovery	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate			
G01	Surrogate/radiological chemical recovery was	H01 Matrix spike (MS)/matrix spike duplicate (MSE	<b>)</b> )		
	above the upper control limit.	recovery was above the upper control limit.			
G02	Surrogate/radiological chemical recovery was	H02 MS/MSD recovery was below the lower control	l		
	below the lower control limit.	limit.			
G03	Surrogate recovery was <10%.	H03 MD/MSD recovery was <10%.			
G04	Surrogate recovery was zero.	H04 MS/MSD pairs exceed the RPD limit.			
G05	Surrogate/radiological chemical recovery data	H05 No action was taken on MS/MSD limit			
	were not present	H06 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d	lata		
G06	Professional judgment was used to qualify the	H07 Radiological MS/MSD recovery was <20%	and.		
000	data	H08 Radiological MS/MSD recovery was >160%			
G07	Radiological chemical recovery was <20%	H09 Radiological MS/MSD samples were not analyze	zed		
G07	Padiological chemical recovery was >150%	at the required frequency	Lu		
000	Radiological chemical recovery was > 15070.	at the required frequency.			
Matri	ix Spike	Laboratory Duplicate			
I01	MS recovery was above the upper control limit.	J01 Duplicate RPD/radiological duplicate error ratio	)		
I02	MS recovery was below the lower control limit.	(DER) was outside the control limit.			
I03	MS recovery was <30%.	J02 Duplicate sample results were >5 times the			
I04	No action was taken on MS data.	contract-required detection limit (CRDL).			
105	Professional judgment was used to qualify the data.	J03 Duplicate sample results were <5 times the CRI	DL.		
		J04 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d	lata.		
		J05 Duplicate was not analyzed at the required freque	ency.		
Trefore	1 A	Destinide Cleanur Cheeler			
Interi	Area Summary	resticide Cleanup Checks			
K01 K02	Area counts were outside the control limits.	L01 10% recovery was obtained during either check	•		
K02	Extremely low area counts or performance was	L02 Recoveries during either check were $>120\%$ .			
1700	exhibited by a major drop-off.	L03 Gel permeation chromatography cleanup recove	eries		
K03	IS retention time varied by more than 30 sec.	were outside the control limits.			
K04	Professional judgment was used to qualify the data.	L04 Florisil cartridge cleanup recoveries were outsic	le		
		the control limits.			
		the control limits. L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d	lata.		
Targe	et Compound Identification	the control limits. L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d Compound Quantitation and Reported CROLs	lata.		
Targe M01	et Compound Identification	the control limits. L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs N01 Ouantitation limits were affected by large off-sc	lata.		
Targe M01 M02	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Oualitative criteria were not met.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> </ul>	lata. cale		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate</li> </ul>	lata. cale		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CROLs</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04 M05	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04 M05 M06	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04 M05 M06	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04 M05 M06 M07	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional indement was used to qualify the	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04 M05 M06 M07	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04 M05 M06 M07 M08	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04 M05 M06 M07 M08	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated binhenyl column checks	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04 M05 M06 M07 M08	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04 M05 M06 M07 M08	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
<b>Targe</b> M01 M02 M03 M04 M05 M06 M07 M08	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborator exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%. tively Identified Compounds Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was above upper control limit.</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01           O02	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%. tively Identified Compounds Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank. Tentatively identified compound result was not	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was above upper control limit.</li> <li>P02 LCS recovery was below lower control limit.</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01           O02	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%. tively Identified Compounds Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank. Tentatively identified compound result was not above 10 times the level found in the blank.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was above upper control limit.</li> <li>P02 LCS recovery was below lower control limit.</li> <li>P03 LCS recovery was &lt;50%.</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01           O02           O03	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%. tively Identified Compounds Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank. Tentatively identified compound result was not above 10 times the level found in the blank. Professional judgment was used to qualify	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was above upper control limit.</li> <li>P02 LCS recovery was below lower control limit.</li> <li>P03 LCS recovery was &lt;50%.</li> <li>P04 No action was taken on the LCS data.</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01           O02           O03	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%. tively Identified Compounds Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank. Tentatively identified compound result was not above 10 times the level found in the blank. Professional judgment was used to qualify analytical data.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was above upper control limit.</li> <li>P02 LCS recovery was below lower control limit.</li> <li>P03 LCS recovery was &lt;50%.</li> <li>P04 No action was taken on the LCS data.</li> <li>P05 LCS was not analyzed at required frequency.</li> </ul>	lata.		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01           O02           O03	t Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was ≥25%. tively Identified Compounds Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank. Tentatively identified compound result was not above 10 times the level found in the blank. Professional judgment was used to qualify analytical data.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was above upper control limit.</li> <li>P02 LCS recovery was below lower control limit.</li> <li>P03 LCS recovery was &lt;50%.</li> <li>P04 No action was taken on the LCS data.</li> <li>P05 LCS was not analyzed at required frequency.</li> <li>P06 Radiological LCS recovery was &lt;50% for aqueometal statemetal stat</li></ul>	lata.		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01           O02           O03	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%. tively Identified Compounds Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank. Tentatively identified compound result was not above 10 times the level found in the blank. Professional judgment was used to qualify analytical data.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was above upper control limit.</li> <li>P02 LCS recovery was below lower control limit.</li> <li>P03 LCS recovery was &lt;50%.</li> <li>P04 No action was taken on the LCS data.</li> <li>P05 LCS was not analyzed at required frequency.</li> <li>P06 Radiological LCS recovery was &lt;50% for aqueo samples, &lt;40% for solid samples.</li> </ul>	lata.		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01           O02           O03	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%. tively Identified Compounds Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank. Tentatively identified compound result was not above 10 times the level found in the blank. Professional judgment was used to qualify analytical data.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was above upper control limit.</li> <li>P02 LCS recovery was below lower control limit.</li> <li>P03 LCS recovery was &lt;50%.</li> <li>P04 No action was taken on the LCS data.</li> <li>P05 LCS was not analyzed at required frequency.</li> <li>P06 Radiological LCS recovery was &gt;150% for aqueo samples, &lt;40% for solid samples.</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata.		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01           O02           O03	et Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was >25%. tively Identified Compounds Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank. Tentatively identified compound result was not above 10 times the level found in the blank. Professional judgment was used to qualify analytical data.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was above upper control limit.</li> <li>P02 LCS recovery was below lower control limit.</li> <li>P03 LCS recovery was &lt;50%.</li> <li>P04 No action was taken on the LCS data.</li> <li>P05 LCS was not analyzed at required frequency.</li> <li>P06 Radiological LCS recovery was &gt;150% for aqueo samples, &lt;160% for solid samples.</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata. ous eous		
Targe           M01           M02           M03           M04           M05           M06           M07           M08           Tenta           O01           O02           O03	t Compound Identification Incorrect identifications were made. Qualitative criteria were not met. Cross contamination occurred. Confirmatory analysis was not performed. No results were provided. Analysis occurred outside 12-hour gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy window. Professional judgment was used to qualify the data. The %D between the two pesticide/polychlorinated biphenyl column checks was ≥25%. tively Identified Compounds Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank. Tentatively identified compound result was not above 10 times the level found in the blank. Professional judgment was used to qualify analytical data.	<ul> <li>the control limits.</li> <li>L05 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs</li> <li>N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-sc peaks.</li> <li>N02 Method detection limits reported by the laborate exceeded corresponding CRQLs.</li> <li>N03 Professional judgment was used to qualify the d</li> <li>Laboratory Control Samples</li> <li>P01 Laboratory control sample (LCS) recovery was above upper control limit.</li> <li>P02 LCS recovery was below lower control limit.</li> <li>P03 LCS recovery was &lt;50%.</li> <li>P04 No action was taken on the LCS data.</li> <li>P05 LCS was not analyzed at required frequency.</li> <li>P06 Radiological LCS recovery was &lt;150% for aquea samples, &lt;160% for solid samples.</li> <li>P07 Radiological LCS recovery was used to qualify the d</li> </ul>	lata. cale ory lata. ous eous lata.		

#### DATA VALIDATION REASON CODES

#### Organic, Inorganic, and Radiological Analytical Data (continued)

Field	Duplicate	Radi	ological Calibration
Q01	Field duplicate RPDs were >30% for water and/or	R01	Efficiency calibration criteria were not met.
	>50% for soil.	R02	Energy calibration criteria were not met.
Q02	Radiological field DER was outside the control	R03	Resolution calibration criteria were not met.
	limit.	R04	Background determination criteria were not met.
Q03	Duplicate sample results were >5 times the CRDL.	R05	Quench curve criteria were not met.
Q04	Duplicate sample results were <5 times the CRDL.	R06	Absorption curve criteria were not met.
		R07	Plateau curve criteria were not met.
		R08	Professional judgment was used to qualify the data.
Radio	logical Calibration Verification		
S01	Efficiency verification criteria were not met.		
S02	Energy verification criteria were not met.		
S03	Resolution verification criteria were not met.		
S04	Background verification criteria were not met.		
S05	Cross-talk verification criteria were not met.		
S06	Professional judgment was used to qualify the data.		

# FIFTH POST-CORRECTIVE-ACTION PCE PLUME SAMPLING

**APRIL 2005** 

1A VOLATILE ORGANICS ANALYSIS DATA SHEET					EPA SAMPLE	NO.
Lab Na	nme: GEL, LLC.		Contract: N/A		AP02C2	
Lab Co	ode: N/A	Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A	SDG	No.: 135526	
Matri;	k: (soil/water)	WATER	Lab S	ample ID:	135526003	<b>x</b> <sup>-1</sup>
Sample	e wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab F	ile ID:	31511	
Level:	(low/med)	LOW	Date 1	Received:	04/29/05	
% Mois	sture: not dec.		Date 2	Analyzed:	05/06/05	
GC Col	umn: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilut	ion Facto	r: 1.0	
Soil E	Extract Volume:	(uL)	Soil 2	Aliquot Vo	olume:	(uL)
	CAS NO.	COMPOUND	CONCENTRATIO	ON UŅITS: /Kg) UG/L	Q	
	127-18-4	Tetrachloroeth	ylene		2.5	=

FORM I VOA

OLM03.0

DATA VALIDATION COPY

-

IV-11

1A VOLATILE ORGANICS ANALYSIS DATA SHEET				
	Contract: N/A	AP02C4		
ase No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526		
WATER	Lab Sample ID:	135526004		
5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31512		
LOW	Date Received:	04/29/05		
	Date Analyzed:	05/06/05		
ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	pr: 1.0		
(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	Olume:(uL)		
	1A ORGANICS ANALYSI ase No.: N/A WATER 5.000 (g/ml) ML LOW LD: 0.25 (mm) (uL)	1A ORGANICS ANALYSIS DATA SHEET Contract: N/A ase No.: N/A SAS No.: N/A SDG WATER Lab Sample ID: 5.000 (g/ml) ML Lab File ID: 5.000 (g/ml) ML Date Received: LOW Date Received: Date Analyzed: Date Analyzed: Dilution Factor (uL) Soil Aliquot V		

CAS NO.	COMPOUND	CONCENTRATIC (ug/L or ug/	ON UNITS: /Kg) UG/L -	Q	
127-18-4	Tetrachloroet	hylene	2.3	:	

FORM I VOA

DATA VALIDATION COPY

IV-12

VOLATILE (	EPA SAMPLE NO.		
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.	c	Contract: N/A	AP03C2
Lab Code: N/A Ca	ase No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526
Matrix: (soil/water) W	WATER	Lab Sample ID	135526006
Sample wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31514
Level: (low/med) I	LOW	Date Received	04/29/05
% Moisture: not dec		Date Analyzed:	05/06/05
GC Column: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	or: 1.0
Soil Extract Volume:	(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	Volume:(uL)

CAS NO.	COMPOUND	CONCENT (ug/L o	RATIO	ON UN (Kg)	NITS: UG/L	Q	
127-18-4	-Tetrachloroethyl	ene			1.0	υ	u

FORM I VOA

OLM03.0

DATA VALIDATION

IV-13

1A VOLATILE ORGANICS ANALYSI	S DATA SHEET	• - •
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.	Contract: N/A	
Lab Code: N/A Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG No.: 135526	
Matrix: (soil/water) WATER	Lab Sample ID: 135526008	
Sample wt/vol: 5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID: 3I516	
Level: (low/med) LOW	Date Received: 04/29/05	
% Moisture: not dec	Date Analyzed: 05/06/05	
GC Column: DB-624 ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Factor: 1.0	
Soil Extract Volume:(uL)	Soil Aliquot Volume:(uI	5)

CAS	NO.	COMPOUND	(ug/L	or	ug/Kg)	UG/L	• •	Q	
127-	-18-4	-Tetrachloroethyle	ene				2.9		1



DATA VALIDATION COPY

IV-14

1A	F	PA SAMPLE NO.
VOLATILE ORGANICS ANALYS	IS DATA SHEET	
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.	Contract: N/A	AP24C2
Lab Code: N/A Case No.: N/A	SAS NO.: N/A SDG NO	.: 135526
Matrix: (soil/water) WATER	Lab Sample ID: 1	35526009
Sample wt/vol: 5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID: 3	1517
Level: (low/med) LOW	Date Received: 0	4/29/05
% Moisture: not dec	Date Analyzed: 0	5/06/05
GC Column: DB-624 ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Factor:	1.0
Soil Extract Volume:(uL)	Soil Aliquot Vol	ume:(uL)

CAS	AS NO. COMPOUND (ug/L or ug/Kg) UG/L				Q		
127-	-18-4	-Tetrachloroet	hylene	0.44	J	J	

FORM I VOA

DATA VALIDATION COPY

-

1A VOLATILE ORGANICS ANALYSIS DATA SHEET			EPA SAMPLE NO.
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.	c	Contract: N/A	AP26C2
Lab Code: N/A Ca	ase No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526
Matrix: (soil/water) W	WATER	Lab Sample ID:	135526007
Sample wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31515
Level: (low/med) I	LOW	Date Received:	04/29/05
% Moisture: not dec		Date Analyzed:	05/06/05
GC Column: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	r: 1.0
Soil Extract Volume:	(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	olume:(uL)

_	CAS NO.	COMPOUND	CONCENT (ug/L o	RATION U r ug/Kg)	NITS: UG/L		Q		
_	127-18-4	-Tetrachloroethyle	ene			3.3		=	

FORM I VOA

# DATA VALIDATION COPY

-

VOLATILE	EPA SAMPLE NO.		
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.		Contract: N/A	AP27C2
Lab Code: N/A	Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526
Matrix: (soil/water)	WATER	Lab Sample ID:	135526005
Sample wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31513
Level: (low/med)	LOW	Date Received:	04/29/05
% Moisture: not dec.		Date Analyzed:	05/06/05
GC Column: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	pr: 1.0
Soil Extract Volume:	(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	Olume:(uL)

CAS NO.	COMPOUND	CONCENTRATION UNITS: (ug/L or ug/Kg) UG/L Q			
127-18-4	Tetrachloroet	hylene	2.3		=





VOLATILE	EPA SAMPLE NO.		
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.		Contract: N/A	AP29C2
Lab Code: N/A	Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526
Matrix: (soil/water)	WATER	Lab Sample ID:	135526002
Sample wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31510
Level: (low/med)	LOW	Date Received:	04/29/05
% Moisture: not dec.		Date Analyzed:	05/06/05
GC Column: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	r: 1.0
Soil Extract Volume:	(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	olume:(uL)

CAS NO.	COMPOUND	CONCENT (ug/L o	RATIC r ug/	ON UNITS: /Kg) UG/L	-	Q	
127-18-4	-Tetrachloroethyle	ene			1.0	U	U



DATA VALIDATION COPY

-

•
	Science Applications intermedicate 151 Lafayette Drive, Oak Ridge,	An Employee-O al Corporation , Tennessee	arnel Compa 37831 (865	rry 5) 481-4600				Cŀ	IAI	р, мі	CLC OF	үе cu	ISTO	 יםכ	Y RE	9f E <b>co</b>	RD	2							D.:	PD0001	7
	PROJECT NAME: Hunt D.O.	er Army # . # 54	Airfield	LTM			1	35	5	26	270	, ,	REQL	JEST	ED P/	ARAM	ETE	RS	13.	55	52	7/	7	LABORATOR General Engi	Y N/	AME: ng Laboratory	
	PROJECT NUMBER: 01 PROJECT MANAGER:	1-1055-04- Patty Stol	-2945-20	00																				LABORATOR 2040 Savage	Y AI Roa	DDRESS:	
	ample Signature) (Printed Name)																					otties/ Vials:	PHONE NO:	(843	3) 556-8171		
	Sample ID Date Collected Time Collected Matrix					8	H	щ													0. of B	OVA SCREENING		OBSERVATIONS, CON	IMENTS,		
0	TH0307	9/20	105	080	0	water		>	•	Â			1.4			20				$\frac{1}{1}$		+	<u>z</u> 2	014	-	te Black	
QX	TB0413	9/20	105	080	0	water	x			19 20 20						1					92 - 44 193 - 94 195 - 94		2			Tria Bhal	F
al	AP2362	4/261	105	14	00	Water	X								1			1月1日	15/1				2				
03	AP0762	4/27	105	134	S	water	X						14					5- 代 幕 -	1				<b>2</b> :				
or	APO1C2	4/26/	20	153	5	water	Х			3.5		N		4 8	17 MA	協		1	*				2,				
.00	AP2962	4/26/	کھ	163	0	water				X						and the second		「大学				Í	2.				
W?	APORCA	4/261	<i>0</i> 5	172	0	water				X								A. A.	1			2	2:				
CH.	APO2C4	4/26	105	172	0	water				X		7				1		34			23		2				
05	AP27C2	4/27/	oS	084	σ	waar				Ŷ						6.5				2		_	2		$\square$	1.1	
ole	APO3CZ	4/27	05	09	15	water				X		4				No.			1 14				2				
0.7	APabla	41271	05	099	Û.	water		것것		X	1. A.										2		2				
18	APOSCA	4/27/	05	104	5	water		бir i		X			15										2				
05	AP25C2	4/27/	05	1200	2	water	X			\$. }		<u> </u>			4								2				
	RELINDUISHED BY:		Date	/Time	RECEN	VED BY	<b>D</b> 1	EX			Date	/Time	-1	ΓΟΤΑ		<b>MBER</b>	OF	CONT	AINE	RS:	ີ	6		Cooler Tempe	ratur	re: [ 4°C	
	Juno funda		412	0105							417	-No	<b>`</b>	Coole	r ID:	#	(1							FEDEX NUME	BER:		
	COMPANY NAME: () 1900 COMPANY NAME: RECEIVED BY: Date/Time RELINQUISHED BY:				E)	)Ei	Κ		191	$\mathcal{D}$					C	/						8431	21	38 1041			
								"	Date	/Time		C	~ ll	Ja	m	દે	Dens	dy		ut		865-6	১৩7	-8266 U	str		
	<u>И.60750</u> СОМРАНУ НАМЕ: 930												qu	y's	hà	s.	'										
													1*		-	-								:			
	RELINQUISHED BY:     Date/Time     RECEIVED BY:       COMPANY NAME:     COMPANY NAME:							1	Date	Time	,																
																				-							

IV-19

<u>`</u>\_`

	-	_	_		_		
	-						
	-						
_							
-		1-	444	-	An E	mplayee-Owned	l Con

Page 2 of 2

CHAIN OF CUSTODY RECORD

## сос NO.: PD00017

		151 Lafayette Drive, Oak Ridge	, Tennessee 37	831(865) 481-4600				Cl	HA	IN	OF (	CUS	<b>STO</b>	DY R	ECO	RD						COC NO	100001	,
		PROJECT NAME: Hunt D.O	ter Army Air # 54	rfield LTM			P	/3	55	52	6/3	RI	ÈQUI	ESTED P		ETERS		35.	52	77	3	LABORATORY N General Enginee	IAME: ring Laboratory	
		PROJECT NUMBER: 0 PROJECT MANAGER:	1-1055-04-2	945-200																		LABORATORY A 2040 Savage Roa	DDRESS:	-
			-																		/ials:	Chaneston, SC 2	29417	
		Sampler (Signature)		(Printed Nar	ne)	Dudy															Bottles/	PHONE NO: (84	43) 556-8171	
		Sample ID	Date Colle	cted Time C	ollected	Matrix	ĕ	g	AH	щ											0.0	OVA SCREENING	OBSERVATIONS, COMMENT SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS	rs.
	94	APOALZ	4/27/09	5 112	5	Under	X	2		P	6				1	107					<u>₹</u>			1:
		APOGCZ	4/27/0	5 129	0	where	X			36		2.4		3.5							2			-[.
		AP2462	4/27/0	5 161	5	wat	f^			X		3									2			-1;
	â	APO8CZ	4/27/0	05 (7)	50	water	X				3				1	うたい		1		12	2			٦.
e e No					/				-	-3 4	100	W		100		ALL ALL		G						
N							$\mathbb{D}$	1		1		1. A.							4					
-20	2									25	N. S.					大街					$\square$			
						K				N				弊	<b></b>	S.		4		_	$\downarrow$			
							1	÷.			$\mathbf{N}$		D	100					÷.	+	-			_
						14/	F										1			+	+			-
						1/0	Ø	Ž4	4										2	+	+			
							_	41 1	Ľ			K						8- C.	12	+	+		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_
					1					=			đ	198	1.5	1	T			a	+			
		RELINQUISHED BY:	5	Date/Time インタック	RECEI	FEDE	X			4	Date/			DTAL NU	MBER	OF CO	NTAIN	IERS	:	0	$\downarrow$	Cooler Temperati	Ire: 270	_
		COMPANY NAME:	$\theta$	1900	COMP	ANY NAME: FEDEX					190	D	C	ooler ID:	#	(1	)					8431 2	" 138  04	
		RECEIVED BY: M. Gothers		Date/Time	RELIN	QUISHED BY:					Date/	lime .		-	3'	1 +	ota		San	yle	v	Bottles		
		COMPANY NAME:	·	920	COMP	ANY NAME:																		
		RELINQUISHED BY:		Date/Time	RECE	VED BY:					Date/1	Time												
		COMPANY NAME:			COMP	ANY NAME:		-																

•

## EIGHT SEMIANNUAL BENZENE PLUME SAMPLING

**APRIL 2005** 

## THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

				• - •
VOLATILE	1A CORGANICS ANALYSI	S DATA SHEET	EPA SAMPLE NO.	
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.		Contract: N/A	AP01C2	
Lab Code: N/A	Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526-1	
Matrix: (soil/water)	WATER	Lab Sample ID:	135527004	
Sample wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31536	
Level: (low/med)	LOW	Date Received:	04/29/05	
<pre>% Moisture: not dec.</pre>		Date Analyzed:	05/07/05	
GC Column: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	or: 1.0	
Soil Extract Volume:	(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	olume:(u	L)



DATA VALIDATION COPY

FORM I VOA

OLM03.0

VOLATILE	1A ORGANICS ANALYSI	S DATA SHEET	EPA SAMPLE NO.
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.		Contract: N/A	AP06C2
Lab Code: N/A	Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526-1
Matrix: (soil/water)	WATER	Lab Sample ID:	135527007
Sample wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31539
Level: (low/med)	LOW	Date Received:	04/29/05
* Moisture: not dec.		Date Analyzed:	05/07/05
GC Column: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	r: 1.0
Soil Extract Volume:_	(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	olume:(uL)

CAS NO.

COMPOUND

CONCENTRATION UNITS: (ug/L or ug/Kg) UG/L Q

71-43-2Benzene 108-88-3Toluene 100-41-4Ethylbenzene 1330-20-7Xylenes (total)	4.1 1.0 1.0	บ บ บ	= 4
---	-------------------	-------------	-----

DATA VALIDATION COPY

-

FORM I VOA

OLM03.0

VOLATILE	1A ORGANICS ANALYSI	S DATA SHEET	EPA SAMPLE NO.
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.		Contract: N/A	AP07C2
Lab Code: N/A	Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526-1
Matrix: (soil/water)	WATER	Lab Sample ID:	135527003
Sample wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31535
Level: (low/med)	LOW	Date Received:	04/29/05
% Moisture: not dec.		Date Analyzed:	05/07/05
GC Column: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	pr: 1.0
Soil Extract Volume:	(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	'olume:(uL)

 

 CAS NO.
 COMPOUND
 CONCENTRATION UNITS: (ug/L or ug/Kg) UG/L
 Q

 71-43-2-----Benzene\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 1.0 U
 U

 108-88-3-----Toluene\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 1.0 U
 U

 100-41-4-----Ethylbenzene\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 1.0 U
 U

 1330-20-7-----Xylenes (total)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 1.0 U
 U

FORM I VOA

OLM03.0



VOLATILE	1A ORGANICS ANALYSI	S DATA SHEET	EPA SAMPLE NO.
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.		Contract: N/A	AP08C2
Lab Code: N/A	Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526-1
Matrix: (soil/water)	WATER	Lab Sample ID:	135527008
Sample wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31540
Level: (low/med)	LOW	Date Received:	04/29/05
<pre>% Moisture: not dec.</pre>		Date Analyzed:	05/07/05
GC Column: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	r: 1.0
Soil Extract Volume:_	(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	olume:(uL)

CAS NO.	COMPOUND	CONCENTRATIC (ug/L or ug/	ON UNITS: /Kg) UG/L	Q	
71-43-2 108-88-3 100-41-4 1330-20-7	Benzene Toluene Ethylbenzene_ Xylenes (tota	1)	1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0	U U U U	u

FORM I VOA

DATA VALIDATION COPY

VOLATILE	1A ORGANICS ANALYSI	IS DATA SHEET	EPA SAMPLE NO.
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.		Contract: N/A	AP23C2
Lab Code: N/A	Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526-1
Matrix: (soil/water)	WATER	Lab Sample ID:	135527002
Sample wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31534
Level: (low/med)	LOW	Date Received:	04/29/05
% Moisture: not dec.		Date Analyzed:	05/07/05
GC Column: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	r: 1.0
Soil Extract Volume:	(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	olume:(uL)

FORM I VOA

OLM03.0

DATA VALIDATION COPY

VOLATTLE	1A ORGANICS ANALYSI	S DATA SHEET	EPA SAMPLE NO.
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.	CROMPLES MUDIC	Contract: N/A	AP25C2
Lab Code: N/A	Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG	No.: 135526-1
Matrix: (soil/water)	WATER	Lab Sample ID:	135527005
Sample wt/vol:	5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID:	31537
Level: (low/med)	LOW	Date Received:	04/29/05
% Moisture: not dec.		Date Analyzed:	05/07/05
GC Column: DB-624	ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Facto	or: 1.0
Soil Extract Volume:_	(uL)	Soil Aliquot V	'olume:(uL)

CAS NO.	COMPOUND	CONCENTRATION (ug/L or ug/Kg	UNITS: ) UG/L	Q	
71-43-2 108-88-3 100-41-4 1330-20-7	Benzene Toluene Ethylbenzene_ Xylenes (tota	.1)	2.7 1.0 1.0 1.0	0 0 0	



OLM03.0

DATA VALIDATION COPY

1A VOLATILE ORGANICS ANALYS	EPA SAMPLE NO.	
Lab Name: GEL, LLC.	Contract: N/A	
Lab Code: N/A Case No.: N/A	SAS No.: N/A SDG No.: 135526-1	
Matrix: (soil/water) WATER	Lab Sample ID: 135527006	
Sample wt/vol: 5.000 (g/ml) ML	Lab File ID: 31538	
Level: (low/med) LOW	Date Received: 04/29/05	
% Moisture: not dec	Date Analyzed: 05/07/05	
GC Column: DB-624 ID: 0.25 (mm)	Dilution Factor: 1.0	
Soil Extract Volume:(uL)	Soil Aliquot Volume:(uI	7)

CAS NO.	COMPOUND	CONCENTRATIO	ON UNITS: /Kg) UG/L	Q	
71-43-2 108-88-3 100-41-4 1330-20-7	-Benzene -Toluene -Ethylbenzene -Xylenes (total)_				

FORM I VOA

OLM03.0



	SAIL.	An Employes-Own al Corporation	ed Company		4 			Ŧ	٥ د	rg	e		[	0f		2						PN	71000	
	151 Lafayette Drive, Oak Ridge,	, Tennessee 37	7831(865) 481-	1600			CH	IAI	NC	OF C	US	IOT	DYR	ECC	DRI	)					000 110.	10		
	PROJECT NAME: Hunter Army Airfield LTM D.O. # 54						35	5	26	20	RE		STED	PARA	METE	RS	35	52	27	2	LABORATORY General Engine	NAME: ering Labo	oratory	
	PROJECT NUMBER: 01-1055-04-2945-200																				LABORATORY	ADDRES	S:	$\neg$
	PROJECT MANAGER: Patty Stoll																			/ials:	2040 Savage Ro Charleston, SC	oad 29417		
	Sampler (Signature)		(Printed	Name)		1												-		se	PHONE NO: (8	43) 556-8	171	_
	/ and		Jame:	s Durd	9															Bott				
	Sample ID	Date Colle	cted Tim	e Collected	Matrix	JEX	ğ	AH	ы											0.0	OVA SCREENING	OBSERV	ATIONS, COMMEN	TS, S
	TH0307	9/261	050	800	webs				x					2		1111				2	n/4	tro	Black	$\neg$
X	TB0413	6126	0< 0	NO NO	water	X												3	2	12		Tr	Bhat	
1	AP2362	4/26/0	5	1400	water	X							1			1.2.5	19月1日 19月1日 1月11日			2				
z	APOTCZ	4/27/	a5 [.	345	water	X							L.A.		S	5-12 17	1			2:				
R	APO162	4/26/0	5 19	535	water	X	-		15	1			1.4		4			est. Fil		2.				
ø	AP2962	41266	5 10	30	mader				X		i. T				1.2 T	19CH			2	2.				
3	APORCA	4/26/0	5 1	70	water				X				1. C. C.			1. H.	11		1	2				
Į.	APO2C4	4/26/	05 1	720	water				X	1			17.1	1.1	1. A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A	5	1	2	4	2				
5	AP27C2	4/27/0	s o	840	waar				Â									9	2	2:				
k	APO3C2	4/27/	05 0	115	water			100	X	1.2	ý C									2				
3	APabca	412710	5 0	950	water				X	Â.			100					2		2				
8	APOSCA	4/27/0	05 1	045	water		1		X					\$1		新				2				
5	AP25C2	4/27/0	5 12	600	water	X					2				ę.					2			1	
	RELINDUISHED BY: Date/Time RECEIVED BY:					.D1	EX			ate/Ti	ime	то	TAL N	UMBE	ROF	CONT	FAINER	S:	K	)	Cooler Tempera	ture: Z	4°C	_
	fins finder 4/20/05					-				11-10	103	Co	oler ID	#	F	1					FEDEX NUMBE	R:	1 // 1	
	COMPANY NAME: () 1900 COMPANY NAME				ANY NAME:	ÊÌ	)Ei	×	(	190	)				<u> </u>	C					8431 2138 1041		1041	
	RECEIVED BY: Date/Time RELINQUISHED				QUISHED BY:					ate/Ti	me		cnll	J	m	18	Dend	7	ú	ł	862-60	51-61	-66 Wd	2
	160There 4/24/05													9	vé	stin	5.							
	COMPANY NAME: COMPANY NAME:													'										
	RELINQUISHED BY:		Date/Tim	e RECEI	VED BY:				D	ate/Ti	me													
	COMPANY NAME:			COMP	ANY NAME:																			

15	51 Lafayette Drive, Oak Ridge,	Tennessee 3	7831(865)	481-4600				Cl	HA	IN	OF	CL	JST	OD	YR	ECO	DRI	D								IΨ	~0	/
P	ROJECT NAME: Hunte D.O.	er Army A # 54	irfield L	тм			Ľ	<u>'3</u>	55	52	6/	8	REQ	UES	TEDP		MET	ERS	1.	35	55	27	7 <i>7</i>	-	LABORATORY N General Engineer	IAME: ing Lab	oratory	
P	PROJECT NUMBER: 01-1055-04-2945-200 PROJECT MANAGER: Patty Stoll																					Male:	1013.	LABORATORY A 2040 Savage Roa Charleston, SC 2	DDRES ad 9417	S:		
Si	Sampler (Signature) (Printed Name)					1-1	1																V and Ha		PHONE NO: (84	3) 556-	3171	
Þ	Sample ID	Date Colle		Time Co	llected	Matrix	IEX I	ğ	AH	CE															OVA SCREENING	OBSER	ATIONS, COMM	MENTS, ONS
17	APOALZ	4/27/0	S	[12!	õ	Water	X			P.			· 5		14	No.					1		2					
A	P0662	4/27/	•5	125	0	water	Х	i.		9/1		3	20 12		1.00	1.44				A	ŝ		2	-				
Δ	Pauca	4/27/0	05	1615		water				X				9 2			に収取				10.00		2	-				
Ł	420804	4/27/	05	(75	0	water	X								繱	14							2	-				
Þ										14			4	ž.	10.5						14		_	$\downarrow$				
L		<hr/>		-			$\mathcal{P}$			43					32		÷			1997 1994			_	+				
L			$\rightarrow \downarrow$	+													· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			2. S.	14-25 Mar	112 112		+				
$\vdash$					$\checkmark$	$\overline{\mathbf{O}}$	$\vdash$		-		R		$ \downarrow$		操	影				2	- 2		+	+				
┝				$\rightarrow$		710	F	E	-	1	$\square$		-						_		2 2 2 2		+	+				
┝				$\in$		1/2	2	7			V		*	Ł		10					1.5		+	$^{+}$				
┝							2	f	5				>	Z						4		1	+	$\dagger$				
										1			÷			1	1						+	T				
R	RELINQUISHED BY:	/	Date/	Ţime	RECEN	VED BY:	·	L		Ť	Date	e/Tim	е	TOT	AL NU	MBE	ROF	CON	ITA	NER	S:		8	$\overline{+}$	Cooler Temperatu	ire: [	-40	
L	Gar Jun	$\Delta$	4/28	105		FEDE	<u>K</u>			4	4/28/05 00				Cooler ID: 4									FEDEX NUMBER:				
c	COMPANY NAME:		19	Ó	COMP	EDEX		-			91	DD				1	#(	1							84312	138	1041	
R	RECEIVED BY:		Date/	Time	RELING	QUISHED BY:					Date	e/Tim	e			2	34	Ŧ	ołz	rl	S	am	ple	/	Bottles			
c	COMPANY NAME:		9.3	05	COMP	ANY NAME:	- ,																				:	
R	RELINQUISHED BY:		Date/	Time	RECEN	VED BY:					Date	e/Tim	e															

ג ג.

## THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.