Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.

101 Colin Drive, Suite 1
Holbrook, NY 11741-4332
631.472.4000
Fax 631.472.4077

Shaw The Shaw Group Inc.™

March 13, 2007

Girish Desai
NYS Department on Environmental Conservation
50 Circle Road
Stony Brook, NY 11790-3409

Subject: **Addendum #1 – Final Remedial Action Report**
Former Watchcase Factory Site
Site ID #152139

Dear Mr. Desai:

Please consider this correspondence as Addendum #1 for the Final Remedial Action Report (FRAR) dated October 16, 2006. The purpose of this addendum is to address the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation's (NYSDEC's) comment letters dated November 20, 2006 and February 16, 2007, and to provide additional data that has since been collected since submittal of the FRAR.

NYSDEC Comment #1 – Page 2, last paragraph: The statement, "Based on the results of the soil gas investigation and the SVIs, there are no issues relating to offsite vapor intrusion" is untrue as of today's date and must be revised.

SVI sampling activities for Residence #2 were completed on December 7 and 8, 2006. Results of the SVI sampling activities for Residence #2 are attached to this correspondence and are summarized below.

In order to properly reflect those results, the following changes/additions to the FRAR are as follows:

Section 1.0, last paragraph is rewritten to read as follows:

"The offsite soil gas investigation, which commenced in October 2005 and was completed in December 2006, included the delineation of soil gas at locations surrounding the Site, as well as the completion of soil vapor intrusion (SVI) studies at six (6) adjacent offsite structures. Based on the results of the soil gas investigation and the SVIs, there are no issues relating to offsite vapor intrusion. Thus, no offsite remediation is necessary at this time."

Section 2.3.3, insert new paragraph between 3rd and 4th paragraph:

"For Residence #2, a total of three (3) samples were collected, including a basement indoor air sample, and indoor air sample collected from the main floor and an outdoor air sample. No slab was present in the basement (i.e. dirt floor); therefore, sub-slab sampling was not applicable for this structure. The sampling activities were completed by CA Rich Environmental Specialists of

Plainview, New York in accordance with the methodology described in the NYSDEC-approved January 9, 2006 Soil Vapor Study scope of work. Laboratory analysis of the samples were all either non-detect or fell under No Further Action (NFA) when compared to Matrix #1 for TCE and Matrix #2 for PCE and TCA."

Section 3.5.2, paragraphs 3 and 4 is rewritten to read as follows:

"To address concerns that any migrating soil gas may pose a health concern to the occupants of the offsite structures located to the southwest, precautionary SVI sampling activities were proposed at Residences #2 and #3 and Business #4. After access was granted for Residence #2 and Business #4, the structures were sampled as per the NYSDEC-approved January 9, 2006 work plan. Analytical results confirmed that there are no issues associated with vapor intrusion at these offsite structures.

The owner of Residence #3 declined to grant access for the sampling. However, based on the sampling results at Residence #2 and Business #4, vapor intrusion does not appear to be an issue at Residence #3. In addition, the analysis of soil gas samples SGP-42 through 45 determined that there are no elevated levels of soil gas near the structures to the south and west of Residence #2."

Section 3.7, insertion of new bullet at end of list:

- "Residence #2 Soil Vapor Intrusion Analytical Report (Appendix L)."

The laboratory analytical report for Residence #2 is enclosed with this addendum and should be included in the FRAR as Appendix L.

A revised Data Usability Summary Report (Appendix K), which has been revised to include the analytical data from Residence #2, is enclosed with this addendum.

Section 4.0, paragraph 6 is rewritten to read as follows:

"From October 2005 to December 2006, an investigation to determine the extent of potential soil gas migration was completed. Based on the analytical results from 14 sampling points that surround the Site in all directions, it was determined that the extent of any offsite soil gas migration is limited. Further, soil vapor intrusion investigations at six (6) adjacent offsite structures, including both commercial and residential structures, confirmed that vapor intrusion is not a concern."

Revised Table 7C and Figure 4, which have been revised to include the results for Residence #2, are enclosed with this addendum.

NYSDEC Comment #2 – Page 13: the report states that the reduction in TCE concentrations in MW-11R indicates "that a residual source of TCE no longer exists." This condition might be implied by the data, but only long-term monitoring of the site can verify it.

Long-term monitoring of monitoring well MW-11R will be included as part of the Site Management Plan.

NYSDEC Comment #3 – Page 17 and 19: The reports use of the adjective "marginal" to describe downgradient groundwater impacts is gratuitous, and should be deleted. Also, the paragraph should be updated to include the recently completed SCDHS private well survey, which confirmed that no private wells could be identified.

The second paragraph of Section 3.6 is rewritten to read as follows:

"Although some groundwater impacts were identified downgradient of the Site, a well survey previously completed determined that there are no public or private potable wells located downgradient of the Site. In October 2006, the Suffolk County Department of Health Services (SCDHS) conducted another private well survey in the area surrounding the Site, and confirmed that there are no private wells located downgradient of the Site. Additionally, the Village of Sag Harbor has passed an ordinance prohibiting the installation of new private wells. Accordingly, the groundwater impacts identified downgradient of the Site do not pose a public health or environmental concern."

The last paragraph of Section 4.0 is rewritten to read as follows:

"In September 2006, an offsite groundwater investigation identified only limited groundwater impacts above the NYSDEC Class GA groundwater standards. However, a previous well survey determined that there are no public or private wells located downgradient of the Site. In October 2006, the SCDHS conducted another private well survey in the area surrounding the Site (Appendix M), and confirmed that there are no private wells located downgradient of the Site. Additionally, the Village of Sag Harbor has passed an ordinance prohibiting the installation of new private wells. Accordingly, the groundwater impacts identified downgradient of the Site do not pose a public health or environmental concern."

The SCDHS memorandum report dated December 12, 2006, is enclosed with this addendum and should be included in the FRAR as Appendix M.

NYSDEC Comment #4 – Page 18: The report states that remediation at the Site has been completed because "there are no other cost-effective actions available to achieve further, marginal reductions in VOC concentrations in any of the environmental media" is not substantiated in the report, which provides no analysis of the feasibility and costs of such treatment options such as permanganate injections. An analysis of benefits and costs (including the potential creation of vinyl chloride as a breakdown product) should be included.

An analysis of remedial technologies is presented below:

Technology	Pro	Con	Applicable For Site	Estimated Cost
AS/SVE	• Proven technology • Effective on all types of VOCs	• Previously used at Site, reached maximum effectiveness	No	NA
Permanganate	• Easy to distribute in subsurface	• Not effective on chlorinated ethanes	No	NA

Excavation	• Effective for soil impacts	• Minimal remedial impact on groundwater • Existing building to remain	No	NA
Pump & Treat (P&T)	• Proven technology	• Long time frame	Yes	$500k
Hydrogen Releasing Compound (HRC)	• Easy to distribute in subsurface	• Slow reaction • Possible incomplete degradation resulting in the creation of vinyl chloride (VC). Could be addressed by the addition of oxygen into the aquifer to facilitate VC biodegradation or by additional chemical oxidation.	Yes	$200k ($290k, if oxygen addition is required)
Persulfate	• Easy to distribute in subsurface	• High soil oxidant demand can impede reaction • Possible creation of vinyl chloride due to incomplete contaminant destruction	Yes	$650k
Thermal SVE (Electrical Resistance Heating (ERH))	• Effective in saturated zone • Effective on all types of VOCs	• Difficult to implement with existing building to remain • Requires continual operation of a SVE system	Yes	$600k
Fenton's Reagent	• Relatively quick reaction	• High soil oxidant demand can impede reaction • Fast CO_2 generation • Possible creation of vinyl chloride due to incomplete contaminant destruction	Yes	$500k

As summarized above, any technology selected to achieve further reductions in groundwater would cost between $200,000 and $650,000 to implement. Further, there are uncertainties associated with several of those technologies (e.g., due to high soil oxidant demand), while others have the potential to create vinyl chloride.

In addition, even if further reductions were to occur, Henry's Law demonstrates that the groundwater could continue to act as a source of soil gas even with groundwater VOC impacts at or below the NYSDEC Class GA standards. Thus, no real advantages would be achieved by implementing any of these cost-ineffective technologies.

These factors demonstrate that there are no cost-effective options to further reduce the remaining groundwater impacts at the Site, and support the conclusion that the remediation at the Site has been completed.

NYSDEC Comment #5: It is recommended that the report acknowledge in Section 4.0 that elevated levels of site-related VOCs are present in on-site soil gas and will be properly managed through a Site Management Plan (SMP) and an Operation, Maintenance & Monitoring (OM&M) plan to protect future occupants of the site.

The following sentence is added at the end of the fifth (5th) paragraph of Section 4.0:

"Elevated levels of Site-related VOCs are present in on-site soil gas and will be properly managed through a Site Management Plan (SMP) and an Operation, Maintenance & Monitoring (OM&M) plan to protect future occupants of the Site."

If you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact me at (631) 472-4000 x234.

Sincerely,

Erik Gustafson
Project Manager

Attachments:

Revised List of Appendices (Page iii)
Revised Table 7C
Revised Figure 4
Revised Data Usability Summary Report (Appendix K)
Residence #2 Soil Vapor Intrusion Analytical Report (Appendix L)
SCDHS Memorandum dated December 12, 2006 (Appendix M)

cc: P. Scully – NYSDEC
C. Vasudevan – NYSDEC
W. Parish – NYSDEC
R. Rusinko, Esq. – NSYDEC, DEE
D. Miles – NYSDOH
S. McLelland – NYSDOH
K. Gomez – NYSDEC
H. Cirrito – NYSDEC
R. Paulsen – SCDHS
A. Juchatz – SCDEE
R. Weber – Bulova
M. Bernstein, Esq. – VNF
M. Chertok, Esq. – SPR
N. Epler – Roux
Shaw File, Holbrook, NY

APPENDICIES

TABLE 7C
SOIL VAPOR INTRUSION (SVI) ANALYTICAL DATA SUMMARY - VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS

Bulova Watchcase Factory
15 Church Street
Sag Harbor, NY

RESIDENT #1

COMPOUND	1st Floor Indoor Air 3/28-29/06	Crawl Space / Basement 3/28-29/06	Sub-Slab 3/28-29/06	Outdoor Air 3/28-29/06
Trichloroethene	0.027	ND (<0.027)	0.2	ND (<0.024)
Tetrachloroethene	0.45	ND (<0.23)	1.8	ND (<0.21)
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.45	0.25	0.42	ND (<0.16)

RESIDENCE #2

COMPOUND	1st Floor Indoor Air 12/7-8/06	Basement Indoor Air 12/7-8/06	Outdoor Air 12/7-8/06
Trichloroethene	0.063	0.085	0.057
Tetrachloroethene	ND (<0.21)	ND (<0.18)	0.23
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND (<0.17)	ND (<0.15)	ND (<0.13)

BUSINESS #1

COMPOUND	1st Floor Indoor Air 06/29/06	Basement Indoor Air 06/29/06	Outdoor Air 06/29/06
Trichloroethene	0.11	0.044	ND (<0.046)
Tetrachloroethene	ND (<0.31)	ND (<0.22)	ND (<0.39)
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND (<0.25)	ND (<0.18)	ND (<0.31)

BUSINESS #2

COMPOUND	1st Floor Indoor Air 03/28/06	Sub-Slab 03/28/06	Outdoor Air 03/28/06
Trichloroethene	0.026	0.056	ND (<0.026)
Tetrachloroethene	ND (<0.22)	0.62	ND (<0.22)
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND (<0.18)	ND (<0.17)	ND (<0.18)

BUSINESS #4

COMPOUND	1st Floor Indoor Air 03/28/06	Crawl Space 03/28/06	Outdoor Air 03/28/06
Trichloroethene	0.036	0.032	0.12
Tetrachloroethene	ND (<0.21)	ND (<0.21)	0.38
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND (<0.17)	ND (<0.17)	ND (<0.18)

BUSINESS #5

COMPOUND	1st Floor Indoor Air 06/29/06	Basement Indoor Air 06/29/06	Sub-Slab 06/29/06	Outdoor Air 06/29/06
Trichloroethene	0.031	0.033	0.11	ND (<0.029)
Tetrachloroethene	0.31	0.62	0.92	ND (<0.24)
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND (<0.19)	ND (<0.15)	0.76	ND (<0.20)

Notes:
Concentrations are reported in units of ug/m^3.
ND = Not Detected (reporting limit)

X-REF	OFFICE	DRAWN BY
---	Holbrook	D. Downing 1/8/07

PM	Appvd. By	DRAWING NUMBER
E. Gustafson	E. Gustafson	SG results 1.8.07

JOB No.
837053

LEGEND

- MONITORING WELL
- SOIL GAS POINT
- PROPERTY LINE
- CHAIN LINK FENCE
- IRON FENCE
- R — RESIDENCE
- B — BUSINESS
- P — PARKING

RESULTS IN ug/m3

- ND — NON-DETECT
- BSMT — BASEMENT
- OA — OUTDOOR AIR
- IA — INDOOR AIR
- SS — SUB-SLAB
- CS — CRAWL SPACE

SGP – 45	4'	8'
TCE	0.18	0.24
PCE	0.71	0.75
TCA	0.59	0.29

SGP – 44	4'	8'
TCE	0.13	0.18
PCE	0.62	0.57
TCA	0.65	0.46

SGP – 34	4'	8'
TCE	66	130
PCE	0.22	0.31
TCA	3.3	5.6

RESIDENCE #2	IA	BSMT	OA
TCE	0.063	0.085	0.057
PCE	ND	ND	0.23
TCA	ND	ND	ND

SGP – 32	4'	8'
TCE	ND	12
PCE	ND	ND
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 38	4'	8'
TCE	0.085	0.082
PCE	ND	0.31
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 25	4'	8'
TCE	13	27
PCE	82	95
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 31	4'	8'
TCE	0.34	1.5
PCE	0.47	0.25
TCA	0.23	0.28

SGP – 41	4'	8'
TCE	0.35	0.46
PCE	20	32
TCA	2.8	8.6

SGP – 19	4'	8'
TCE	59	130
PCE	87	82
TCA	15	17

BUSINESS #5	IA	BSMT	SS	OA
TCE	0.031	0.033	0.11	ND
PCE	0.31	0.62	0.92	ND
TCA	ND	ND	0.76	ND

SGP – 43	4'	8'
TCE	0.14	0.15
PCE	0.52	0.51
TCA	3.4	3.6

SGP – 42	4'	8'
TCE	0.19	0.22
PCE	0.74	0.69
TCA	0.80	0.78

BUSINESS #4	IA	CS	OA
TCE	0.036	0.032	0.12
PCE	ND	ND	0.38
TCA	ND	ND	ND

SGP – 33	4'	8'
TCE	250	300
PCE	ND	ND
TCA	4.1	4.6

SGP – 27	4'	8'
TCE	1100	980
PCE	25	27
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 26	4'	8'
TCE	390	400
PCE	19	18
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 28	4'	8'
TCE	4400	1200
PCE	ND	42
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 24	4'	8'
TCE	13000	8100
PCE	ND	50
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 18	4'	8'
TCE	ND	18
PCE	79	87
TCA	ND	ND

BUSINESS #1	IA	BSMT	OA
TCE	0.11	0.044	ND
PCE	ND	ND	ND
TCA	ND	ND	ND

SGP – 30	4'	8'
TCE	ND	6.6
PCE	15	10
TCA	ND	12

SGP – 20	4'	8'
TCE	11	32
PCE	64	99
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 35	4'	8'
TCE	0.099	0.16
PCE	ND	0.35
TCA	ND	0.17

SGP – 29	4'	8'
TCE	110	82
PCE	40	51
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 23	4'	8'
TCE	ND	120
PCE	ND	58
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 36	4'	8'
TCE	260	240
PCE	58	34
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 37	4'	8'
TCE	ND	14
PCE	ND	8.3
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 22	4'	8'
TCE	ND	9.1
PCE	63	78
TCA	ND	ND

SGP – 21	4'	8'
TCE	0.072	0.17
PCE	2.0	2.6
TCA	0.17	0.20

BUSINESS #2	IA	SS	OA
TCE	0.026	0.056	ND
PCE	ND	0.62	ND
TCA	ND	ND	ND

SGP – 40	8'
TCE	0.12
PCE	1.1
TCA	0.52

RESIDENCE #1	IA	BSMT	SS	OA
TCE	0.027	ND	0.20	ND
PCE	0.45	ND	1.8	ND
TCA	0.45	0.25	0.42	ND

SGP – 39	8'
TCE	0.31
PCE	0.27
TCA	ND

MADISON STREET · CHURCH STREET · SAGE STREET · UNION STREET · DIVISION STREET · WASHINGTON STREET · BURKE STREET · CONCRETE RETAINING WALL · CONCRETE CURB · CONC. WALK · CONCRETE · CONCRETE WALL · FORMER INCINERATOR · FORMER COAL BIN · FORMER HOUSE · TELEPHONE POLE DIVIDER · FURNACE AREA · CHIMNEY · EQUIPMENT ROOM · INTERIOR COURTYARD · BITUMINOUS PAVEMENT · MW-1 · MW-2 · MW-3 · MW-9R · MW-11R · MW-12R · MW-13 · MW-14 (DESTROYED) · MW-15 · MW-16 · MW-17 (DESTROYED) · MW-22 · SGP-1 · SGP-2 · SGP-3 · SGP-4 · SGP-5 · SGP-6 · SGP-7 · SGP-8 · SGP-9 · SGP-10 · SGP-11 · SGP-12 · SGP-13 · SGP-14 · SGP-15 · B1 · B2 · B4 · B5 · R1 · R2 · R3

SCALE
0 50 100 FEET

SOURCE: YOUNG & YOUNG
400 OSTRANDER AVENUE, RIVERHEAD, N.Y.
DATE: APRIL 4, 1994

Shaw™
Shaw E & I, Inc.
101-1 COLIN DRIVE
HOLBROOK, N.Y. 11741
(516) 472-4000

FIGURE 4
SOIL GAS & SOIL VAPOR INTRUSION (SVI) RESULTS

FORMER WATCH CASE FACTORY
15 CHURCH STREET
SAG HARBOR, NEW YORK

APPENDIX K

Data Usability Summary Report

BULOVA SAG HARBOR
DATA USEABILITY SUMMARY REPORT (DUSR)
FOR VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS (EPA0LM04.2) and
TOXIC ORGANIC COMPOUNDS IN AMBIENT AIR (Modified TO-15 SIM)
SAMPLES COLLECTED AND ANALYZED IN
MARCH /JUNE/JULY/SEPTEMBER/DECEMBER/ 2006
Report Prepared by
Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure
September 2006 / February 2007

The DUSR addresses the following questions:

1. Is the data package complete as defined under the requirements for the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Analytical Services Protocol (ASP) Category B or USEPA CLP deliverable?
   All standard data deliverable requirements were met. It should be noted that no instrument performance checks or initial calibration information were provided for the modified TO-15 data since no raw data were included in the packages. This is not an issue since continuing calibration data were provided which exhibited acceptable recoveries.

2. Have all holding times been met?
   Yes, all holding times were met for all samples.

3. Do all the QC data fall within the protocol required limits and specifications?
   All associated QC data were acceptable with the exception that common laboratory contaminant(s) were detected in the method and/or trip blanks and low surrogate recoveries were experienced for the laboratory control samples associated with the volatile organic compounds (VOCs). These are discussed in the detail in the following evaluation.

4. Have all of the data been generated using established and agreed upon analytical protocols? Yes

5. Does an evaluation of the raw data confirm the results provided in the data summary sheets and quality control verification forms?
   Yes for VOC; not applicable for TO-15 GC/MS SIM results since no raw data were provided in the data deliverables.

6. Have the correct data qualifiers been used? Yes

This evaluation applies to data packages from Chemtech Laboratory and Air Toxics Ltd. containing results from analyses of water and air samples collected for the Bulova Sag Harbor project for TCL VOC and AIR TO-15 GC/MS SIM. The package identifiers that will be used throughout this report are Sample Delivery Group (SDG) numbers X4423 (waters) and air 0603660, 0603659, 0603661, 0607026, 0607027,

0607388, and 0612217. The QC parameters that were evaluated were System Monitoring Compound Recoveries, Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) Recoveries, Laboratory Control Standard (LCS) Recoveries, Method Blanks and Trip Blanks, GC/MS Mass Calibration and Ion Abundance Pattern, Initial and Continuing Calibrations, Stability of Internal Standard Response and Retention Times, Field Duplicates and Laboratory Replicates, Dilution and/or Reanalysis of Samples, Matrix Spikes, and Matrix Spike Duplicates.

System Monitoring Compound Recoveries - VOCs

Chemtech's system monitoring compound recovery limits are slightly broader than those required by the ASP Exhibit E, Part IX, Table 6 for 4-bromofluorobenzene. The other two monitoring compounds have the same limits. The lab has used 86-115% for 4-bromofluorobenzene, and the ASP limits are 86-110%. The limits in Table 6 were used to evaluate this data. They are 88-110% for toluene-d8, 86-110% for 4-bromofluorobenzene, and 76-114% for 1,2-dichloroethane-d4. All surrogates were within the ASP QC limits with the exceptions noted below

System Monitoring Compound Recoveries - VOCs

WATER X4423

VOC Surrogate Recoveries Exceeding ASP Acceptance Criteria

Sample ID	Dichloroethane-d4	Toluene-d8	4-Bromofluorobenzene
VLCS01	42	40	40
VLCS02	39	37	38

It should be noted that LCS recoveries for all target compounds were within QC limits. Low LCS surrogate recoveries have no effect on the usability of sample results since all sample results exhibited acceptable recoveries.

System Monitoring Compound Recoveries – AIR - Method TO-15 GC/MS SIM

AIR WO#0603660 - All ASP requirements were met. No data were qualified.
AIR WO#0603659 - All ASP requirements were met. No data were qualified.
AIR WO#0603661 - All ASP requirements were met. No data were qualified.
AIR WO#0607026 - All ASP requirements were met. No data were qualified.
AIR WO#0607027 - All ASP requirements were met. No data were qualified.
AIR WO#0607388 - All ASP requirements were met. No data were qualified.
AIR WO#0612217 – All ASP requirements were met. No data were qualified.

Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) Recoveries

No associated samples were used/reported for the MS/MSD analyses. No action was required.

Laboratory Control Standard (LCS) Recoveries
Chemtech has spiked all VOC LCS samples with a full target analyte list but used the abbreviated list for LCS QC Summary. No action was required.

Air Toxics LTD has reported trichloroethene, tetrachloroethene, and 1,1,1-trichloroethane as compounds of concern (COC) for 'Method TO-15" and all LCS recoveries were met.

Method Blanks
WATERS X4423
VOC method blanks reported non-detect, at less than the MDL, for all target analytes except for acetone in VBLK01 and VBLK02 and 2-butanone in VBLK02. Acetone was detected at 6.6J µg/L and 11 ug/L for both blanks and 2-butanone was detected at 3.1J µg/L in VBLK02. Acetone and 2-butanone are common lab contaminants so the blank action level is set at ten times the blank level. All samples with detected acetone results were below the reporting limit and less than 10X method blank amounts and should be blank qualified (U) and considered to be non-detect. Affected samples are as follows: BSH-GP-3(46-48), BSH-GP-3(26-28), BSH-GP-3(16-18), BSH-GP-3(7-9), BSH-GP-2 (50-52), BSH-GP-2(11-13), and BSH-GP-1(18-20). 2-Butanone was not detected in any VLK02 associated samples so no action was required.

Trip blank reported non-detect, at less than the MDL, for all target analytes except for acetone at 11 µg/L. All samples with detected acetone results were detected below the reporting limit and less than 10X the trip blank contamination for associated samples: BSH-GP-3(46-48), BSH-GP-3(26-28), BSH-GP-3(16-18), BSH-GP-3(7-9), BSH-GP-2 (50-52), BSH-GP-2(11-13), and BSH-GP-1 (18-20) and results were blank qualified.

AIR – METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM
Method blanks reported non-detect, at less than the MDL, for all compounds of concern. No action was required.

GC/MS Instrument Tune (GC/MS Mass Calibration and Ion Abundance Pattern)
WATERS
The VOC relative ion abundances for bromofluorobenzene (BFB) were all within acceptance criteria for the project samples and associated laboratory QC samples.

AIR – METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM
No Instrument Performance Checks or Initial Calibrations were include in the data package, therefore; were not evaluated.

Initial and Continuing Calibrations (ICAL/CCAL)
For VOC analyses the QC criteria for relative response factor (RRF), relative standard deviation (%RSD) and percent difference (%D) were met for all target compounds reported by Chem Tech.

AIR – METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM
No Initial Calibrations were included in the data package and were not evaluated. Continuing calibrations were included for all samples and no action was required.

Field Duplicates and Laboratory Replicates
WATERS VOC and AIR - METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM
There were no laboratory replicates associated with these SDG's. One field duplicate in WO#0612217 was collected with similar results. Trichloroethene results in the original sample at 0.082 µG/m3 and Duplicate at 0.083 µG/m3 with an RPD of 1.2. No action was required.

Stability of Internal Standard Response and Retention Times
Internal Standard Response and Retention Times
WATERS X4423
For VOCs all internal standard areas for samples, calibration standards, and method blanks were within acceptance criteria of +100 to –50%.

AIR – METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM
No internal standards summaries were included in the data packages; and were not evaluated.

References

EPA Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Organics Analysis, October 1999.
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Analytical Services Protocol, June 2000.

APPENDIX L

Residence #2 Soil Vapor Intrusion Analytical Report

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

WORK ORDER #: 0612217

Work Order Summary

CLIENT:	Mr. Stephen Malinowski CA Rich Consultants, Inc. 17 Dupont Street Plainview, NY 11803	**BILL TO:**	Mr. Stephen Malinowski CA Rich Consultants, Inc. 17 Dupont Street Plainview, NY 11803
PHONE:	516-576-8844	**P.O. #**	Sagharbor Air
FAX:	516-576-0093	**PROJECT #**	Sutton
DATE RECEIVED:	12/11/2006	**CONTACT:**	Kelly Buettner
DATE COMPLETED:	12/22/2006		

FRACTION #	NAME	TEST	RECEIPT VAC./PRES.
01A	C1-BFloor	Modified TO-15 SIM	0.0 "Hg
01AA	C1-BFloor Duplicate	Modified TO-15 SIM	0.0 "Hg
02A	C2-1Floor	Modified TO-15 SIM	4.0 "Hg
03A	C3-Out	Modified TO-15 SIM	1.6 psi
04A	Lab Blank	Modified TO-15 SIM	NA
05A	CCV	Modified TO-15 SIM	NA
06A	LCS	Modified TO-15 SIM	NA

CERTIFIED BY: Linda J. Turner DATE: 12/22/06

Laboratory Director

Certfication numbers: CA NELAP - 02110CA, LA NELAP/LELAP- AI 30763, NJ NELAP - CA004
NY NELAP - 11291, UT NELAP - 9166389892
Name of Accrediting Agency: NELAP/Florida Department of Health, Scope of Application: Clean Air Act,
Accreditation number: E87680, Effective date: 07/01/06, Expiration date: 06/30/07
Air Toxics Ltd. certifies that the test results contained in this report meet all requirements of the NELAC standards

180 BLUE RAVINE ROAD, SUITE B FOLSOM, CA - 95630
(916) 985-1000 . (800) 985-5955 . FAX (916) 985-1020

LABORATORY NARRATIVE
Modified TO-15 SIM
CA Rich Consultants, Inc.
Workorder# 0612217

Three 6 Liter Summa Special (SIM Certified) samples were received on December 11, 2006. The laboratory performed analysis via modified EPA Method TO-15 using GC/MS in the SIM acquisition mode. The method involves concentrating up to 0.5 liters of air. The concentrated aliquot is then flash vaporized and swept through a water management system to remove water vapor. Following dehumidification, the sample passes directly into the GC/MS for analysis.

Method modifications taken to run these samples are summarized in the below table. Specific project requirements may over-ride the ATL modifications.

Requirement	*TO-15*	*ATL Modifications*
ICAL %RSD acceptance criteria	</=30% RSD with 2 compounds allowed out to < 40% RSD	Project specific; default criteria is </=30% RSD with 10% of compounds allowed out to < 40% RSD
Daily Calibration	+- 30% Difference	Project specific; default criteria is </= 30% Difference with 10% of compounds allowed out up to </=40%.; flag and narrate outliers
Blank and standards	Zero air	Nitrogen
Method Detection Limit	Follow 40CFR Pt.136 App. B	The MDL met all relevant requirements in Method TO-15 (statistical MDL less than the LOQ). The concentration of the spiked replicate may have exceeded 10X the calculated MDL in some cases

Receiving Notes

There were no receiving discrepancies.

Analytical Notes

There were no analytical discrepancies.

Definition of Data Qualifying Flags

Eight qualifiers may have been used on the data analysis sheets and indicates as follows:

B - Compound present in laboratory blank greater than reporting limit (background subtraction not performed).

J - Estimated value.

E - Exceeds instrument calibration range.

S - Saturated peak.

Q - Exceeds quality control limits.

U - Compound analyzed for but not detected above the reporting limit.

UJ- Non-detected compound associated with low bias in the CCV

N - The identification is based on presumptive evidence.

File extensions may have been used on the data analysis sheets and indicates as follows:

a-File was requantified

b-File was quantified by a second column and detector

r1-File was requantified for the purpose of reissue

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

Summary of Detected Compounds
MODIFIED EPA METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM

Client Sample ID: C1-BFloor

Lab ID#: 0612217-01A

Compound	Rpt. Limit (ppbv)	Amount (ppbv)	Rpt. Limit (uG/m3)	Amount (uG/m3)
Trichloroethene	0.0040	0.015	0.022	0.082

Client Sample ID: C1-BFloor Duplicate

Lab ID#: 0612217-01AA

Compound	Rpt. Limit (ppbv)	Amount (ppbv)	Rpt. Limit (uG/m3)	Amount (uG/m3)
Trichloroethene	0.0040	0.015	0.022	0.083

Client Sample ID: C2-1Floor

Lab ID#: 0612217-02A

Compound	Rpt. Limit (ppbv)	Amount (ppbv)	Rpt. Limit (uG/m3)	Amount (uG/m3)
Trichloroethene	0.0046	0.012	0.025	0.063

Client Sample ID: C3-Out

Lab ID#: 0612217-03A

Compound	Rpt. Limit (ppbv)	Amount (ppbv)	Rpt. Limit (uG/m3)	Amount (uG/m3)
Trichloroethene	0.0036	0.010	0.020	0.057
Tetrachloroethene	0.024	0.033	0.16	0.23

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

Client Sample ID: C1-BFloor

Lab ID#: 0612217-01A

MODIFIED EPA METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM

Compound	Rpt. Limit (ppbv)	Amount (ppbv)	Rpt. Limit (uG/m3)	Amount (uG/m3)
Trichloroethene	0.0040	0.015	0.022	0.082
Tetrachloroethene	0.027	Not Detected	0.18	Not Detected
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.027	Not Detected	0.15	Not Detected

Container Type: 6 Liter Summa Special (SIM Certified)

Surrogates	%Recovery	Method Limits
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	97	70-130
Toluene-d8	102	70-130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	106	70-130

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

Client Sample ID: C1-BFloor Duplicate

Lab ID#: 0612217-01AA

MODIFIED EPA METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM

Compound	Rpt. Limit (ppbv)	Amount (ppbv)	Rpt. Limit (uG/m3)	Amount (uG/m3)
Trichloroethene	0.0040	0.015	0.022	0.083
Tetrachloroethene	0.027	Not Detected	0.18	Not Detected
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.027	Not Detected	0.15	Not Detected

Container Type: 6 Liter Summa Special (SIM Certified)

Surrogates	%Recovery	Method Limits
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	101	70-130
Toluene-d8	102	70-130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	108	70-130

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

Client Sample ID: C2-1Floor

Lab ID#: 0612217-02A

MODIFIED EPA METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM

Compound	Rpt. Limit (ppbv)	Amount (ppbv)	Rpt. Limit (uG/m3)	Amount (uG/m3)
Trichloroethene	0.0046	0.012	0.025	0.063
Tetrachloroethene	0.031	Not Detected	0.21	Not Detected
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.031	Not Detected	0.17	Not Detected

Container Type: 6 Liter Summa Special (SIM Certified)

Surrogates	%Recovery	Method Limits
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	104	70-130
Toluene-d8	100	70-130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	98	70-130

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

Client Sample ID: C3-Out

Lab ID#: 0612217-03A

MODIFIED EPA METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM

Compound	Rpt. Limit (ppbv)	Amount (ppbv)	Rpt. Limit (uG/m3)	Amount (uG/m3)
Trichloroethene	0.0036	0.010	0.020	0.057
Tetrachloroethene	0.024	0.033	0.16	0.23
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.024	Not Detected	0.13	Not Detected

Container Type: 6 Liter Summa Special (SIM Certified)

Surrogates	%Recovery	Method Limits
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	106	70-130
Toluene-d8	102	70-130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	105	70-130

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

Client Sample ID: Lab Blank

Lab ID#: 0612217-04A

MODIFIED EPA METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM

Compound	Rpt. Limit (ppbv)	Amount (ppbv)	Rpt. Limit (uG/m3)	Amount (uG/m3)
Trichloroethene	0.0030	Not Detected	0.016	Not Detected
Tetrachloroethene	0.020	Not Detected	0.14	Not Detected
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.020	Not Detected	0.11	Not Detected

Container Type: NA - Not Applicable

Surrogates	%Recovery	Method Limits
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	90	70-130
Toluene-d8	100	70-130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	94	70-130

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

Client Sample ID: CCV

Lab ID#: 0612217-05A

MODIFIED EPA METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM

Compound	%Recovery
Trichloroethene	83
Tetrachloroethene	87
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	80

Container Type: NA - Not Applicable

Surrogates	%Recovery	Method Limits
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	89	70-130
Toluene-d8	100	70-130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	100	70-130

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

Client Sample ID: LCS

Lab ID#: 0612217-06A

MODIFIED EPA METHOD TO-15 GC/MS SIM

Compound	%Recovery
Trichloroethene	90
Tetrachloroethene	98
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	87

Container Type: NA - Not Applicable

Surrogates	%Recovery	Method Limits
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	91	70-130
Toluene-d8	100	70-130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	98	70-130

APPENDIX M

SCDHS Memorandum dated December 12, 2006

Suffolk County Health Department

Memo

To: Sy Robbins

From: Mary Hime

CC: Susan Reilly, Robert Farmer, Paul Ponturo

Date: 12/12/2006

Re: SV1806

Bulova Factory Private Well Survey

A field survey was conducted in the area surrounding the Bulova Factory on October 11, 2006. Notes were left at the 10 homes sampled in 1993 on Rysam Street and Dering Road, northeast of the site. There was only one response to the notes. Roger Treffousse of 49 Rysam Street had his well water tested on October 25. There were no detections of SVOC's or VOC's, with the exception of 1.4ppb chloroform. All businesses on Main Street that were not shown to be on public water on the SCWA maps were visited. All storefronts on Main Street in Sag Harbor were determined to be on public water. Also, the businesses located on Bay Street, north of Main Street were also determined to be on public water. Homes located west of Main Street and east of Railroad Avenue that are not shown to be on public water by the SCWA maps were left notes. There has not been any response to these notes. A total of approximately 20 notes were left for home and business owners. Please let me know if you need any more information.