Site Investigation Report

Schmigel Site Hoosick Falls, New York NYSDEC Site ID No. 442002

CHA Project Number: 16426.1001.1102

Prepared for:



101 Columbia Road Morristown, NJ 07962

Prepared by:



III Winners Circle Albany, New York 12205 (518) 453-4500

November 19, 2008

QUALIFICATIONS AND CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

This Site Investigation Report was compiled by qualified environmental scientists, engineers and employed by Clough Harbour & Associates LLP (CHA).

This report has been prepared expressly for the use of the Honeywell. No other parties are entitled to rely upon this report unless our express written consent is first obtained. All conclusions drawn were based on CHA's review of available historical data, field inspection and analytical results from sampling performed during the course of this project. Recommendations are submitted based on CHA's knowledge, experience, and professional judgment.

Inspection and Report Completed By:

lpb

Seth H. Fowler, CHMM Senior Scientist

Report Reviewed By:

Christopher A. Burns Senior Principal Scientist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PROJECT BACKGROUND	1
OBJECTIVES/SCOPE OF WORK	3
REPORT ORGANIZATION	3
FIELD ACTIVITIES	4
TEST PIT INSTALLATION	4
BORING/MONITORING WELL INSTALLATION AND INSPECTION OF	
EXISTING WELLS	6
SOIL/DRUM SAMPLING	8
GROUNDWATER SAMPLING	8
DECONTAMINATION PROCEDURES	9
SITE SURVEY	9
RESULTS	10
SOIL SAMPLE RESULTS	10
DRUM SAMPLE RESULTS	11
GROUNDWATER SAMPLE RESULTS	11
GROUNDWATER CONTOUR PLAN	11
DATA VALIDATION	12
CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS	13
CONCLUSIONS	13
RECOMMENDATIONS	14
	INTRODUCTION PROJECT BACKGROUND

FIGURES

|--|

- Figure 2 Site Plan
- Figure 3 Test Pit Location Plan
- Figure 4 Groundwater Contour Map

TABLES

- Table 1Test Pit Soil Sample Summary
- Table 2
 Test Pit/Drum TCLP Sample Summary
- Table 3Groundwater Sample Summary
- Table 4Groundwater Elevations

APPENDICES

- Appendix A Test Pit Logs
- Appendix B Subsurface Logs
- Appendix C Well Construction Logs
- Appendix D Well Level/ Well Sampling Logs
- Appendix E Laboratory Analytical Reports Soil/TCLP Samples
- Appendix F Laboratory Analytical Reports Groundwater Samples
- Appendix G Data Validation Summary Report

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Clough Harbour & Associates LLP (CHA) has prepared this Site Investigation Report under contract to MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. (MACTEC) for use by Honeywell International Inc. (Honeywell). This report documents the results of environmental investigation activities completed by CHA at the Alexander Schmigel Site (site) in Hoosick Falls, New York in accordance with the Order on Consent (Index #A4-0551-0506) between Honeywell and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). The work described herein was performed in accordance with the NYSDEC-approved scope of work letter prepared by MACTEC dated September 25, 2006 and subsequently revised Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) issued on December 14, 2006 (collectively referred to herein as the "Work Plan").

1.1 **PROJECT BACKGROUND**

The subject site is located in Hoosick Falls, New York on State Route 67 (see Figure 1). The area around the site has a residential use with multiple mobile homes and a single-family house on the property. The site is the location of a former depression that was reportedly filled with residential refuse and demolition debris between 1977 and 1995. Exact dimensions of the disposal area have not previously been confirmed. Mr. Alexander Schmigel, the former property owner, reportedly stated that over an approximate two-week period in 1977 he allowed the disposal of 55-gallon drums containing various chemicals at the site. He indicated that the drums were from the former Norplex Oak Materials facility located in Hoosick Falls.

Mr. Schmigel has been interviewed by various parties numerous times over the years and he has not been consistent with his statements regarding the number of drums reportedly brought to the site for disposal. His estimates have ranged from between 100 to 200 drums, and he has reported that at least some of these drums were emptied on the site and the empty drums were then taken off site for reuse. The remainder of the drums were reportedly crushed and placed in the open pit. The drummed materials reportedly contained methyl cellosolve, acetone, polymer resin, and 2-methoxyl ethyl ester.

Mr. Robert Brenenstuhl, the current property owner and Mr. Schmigel's son-in-law, has stated that he believes Mr. Schmigel overestimated the number of drums that were disposed at the site. Mr. Brenenstuhl believes that very few drums were buried on site due to the limited size of the disposal area and because he believes the majority of the drums were removed for recycling.

Historic documentation provides varying information regarding the size of the disposal area, with the most recent records indicating the area covers approximately 0.23 acre and the fill/waste material is present to a maximum depth of 12 feet below ground surface, which is assumed to be the top of bedrock. Mr. Brenenstuhl more recently estimated the disposal area to be much smaller (possibly as small as 20 feet by 20 feet) and that the disposed material includes household wastes, building debris and scrap metal.

There have been numerous environmental investigations conducted at the site dating back to 1986. These investigations, as documented in a March 31, 2004 "Petition to Delist" submittal to NYSDEC completed by Parsons on behalf of Honeywell, include:

- installation of groundwater monitoring wells and collection of soil, groundwater and surface water samples in 1986;
- completion of a magnetometer survey and excavation of test pits within the disposal area in 1987 (which yielded much metallic debris and scrap materials but only one intact drum of material that was overpacked and taken offsite for disposal and two crushed empty drums);
- additional sampling of groundwater and surface water in 1989;
- routine groundwater monitoring conducted between 1989 and 1994 and from 1999 to 2003;
- testing of nearby residential water wells between 1986 and 1994; and
- the "Final Site Inspection Prioritization Report" prepared by Roy F. Weston, Inc. in 1998 for the USEPA.

The submittal concluded that the site should be removed from the Registry based on the following:

- No significant accumulation of buried drums has been identified at the site and no major sources of contamination have been identified within the disposal area;
- Soil sample analytical results indicate that the site soil does not present a threat to human health or the environment;
- VOC concentrations in groundwater have decreased significantly over time to the point that the most recent analytical results from 2003 found that there were no detected VOC parameters; and
- The most recent analytical results for residential water well samples met NYSDEC groundwater criteria.

The "Petition to Delist" was denied by NYSDEC in January 26, 2005. In a letter to Parsons, NYSDEC cited the following reasons for denying the petition.

- Only the current or former owner or operator of the site may make the petition.
- Additional investigations were required to fully define the extent of contamination. Specifically, the source of contamination was never removed, no upgradient wells had been installed, the extent of downgradient groundwater contamination had not been determined, no groundwater contour maps had been produced, and no bedrock wells had been installed (despite the presence of shallow bedrock at the site).

1.2 OBJECTIVES/SCOPE OF WORK

The objective of this site investigation is to fill in the data gaps that were outlined in NYSDEC's January 26, 2005 letter to Parsons. Specifically, those data gaps include defining the lateral and vertical extent of the disposal area, confirming the extent of groundwater contamination, and confirming the groundwater flow direction.

To achieve these objectives in accordance with the NYSDEC-approved Work Plan, CHA completed the following scope of work:

- Preparation of Health and Safety Plan
- Excavation of test pits to confirm the dimensions of the disposal area and determine if ongoing sources of contamination (such as intact buried drums) exist.
- Installation of three additional groundwater monitoring wells (one upgradient and two downgradient of the disposal area).
- Completion of a land survey to support the preparation of a "to-scale" site plan, groundwater contour map, and contaminant distribution map.
- Collection of two rounds of groundwater samples from both the existing and newly installed groundwater monitoring wells.
- Preparation of a report to document the results of the site investigation activities.

1.3 REPORT ORGANIZATION

The report is organized into four main sections as follows. Section 1.0 is this Introduction with a brief site history and scope of work. Section 2.0 discusses the field activities undertaken and observations made while on site. Section 3.0 summarizes and discusses the analytical results of the soil, drum, and groundwater sampling and provides a summary of the data validation. Finally, Section 4.0 provides the conclusions and recommendations pertaining to the field observations and analytical data that was collected and provides recommendations for further action necessary at the site.

2.0 FIELD ACTIVITIES

The following sections document the field investigation and sample collection activities performed by CHA. A MACTEC representative was on site to observe CHA's activities. Representatives from NYSDEC were onsite each day during test pit excavation and during the final day of boring/monitoring well installation.

2.1 TEST PIT INSTALLATION

Prior to the start of field work, CHA made an initial site visit on October 19, 2007 accompanied by John Scrabis of MACTEC. There were signs of debris such as tires, rims, and a sink observed at the surface in many areas of the suspected disposal area. It was determined that the test pits would be focused starting at the base of the slope at the north end of the reported disposal area and continue to the driveway to the south.

Between October 22 and 23, 2008, a CHA subcontractor, Precision Industrial Maintenance Inc. of Schenectady, New York used a rubber-tired backhoe to excavate 14 test pits to investigate the contents and limits of the disposal area. The test pits were identified as TP-1 through TP-14 and their locations are shown on Figures 2 and 3. Copies of the test pit logs prepared by the CHA site representative are included in Appendix A. CHA used a photoionization detector (PID) to monitor the work area and excavated materials for the presence of volatile organic compound (VOC) vapors during the test pit excavation activities.

<u>Test Pits – No Drums Encountered</u>

Test pits TP-1 through TP-5, TP-7, TP-8, and TP-14 encountered weathered shale bedrock at depths that varied from 5.5' below ground surface (bgs) to 9' bgs. The soils in each of these test pits were typically observed to be a mixture of fine/medium/coarse sand and gravel. Varying amounts of metal, tires, wood, plastic, and glass observed in each of these test pits; however, no drums were observed. There were no visual or olfactory signs of contamination noted by the CHA representative and no PID readings above background levels were observed. Soil samples were collected from test pits TP-1, TP-2, TP-5, TP-7, TP-8, and TP-14 for laboratory analysis for Target Compound List (TCL) VOCs, including methyl cellosolve, by SW-846 Methods 8260B and 8015B.

Bedrock was not reached in test pit TP-13, which was excavated to 9' bgs. There were no visual or olfactory signs of contamination and no PID readings above background at TP-13 except for a grey-black soil layer encountered at 4.5' bgs that exhibited a slight septic-like odor and a PID reading of 2.1 ppm. Soil samples were collected from test pit TP-13 and analyzed for the parameters previously stated.

<u> Test Pits – Drums Encountered</u>

Test pits TP-6 and TP-9 through TP-12 encountered buried metal drums in addition to solid waste materials similar to those that were identified in the other test pits. However, less solid waste (metal, wood, brick, etc.) was observed at these test pit locations relative to that observed in the other test pits.

In test pit TP-6, there was a crushed drum observed at 2.5' bgs. The drum had a plastic liner and residual black soil/sludge inside it that exhibited a slight odor. A sample of the material in this drum was collected for analysis for hazardous waste characteristics, including analysis by Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP). A second rusty and crushed drum was encountered at 4' bgs. This drum did not have a liner, had no odor, and appeared to be an old burn barrel due to the holes cut into the sides and bottom and presence of ash in the drum. There were no PID readings observed above background during excavation of test pit TP-6 or from either of the drums identified.

Test pit TP-9 also encountered buried drums. Three crushed, empty drums were encountered at 2.5' bgs in this test pit. There were no PID readings above background, visual, or olfactory indications of contamination at the 2.5' depth. One relatively intact metal drum was found at 5' bgs in test pit TP-9. This drum was observed to contain a whitish/grey semi-solid material that exhibited a strong glue-like odor. A maximum observed PID reading of 1,306 ppm was obtained when the PID probe tip was placed near the drum. A waste characterization sample was collected from this drum for TCLP analysis. Test pit TP-9 was terminated at 6' bgs to avoid the possibility of disturbing additional drums. Some perched water was encountered in TP-9 at 5'-6' bgs; the water had a slight odor and color but no sheen. A soil sample was collected at the bottom of the excavation at 6' bgs for analysis for VOCs as described above for other test pit soil samples.

Test pit TP-10 encountered one buried drum at 4.5' bgs and two drums were observed in the side wall at that same depth. Each of the metal drums appeared to be empty. A slight chemical odor was noted during excavation of test pit TP-10; however, no PID readings above background were observed. The excavation was terminated at 4.5' to avoid the possibility of disturbing additional drums. Some perched water was encountered in TP-10 at 4.5' bgs; the water had a slight odor but no sheen. A soil sample was collected from 4.5' bgs for VOC analysis as described above for the other test pit soil samples. The soil sample was found to have a slight odor and exhibited an open-air PID reading of 6.2 ppm.

Two partially crushed, empty drums were encountered at less that 2' bgs in test pit TP-11. The test pit excavation was terminated at 3' bgs to avoid potentially disturbing additional drums. There were no visual or olfactory signs of contamination noted and no PID readings above background were observed at test pit TP-11. A soil sample was collected in TP-11 near the buried drums.

One partially crushed, empty drum was encountered at less that 2' bgs in test pit TP-12. The drum exhibited a slight solvent odor, but no readings above background were obtained when the drum was screened with the PID. The drum had a label that was partially visible that read "Flammable – EPON Resin 1011-A-80". Test pit TP-12 was terminated at 5' bgs without reaching bedrock. A soil sample was collected in TP-12 from the bottom of the test pit.

Upon completion, each test pit was backfilled with excavated material and compacted with the excavator. Drums that were encountered and disturbed during excavation of test pits TP-6 and TP-9 were removed and placed in plastic "overpack" drums. Both crushed drums disturbed

during excavation of test pit TP-6 were placed in a single overpack drum. In the case of test pit TP-9, the relatively intact drum that was encountered at 5' bgs and contained a whitish/gray material was placed in an overpack drum. Samples of the materials in these overpacks were collected and submitted to the laboratory for waste characterization testing (including TCLP analysis). The drums will be disposed of under separate contract by a Honeywell waste disposal vendor as deemed appropriate following the review of the TCLP analysis. The results of the waste characterization analyses are discussed in Section 3.2.

In summary, buried metal drums were encountered in 6 of the 14 test pits that CHA excavated within the disposal area. Most of the drums appeared to be crushed and empty, with no evidence of gross contamination adjacent to the drums. As shown on Figure 3, the buried drums appear to be limited to the central and western portions of the disposal area. There was buried solid waste/debris observed in all 14 test pits. This waste/debris appears to extend past the area of the installed test pits in some areas based on observations of surface debris and the topography of the area. The approximate area of buried solid waste and debris is also shown on Figure 3.

2.2 BORING/MONITORING WELL INSTALLATION AND INSPECTION OF EXISTING WELLS

Drilling and well installation activities were completed between October 29 and 31, 2007 by a CHA subcontractor, Aquifer Drilling and Testing Inc. of Troy, New York. A CHA representative was on site to direct the drilling activities. Drilling and soil sampling methods were consistent with the methods specified in the Work Plan (i.e., hollow stem augers were used to drill through overburden to auger refusal and air rotary drilling was used to advance the borings into bedrock). Boring logs for each of the three well borings (MW-1, MW-2 and MW-3) were prepared by CHA; copies of the soil boring logs are provided in Appendix B and copies of well construction records are provided in Appendix C. The locations of the borings/wells are shown on Figure 2.

The first boring installed was at the location of the proposed upgradient groundwater monitoring well (MW-1). Boring MW-1 encountered bedrock in the form of weathered shale at 4.5' bgs. The overburden was observed to be fine/medium/coarse sand with some fine gravel and some silt from 6" to 2.5' bgs and silt with trace sand from 2.5 to 4.5' bgs. No visual or olfactory evidence of contamination was observed by CHA and there were no VOCs detected above background with the PID in any of the soil samples collected. Upon reaching auger refusal, an air rotary drill bit was used to drill to 26' bgs (or 21.5' below the point of hollow stem auger refusal). Upon reaching the termination depth of the boring, very little groundwater was present and the borehole was left open for just over 24 hours. After this period, less than 0.1' of groundwater was present in the borehole. Since there was not enough groundwater to justify installation of a groundwater monitoring well, boring MW-1 was backfilled with bentonite chips to 4' bgs and concrete was placed from 4' bgs to the ground surface.

The second boring installed was MW-2, which was the first of two down-gradient monitoring wells to be installed. This boring was installed to the southwest of the site and disposal area in the NYSDOT right-of-way of State Route 67. A highway work permit was obtained by CHA from NYSDOT for this purpose. Overburden soils consisted of well graded fine/medium/coarse sand from 0-24' bgs and 32' to 38' with fine/coarse gravel from 24' - 32' bgs. There was no

visual or olfactory evidence of contamination and no VOCs were detected with the PID above background levels during screening of the split-barrel soil samples collected for visual inspection. Saturated soils were encountered at 32'-34' bgs, the boring was terminated at 38' bgs, and a groundwater monitoring well was installed. Bedrock was not encountered within the drilled depth of the MW-2 boring.

The second down-gradient monitoring well (MW-3) was installed south of the disposal area on the edge of the driveway into the property. At this location, bedrock was encountered at 2.5' bgs. The shallow overburden consisted of fine/medium/coarse sands. Weathered bedrock was augered from 2.5' to 5.0' bgs (auger refusal). No visual or olfactory evidence of contamination was observed by CHA and there were no VOCs detected above background with the PID in any of the soil samples collected. An air rotary drill rig was used to advance the boring from 5' to 21.3' bgs. Groundwater was encountered at a depth of 15' bgs and a groundwater monitoring well was installed.

Approximately one week after the installation of monitoring wells MW-2 and MW-3, the two wells were developed. Development was completed using a submersible pump and raising and lowering the pump to surge the water in the well to suspend sediment such that it could be pumped out. Monitoring well MW-2 was pumped for approximately one hour and 65 gallons were removed. The turbidity level stabilized toward the end of development of MW-2 and was observed to be 17 NTUs. Monitoring well MW-3 was pumped for approximately one hour and approximately 40 - 45 gallons of water were removed. The well cleared up during development and stabilized with a turbidity of 37 NTUs. All purge water was discharged on the ground away from the monitoring wells.

There are three existing groundwater monitoring wells located at the site. The existing groundwater monitoring wells are numbered OW-27, OW-28 and OW-29 and the locations of these wells are shown on Figure 2. The existing wells were inspected by CHA. Monitoring well OW-27 was found to be in good condition; however, it could not be locked due to a broken riser cap. Monitoring well OW-28 was damaged (the casing appeared to be pinched or bent below the ground surface) such that a bailer could not be inserted past the obstruction point. However, the well riser was sufficiently intact to allow pump tubing fitted with a bottom check valve to pass down the well to facilitate sampling. It was also noted that the protective steel casing of OW-28 was loose and could be pulled from the ground; thus the surface seal of the well appears to be compromised. Lastly, monitoring well OW-29 was inspected and found to be significantly compromised. The riser pipe had heaved to approximately 2" above the protective steel casing and the surface seal was broken. The well riser was blocked or broken at 1.5' bgs. No reliable depth-to-groundwater measurement or groundwater sample could be collected from OW-29

It should also be noted that there is a concrete cistern located near well OW-29. The cistern was observed to be 2.5' in diameter and approximately 5' deep. The water in the cistern was approximately 1' deep and therefore it appears that there is approximately 3.5' to 4' of sediment in the bottom of the cistern.

2.3 SOIL/DRUM SAMPLING

As mentioned in Section 2.1, soil samples were collected from each test pit with the exception of TP-3 and TP-4. Test pits TP-3 and TP-4 had no evidence of contamination and were consistent with the conditions observed in test pits TP-1 and TP-2. Generally the soil samples were collected from the bottom of the test pit excavation prior to backfilling. In the case of test pits TP-10 and TP-11, the soil samples were collected near the buried drums encountered within those test pits.

Each soil sample was collected using an Encore[™] Sampler in accordance with USEPA Method 5035. Two individual soil samples were collected at each sample location. The first was analyzed for the TCL VOCs by SW-846 Method 8260B and the second was analyzed for methyl cellosolve by SW-846 Method 8015B. All laboratory reports are ASP Category B deliverables packages and the laboratory data received was compared to NYSDEC Part 375 Soil Cleanup Objectives.

As previously stated, drums encountered at test pits TP-6 and TP-9 were placed in overpacks and the contents of these drums were sampled for waste characterization purposes. The material present in the TP-6 drums was a wet, black sludge/soil mixture that was observed to have a slight odor. The material present in the drum removed from test pit TP-9 at 5' bgs was a white/gray semi-solid material with a strong glue-like odor. The samples collected from the two overpacks were each analyzed for TCLP VOCs, TCLP SVOCs, and TCLP RCRA metals (arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury, selenium, and silver). Both samples were also analyzed for ignitability, corrosivity and reactivity. All laboratory reports are ASP Category B deliverable packages.

2.4 GROUNDWATER SAMPLING

As discussed in Section 2.2, two additional groundwater monitoring wells (MW-2 & MW-3) were successfully installed as part of this investigation and two (OW-27 & OW-28) of the three existing groundwater monitoring wells located at the site were found to be in a condition that allowed for groundwater samples to be collected. These four monitoring wells were sampled as part of this investigation. There is also a cistern present on the site from which a water sample was collected.

Two groundwater monitoring events were performed by CHA personnel, with the first occurring on November 8, 2007 and the second taking place on December 13, 2007. During each event, the four wells were purged of three volumes prior to sampling. During the purging activities, field indicator parameters including pH, temperature, conductivity, and turbidity were measured to evaluate well stabilization. All purge water was discharged on the ground away from the monitoring wells.

The water samples obtained from wells MW-2, MW-3, and OW-27 were collected using a dedicated, disposal bailer while the sample collected from well OW-28 was collected using dedicated tubing and a check valve. The water sample collected from the cistern was obtained

using a dedicated, disposal beaker and the sample was collected from the surface of the water in the cistern. Copies of CHA's well sampling logs are included in Appendix D.

The groundwater samples were analyzed for the TCL VOCs by SW-846 Method 8260B and methyl cellosolve by SW-846 Method 8015B. All laboratory reports are ASP Category B deliverables packages.

2.5 DECONTAMINATION PROCEDURES

During the course of the fieldwork, to minimize the potential for cross contamination during sampling, disposable sampling equipment was used whenever possible. Drilling/excavating equipment that directly contacted potentially contaminated media was decontaminated by cleaning with a high pressure water wash. Decontamination of non-disposable equipment was performed prior to use at a new location or sample collection. Decontamination of non-disposable sampling equipment included a soap/water wash, potable water rinse, distilled water rinse, and wipe-drying with a clean cloth or air drying. During groundwater sample collection, a new disposable bailer or tubing was used at each well location. The submersible pump, as used during monitoring well development, was cleaned with a soap/water wash and distilled water rinse prior to use at each well.

2.6 SITE SURVEY

A site survey was completed following the excavation of test pits and installation of the new groundwater monitoring wells. CHA subcontracted William A. Wiley – Land Surveyor (Wiley), a New York State-licensed surveyor to complete the work. Wiley established the horizontal and vertical locations of the test pits and monitoring wells.

Horizontal locations were based on New York State Plane Coordinates based on NAD83 (feet) and vertical locations were be based on U.S.G.S. "TT 9 GDF 1942" (feet). There are two benchmarks on site, one of which is shown on Figure 2, that were also used to survey horizontal locations and vertical elevations. The vertical locations of the top of well casings were recorded to the nearest 0.01 foot (both the new monitoring wells and previously existing monitoring wells). The survey data was used to prepare the test pit location plan and groundwater contour map included in this report.

3.0 **RESULTS**

3.1 SOIL SAMPLE RESULTS

The results of the soil sample analysis are summarized in Table 1 and copies of the laboratory reports are included in Appendix E. The depth of each soil sample is identified in parentheses next to the sample identification numbers for the test pit soil samples. The soil sample results were compared to the NYSDEC Part 375 Unrestricted Use and Restricted Use - Residential Soil Cleanup Objectives (SCOs). These SCOs are presented in Table 1 for comparison to the detected parameters found at the site.

The analyses for methyl cellosolve, shown on Table 1 as 2-methoxyethanol, did not detect this parameter in any of the soil samples. There were, however, a number of detected VOC parameters found in the soil samples. Methylene chloride was detected in each of the twelve samples; however, in each case the result was flagged by the laboratory as being detected in the associated laboratory blank. Methylene chloride is a common laboratory contaminant and therefore is not expected to be a contaminant of concern in this case. Aside from methylene chloride, there were no detected parameters identified in the soil samples collected from TP-1 through TP-7 and TP-14.

Sample TP-8 and the duplicate sample collected from TP-8 (identified as sample TP-20) had detected levels of acetone of 47 μ g/kg acetone and 120 μ g/kg, respectively. The Unrestricted Use SCO for acetone is 50 μ g/kg while the Restricted Use – Residential SCO is 100,000 μ g/kg. Therefore, the acetone level found in Sample TP-20 exceeded the Unrestricted Use SCO but is well below the Restricted Use – Residential SCO.

Sample TP-9 was diluted due to a high detected concentration of acetone. The diluted sample was found to have acetone at 27,000 µg/kg. Since the sample was diluted for acetone, only the undiluted results are referenced for all other constituents. Other detected parameters in sample TP-9 included 2-butanone (6 µg/kg - estimated value), 4-methyl-2-pentanone (52 µg/kg), ethylbenzene (17 µg/kg), toluene (22 µg/kg), and total xylenes (31 µg/kg). The detected levels of each of these parameters aside from acetone do not exceed the either of the referenced SCOs. However the detected level of acetone (27,000 µg/kg) is above the unrestricted use SCO of 50 µg/kg and below the Restricted Use – Residential SCO of 100,000 µg/kg.

The soil samples collected from test pits TP-10 and TP-11 were also diluted due to high concentrations of acetone. Acetone was detected in the diluted samples for TP-10 and TP-11 at 7,200 μ g/kg and 3,200 μ g/kg, respectively. Since the sample was diluted for acetone only, the undiluted results are referenced for all other constituents. Aside from methylene chloride, there were no other detected parameters in sample TP-10. Sample TP-11 had detected levels of 1,1,2-trichloroethane (2J μ g/kg), 1,1-dichloroethene (14 μ g/kg), 2-butanone (6J μ g/kg), 4-methyl-2-pentanone (18J μ g/kg), ethylbenzene (2J μ g/kg), toluene (42 μ g/kg), and total xylenes (5J μ g/kg). None of the detected parameters, aside from acetone, exceed either of the referenced SCOs. Similar to TP-9, the acetone concentration in both TP-10 and TP-11 is above the unrestricted use SCO of 50 μ g/kg and below the restricted use – residential SCO of 100,000 μ g/kg.

Sample TP-12 has detected levels of 2-butanone and ethylbenzene at 6 μ g/kg and 2 μ g/kg, respectively, and both results were flagged as estimated values. The TP-12 soil sample also contained acetone at a reported concentration of 36 μ g/kg. All of these levels are below the referenced SCOs. Sample TP-13 was found to have acetone at 6 μ g/kg; however, this result was flagged as an estimated value by the laboratory and is well below the SCOs.

3.2 DRUM SAMPLE RESULTS

The contents of the two overpack drums were sampled during the installation of the test pits. The results of the TCLP sample results are summarized in Table 2 and the laboratory report is included in Appendix E.

Lead was detected in the TP-6 overpack at a TCLP concentration of 13,300 μ g/l, which exceeds the characteristic hazardous waste threshold for lead of 5000 μ g/l. Corrosivity, Reactivity, and Ignitability were all below characteristic hazardous waste values. The presence of lead at this concentration classifies the contents of the drum in test pit TP-6 as characteristic hazardous waste.

Based on the characterization test results for the TP-9 overpack drum, the contents of this drum are not considered hazardous waste.

3.3 GROUNDWATER SAMPLE RESULTS

As detailed in Section 2.4, four groundwater monitoring wells and a cistern were sampled during two different sampling events. The samples were analyzed for TCL VOCs and methyl cellosolve. There were no VOCs detected in any of the groundwater samples collected during either of the two groundwater monitoring events. The results of both of the groundwater sampling events are summarized in Table 3 and copies of the laboratory reports are included in Appendix F.

These results appear to confirm the previous groundwater sampling results that had showed a continuous decline in the concentrations of VOCs to the point where the latest groundwater sampling collected in March of 2003 had shown no detected parameters.

3.4 GROUNDWATER CONTOUR PLAN

Groundwater elevations were collected during each groundwater sampling event prior to purging of each groundwater monitoring well. The groundwater elevations collected during each monitoring event are presented in Table 4.

The groundwater elevations were observed to be slightly higher during the second event on December 13, 2007 compared to the first round of groundwater elevations collected on November 8, 2007. As discussed above in Section 2.2, although monitoring well OW-29 was in poor condition, the water levels measured in this well are believed to be representative of the shallow groundwater elevation at that location. Monitoring well MW-3 is the only monitoring well at the site that is installed into bedrock and, due to the inherit differences in groundwater

movement and depth in overburden and bedrock monitoring wells, monitoring well MW-3 was not used in preparation of the groundwater contour map.

A groundwater contour map was developed using the groundwater elevations that were collected during the December 13, 2007 monitoring event as is included as Figure 4. Groundwater generally moves in a west/southwesterly direction across the subject site. The topography of the site and the geologic conditions indicate that groundwater moves in a slightly more westerly direction within the fill area.

3.5 DATA VALIDATION

All soil, groundwater and waste samples submitted for analytical testing were analyzed by TestAmerica of Amherst, New York. Data validation was performed by MACTEC in accordance with the project QAPP. Copies of the MACTEC data usability summary reports and data validation summaries are included in Appendix G. Overall, the data were mostly acceptable with the exception of some issues as discussed in the data validation reports.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 CONCLUSIONS

- Buried drums were encountered in the area of test pits TP-6, TP-9, TP-10, TP-11, and TP-12. The majority of the drums observed were crushed and appeared to be empty. The estimated area of buried drums is shown on Figure 3. The extent of this area is approximately 2,000 square feet. The depth of the fill/waste and drums is estimated to be up to 9' bgs however most of the test pit locations where drums were observed were not excavated to the underlying bedrock and therefore the depth of buried drums, the volume of the fill area with drums present is approximately 18,000 cubic feet or 665 cubic yards of material (soil/drums/waste). It is estimated that the drums and solid waste (metal, wood, tires, concrete) account for approximately 10-15% of this overall volume.
- As noted in Section 2.1, buried solid waste/debris such as metal, tires, wood, plastic, and glass were observed in each of the test pits installed. The estimated area of this waste/debris based on perimeter test pit observations, surface debris observations and the topography of the fill area, is shown in Figure 3. This area, excluding the buried drum area, is approximately 8,500 square feet in size. Assuming an average depth to bedrock in this area of 6', the entire volume of waste/debris/fill, excluding the area of confirmed buried drums, is approximately 51,000 cubic feet or 2,333 cubic yards of material.
- During test pit excavation two drums with partial contents were encountered and disturbed during excavation. The first drum was excavated from test pit TP-6 and second drum was excavated from test pit TP-9. Both drums were overpacked upon removal from the excavation, labeled appropriately, and left at the site. The contents of both drums were sampled the day they were excavated and analyzed for TCLP analysis. The laboratory results indicate that TP-6 overpack contains hazardous waste based on the TCLP lead result and the contents in the TP-9 overpack drum are non-hazardous.
- There were a number of detected VOC parameters found in the soil samples collected from the test pits. All detected parameters were found to be below the Part 375 Unrestricted Use SCOs and the Restricted Use Residential SCOs with the exception of acetone in soil samples TP-9, TP-10, TP-11 and TP-20 (duplicate of TP-8). The acetone levels in these four samples exceed the Unrestricted Use SCO for acetone but were less than the Restricted Use Residential SCO.
- There were no VOC parameters detected in the groundwater samples collected from the four groundwater monitoring wells and the cistern sampled during the two monitoring events. There is no impact to groundwater within the fill area or immediately down gradient of the fill area.
- Groundwater contours developed from groundwater elevations taken from monitoring wells OW-27, OW-28, MW-2 and MW-3 show that groundwater flows southwest across the fill site.

4.2 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- The overpacked drum from TP-6 should be managed and disposed of as hazardous waste and the overpacked drum associated with test pit TP-9 can be managed as non-hazardous waste.
- CHA recommends that a remedial work plan be prepared to address the waste disposal area. Specifically, the work plan should address the remaining buried drums and soil/waste that contains acetone above the Unrestricted Use SCO.
- Based on the groundwater sample results, no further action with respect to site groundwater is necessary assuming that the source area is remediated.

FIGURES









TABLES

Table 1 Test Pit Soil Sample Summary Schmigel Site Hoosick Falls, NY

Sample San	Location nple Date	TP-1 (7) 10/22/2007	TP-2 (3) 10/22/2007	TP-5 (8 1/2) 10/22/2007	TP-6 (7) 10/22/2007	TP-7 (7) 10/22/2007	TP-8(4) 10/23/2007	TP-9(6) 10/23/2007	TP-10(4) 10/23/2007	TP-11(3) 10/23/2007	TP-12(4-5) 10/23/2007	TP-13(4-5) 10/23/2007	TP-14(5) 10/23/2007	TP-20(4) Dup. to TP-8 10/23/2007	Soil Cleanup Objectives	Soil Cleanup Objectives Restricted Use -
Parameter	Units														Unrestricted Use	Residential
2-METHOXYETHANOL	ug/kg	5600 U	5600 U	5900 U	5500 U	5300 U	5400 U	61000 U	5800 U	5900 U	6100 U	5100 U	5600 U	5400 U	NA	NA
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	680	100,000
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	2 J	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
1,1-Dichloroethane	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	60	5 U	6 U	270	19000
1,1-Dichloroethene	ug/kg	70	60	6 U	60	5 0	60	50	50	14	50	60	5 0	6 U	330	100000
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ug/kg	70	6 U	6 U	60	50	60	50	50	50	50	60	50	6 U	NA	NA
1,2: Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	ug/kg	70	60	60	60	50	60	50	50	50	50	60	50	6 U	NA	NA
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ug/kg	70	60	60	60	50	60	50	50	50	50	60	50	60	1100	100000
1,2-Dichloroethane	ug/kg	70	60	60	60	50	60	50	50	50	50	60	50	60	20	100000
1,2-Dichloropropane	ug/kg	70	60	60	60	50	60	50	50	50	50	60	50	60	NA 2400	NA 17000
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ug/kg	70	60	60	60	50	60	50	50	50	50	60	50	60	2400	1/000
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ug/kg	7 0	<u> </u>	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	50	50	50	50	60	5 0	<u>6 U</u>	1800	9800
2-buldhone	ug/kg	36 U	32 U	28 U	28 U	27 U	28 U		24 0	25.11	26 J	28 U	25 U	29 U	NA NA	NA NA
2-nexalibile	ug/kg	36 U	32 U	28 U	28 U	27 U	28 U	27 U	24 0	19 1	20 0	20 U	25 U	29 U	NA NA	NA NA
	ug/kg	36 11	32 U	28 U	28 U	27 0	20 U	27000 D	7200 D	3200 D	20 0 36 B	28 0	25 U	129 0	50	10000
Benzene	ug/kg ug/kg	7 11	611	6 11	611	511	611	5 11	511	511	511	611	5 11	611	60	2900
Benzene (1-methylethyl)-	ug/kg	7 11	611	611	611	5 11	611	50	50	50	5 0	611	5 11	611	NΔ	2300
Bromodichloromethane	ug/kg	7 11	611	611	611	5 11	611	50	50	50	5 0	611	5 11	611	NA	NΔ
Bromoform	ug/kg	7 11	611	611	611	5 0	611	50	50	50	5 0	611	5 0	611	NΔ	NΔ
Bromomethane	ug/kg	14 []	13 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	11 U	10 U	12 U	NA	NA
Carbon Disulfide	ua/ka	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
Carbon Tetrachloride	ua/ka	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	760	1400
Chlorobenzene	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	1100	100000
Chlorodibromomethane	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
Chloroethane	ug/kg	14 U	13 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	11 U	10 U	12 U	NA	NA
Chloroform	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	370	10000
Chloromethane	ug/kg	14 U	13 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	11 U	10 U	12 U	NA	NA
Cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
Cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
CYCLOHEXANE	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
Ethylbenzene	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	17	5 U	2 J	2 J	6 U	5 U	6 U	1000	30000
Ethylene Dibromide	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
Freon 113	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
METHYL ACETATE	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
Methyl T-Butyl Ether (MTBE)	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	930	62000
METHYLCYCLOHEXANE	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
Methylene Chloride	ug/kg	8 B	8 B	8 B	7 B	9 B	10 B	7 B	5 B	90 B	7 B	7 B	6 B	6 B	50	51000
Styrene	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 0	5 U	5 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	NA	NA
Ietrachloroethene	ug/kg	7 U	<u>6 U</u>	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	5 U	<u>5 U</u>	5 U	5 U	<u>6 U</u>	5 U	6 U	1300	5500
Toluene	ug/kg	7 U	6 U	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U	22	<u>5 U</u>	42	5 U	<u>6 U</u>	5 U	6 U	/00	100000
I otal Xylenes	ug/kg	22 U	19 U	17 U	17 U	16 U	17 U	31	15 U	5]	16 U	17 U	15 U	17 U	260	100000
Trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/kg	<u>/U</u>	6 U	6 U	6 U	50	6 U	50	50	50	50	60	<u>5</u> U	6 U	NA	NA
Trial laws attributes	ug/kg	7 U	60	6 U	6 U	50	60	50	50	50	50	60	50	6 U	NA 470	NA 10000
	ug/kg	70	6 U	60	60	50	60	50	50	50	50	60	50	<u>ь</u> О	4/0	10000
	ug/Kg	/ U	6 U	60	60	50	60	50	50	50	50	60	50	<u>б</u> U	NA 20	
vinyi Chioriae	ug/kg	14 U	13 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U	10.0	10 0	10 0	11 U	10.0	12 U	20	210

NOTES:

NYSDEC Part 375 Soil Cleanup Objectives (SCOs)
 The compound was not detected at the indicated concentration.
 Associated value is estimated.
 B - Analyte was detected in the laboratory blank as well as the sample.

D - Sample was reanalyzed following a Dilution.

NA - Guidance value not available

BOLD values are detected compounds Indicates associated value exceeds NYSDEC Part 375 Unrestricted Use SCOs.

TABLE 2 Test Pit/Drum TCLP Sample Summary Schmigel Site Hoosick Falls, NY

		Sample Location	TP-6 (2 1/2)	TP-9(DRUM)
		Sample Date	10/22/2007	10/23/2007
		Characteristic		
		Hazardous Waste		
Parameter	Units	Threshold Values		
Arsenic	ug/l	5000	10 U	10 U
Barium	ug/l	100000	618	50.3
Cadmium	ug/l	1000	11.3	1 U
Chromium	ug/l	5000	4 U	4 U
Lead	ug/l	5000	13300	10.8
Selenium	ug/l	1000	15 U	15 U
Silver	ug/l	5000	3 U	3 U
Mercury	ug/l	200	0.2 U	0.2 U
Chlordane	mg/l	0.03	0.002 U	0.002 U
Chlorinated Camphene	mg/l	NA	0.004 U	0.004 U
Endrin	mg/l	0.02	0.0002 U	0.0002 U
Gamma-Bhc (Lindane)	mg/l	NA	0.0002 U	0.0001 J
Heptachlor	mg/l	0.008	0.0002 U	0.0002 J
Heptachlor Epoxide	mg/l	0.008	0.0002 U	0.0002 U
Methoxychlor	mg/l	10	0.0002 U	0.0002 U
2,3,5-Trichlorophenoxypropionic acid	mg/l	NA	0.002 U	0.002 U
2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid	mg/l	NA	0.002 U	0.002 U
1,1-Dichloroethene	ug/l	700	10 U	10 U
1,2-Dichloroethane	ug/l	500	10 U	10 U
2-Butanone	ug/l	NA	50 U	38 J
Benzene	ug/l	500	10 U	13
Carbon Tetrachloride	ug/l	500	10 U	10 U
Chlorobenzene	ug/l	100000	10 U	10 U
Chloroform	ug/l	6000	10 U	10 U
Tetrachloroethene	ug/l	700	10 U	10 U
Trichloroethylene	ug/l	500	10 U	10 U
Vinyl Chloride	ug/l	200	10 U	10 U
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	mg/l	7.5	0.04 U	0.04 U
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	mg/l	400	0.02 U	0.02 U
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	mg/l	2	0.02 U	0.02 U
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	mg/l	0.13	0.02 U	0.02 U
2-Methylphenol	mg/l	NA	0.02 U	0.02 U
3-METHYLPHENOL	mg/l	NA	0.04 U	0.04 U
4-Methylphenol	mg/l	NA	0.02 U	0.02 U
Hexachlorobenzene	mg/l	0.13	0.02 U	0.02 U
Hexachlorobutadiene	mg/l	0.5	0.02 U	0.02 U
Hexachloroethane	mg/l	3	0.02 U	0.02 U
Nitrobenzene	mg/l	2	0.02 U	0.02 U
Pentachlorophenol	mg/l	100	0.04 U	0.04 U
Pyridine	mg/l	5	0.1 U	0.1 U

NOTES:

1. Corrosivity, Reactivity, and Ignitability were all below Characteristic

Hazardous Waste limit value in both samples

U - The compound was not detected at the indicated concentration.

J - Associated value is estimated.

NA - Guidance value not available

BOLD values are detected compounds

Indicates associated value exceeds Characteristic Hazardous Waste limit value.

Table 3 Groundwater Sample Summary Schmigel Site Hoosick Falls, NY

Sample Lo	cation	OW-27		OW-27	OW-28	OW-28	MW-2	MW-2	MW-3	MW-3	CISTERN	CISTERN	CHA-1	CHA	-1
Sample	e Date	11/08/20	07	12/13/2007	11/08/2007	12/13/2007	11/08/2007	12/13/2007	11/08/2007	12/13/2007	11/08/2007	12/13/2007	11/08/2007	12/13/	2007
Parameter	Units														
2-METHOXYETHANOL	ug/l	< 2000	U	< 2000 U	< 2000 l	J < 2000 U	< 2000 l	J < 2000 U	< 2000 U	< 2000 U	< 2000 U	< 2000 U	< 2000 U	< 2000	i U
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
1,1-Dichloroethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 L	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
1,2: Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
1,2-Dichloroethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 L	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
1,2-Dichloropropane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
2-Butanone	ug/l	< 5.0	U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 l	J < 5.0 U	< 5.0 l	J < 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0	U
2-Hexanone	ug/l	< 5.0	U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 L	J < 5.0 U	< 5.0 l	J < 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0	U
4-Methyl-2-Pentanone	ug/l	< 5.0	U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 L	J < 5.0 U	< 5.0 l	J < 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0	U
Acetone	ug/l	< 5.0	U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 l	J < 5.0 U	< 5.0 l	J < 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0 U	< 5.0	U
Benzene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 L	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
Benzene, (1-methylethyl)-	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Bromodichloromethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 L	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
Bromoform	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
Bromomethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
Carbon Disulfide	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 L	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
Carbon Tetrachloride	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
Chlorobenzene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 L	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
Chlorodibromomethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Chloroethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Chloroform	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Chloromethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
CYCLOHEXANE	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Dichloromethane	ug/I	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U) < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 0	< 1.0 0	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Ethylbenzene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Ethylene Dibromide	ug/I	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U) < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 0	< 1.0 0	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Freon 113	ug/l	< 1.0	0	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
METHYL ACEIATE	ug/I	< 1.0	0	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	V < 1.0 U	< 1.0 0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Methyl I-Butyl Ether (MIBE)	ug/I	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U) < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 0	< 1.0 0	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
METHYLCYCLOHEXANE	ug/l	< 1.0	0	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Styrene	ug/I	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U) < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 0	< 1.0 0	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Ietrachloroethene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Toluene	ug/l	< 1.0	0	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Total Xylenes	ug/I	< 3.0	U	< 3.0 U	< 3.0 L	J < 3.0 U	< 3.0	J < 3.0 U	< 3.0 U	< 3.0 U	< 3.0 0	< 3.0 0	< 3.0 0	< 3.0	<u> </u>
Trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 L	V < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Trans-1,3-Dicnioropropene	ug/I	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	V < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	U < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U
Trichloroethylene	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	V < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
Irichiorofluoromethane	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	V < 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	J < 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	<u> </u>
	ug/I	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 l	V < 1.0 U	< 1.0	U 4.0 U	< 1.0	U					
Vinylidene Chloride	ug/l	< 1.0	U	< 1.0 U	<1.0 l	J <1.0 U	< 1.0 l	JI<1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0 U	< 1.0	U

Table 4 Groundwater Elevations Schmigel Site Hoosick Falls, NY

Well Location	Elevation - top of riser	<i>Groundwater Elevation 11/8/2007</i>	<i>Groundwater Elevation 12/13/2007</i>
OW-27	540.87	530.32	533.87
OW-28	542.05	534.50	537.25
OW-29	522.37	518.12	517.75
MW-2	521.55	485.85	488.39
MW-3	533.21	524.26	525.76

Note: Elevations are based on U.S.G.S. "TT 9 GDF 1942"

APPENDIX A

Clough, I	Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit N	lo.: TP- 1			
Project Name: Schmig	gel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)				
Project Location: Rte	67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged B	y: J. Herrick			
Project Number: 1642	26.1002.1102	Date: 10/2	22/07 Start: 9:30 AM Finish: 10:10 AM			
Excavation Contracto	r: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe				
	General Informati	on:				
Length: <u>12'</u>	Width: <u>5'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>9'</u>				
Groundwater in Pit:	🗌 Yes 🛛 No	lf yes, what	at depth:			
Depth to Top of Waste	e: <u>2'</u>	Depth to E	Bottom of Waste: <u>6'</u>			
Description of Waste:	Tires, wood shingles, metal, plastic, glass, br	ick and cas	<u>t iron sink</u>			
Drums Encountered:	☐ Yes	Materials	in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 📄 No			
Description/Condition	of Drums: <u>N/A</u>					
Location Marked:	🛛 Yes 🔲 No	With: <u>La</u>	beled stake w/ blue ribbon			
Pictures Taken:	🛛 Yes 🔲 No	-				
	Sampling Informat	tion: Yes 🗆 N				
Sampling Method: Gr	ab		Sampling Time: <u>10:30 AM</u>			
Sample Analyses: VC	C's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)		No. of Bottles: <u>3 encores, 1 jar</u>			
	Test Pit Profile		PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:			
			- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit			
0-2'	Topsoil and organics w/ trace metals starting at the 1' level		 No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit 			
			- Waste layer mixed from 1' - 6' in test pit			
2'-6'	FMC sand and gravel and silt with tires, metals, wood shingles, plastic, glass, brick and a cast iron sink		- Sample TP-1(7') was taken at 7' from wall of trench			
6' – 9'	Brown/gray f sand and silt with some weathered shale					
9'	Shale					
Kill6426kacketerTD4 keeste						

Clough,	Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 2				
Project Name: Schmig	gel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)				
Project Location: Rte	67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick				
Project Number: 1642	26.1002.1102	Date: 10/22/07 Start:11:30 AM Finish: 12:10 PM				
Excavation Contracto	r: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe				
	General Information	ion:				
Length: <u>10'</u>	Width: <u>4'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>6'</u>				
Groundwater in Pit:	🗌 Yes 🖾 No	If yes, what depth:				
Depth to Top of Waste	e: <u>0'</u>	Depth to Bottom of Waste: 3'				
Description of Waste:	Tires, wood, metal and bricks					
Drums Encountered:	☐ Yes ☐ No No. of Drums: <u>N/A</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 📋 No				
Description/Condition	of Drums: <u>N/A</u>					
Location Marked:	🛛 Yes 🔲 No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon				
Pictures Taken:	🛛 Yes 🔲 No					
	Sampling Informat Sample Collected:	tion: Yes □ No				
Sampling Method: Gr	<u>ab</u>	Sampling Time: <u>11:45 AM</u>				
Sample Analyses: VC	C's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)	No. of Bottles: <u>3 encores, 1 jar</u>				
	Test Pit Profile	PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:				
		- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit				
0-3'	Topsoil and organics w/ F sand	- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit				
	tires, metal, wood and bricks scattered throughout this layer	- Waste layer mixed from surface - 3' in test pit				
		- Sample TP-2(3') was taken at 3' from waste layer in wall of trench				
3' - 6'	Light brown F sand and silt with pieces of weathered shale					
9'	Shale					

Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 3				
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)				
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick				
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/22/07 Start:12:15 PM Finish: 12:30 PM				
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe				
General Infor	mation:				
Length: <u>10'</u> Width: <u>4'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>5.5'</u>				
Groundwater in Pit: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No	If yes, what depth:				
Depth to Top of Waste: <u>0'</u>	Depth to Bottom of Waste: 3'				
Description of Waste: Wood, metal and bricks					
Drums Encountered: \Box Yes \boxtimes No No. of Drums: <u>N/A</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No				
Description/Condition of Drums: <u>N/A</u>					
Location Marked: Xes INo	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon				
Pictures Taken: Xes No					
Sampling Info	nmation:				
Sample Collected.	Sampling Time: <u>N/A</u>				
Sample Analyses: <u>N/A</u>	No. of Bottles: <u>N/A</u>				
Test Pit Profile	PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:				
	- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit				
0-3' Topsoil and organics w/ F sand, silt stones	and - No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit				
Metal, wood and bricks scattered throughout this layer	- Waste layer mixed from surface - 3' in test pit				
	- No sample was taken in this test pit since it was similar to TP-2				
3' – 5.5' Light brown F sand and silt with pie of weathered shale	eces				
5.5' Shale					

Clough, H	Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit N	lo.: TP- 4		
Project Name: Schmig	gel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)			
Project Location: Rte 6	67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By	y: J. Herrick		
Project Number: 1642	6.1002.1102	Date: 10/2	22/07 Start:12:30 PM Finish: 12:50 PM		
Excavation Contractor	r: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipmen	t: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe		
	General Information	on:			
Length: <u>10'</u>	Width: <u>4'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>5.5'</u>			
Groundwater in Pit:	🗌 Yes 🛛 No	lf yes, wha	at depth:		
Depth to Top of Waste	e: <u>6"</u>	Depth to E	Bottom of Waste: 5.5		
Description of Waste:	Wood, metal, tires and bricks				
Drums Encountered:	☐ Yes ⊠ No No. of Drums: <u>N/A</u>	Materials	in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No		
Description/Condition	of Drums: <u>N/A</u>				
Location Marked:	🛛 Yes 🔲 No	With: Lat	beled stake w/ blue ribbon		
Pictures Taken:	🛛 Yes 🔲 No				
	Sampling Informat	ion: ∕oo ⊠ N			
Sampling Method: <u>N/A</u>			Sampling Time: <u>N/A</u>		
Sample Analyses: <u>N/A</u>	<u>\</u>		No. of Bottles: <u>N/A</u>		
	Test Pit Profile		PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:		
			- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit		
0 – 3.5'	Topsoil and organics w/ F sand, silt and stones		 No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit 		
	Metal, wood, tires and bricks scattered throughout this layer starting at 6"		- Waste layer mixed from surface - 3' in test pit		
			 No sample was taken in this test pit since it was similar to TP-2 and TP-3 		
3.5' – 5.5'	Light brown F sand and silt with pieces of weathered shale Metal, wood, tires and bricks continued to be scattered throughout this layer				
5.5'	Shale				
K:\16426\test pits\TP-4 log.doc					

Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 5		
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)		
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick		
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/22/07 Start:12:55PM Finish: 1:45 PM		
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe		
General Informa	tion:		
Length: <u>12"</u> Width: <u>4'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>8.5'</u>		
Groundwater in Pit: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No	If yes, what depth:		
Depth to Top of Waste: <u>6"</u>	Depth to Bottom of Waste: 8.5		
Description of Waste: Wood, metal, tires, bike frames, and plastic	(pool liner)		
Drums Encountered: \Box Yes \boxtimes No No. of Drums: <u>N/A</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No		
Description/Condition of Drums: <u>N/A</u>			
Location Marked: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon		
Pictures Taken: Xes No			
Sampling Informa	ation:		
Sample Collected.	Sampling Time: <u>1:25 PM</u>		
Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)	No. of Bottles: <u>6 encores, 2 jars</u>		
Test Pit Profile	PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:		
	- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit		
0 – 1' Topsoil and organics w/ F sand and silt Metal, wood, tires and bricks scattered	- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit		
throughout this layer starting at 6"	- Waste layer mixed from 6" - 8 5' in		
	test pit w/ heavy concentration of wood from 5' - 8.5'		
1' – 8.5' FMC sand and gravel and silt Metal wood tires and plastic continue	- Sample TP-5(8.5')/MSMSD taken at bottom of test pit		
to be scattered throughout this layer	- MSMSD taken at this location		
	—		
8.5' Shale			

K:\16426\test pits\TP-5 log.doc

Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 6				
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location:Area of Concern (former fill area)				
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick				
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/22/07 Start:2:20PM Finish: 3:35 PM				
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe				
General Informat	ion:				
Length: <u>12'</u> Width: <u>8'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>7'</u>				
Groundwater in Pit: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No	If yes, what depth:				
Depth to Top of Waste: <u>6"</u>	Depth to Bottom of Waste: 7'				
Description of Waste: Wood, bricks, tires and a chrome bumper					
Drums Encountered: 🛛 Yes \Box No No. of Drums: <u>2</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No				
Description/Condition of Drums: Both drums were crushed and rus	ty				
Location Marked: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon				
Pictures Taken: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No					
Sample Collected: ⊠ Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015) and Test Pit Profile 0 – 1' Topsoil and organics and silt Metal, wood, tires and bricks scattered throughout this layer starting at 6" 1' – 7' FMC sand and gravel w/ stones and silt Metal, wood, tires, bricks and a chrome bumper were encountered in this layer. Rusty, crushed drum w/ plastic liner encountered lying horizontally at 2.5' w/ residual soil/sludge inside. Second rusty crushed (empty) burn barrel encountered at approximately 4'. 7' Shale	Yes No Sampling Time: 2:55 PM and 3:20 PM full TCLP No. of Bottles: 3 encores, 4 jars PID Readings/Test Pit Notes: - No odor, visual or PID readings throughout test pit - Waste layer mixed from 6" - 7' in test pit - Sample TP-6(2.5') (full TCLP) taken from interior of rusty drum w/ evidence of plastic liner found lying horizontally at 2.5' in test pit. Material in drum was a wet, black, sludge/soil mixture w/ a slight odor with 0.0 PPM. This drum was removed from excavation and overpacked - A second rusty and crushed drum was encountered at approximately 4'. This drum did not have a liner and appeared to be an old burn barrel as determined by holes cut into sides and bottom and evidence of ashes in barrel. Drum empty w/ no odor and 0.0 PPM.				
	- Sample TP-6(7') was taken from bottom of test pit.				

Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 7
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/22/07 Start:3:35 PM Finish: 4:00 PM
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe
General Information:	
Length: <u>12'</u> Width: <u>5'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>7'</u>
Groundwater in Pit: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No	If yes, what depth:
Depth to Top of Waste: <u>1'</u>	Depth to Bottom of Waste: 7'
Description of Waste: Wood, metal, bricks and concrete	
Drums Encountered: \Box Yes \boxtimes No No. of Drums: <u>N/A</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No
Description/Condition of Drums: <u>N/A</u>	
Location Marked: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon
Pictures Taken: Xes No	
Sample Collected: Xes No	
Sampling Method: Grab	Sampling Time: <u>3:50 PM</u>
Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)	No. of Bottles: <u>3 encores, 1 jar</u>
Test Pit Profile	PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:
	- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit
0-1' Topsoil and organics w/ silt	 No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit
	- Waste layer mixed from 1' - 7' in test pit w/ relatively little amounts of waste. One large piece of concrete
 FMC sand and gravel and slit w/ some stone Metal, wood, bricks and large piece of concrete encountered throughout this layer (small amount of waste) 	 Sample TP-7(7') was taken at bottom of test pit
7' Shale	

Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area) Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY Logged By: J. Herrick Project Number: 16426.1002.1102 Date: 10/23/07 Start.8:15 AM Finish: 8:40 AM Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc. Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe General Information: Length: 10' Width: 4' Max. Depth: 4' Groundwater in Pit: Yes No If yes, what depth:	Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 8		
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY Logged By: J. Herrick Project Number: 16426.1002.1102 Date: 10/23/07 Start:8:15 AM Finish: 8:40 AM Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc. Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe General Information: Length: 10' Width: 4' Max. Depth: 4' Groundwater in Pit: Yes No If yes, what depth:	Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)		
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102 Date: 10/23/07 Start:8:15 AM Finish: 8:40 AM Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc. Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe General Information: Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe Length: 10' Width: 4' Max. Depth: 4' Groundwater in Pit: Yes No If yes, what depth:	Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick		
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc. Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe General Information: Image: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe Length: $\underline{10'}$ Width: $\underline{4'}$ Max. Depth: $\underline{4'}$ Groundwater in Pit: Yes No If yes, what depth: Image: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe Depth: 10' Width: $\underline{4'}$ Max. Depth: $\underline{4'}$ Max. Depth: $\underline{4'}$ Depth to Top of Waste: 2.5' Depth to Bottom of Waste: 4' Description of Waste: Small amount of metal and fabric (rug-like) Depth to Bottom of Waste: 4' Drums Encountered: Yes No No. of Drums: N/A Materials in Drums? Yes No Location Marked: Yes No No Sampling Information: Sample Collected: No Sampling Time: 8:20 AM and 8:00 AM Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015) No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jar PID Readings/Test Pit Notes: 0 Test Pit Profile PID Readings/Test Pit Notes: - 0.0 PPM throughout test pit - 0 0 -1.5' Topsoil and organics w/ silt - No ador, visual or other evidence of contamination through	Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/23/07 Start:8:15 AM Finish: 8:40 AM		
General Information: Length: 10' Width: 4' Max. Depth: 4' Groundwater in Pit: Yes No If yes, what depth:	Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe		
Length: $10'$ Width: $4'$ Max. Depth: $4'$ Groundwater in Pit:YesNoIf yes, what depth:Depth to Top of Waste: $2.5'$ Depth to Bottom of Waste:Depth to Top of Waste:Small amount of metal and fabric (rug-like)Depth to Bottom of Waste:Drums Encountered:YesNoNo. of Drums:MAMaterials in Drums?YesNoDescription/Condition of Drums:NAMaterials in Drums?YesLocation Marked:YesNoWith:Labeled stake w/ blue ribbonPictures Taken:YesNoSampling Information: Sample Collected:Sampling Time:Sample Analyses:YOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jarSample Analyses:YOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jar0 - 1.5'Topsoil and organics w/ silt-0.0 PPM throughout test pit0 - 1.5'Topsoil and organics w/ silt-No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit1.5' - 4'FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rugSample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit	General Information:			
Groundwater in Pit: Yes No If yes, what depth:	Length: <u>10'</u> Width: <u>4'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>4'</u>		
Depth to Top of Waste: 2.5' Depth to Bottom of Waste: 4' Description of Waste: Small amount of metal and fabric (rug-like) Drums Encountered: Yes No No. of Drums: \underline{MA} Materials in Drums?: Yes No Description/Condition of Drums: \underline{MA} Materials in Drums?: Yes No Description/Condition of Drums: \underline{MA} With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon Pictures Taken: $\underline{\otimes}$ Yes No No Sampling Information: Sample Collected: No Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015) No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jar PID Readings/Test Pit Notes: 0 - 1.5' Topsoil and organics w/ silt - 0.0 PPM throughout test pit - No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit 1.5' - 4' FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug- - Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit	Groundwater in Pit: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No	If yes, what depth:		
Description of Waste: Small amount of metal and fabric (rug-like)Drums Encountered:YesNoNo. of Drums: N/AMaterials in Drums?:YesNoDescription/Condition of Drums:N/AWith:Labeled stake w/ blue ribbonDescription/ConditionNoDescription/Condition of Drums:N/AWith:Labeled stake w/ blue ribbonPictures Taken: \Box YesNoNoSample Collected: \Box YesNoSample Collected: \Box YesNoSample Analyses:YOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jarPID Readings/Test Pit Notes:- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit0 - 1.5'Topsoil and organics w/ silt- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit1.5' - 4'FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit	Depth to Top of Waste: 2.5'	Depth to Bottom of Waste: <u>4'</u>		
Drums Encountered:YesNoNo. of Drums:N/AMaterials in Drums?:YesNoDescription/Condition of Drums:N/ALocation Marked: \boxtimes YesNoWith:Labeled stake w/ blue ribbonPictures Taken: \boxtimes YesNoSampling Information: Sample Collected:NoSampling Time: 8:20 AM and 8:00 AMSample Analyses:VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jarPID Readings/Test Pit Notes:0 - 1.5'Topsoil and organics w/ silt- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit1.5' - 4'FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug Sample TP-8(4) was taken at bottom of test pit	Description of Waste: Small amount of metal and fabric (rug-like)			
Description/Condition of Drums: \overline{WA} Location Marked: \boxtimes YesNoWith:Labeled stake w/ blue ribbonPictures Taken: \boxtimes YesNoSampling Information: Sample Collected: \boxtimes YesNoSampling Method:GrabSampling Time: 8:20 AM and 8:00 AMSample Analyses:VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jarPID Readings/Test Pit Notes:0 - 1.5'Topsoil and organics w/ silt- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit0 - 1.5'Topsoil and organics w/ silt- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit1.5' - 4'FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit	Drums Encountered: Yes No No. of Drums: N/A	Materials in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 📋 No		
Location Marked: \square Yes \square NoWith:Labeled stake w/ blue ribbonPictures Taken: \square Yes \square NoSampling Information: Sample Collected: \square Yes \square NoSampling Method:GrabSampling Information: Sampling Time: 8:20 AM and 8:00 AMSample Analyses: \vee OC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jarSample Analyses: \vee OC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jarTest Pit ProfilePID Readings/Test Pit Notes: - 0.0 PPM throughout test pit $0-1.5'$ Topsoil and organics w/ silt- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit $0-1.5'$ Topsoil and organics w/ silt- Waste layer mixed from 2' - 4' in test pit w/ relatively little amounts of waste encountered in test pit. $1.5' - 4'$ FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit	Description/Condition of Drums: <u>N/A</u>			
Pictures Taken: \bigvee YesNoSampling Information: Sampling Method:Sample Collected: \bigvee YesNoSample Analyses:VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jarSample Analyses:VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jarTest Pit ProfilePID Readings/Test Pit Notes:0 - 1.5'Topsoil and organics w/ silt- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit1.5' - 4'FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit	Location Marked: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon		
Sampling Information: Sample Collected: Yes NoSampling Method: GrabSampling Time: 8:20 AM and 8:00 AMSample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jarTest Pit ProfilePID Readings/Test Pit Notes: - 0.0 PPM throughout test pit $0 - 1.5'$ Topsoil and organics w/ silt- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit $0 - 1.5'$ Topsoil and organics w/ silt- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit $1.5' - 4'$ FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit	Pictures Taken: Xes No			
Sampling Method: Grab Sampling Time: 8:20 AM and 8:00 AM Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015) No. of Bottles: 6 encores, 2 jar Test Pit Profile PID Readings/Test Pit Notes: 0 - 1.5' Topsoil and organics w/ silt 0 - 1.5' Topsoil and organics w/ silt 1.5' - 4' FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug-	Sampling Information:			
Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015) No. of Bottles: <u>6 encores, 2 jar</u> Test Pit Profile PID Readings/Test Pit Notes: 0 - 1.5' Topsoil and organics w/ silt - 0.0 PPM throughout test pit 0 - 1.5' Topsoil and organics w/ silt - No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit 1.5' - 4' FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug- - Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit	Sampling Method: Grab	Sampling Time: <u>8:20 AM and 8:00 AM</u>		
Test Pit ProfilePID Readings/Test Pit Notes:0 - 1.5'Topsoil and organics w/ silt- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit1.5' - 4'FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit	Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)	No. of Bottles: <u>6 encores, 2 jar</u>		
 0 - 1.5' Topsoil and organics w/ silt 0.0 PPM throughout test pit No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit Waste layer mixed from 2' - 4' in test pit w/ relatively little amounts of waste encountered in test pit. 1.5' - 4' FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug- 	Test Pit Profile	PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:		
0-1.5'Topsoil and organics w/ silt- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit1.5' - 4'FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit		- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit		
 Waste layer mixed from 2' - 4' in test pit w/ relatively little amounts of waste encountered in test pit. 1.5' - 4' FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug- Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit 	0-1.5' Topsoil and organics w/ silt	 No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit 		
1.5' - 4' FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit		- Waste layer mixed from 2' - 4' in test pit w/ relatively little amounts of waste encountered in test pit.		
	1.5' – 4' FMC sand and gravel and trace silt Small amounts of metal and fabric (rug- like) were encountered between 2' – 4'	- Sample TP-8(4') was taken at bottom of test pit		
like) were encountered between 2' – 4' - Duplicate sample TP-20(4') was taken at bottom of test pit as well		- Duplicate sample TP-20(4') was taken at bottom of test pit as well		
		-		
4' Shale	4' Shale			
Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 9			
--	--	--	--	--
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)			
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick			
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/23/07 Start:8:40 AM Finish: 9:30 AM			
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe			
General Informat	ion:			
Length: <u>10'</u> Width: <u>4'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>6'</u>			
Groundwater in Pit: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	If yes, what depth: 5'			
Depth to Top of Waste: 2'	Depth to Bottom of Waste: 6'			
Description of Waste: Small amount of metal				
Drums Encountered: 🛛 Yes \Box No No. of Drums: <u>4</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No			
Description/Condition of Drums: <u>3 drums were rusty crushed and pamaterial</u>	artial; one was full form, rusty and full of solid white			
Location Marked: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon			
Pictures Taken: Xes No				
Sampling Informa Sample Collected:	tion: Yes □ No Sampling Time: <u>9:15 AM and 9:10 AM</u>			
Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015) and	<u>full TCLP</u> No. of Bottles: <u>3 encores, 4 jars</u>			
 0-2' Topsoil and organics and silt 2'-6' FMC sand and gravel w/ stones and silt Small amount of metal scattered throughout this layer. 3 rusty, crushed and partial drums (empty) encountered @ 2-5' 1 full shape, rusty and full of white solid drum encountered @ 5' 6' Ended excavation @ 6' due to probability of disturbing additional drums Note: Encountered water at 5' which had odor, was datin color but had no sheen. 	 Odor encountered when full drum was excavated. No other visual or other evidence of contamination was encountered throughout test pit Small amount of waste mixed from 2' 6' in test pit. Sample TP-9(Drum) (full TCLP) taken from interior of full drum. Drum contained mixture of 2 substances. Whitish/gray gelatinus material (1306 PPM) w/ strong glue-like odor and a white soild plastic like material w/ no odor and 0.0 PPM. Sample TP-9(6') was taken from bottom of test pit. 			

-9 log.do

Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 10			
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)			
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick			
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/23/07 Start:9:45 AM Finish: 10:30 AM			
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe			
General Informati	on:			
Length: <u>10'</u> Width: <u>4'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>4.5'</u>			
Groundwater in Pit: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	If yes, what depth: <u>4.5'</u>			
Depth to Top of Waste: <u>6"</u>	Depth to Bottom of Waste: 3'			
Description of Waste: concrete				
Drums Encountered: \Box Yes \Box No No. of Drums: <u>3</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No			
Description/Condition of Drums: <u>Drums were all rusted, partial and c</u> 2 other drums were observed in side	crushed. One drum was encountered in excavation,			
Location Marked: \square Ves \square No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon			
Dictures Taken: \square Ves \square No	With: Labeled stake W/ blue ribbon			
Sampling Informat	ion:			
Sample Collected: X	′es L_ No Sampling Time: <u>10:00 AM</u>			
Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)	No. of Bottles: <u>3 encores, 1 jar</u>			
Test Pit Profile	PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:			
0-1' Topsoil and organics and silt	- Slight odor encountered in excavation w/ 0.0 PPM readings			
1' - 2' FMC sand and gravel w/ silt	 No other visual or other evidence of contamination was encountered throughout test pit except small white 			
2' – 4.5' Brown silt and F sand w/ pieces of weathered shale Encountered rusty, crushed partial drum at 4.5' in	piece of material (similar to that encountered in full drum located in TP-6) found in soil near partial drum at 4.5' level.			
excavation. Also observed 2 drums in side walls of excavation. All drums appeared to be empty and were all in the same condition	- Pieces of concrete encountered in excavation from 6"-3' in test pit			
Ended excavation @ 4.5' due to probability of disturbing additional drums which appeared to be	- Partial rusty, crushed and empty drum encountered at 4.5'			
present. Note: Encountered water at 4.5' which had odor, was dark in color but had no sheen.	 Sample TP-10(4.5') was taken from soil near located drum. Soil sample had slight odor w/ a PID reading of 6.2 PPM. 			
K:\16426\test pits\TP-10 log.doc				

Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 11			
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)			
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick			
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/23/07 Start:10:30 AM Finish: 10:50 AM			
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe			
General Information	on:			
Length: <u>8'</u> Width: <u>3'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>3'</u>			
Groundwater in Pit: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No	If yes, what depth: <u>N/A</u>			
Depth to Top of Waste: <u>N/A</u>	Depth to Bottom of Waste: <u>N/A</u>			
Description of Waste: <u>N/A</u>				
Drums Encountered: \square Yes \square No No. of Drums: <u>2</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No			
Description/Condition of Drums:Drums were all rusted, partial and on the other drums was observed in the be empty, possibly some residual states.	crushed. One drum was encountered in excavation, he bottom of the test pit. Both drums appeared to soil.			
Location Marked: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon			
Pictures Taken: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No				
Sampling Informat Sample Collected: Sampling Method: Grab	tion: Yes D No Sampling Time: <u>10:40 AM</u>			
Test Pit Profile	No. of Bottles: <u>3 encores, 1 jar</u> PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:			
	- Slight odor encountered in excavation w/ 0.0 PPM readings			
0-3' Topsoil, organics, silt FMC sand and gravel w/ pieces of shale	 No other visual or other evidence of contamination was encountered throughout test pit. 			
Ended excavation @ 3' due to probability of disturbing additional drums.	 No waste encountered in excavation First partial, very rusty, crushed (some soil inside) drum was 			
No other waste was encountered in test pit	encountered @ 2'. Slight odor w/ 0.0 PPM inside drum.			
Encountered 1 rusty, crushed partial drum at 2' in excavation. Also observed 1 additional drum at bottom of test pit @ 3'. Both drums appeared to be empty and were all in the same condition	 Second drum encountered @ 3' in bottom of excavation. Drum was crushed, rusty and partial and appeared to be empty w/ some residual soil inside. 			
	 Sample TP-11(3') was taken from soil near located drum. Soil sample had no odor w/ a PID reading of 0.0 PPM. 			

K:\16426\test pits\TP-11 log.doc

Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 12			
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location:Area of Concern (former fill area)			
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick			
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/23/07 Start:10:55 AM Finish: 11:45 AM			
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe			
General Information	on:			
Length: <u>8'</u> Width: <u>4'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>5'</u>			
Groundwater in Pit: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No	If yes, what depth: <u>N/A</u>			
Depth to Top of Waste: <u>N/A</u>	Depth to Bottom of Waste: <u>N/A</u>			
Description of Waste: <u>N/A</u>				
Drums Encountered: \Box Yes \Box No No. of Drums: <u>1</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No			
Description/Condition of Drums:Drum was crushed and empty. Drun EPON RESIN 1001-A-80.	m had label on it. Able to make out "Flamable"			
Location Marked: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon			
Pictures Taken: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No				
Sampling Informat				
Sample Collected:	Sampling Time: <u>11:30 AM</u>			
Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)	No. of Bottles: <u>3 encores, 1 jar</u>			
Test Pit Profile	PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:			
	- 0.0 PPM in excavation			
 0-1' Topsoil and organics 1'-4' FMC sand and gravel w/ silt 4'-5' black/gray silt and F sand w/ septic like odor (0.0 PPM) Encountered crushed drum at 1' in excavation. Drum still had little rust. Partial label still attached (Refer above for wording on label). Drum was empty, had a slight solvent odor and 0.0 PPM reading on the PID. No waste encountered in excavation Ended excavation @ 5' 	 No other visual or other evidence of contamination was encountered throughout test pit aside from described below associated with the one drum identified. No waste encountered in test pit Crushed and empty drum w/ partial label encountered at 1'. Interior of drum had slight odor w/ PID reading of 0.0 PPM. Sample TP-12(4-5') was taken from black/gray soil at bottom of test pit. Soil sample had slight septic odor w/ a PID reading of 0.0 PPM. 			

Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 13			
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)			
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick			
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/23/07 Start:12:00 PM Finish: 12:45 PM			
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe			
General Informati	on:			
Length: <u>12'</u> Width: <u>4'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>9'</u>			
Groundwater in Pit: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No	If yes, what depth: <u>N/A</u>			
Depth to Top of Waste: <u>1'</u>	Depth to Bottom of Waste: 7'			
Description of Waste: Wood, metal and tires				
Drums Encountered: \Box Yes \boxtimes No No. of Drums: <u>N/A</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 📋 No			
Description/Condition of Drums: <u>N/A</u>				
Location Marked: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon			
Pictures Taken: Xes No	ion			
Sampling Informat Sample Collected:	ion: (es 🗌 No			
Sampling Method: Grab	Sampling Time: <u>12:10 PM</u>			
Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)	No. of Bottles: <u>3 encores, 1 jar</u>			
Test Pit Profile	PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:			
0-1' Topsoil and organics	 No other visual or other evidence of contamination was encountered throughout test pit 			
1'-7' FMC sand and gravel w/ silt and stones	- Wood, tires and metal encountered between 1'-7'. Heavy layer of wood encountered between 5'-7'.			
Wood, tires and metal encountered throughout this layer w/ a heavy concentration of wood between 5'-7'	- Sample TP-12(4-5') was taken from black/gray soil in waste layer at 4'-5'. Soil sample had no odor, but had a			
7' – 9' black/gray silt and F sand w/ septic like odor (0.0 PPM) (similar to that found in TP-12 @ 4'-5')	PID reading of 2.1 PPM.			
Ended excavation @ 9' (no shale/bedrock encountered)				

K:\16426\test pits\TP-13 log.doc

Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Test Pit Log	Test Pit No.: TP- 14				
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation	Test Pit Location: Area of Concern (former fill area)				
Project Location: Rte 67, Hoosick Falls, NY	Logged By: J. Herrick				
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102	Date: 10/23/07 Start: 1:00 PM Finish: 1:15 PM				
Excavation Contractor: Precision Industrial Maintenance, Inc.	Equipment: Case 580M 4x4 extendahoe				
General Informat	ion:				
Length: <u>12'</u> Width: <u>4'</u>	Max. Depth: <u>6'</u>				
Groundwater in Pit: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No	If yes, what depth: <u>N/A</u>				
Depth to Top of Waste: <u>1'</u>	Depth to Bottom of Waste: $3'$				
Description of Waste: Concrete and some metal					
Drums Encountered: Yes No No. of Drums: <u>N/A</u>	Materials in Drums?: 🗌 Yes 🛛 No				
Description/Condition of Drums: N/A					
Location Marked: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	With: Labeled stake w/ blue ribbon				
Pictures Taken: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No					
Sampling Informa	tion: Ves 🔲 No				
Sample Collected.	Sampling Time: <u>1:15 PM</u>				
Sample Analyses: VOC's (8260) and Methyl Cellosolve (8015)	No. of Bottles: <u>3 encores, 1 jar</u>				
Test Pit Profile	PID Readings/Test Pit Notes:				
	- 0.0 PPM throughout test pit				
0-1' Topsoil and organics	- No odor, visual or other evidence of contamination throughout test pit				
	- Waste layer mixed from 1' - 5' in test				
1'-5' FMC sand and gravel and silt	- Sample TP-1 $1(5')$ was taken at 5'				
Concrete and metal scattered throughout this layer	just above shale at bottom of test pit.				
5' – 6' Brown/gray f sand and silt with some weathered shale					
6' Shale					
K:\16426\test.pits\TP-14.log.doc					

APPENDIX B

	CHA										Schm	igel JBS	Sit UR	FACE LC	gation)G	
PRO	PROJECT NUMBER: 16426										HO	LEI	NUN	MBER M	W-1	Page 1 of 2
LOC	ΑΤΙΟΙ	N: HO	oosick Falls, I	Yo	rk				DRILL FLUID:			DR	ILLING METH	OD: Air Rota	v	
CLIE	NT:	MAC	TEC Engine	ering	ar	d Cons	sulting				DATE	ті	ЛЕ	WATER	CASING BOTTOM (ft)	HOLE BOTTOM (ft)
CON	ITRAC	CTOR:	Aquifer Drill	ing a	and	Testin	g									
DRIL	LER:	R. (Cemfert		IN	SPECTO	R: J.	Herrick		WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS						
STA	RT DA	TE ar	nd TIME: 10/29	/200	7					DURING						
FINIS	SH DA FACE	ATE ar	nd TIME: 10/29	/200												
ELE	/:				CH	HECKED	by: S	. Fowler								
SAMP./CORE NUMBER	SAMP. ADV. (f LEN. CORE (ft	RECOVERY (ft)	PID Readings (ppm)	"N" Value or RQD%	SAMPLE	DEPTH (Feet)	GRAPHICS	DESCR	IPT	ION AND CLASSIFI	CATION		ELEVATION	(jeed) Ch Dril Re	emarks on aracter of ling, Water eturn, etc.	WATER LEVELS AND/OR WELL DATA
GEOPROBE LOG SCHMIGEL SITE INVESTIGATION BOKING LOGSGEN UPVATEUCHAGUT 4//US	3	3	0.0	12		-2 -4 -6 -8 -10 -12 -12 -14		TOPSOIL or waste, i.e. pla no evidence <u>f.m.c. SAND</u> no odor, no e <u>SILT</u> , some f light brown, o contaminatio <u>SHALE</u>	Sarting and a straight of a st	hics and silt with h c/glass bottles, dr contamination. (Tr d f.c. Gravel, trac ence of contamin and, trace weathe no odor, no evide ML)	red shale, ence of	r,		0' to 3': 1 3' to 26'	Hand dug	

PRO	CLOUGH HARBOUR & ASSOCIATES LLP PROJECT NUMBER: 16426								Schmige SUBS HOLE	I Site I SURFA NUME	Investigation ACE LOG BER MW-1	Page 2 of 2
SAMP./CORE NUMBER	SAMP. ADV. (ft) LEN. CORE (ft)	RECOVERY (ft)	PID Readings (ppm)	"N" Value or RQD%	SAMPLE	DEPTH (Feet)	GRAPHICS	DESCR	IPTION AND CLASSIFICATION	ELEVATION (Feet)	Remarks on Character of Drilling, Water Return, etc.	WATER LEVELS AND/OR WELL DATA
						-16 -18 -20 -22 -22 -24 -26 -28 -30 -32		SHALE (cont End of Boring	g at 26 ft		Dry well - Abandoned in place. Bentonite chips from 4' to 26' bgs and concrete from 0' to 4' bgs.	

	CLOUGH HARBOUR & ASSOCIATES LLP									Schm Sl	igel Si t JBSUR	t e Investi FACE LC	gation)G _{M-2}	
PRC	PROJECT NUMBER: 16426												N-∠	Page 1 of 3
LOC	CATIO	N: H	oosick Falls,	New	Yo	rk			DRILL FLUID:		DR	ILLING METH	OD: Air Rota	ry
CLI	ENT:	MAC	CTEC Engine	ering	an	d Cons	sulting		_	DATE	TIME	WATER DEPTH (ft)	CASING BOTTOM (ft)	HOLE BOTTOM (ft)
CO	NTRA	CTOR	: Aquifer Dril	ling a	ind	Testin	g			10-31-07	00:00	33.2		
DRI	LLER:	R. (Cemfert		IN	SPECTO	R: J.	Herrick	OBSERVATIONS					
STA	RT D	ATE a	nd TIME: 10/29	9/200	7				DURING DRILLING					
FIN		ATE a =	nd TIME: 10/31	/200	7				_					
ELE	V:	-			C⊦	IECKED	BY: S	. Fowler						
SAMP./CORE NUMBER	SAMP. ADV. (ft) LEN. CORE (ft)	RECOVERY (ft)	PID Readings (ppm)	"N" Value or RQD%	SAMPLE	DEPTH (Feet)	GRAPHICS	DESCRII	PTION AND CLASSIF	ICATION	ELEVATION	Re Ch Drill Re	marks on aracter of ling, Water eturn, etc.	WATER LEVELS AND/OR WELL DATA
<u>σ</u> S-1	5	5	0.0	10				TOPSOIL, f. s shale, trace w no evidence o <u>f.m.c. SAND</u> odor, no evide <u>f.m. SAND</u> br of contaminat	sand and silt, trace of vood/roots, brown, c of contamination. (T and f.c. Gravel, bro ence of contamination rown, dry, no odor, f tion. (SP)	weathered dry, no odo OPSOIL) wn, dry, nc on. (SP)	r, 	0' to 18':	Air Rotary	
0-PDA1EDCHA.GU1 4/7/08	2	1.8	0.0	10				becomes f.m. gravel (SP)	c. sand and grades	with trace				
	2	1.6	0.0	22		- 10 		grades with so	ome silt (SM)					
OBE LOG SCHMIGEL SITE INVESTIG S C	2	1.5	0.0	19				<u>f.m. SAND</u> no odor, no ev	and f.c. Gravel, trac vidence of contamir	ce silt, dry, nation. (SP) vel, brown,)			
GEOPH								(SP)		anination.				

CLOUGH HARBOUR & ASSO	
PROJECT NUMBER 16426	

Schmigel Site Investigation SUBSURFACE LOG HOLE NUMBER MW-2

PRC	JECT NUMBER: 16426					Page 2 c						
SAMP./CORE NUMBER	SAMP. ADV. (ft) LEN. CORE (ft)	RECOVERY (ft)	PID Readings (ppm)	"N" Value or RQD%	SAMPLE	DEPTH (Feet)	GRAPHICS	DESCR	IPTION AND CLASSIFICATION	ELEVATION (Feet)	Remarks on Character of Drilling, Water Return, etc.	WATER LEVELS AND/OR WELL DATA
S-6	2	1.5		17				f.m. SAND, tr dry, no odor, (SP) (continu	race silt, trace f. gravel, brown, no evidence of contamination. <i>ied)</i>			
S-7	2	1.6	0.0	24		- 16		<u>f.m.c. SAND</u> brown, dry, n contaminatio	and Silt, some f.c. Gravel, to odor, no evidence of n. (SP)			
			0.0		_	-18					18' to 38': Auger	
S-8	2	0.8		1		-						
		4.7	0.0			-20		<u>f.m.c. SAND</u> brown, dry, n contaminatio	trace f.c. gravel, trace silt, to odor, no evidence of n. (SP)			
2-9	2	1.7		14		-						
S-10	2	16	0.0	14		- 22		<u>f. SAND</u> , trac evidence of c	e silt, brown, dry, no odor, no contamination. (SP)			
		1.0										
800 / /			0.0			-24		f.c. GRAVEL evidence of c	, trace silt, dry, no odor, no contamination. (GP)			
A.GDT 4/7/	2	1.5		19		-						
PDATEDCH			0.0			-26						
∩ <mark>S-12</mark> 008:00	2 2	0.8		16		-						
			0.0			-28						
S-13 ESTIGATIOI	8 2	0.9		21		-						
			0.0			-30						
ย <mark>IS-14</mark> ยุ ยุ	2	0.9		15		-						
COPROBE LC		1.0	0.0	00		-32		f.m.c. SAND brown, dry, n contaminatio	some f.c. Gravel, trace silt, o odor, no evidence of n. (SP)			
၂၁-15 ၂၂၃-15	y 2	1.3		22		-						

PRO	JECT	NUM	CLOUGH HARBOUR BER: 16426	R & ASSO					Schmigel Site Investigation SUBSURFACE LOG HOLE NUMBER MW-2 Page 3 of 3								
SAMP./CORE NUMBER	SAMP. ADV. (ft) LEN. CORE (ft)	RECOVERY (ft)	PID Readings (ppm)	"N" Value or RQD%	SAMPLE	DEPTH (Feet)	GRAPHICS	DESCR	RIPTION AND CLASSIFICATION	ELEVATION (Feet)	Remarks on Character of Drilling, Water Return, etc.	WATER LEVELS AND/OR WELL DATA					
S-16	2	1.3	0.0	16		34 36		trace shale									
S-17	2	1.7		25		- 		End of Borin	g at 38 ft								
00//# 100.4						- 42 44											
						- 46											
						- 48 - 50 -											

				R & ASS							Schm	i gel Si JBSUF	te RF/	Investig	gation G	
PF	ROJEC	ΓΝυΜ	BER: 16426												v-5	Page 1 of 2
LC	CATIC	N: H	oosick Falls,	New	Yo	ork				DRILL FLUID:		DF	RILL	ING METHO	D: Air Rota	ry
C	IENT:	MAG	CTEC Engine	ering	l ar	nd Cons	sulting	1		-	DATE	TIME		WATER DEPTH (ft)	CASING BOTTOM (ft)	HOLE BOTTOM (ft)
С	ONTRA	CTOR	Aquifer Drill	ling a	and	Testin	g				10-30-07	00:00		14.9		
DI	RILLER	: R.	Cemfert		IN	SPECTO	R: J.	Herrick		OBSERVATIONS						
ST	ART D	ATE a	nd TIME: 10/30)/200	07					DORING						
FI	JRFACI	ATE a E	nd TIME: 10/30)/200						-						
EL	EV:			1	Cł	HECKED	by: S	5. Fowler								
SAMP./CORE	NUMBER SAMP. ADV. (fl LEN. CORE (ft	RECOVERY (ft)	PID Readings (ppm)	"N" Value or RQD%	SAMPLE	DEPTH (Feet)	GRAPHICS	DESCR	IPT	ION AND CLASSIF	ICATION	ELEVATION	(Feet)	Rer Cha Drilli Re	marks on aracter of ng, Water turn, etc.	WATER LEVELS AND/OR WELL DATA
	5 ± 1 2 2 0.8 3 1 4 0.1	1 0.8 1 0.1	0.0	10				f.m.c. SAND organics, trac of contamina f.m. SAND s no evidence Weathered E SHALE	Second seco	ome f.c. Gravel, tr silt, dry, no odor, n. (SP) ne f.c. Gravel, dry contamination. (S <u>DROCK</u> (Shale)	ace no evidenc	e		0' to 5': A	vuger 9' : Air Rotary	
הבטראטשב בטט מטחווויטבר																

PRO	CLOUGH HARBOUR & ASSOCIATES LLP								Schmigel Site Investigation SUBSURFACE LOG HOLE NUMBER MW-3 Page 2 of 2								
SAMP./CORE NUMBER	SAMP. ADV. (ft) LEN. CORE (ft)	RECOVERY (ft)	PID Readings (ppm)	"N" Value or RQD%	SAMPLE	DEPTH (Feet)	GRAPHICS	DESCR	IPTION AND CLASSIFICATION	ELEVATION (Feet)	Remarks on Character of Drilling, Water Return, etc.	WATER LEVELS AND/OR WELL DATA					
						-16 -18 -20 -22 -22 -24 -24 -26 -28 -30 -32		End of Boring	g at 21.3 ft								

APPENDIX C

CHA V	VELL CONSTRUCTIO	ON LOG	BORING NO. MW-2
CLOUGH HARBOUR & ASSOCIATES LLP PROJECT & LOCATION: Schmigel Site Investigation	Hoosick Falls, NY		WELL NO. MW-2
CLIENT: MACTEC Consulting and En	ngineering		PROJECT NO.: 16426.1002.1102
CONTRACTOR: Aquifer Drilling and Testing,	INC.		SHEET NO.: 1 OF 1
			ELEVATION:
			START DATE: 10/31/07 TIME:
			FINISH DATE: 10/31/07 TIME:
			DRILLER: R. Comfort
			INSPECTOR: J. Herrick
Locking Steel Cap		Depth Above G Pipe:	Ground of Riser 3.0'
Riser Vent Hole		Type of Cap:	Locking gripper
	V V V	V V	
Protective Casing Weep Hole		Type of Surfac	e Seal: <u>Concrete</u>
		Thickness of S	urface Seal: <u>1'</u>
		Type of Protec	tive Casing: <u>Steel</u>
		Inside Dia. Of (Casing: <u>4"</u>
		Depth Above C	Ground of Casing: <u>3.2'</u>
Diameter Borehole: <u>8"</u>		Depth Below G	Fround of Casing: <u>1.8'</u>
Type of Backfill Around Riser Pipe: <u>Bentonite grout</u>			
Inside Diameter of Riser Pipe: <u>2</u> "			
		Type of Bentor	nite Seal: <u>Bentonite Chips</u>
Depth to Top of Fine Sand		Depth to Top o	f Bentonite Seal: 24'
Choke: <u>NA</u>			
		Type of Screer	n: <u>Slotted, Sch 40, PVC</u>
T (0, 15, 1,,,,,	┓ !!■!!	Screen Diamet	er: <u>2"</u>
Type of Sand Pack: <u>#2 Sand</u>	- 1 1	Screen Slot Si	ze [.] 0.020"
Depth to Top of Sand Pack: <u>26'</u>		Depth to Top o	f Screen: 28'
Depth to Bottom of Sand Pack: <u>38</u> '		Depth to Botto	m of Screen: 38'
Backfill (if any): <u>NA</u>	├──≯ @@@@] ∢ ────	Depth to Botto	m of Borehole: <u>38'</u>

PROJECT & LOCATION: Schmigel Site Investigation Hoosick Falls, NY PROJECT NO.: 16426.1002. CLIENT: MACTEC Consulting and Engineering PROJECT NO.: 16426.1002. CONTRACTOR: Aquifer Drilling and Testing, Inc. SHEET NO.: 1 OF 1 ELEVATION: START DATE: 10/30/07 FINISH DATE: 10/30/07 FINISH DATE: 10/30/07 DRILLER: R. Comfort INSPECTOR: J. Herrick Locking Steel Cap Depth Above Ground of Riser Pipe: 3.0' Riser Vent Hole Type of Cap: Locking gripper	I102
CLIENT: MACTEC Consulting and Engineering PROJECTINOL. 10420.1002. CONTRACTOR: Aquifer Drilling and Testing, Inc. SHEET NO.: 1 OF 1 ELEVATION: START DATE: 10/30/07 FINISH DATE: 10/30/07 DRILLER: R. Comfort INSPECTOR: J. Herrick Locking Steel Cap Riser Vent Hole Type of Cap: Locking gripper	
ELEVATION: START DATE: 10/30//07 FINISH DATE: 10/30//07 DRILLER: R. Comfort INSPECTOR: J. Herrick Depth Above Ground of Riser Pipe: 3.0' Type of Cap: Locking gripper	TIME:
START DATE: 10/30//07 FINISH DATE: 10/30//07 DRILLER: R. Comfort INSPECTOR: J. Herrick Depth Above Ground of Riser Pipe: 3.0' Type of Cap: Locking gripper	
FINISH DATE: 10/30/07 DRILLER: R. Comfort INSPECTOR: J. Herrick Depth Above Ground of Riser Pipe: 3.0' Type of Cap: Locking gripper	TIME:
Locking Steel Cap Depth Above Ground of Riser Riser Vent Hole Type of Cap: Locking gripper	
Locking Steel Cap Depth Above Ground of Riser Riser Vent Hole Type of Cap:	
Locking Steel Cap Depth Above Ground of Riser Riser Vent Hole Type of Cap:	
Locking Steel Cap Depth Above Ground of Riser Riser Vent Hole Type of Cap:	
Riser Vent Hole	
Protective Casing Ween Hole Type of Surface Seal: Concrete	
Thickness of Surface Seel: 1'	
Type of Protective Casing:	بما
Inside Dia. Of Casing: <u>4"</u>	
Depth Above Ground of Casing: <u>3.</u>	<u>1'</u>
Diameter Borehole: 4"	,
	-
Type of Backfill Around Riser I Pipe: Concrete	
Inside Diameter of Riser Pipe:	
Type of Bentonite Seal: Bentonite C	Chips
	
Depth to Top of Fine Sand	
Type of Screen: <u>Slotted, Sch 40, P</u>	VC
Type of Sand Back: #2 Sand	
screen Slot Size: 0.020"	
Depth to Top of Sand Pack:8'	
Depth to Bottom of Sand Pack: 21.3'	
Depth to Bottom of Screen:1	
Backfill (if any): <u>NA</u> Depth to Bottom of Borehole: <u>21</u>	.3'

APPENDIX D

	SOUR & ASSOCIATES LLP				Well Level Data
Project Name	e: Schmigel Site Investig	gation		Logged By	: J. Herrick / J. Morey
Project Locat	tion: NYS Rte. 67, Hoos	ick Falls, NY		Date: 11/8/	/07
Project Numb	per: 16426.1002.1102			Instrument	: Solinst Water Level Meter
Well ID	Measuring Point (TOC/TOR)	Measurement Time (HR:MIN)	Dept	h to Water (ft.)	Comments
OW-27	TOR			10.55	
OW-28	TOR			7.55	
OW-29	TOR			4.25	
MW-2	TOR			35.70	
MW-3	TOR			8.95	
0					

Comments:

OW-28 has the PVC riser pipe broke and splintered at approx. 2' ags., steel casing can be lifted off of well and cap is unable to be secured due to damage. Surface seal is also compromised.

OW-29 is severly damaged. Surface seal is damaged, PVC riser pipe extends above steel protective casing by approx. 2", bottom of appears to be only 1.5' bgs. Appears that the only water that enters the well is surface water. Well appears to be severly compromised.

Clough, Ha Well Sam	irbour 8 pling/De	ເ Assoc evelopn	iates LL	_P g	San	nple/Well Desigr	nation: OW	-27		
Project Name: Schmigel	Site Inve	stigation			Log	ged By: J. Herric	k / J. Morey			
Project Location: NYS R	te. 67 Hc	osick Fal	ls, NY		Date	e: 11/8/07				
Project Number: 16426.	1 <u>002.110</u> 2	2			Scre	een Length: N/A				
 Depth to Bottom of W (from TOC) Column of Water: <u>3.4</u> [(1) – (2)] Volume Conversion: (see below) Method of Purging: □ W 	/ell: <u>13.95</u> <u>10</u> ft. <u>0.163</u> gal VaTerra [>	_ft. ./ft. ⊲ Bailer [Pur	ge Informa sible □ Oth	tion: (2) [(1) (4) \ (6) 1 [¹ ner:	Depth to Water: <u>1</u> from TOC) Well Riser Diame 1 Well Volume: <u>0</u> (3) x (5)]	1 <u>0.55</u> ft. eter: <u>2</u> in. . <u>55</u> gal.			
Volume Conversion: (gal./ft.) Began Purging at: 11:00 AM 2" = 0.163 4" = 0.653 6" = 1.469 8" 2.611 10" = 4.08										
Field Analysis:	· · · ·	0.000								
Volume Purged (gal.)	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0						
Time	11:02	11:06	11:11	11:20			1:00			
ORP/EH (mV)	38.0	29.9	26.8	21.9						
рН	6.64	6.48	6.40	6.34						
Cond. (uS/CM)	440	405	396	404						
Turbidity (NTU)	58.1	24.7	18.8	40.6			8.4			
D.O. (mg/L)	NM	NM	NM	NM						
Temperature (°C)	12.10	12.40	12.13	12.21						
Total Volume Purged: 2	gal.			<u>ד</u>	Γotal Pu	rge Time: <u>20 min</u>	<u>iutes</u>			
			Samp	oling Inform	nation:					
Sampling Method: <u>Grab/</u>	<u>/Bailer</u>			٦	No. of B	ottles: <u>6</u>				
Sampling Time: <u>1:00 PM</u>	1									
Sample Analyses: <u>TCL \</u>	/OC's (82	<u>.60) & Me</u>	thylcellos	<u>olve (8015)</u>						
Comments: NM = Parameter not me	asured.									
Water was slightly turbid no sheen and no efferve	l, slightly a	cloudy and	d amber ir	n color w/ tra	ace float	ling orange partic	culates, sligh	nt organic	odor w/	
Water recharged slowly.	1									
Well unable to be locked	due to br	roken wel	l cap.							

K:\16426\Data\Well Sampling\110807 sampling\OW-27_Well Sampling Log.doc

Clough, Ha Well Sam	arbour 8 pling/De	Assoc evelopn	iates LL nent Log	-P 9	5	Sample/W	/ell Designa	ation: OW-	28		
Project Name: Schmigel	Site Inve	stigation			L	Logged By	/: J. Herrick	/ J. Morey			
Project Location: NYS R	te. 67 Ho	osick Fal	ls, NY		0	Date: 11/8	/07				
Project Number: 16426.	1002.1102	2			5	Screen Le	ngth: N/A				
,			Pur	ge Inforn	nation		0				
 (1) Depth to Bottom of V (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: <u>4.7</u> [(1) – (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: (see below) 	Vell: <u>11.70</u> <u>15</u> ft. <u>0.163</u> gal	<u>.</u> ft. ./ft.			((2) Depth ((from T 4) Well Ri (6) 1 Well [(3) x (5	to Water: <u>7.</u> OC) iser Diamete Volume: <u>0.6</u> 5)]	<u>55</u> ft. er: <u>2</u> in. 57 gal.			
Method of Purging: X	VaTerra] Bailer [sible 🗌 C	ther:						
$2^{"} = 0.163$	и./п.) ве <u>(</u> 4" =	0.653	ng at: 11:	25 AIVI 6" = 1.46	69		8" 2.611		10" = 4	.08	
Field Analysis:										1	
Volume Purged (gal.)	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5						
Time 11:25 11:32 11:37 11:40 11:53 1:20											
ORP/EH (mV) 36.4 72.4 81.2 95.1 109.9											
рН	pH 7.08 6.94 7.08 6.87 6.82										
Cond. (uS/CM)	154	149	145	144	149)					
Turbidity (NTU)	351	224	168	218	349)		38 and rising			
D.O. (mg/L)	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM						
Temperature (°C)	11.17	11.09	11.23	11.29	11.0	4					
Total Volume Purged: 2.	<u>.5</u> gal.				Total	Purge Tir	ne: <u>28 minu</u>	<u>ites</u>			
			Samp	oling Info	rmatio	on:					
Sampling Method: Grab	/Waterra				No. o	of Bottles:	<u>6</u>				
Sampling Time: <u>1:20 PM</u>	<u>1</u>										
Sample Analyses: TCL	VOC's (82	60) & Me	thylcelloso	olve (8015	5 <u>)</u>						
Comments: NM = Parameter not me	asured.										
Water remained turbid a	is purging	continue	d. Water	was tan in	color	w/ no odo	r, no sheen	and no effe	ervesenc	e.	
Water recharged slowly.											
Well is compromised. W ground surface and surfa can not be inserted into	Vell casing ace seal is well.	j can be p s broken.	oulled from PVC rise	n ground, r is deforr	PVC ri ned jus	ser is brol st below g	ke of and sp round surfac	lintered ap ce enough	prox 2' al so that a	bove bailer	
Well can not be locked/s	secured du	ue to dam	aged well	casing/co	over.						

K:\16426\Data\Well Sampling\110807 sampling\OW-28_Well Sampling Log.doc

Clough, Ha Well Sam	arbour 8 pling/De	Associ evelopm	ates LL ent Log	_P 9		Sample/We	ll Designa	tion: OW	-29	
Project Name: Schmigel	Site Inve	stigation				Logged By:	J. Herrick	/ J. Morey	,	
Project Location: NYS R	te. 67 Ho	osick Fall	s, NY			Date: 11/8/0	7			
Project Number: 16426.	1002.1102	2				Screen Leng	gth: N/A			
 (1) Depth to Bottom of V (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: <u>1.2</u> [(1) – (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: (see below) 	Vell: <u>5.45</u> f <u>20</u> ft. <u>0.163</u> gal	it. ./ft.	Pur	ge Informa	ation	n: (2) Depth to (from TO (4) Well Rise (6) 1 Well Vo [(3) x (5)]	Water: <u>4.2</u> C) er Diamete olume: <u>0.1</u>	<u>25</u> ft. er: <u>2</u> in. 96 gal.		
Volume Conversion: (ga	l./ft.) Be	an Purgir	ig at: 10:		<u>ier:</u>		" 0.044		40" 4	
2" = 0.163 Field Analysis:	4" =	0.653		6" = 1.469)	8	2.611		10" = 4	.08
Volume Purged (gal.)	0.15	0.17								
Time	10:50	10:53								
ORP/EH (mV)	349.2	345.6								
рН	7.48	7.46								
Cond. (uS/CM)	282	281								
Turbidity (NTU)	>1000	>1000								
D.O. (mg/L)	NM	NM								
Temperature (°C)	8.52	8.15								
Total Volume Purged: 0.	<u>.17</u> gal.				Tota	Il Purge Time	e: <u>3 minute</u>	<u>es</u>		
			Samp	oling Inform	nati	on:				
Sampling Method: Grab	/Bailer				No.	of Bottles: 0				
Sampling Time: NO SAM	MPLE TAP	<u>KEN</u>			-					
Sample Analyses: TCL	VOC's (82	60) & Met	hylcelloso	olve (8015)						
Comments: NM = Parameter not me	asured.									
Water was turbid, cloudy	y dark bro	wn in colo	r w/ no oo	dor, no shee	en a	nd no efferve	esence.			
Well dry at approx. 0.17	gallons w	/ no recha	rge. IE. ı	no sample v	was	taken.				
Well is severly comprom pipe. Surface seal is bro run-off surface water.	iised. We oken. We	II casing is II appears	loose fro to extend	om ground. d only appro	PV ox. 1	C riser pipe .5' into groui	extends ap nd. Water	prox. 2" a in well ap	above stee pears to b	e only
Well can not be secured	l/locked du	ue to dama	age to ca	sing cover.						

Clough, Ha Well Sam	rbour 8 pling/De	Assoc	iates LL າent Lo	_P g		Sar	nple/Well	Designa	tion: MW	-2/CHA-1		
Project Name: Schmigel	Site Inve	stigation				Log	ged By: J	. Herrick	J. Morey			
Project Location: NYS R	te. 67 Hc	osick Fall	ls, NY			Dat	e: 11/8/07	,				
Project Number: 16426.	1002.1102	2				Scr	een Lengt	th: 10'				
 (1) Depth to Bottom of W (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: <u>5.0</u> [(1) – (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: (see below) Method of Purging: □ W 	√ell: <u>40.75</u> <u>)5</u> ft. <u>0.163</u> gal VaTerra [<u>,</u> ft. ./ft.] Bailer [⊵	Pur ⊴Submer:	sible 🗌 C	natior Other:	n: (2) (4) (6)	Depth to \ (from TOC Well Rise 1 Well Vo ((3) x (5)]	Water: <u>35</u> C) r Diamete lume: <u>0.8</u>	<u>.70</u> ft. er: <u>2</u> in. <u>2</u> gal.			
Volume Conversion: (gal./ft.)Began Purging at:9:50 AM $2" = 0.163$ $4" = 0.653$ $6" = 1.469$ $8" 2.611$ $10" = 4.08$												
Field Analysis:												
Volume Purged (gal.) 2 4 6 10 13 15 10.00												
Time 9:52 9:54 9:57 10:02 10:05 10:07 12:30												
ORP/EH (mV) 366.4 348.8 345.8 348.3 349.5 349.4												
рН	7.59	7.55	7.50	7.42	7.4	40	7.40					
Cond. (uS/CM)	228	208	208	211	21	2	213					
Turbidity (NTU)	>1000	506	158	78.2	20	.2	18.0		14.2			
D.O. (mg/L)	NM	NM	NM	NM	N	М	NM					
Temperature (°C)	8.46	8.33	8.39	8.40	8.4	46	8.48					
Total Volume Purged: 1	<u>5</u> gal.				Tota	al Pu	irge Time	: <u>17 minu</u>	tes			
			Samp	oling Info	rmati	on:						
Sampling Method: <u>Grab</u> Sampling Time: <u>MW-2: *</u>	<u>/Bailer</u> 12:30 PM	<u>/ CHA-1:</u>	<u>12:00 PM</u>	<u>.</u>	No.	of B	ottles: <u>6 +</u>	<u>- 6</u>				
Sample Analyses: TCL	√OC's (82	<u>.60) & Me</u>	thylcelloso	<u>olve (8015</u>	<u>5)</u>							
Comments: NM = Parameter not me	asured.											
Water was turbid at begi	inning of p	ourging, th	ien cleare	ed w/ no o	dor, n	io sh	een and r	no efferve	sence.			

Clough, Ha Well Sam	arbour 8 pling/De	& Assoc evelopn	iates LL nent Log	_P g	s	ample/Well	Designation: M	W-3/MSMS	3D			
Project Name: Schmigel	Site Inve	stigation			L	ogged By: J	. Herrick / J. Mor	еу				
Project Location: NYS R	te. 67 Ho	osick Fal	ls, NY		D	ate: 11/8/07	7					
Project Number: 16426.	1002.1102	2			s	creen Lengt	th: 10'					
 (1) Depth to Bottom of W (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: <u>14</u> [(1) – (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: (see below) Method of Purging: □ W 	Vell: <u>23.85</u> <u>.90</u> ft. <u>0.163</u> gal VaTerra [<u>.</u> ft. ./ft.] Bailer [∕	Pur ⊴Submers	sible 🗌 C	nation: (2 (4 (6 Other:	2) Depth to \ (from TOC 4) Well Rise 6) 1 Well Vo [(3) x (5)]	Water: <u>8.95</u> ft. C) r Diameter: <u>2</u> in. lume: <u>2.43</u> gal.					
Volume Conversion: (gal./ft.)Began Purging at: 10:22 AM2" = 0.1634" = 0.6536" = 1.4698" 2.61110" = 4.08												
Field Analysis:												
Volume Purged (gal.) 3 7 10 13 15 17												
Time 10:24 10:27 10:30 10:32 10:35 10:37 12:20												
ORP/EH (mV) 365.0 358.8 353.7 350.8 349.2 350.0												
рН	7.30	7.36	7.41	7.46	7.49	7.41						
Cond. (uS/CM)	625	649	647	638	641	641						
Turbidity (NTU)	23	95.2	135	38.2	12.6	9.95	6.49					
D.O. (mg/L)	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM						
Temperature (°C)	12.93	13.12	13.06	13.04	12.98	3 13.15						
Total Volume Purged: <u>1</u>	<u>7</u> gal.				Total	Purge Time	: <u>15 minutes</u>					
			Samp	oling Info	rmatio	า:						
Sampling Method: <u>Grab</u> , Sampling Time: <u>12:20 P</u>	/ <u>Bailer</u> <u>M</u>				No. of	Bottles: <u>6 +</u>	<u>- 6</u>					
Sample Analyses: TCL	VOC's (82	60) & Me	thylcellos	olve (8015	5 <u>)</u>							
Comments: NM = Parameter not me	asured.											
Water was turbid at begi	inning of p	ourging, th	nen cleare	ed w/ no o	dor, no	sheen and r	no effervesence.					

Clough, Ha Well Samı	rbour 8 pling/De	، Assoc evelopn	iates LL	_P g	Si	ample/Wel	I Designatio	on: Cistern			
Project Name: Schmigel	Site Inve	stigation			La	ogged By: J	J. Herrick / J	. Morey			
Project Location: NYS R	te. 67 Hc.	osick Fall	ls, NY		D	ate: 11/8/07	7				
Project Number: 16426.2	1002.110:	2			S	creen Leng	th: N/A				
 (1) Depth to Bottom of W (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: <u>1</u> ff [(1) – (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: (see below) Method of Purging: W 	/ell: <u>Appro</u> t. <u>NA</u> gal./ft <u>VaTerra [</u>	<u>>x. 5</u> ft. <u>] Bailer [</u>	Pur	ge Informat	tion: (2 (4 (6 <u>er:</u>	2) Depth to V (from TO(4) Well Rise 5) 1 Well Vo [(3) x (5)]	Water: <u>1</u> ft. C) r Diameter: lume: <u>NA</u> ga	<u>NA</u> in. al.			
Volume Conversion: (gal./ft.) $2" = 0.163$ $4" = 0.653$ $6" = 1.469$ $8" 2.611$ $10" = 4.08$ Field Analysis:											
Field Analysis:	 	 T	 T				 TT		 		
Volume Purged (gal.)	ļ		ļ	ļ							
Time	1:45										
ORP/EH (mV)	167.7		[
рН	6.50										
Cond. (uS/CM)	200			ļ							
Turbidity (NTU)	11			ļ							
D.O. (mg/L)	NM										
Temperature (°C)	9.00										
Total Volume Purged: <u>N</u>	<u>A</u> gal.			т	otal I	Purge Time	: <u>NA</u>				
			Samp	oling Inform	ation	1:					
Sampling Method: Grab/	<u>Beaker</u>				<u>اء</u> م	Dettine: C					
Sampling Time: <u>1:45 PM</u>	<u>1</u>			N	10. 01	Bottles: <u>6</u>					
Sample Analyses: <u>TCL \</u>	<u>/OC's (82</u>	<u>:60) & Me</u>	thylcellos	<u>olve (8015)</u>							
Comments: NM = Parameter not me	asured.										
Water was clear. colorles	ss an odo	rless w/ a	ı slight sh∉	een on surfa	ice ar	nd no efferv	esence.				
Surface of cistern is com approx. 4 1/2 ' deep w/ a	prised of concrete	a concret :/hard bott	:e pad w/ a tom and is	approx. a 2 ⁻ s has approx	1/2' ci (, 3 1/	iccular oper '2' to 4' of se	ning. The st ediment in it	ructure appe	ars to be		
Cistern has a tire and rin	n as a sur	face cove	∍r.								

	SOUR & ASSOCIATES LLP		Well Level Data					
Project Name	e: Schmigel Site Investig	gation		Logged By: J. Herrick				
Project Locat	tion: NYS Rte. 67, Hoos	sick Falls, NY		Date: 12/1	3/07			
Project Numb	per: 16426.1002.1102			Instrument	: Solinst Water Level Meter			
Well ID	Measuring Point (TOC/TOR)Measurement Time (HR:MIN)TOP		Dept	h to Water (ft.)	Comments			
OW-27	TOR			7.00				
OW-28	TOR			4.80				
OW-29	TOR			4.62				
MW-2	TOR			33.16				
MW-3	TOR			7.45				

Comments:

OW-28 has the PVC riser pipe broke and splintered at approx. 2' ags., steel casing can be lifted off of well and cap is unable to be secured due to damage. Surface seal is also compromised.

OW-29 is severly damaged. Surface seal is damaged, PVC riser pipe extends above steel protective casing by approx. 2", bottom of appears to be only 1.5' bgs. Appears that the only water that enters the well is surface water. Well appears to be severly compromised.

Clough, Ha Well Sam	irbour & pling/De	. Assoc ∋velopn	iates Ll	LP g	Sample/We	ell Designa	ation: OW	-27	
Project Name: Schmigel	Site Inve	stigation	Logged By: J. Herrick / J. Morey						
Project Location: NYS R	Date: 12/13	3/07							
Project Number: 16426	Screen Ler	ath. N/A							
Purge Information:									
 (1) Depth to Bottom of W (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: <u>6.9</u> [(1) – (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: (see below) 	(2) Depth to (from TC (4) Well Ris (6) 1 Well \ [(3) x (5)	 (2) Depth to Water: <u>7.00</u> ft. (from TOC) (4) Well Riser Diameter: <u>2</u> in. (6) 1 Well Volume: <u>3.39</u> gal. [(3) x (5)] 							
Method of Purging:	√aTerra 🗵	🛛 Bailer 🗌	Submer	sible 🗌 Othe	·:				
Volume Conversion: (ga 2" = 0.163	I./ft.) Beg 4" =	jan Purgi 0.653	ng at: 11:	:00 AM 6" = 1.469		8" 2.611		10" = 4.	.08
Field Analysis:			1						1
Volume Purged (gal.)	1.0	2.0	3.5						
Time	9:55	9:59	10:05				11:35		
ORP/EH (mV)	41.0	2.60	-24.7						
рН	6.03	6.05	6.02						
Cond. (uS/CM)	263	302	324						
Turbidity (NTU)	202	45.7	25.4				39.0		
D.O. (mg/L)	NM	NM	NM						
Temperature (°C)	8.14	9.06	9.25						
Total Volume Purged: 3.	<u>5</u> gal.			Тс	tal Purge Tim	ne: <u>12 minu</u>	<u>ites</u>		
			Samp	oling Informa	tion:				
Sampling Method: Grab	/Bailer			Na	of Pottloo: 6	2			
Sampling Time: <u>11:35 A</u>	M			INC	. of bottles. <u>c</u>	<u>)</u>			
Sample Analyses: TCL	<u>VOC's (82</u>	<u>60) & Me</u>	thylcellos	olve (8015)					
Comments: NM = Parameter not me	asured.								
Water was turbid, and dull rusty brown in color w/ floating brown/orange particulates. No odor, no sheen and no effervesence observed.									
Well unable to be locked	due to br	oken wel	l cap.						

Clough, Ha Well Samı	rbour & pling/De	د Assoc evelopn	iates Ll nent Lo	LP g	San	Sample/Well Designation: OW-28				
Project Name: Schmigel	Site Inve	stigation	Log	Logged By: J. Herrick						
Project Location: NYS R	Dat	Date: 12/13/07								
Project Number: 16426.	Scr	een Length: N/A								
Purge Information (1) Depth to Bottom of Well: <u>11.70</u> ft. (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: <u>6.90</u> ft. [(1) – (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: <u>0.163</u> gal./ft. (see below) Method of Purging: ⊠ WaTerra □ Bailer □ Submersible □ Other:						 (2) Depth to Water: <u>4.80</u> ft. (from TOC) (4) Well Riser Diameter: <u>2</u> in. (6) 1 Well Volume: <u>3.37</u> gal. [(3) x (5)] 				
Volume Conversion: (gal 2" = 0.163	l./ft.) Beç 4" =	jan Purgir 0.653	ng at: 11:	:25 AM 6" = 1.469		8" 2.611		10" = 4.	.08	
Field Analysis:						1				
Volume Purged (gal.)	1.0	2.0	3.5							
Time	9:30	9:38	9:46				11:20			
ORP/EH (mV)	97.0	67.7	66.5							
рН	6.58	6.18	6.23							
Cond. (uS/CM)	141	143	144							
Turbidity (NTU)	328	107	107				133			
D.O. (mg/L)	NM	NM	NM							
Temperature (°C)	7.18	6.98	6.91							
Total Volume Purged: 3.	<u>5</u> gal.			T	otal Pu	ırge Time: <u>11 miı</u>	nutes			
			Sam	pling Inform	ation:					
Sampling Method: <u>Grab/</u>	<u>Waterra</u>			Ν	lo. of B	ottles: <u>6</u>				
Comple Apply 200: TCL				-bra (901E)						
Comments:	/UU's (82	60) & Me	thylcellos	<u>OIVE (8015)</u>						
NM = Parameter not mea	asured.									
Water was turbid and clo	oudy light	brown in <i>i</i>	color. The	ere was no o	dor, no	sheen and no ef	fervesence	observed.		
Well is compromised. Well casing can be pulled from ground, PVC riser is broke of and splintered approx 2' above ground surface and surface seal is broken. PVC riser is deformed just below ground surface enough so that a bailer can not be inserted into well.										
Well can not be locked/s	ecured du	ue to dam	aged wel	l casing/cove	ər.					

K:\16426\Data\Well Sampling\121307 sampling\OW-28_Well Sampling Log.doc

Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP Well Sampling/Development Log Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation Project Location: NYS Rte. 67 Hoosick Falls, NY Project Number: 16426.1002.1102 Purge Informati (1) Depth to Bottom of Well: <u>5.45</u> ft. (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: <u>0.83</u> ft. [(1) – (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: <u>0.163</u> gal./ft. (see below) Method of Purging: □ WaTerra ⊠ Bailer □ Submersible □ Othe Volume Conversion: (gal./ft.) Began Purging at: 10:50 AM 2" = 0.163				Sample/Well Designation: OW-29					
Project Name: Schmigel	Site Investigat	Logged By: J	. Herrick						
Project Location: NYS R	te. 67 Hoosick	Falls, NY		Date: 11/8/07	7				
Project Number: 16426.	1002.1102			Screen Lengt	th: N/A				
 (1) Depth to Bottom of W (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: <u>0.8</u> [(1) – (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: (see below) Method of Purging: W 	/ell: <u>5.45</u> ft. <u>}3</u> ft. <u>0.163</u> gal./ft. <u>VaTerra ⊠ Bai</u> l	Purg	 (2) Depth to Water: <u>4.62</u> ft. (from TOC) (4) Well Riser Diameter: <u>2</u> in. (6) 1 Well Volume: <u>0.41</u> gal. [(3) x (5)] 						
Volume Conversion: (ga 2" = 0.163	I./ft.) Began P 4" = 0.65	urging at: 10:8	50 AM 6" = 1.469	8"	2.611	10" = 4	10" = 4.08		
Field Analysis:							1		
Volume Purged (gal.)									
Time									
ORP/EH (mV)									
рН									
Cond. (uS/CM)									
Turbidity (NTU)									
D.O. (mg/L)									
Temperature (°C)									
Total Volume Purged: <u>0.</u>	<u>.0</u> gal.		To	tal Purge Time	:				
		Samp	ling Informat	tion:					
Sampling Method: Grab/	<u>/Bailer</u>		No	of Bottles: 0					
Sampling Time: <u>NO SAN</u>	<u>IPLE TAKEN</u>		NO	. of Dotties. <u>o</u>					
Sample Analyses: TCL	<u>√OC's (8260) &</u>	Methylcellosc	olve (8015)						
Comments: NM = Parameter not me	asured.								
Well is severly compromised. Well casing is loose from ground. PVC riser pipe extends approx. 2" above steel riser pipe. Surface seal is broken. Well appears to extend only approx. 1.5' into ground. Water in well appears to be only run-off surface water.									

K:\16426\Data\Well Sampling\121307 sampling\OW-29_Well Sampling Log.doc

Clough, Ha Well Sam	rbour 8 pling/De	√Assoc ∋velopn	iates LL nent Log	_P g	s	Sample/Well Designation: MW-2/CHA-1				
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation Logged By: J. Herrick Project Location: NXS Rte .67, Hoosick Falls, NX Date: 12/13/07										
Project Location: NYS R	D	ate: 12/13/0)7							
Project Number: 16426.1002.1102 Screen Length: 10'										
Purge Information: (1) Depth to Bottom of Well: 40.75 ft. (2) Depth to Water: 33.16 ft. (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: 7.59 ft. (4) Well Riser Diameter: 2 in. (1) - (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: 0.163 gal./ft. (6) 1 Well Volume: 1.24 gal. (see below) [(3) x (5)] Method of Purging: □ WaTerra □ Bailer ⊠Submersible □ Other:										
Volume Conversion: (gal 2" = 0.163	l./ft.) Beg 4" =	jan Purgir 0.653	ng at: 10:	46 AM 6" = 1.46	69	8"	2.611		10" = 4.	.08
Field Analysis:							 1			
Volume Purged (gal.)	1.5	2.5	4	8	10	12				
Time	10:50	10:53	10:55	10:58	11:00) 11:03		12:20		
ORP/EH (mV)	-9.7	-2.5	5.6	9.4	13.5	18.6				
рН	6.71	6.68	6.68	6.69	6.67	6.64				
Cond. (uS/CM)	218	216	214	213	215	213				
Turbidity (NTU)	1000	359	174	71.0	39.3	23.5		124		
D.O. (mg/L)	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM				
Temperature (°C)	8.63	8.97	8.87	8.98	8.98	9.12				
Total Volume Purged: <u>12</u>	2 gal.				Total	Purge Time	: 17 <u>minut</u>	ies		
	- 0		Samr	oling Info	rmatior	ו:				
Sampling Method: Grab/	<u>'Bailer</u>				No. of	Bottles: 6 +	- 6			
Sampling Time: <u>MW-2: 1</u>	2:20 PM	<u>/ CHA-1: </u>	<u>1:00 PM</u>			_				
Sample Analyses: TCL \	<u>/OC's (82</u>	<u>.60) & Me</u>	thylcelloso	<u>olve (8015</u>	5 <u>)</u>					
Comments: NM = Parameter not mea	asured.									
Water was turbid at beginning of purging and brown in color and cleared during purging. No odor, no sheen and no effervescence.										

Clough, Ha Well Sam	Harbour & Associates LLP				San	Sample/Well Designation: MW-3/MSMSD				
Project Name: Schmigel Site Investigation Logged By: J. Herrick Project Location: NYS Rte. 67 Hoosick Falls, NY Date: 12/13/07										
Project Location: NYS R	te. 67 Hc	osick Fal	ls, NY		Dat	Date: 12/13/07				
Project Number: 16426.	1002.1102	2	Scr	een Length: 10'						
Purge Information (1) Depth to Bottom of Well: <u>23.85</u> ft. (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: <u>16.4</u> ft. [(1) – (2)] (5) Volume Conversion: <u>0.163</u> gal./ft. (see below) Mathed of Durging: □ WaTerra □ Pailor ∑Submersible □ Other						 (2) Depth to Water: <u>7.45</u> ft. (from TOC) (4) Well Riser Diameter: <u>2</u> in. (6) 1 Well Volume: <u>8.02</u> gal. [(3) x (5)] 				
Volume Conversion: (gal./ft.)Began Purging at: 10:22 AM $2^{\circ} = 0.163$ $4^{\circ} = 0.653$ $6^{\circ} = 1.469$ $8^{\circ} 2.611$ $10^{\circ} - 4.08$										
Field Analysis:										
Volume Purged (gal.)	3	8	10							
Time	10:17	10:20	10:22	1	1:45					
ORP/EH (mV)	-29.1	-32.6	-30.5							
рН	6.26	6.41	6.49							
Cond. (uS/CM)	625	620	615							
Turbidity (NTU)	5.34	10.4	32.3		15.6					
D.O. (mg/L)	NM	NM	NM							
Temperature (°C)	10.55	11.0	11.2							
Total Volume Purged: 10	<u>0</u> gal.		_	Т	otal Pu	irge Time: <u>7 minutes</u>	<u>S</u>			
			Samp	oling Inform	ation:					
Sampling Method: Grab	/Bailer			Ν	o. of B	ottles: 6 + 6				
Sampling Time: <u>11:45 P</u>	M									
Sample Analyses: <u>TCL</u>	VOC's (82	60) & Me	thylcellos	olve (8015)						
NM = Parameter not me	asured.									
MSMSD Sample Taken	Here									
No odor, no sheen and r	no efferve	sence obs	served.							
Kil16426\Data\Wall Sampling/121207 cc	ampling/MW/-3_M	Vell Sampling L	a doc							

Clough, Ha Well Sam	irbour 8 pling/De	√Assoc ∋velopn	iates Ll	_P g	Sample/V	Sample/Well Designation: Cistern				
Project Name: Schmigel	Site Inve	stigation	Logged B	Logged By: J. Herrick						
Project Location: NYS R	te. 67 Hc	osick Fal	ls, NY		Date: 12/	Date: 12/13/07				
Project Number: 16426.	1002.1102	2	Screen Le	ength: N/A						
Purge Information: (1) Depth to Bottom of Well: Approx. 5 ft. (from TOC) (2) Depth to Water: 1 ft. (from TOC) (3) Column of Water: 1 ft. [(1) - (2)] (4) Well Riser Diameter: NA in. (6) 1 Well Volume: NA gal. (see below) (5) Volume Conversion: NA gal./ft. (see below) (6) 1 Well Volume: NA gal. [(3) x (5)] Method of Purging: WaTerra Bailer Submersible Other:										
Volume Conversion: (gal./ft.) 2" = 0.163 4" = 0.653 6" = 1.469 8" 2.611 10" = 4.08										
Field Analysis:	 		 	 				 T		
Volume Purged (gal.)	 		ļ	ļ						
Time	10:35									
ORP/EH (mV)	-9.5									
рН	6.54									
Cond. (uS/CM)	199									
Turbidity (NTU)	9.37									
D.O. (mg/L)	NM									
Temperature (°C)	5.24									
Total Volume Purged: <u>N</u>	<u>A</u> gal.			Tc	otal Purge Ti	me: <u>NA</u>				
			Sam	pling Informa	ition:					
Sampling Method: Grab/	/Beaker			NL	- of Dottloou	<u>^</u>				
Sampling Time: <u>12:05 P</u>	M			INU). Of BOUIES.	<u>b</u>				
Sample Analyses: <u>TCL \</u>	<u>/OC's (82</u>	<u>60) & Me</u>	thylcellos	<u>olve (8015)</u>						
Comments: NM = Parameter not me	asured.									
Water was clear. colorle	ss an odo	rless w/ a	a slight sh	een on surfac	e and no eff	ervesence.				
Surface of cistern is com approx. 4 1/2 ' deep w/ a	prised of concrete	a concret /hard bot	te pad w/ a tom and is	approx. a 2 1/ s has approx.	'2' circular o 3 1/2' to 4' c	pening. The stru of sediment in it.	cture appears to	o be		
Cistern has a tire and rin	n as a sur	face cove	ər.							

APPENDIX G



DATA VALIDATION SUMMARY REPORT OCTOBER THROUGH DECEMBER 2007 SAMPLING HONEYWELL – SCHMIGEL SITE INVESTIGATION HOOSICK FALLS, NEW YORK

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Data validation was completed on soil and groundwater samples collected in October, November, and December, 2007, in support of the Alexander Schmigel Site Investigation, Hoosick, New York. Samples were analyzed by Test America Laboratories located in Buffalo, New York and reported in data sets A07-C236, A07-C258, A07-D027, and A07-E495. The following U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) analytical methods (USEPA, 1996) were performed:

- Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) by USEPA Method SW846 8260
- Methyl Cellosolve (2-Methoxyethanol) by USEPA Method SW846 8015
- Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) VOCs by USEPA Method SW846 8260
- TCLP Semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs) by USEPA Method SW846 8270
- TCLP Pesticides by USEPA Method SW846 8081
- TCLP Herbicides by USEPA Method SW846 8151
- TCLP Metals by USEPA Method SW846 6010 and Method SW846 7470
- Reactive Sulfide and Reactive Cyanide by USEPA Method SW846 Section 7.3
- Flashpoint by USEPA Method SW846 1010

Data validation was completed by the MACTEC project chemist in accordance with the Honeywell Remediation Program Level III and IV data validation procedures described in the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) (MACTEC, 2006). The Honeywell review meets objectives described in the NYSDEC Data Usability Summary Report (DUSR) guidelines (NYSDEC, 2002). A Honeywell Level IV data validation was completed by the MACTEC project chemist on ten percent of the data (data package A07-C236). A Honeywell Level III data validation was completed by the MACTEC project chemist on the remaining samples. Data validation findings from the Level III and Level IV validation are reported in Section 2. A summary of samples and analytical parameters is presented on Table 1. Data were reviewed using precision and accuracy control limits presented in QAPP Table A-3. Data quality reviews for the items listed above were completed using professional judgment and data validation procedures described in the following guidelines:

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 1999. "USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review"; Office of Emergency and Remedial Response; EPA-540/R-99/008; October 1999.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 2004. "USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Data Review"; Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation; EPA-540-R-04-004; October 2004.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 1999. "USEPA Region II Standard Operating Procedure for the Validation of Organic Data Acquired using SW-846 Method 8260B"; USEPA Region II; HW-24; Revision 1; June 1999.

Final sample results are presented in Attachment A.



During the Level III data validation the following data quality indicators were reviewed:

- Case Narrative
- Sample Collection and Holding Times
- Initial Calibrations
- Continuing Calibrations
- Instrument Performance Checks (Tune)
- Internal Standard Response (GC/MS)
- Interference Checks (ICP)
- Serial Dilutions (ICP)
- QC Blanks
- Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)
- Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates (MS/MSD)
- Laboratory and Field Duplicates
- Surrogate Spikes
- Reporting Limits
- Data Completeness
- Electronic Data Verification

During the Level IV review the following data quality indicators were also reviewed:

- Calculation checks specified in USEPA guidelines
- Analyte Quantitation

Data qualifications were completed if necessary in accordance with the guidelines and professional judgment using the following qualifiers:

U = The target compound was not detected at a concentration greater than the associated quantitation limit

J = The reported concentration is considered an estimated value

2.0 LEVEL III and IV DATA VALIDATION ACTIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

Samples collected during October through December 2007 included in the data evaluation are listed on Table 1.

With the exception of the items discussed below, quality control (QC) parameters and measurements checked during validation met requirements in the analytical method, validation guidelines, and/or QAPP. Unless specified below, results are interpreted to be usable as reported by the laboratory.

Tentatively identified compounds (TICs) were not reported for the VOC and SVOC analyses.

2.1 Volatile Organic Compounds - Water

Initial Calibration



Percent relative standard deviations (RSDs) between initial calibration relative response factors (RRFs) for the initial calibration associated with samples collected on November 8, 2007, are above the USEPA Region 2 control limit of 20 for bromomethane (58), methylene chloride (35), 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene (31), and 1,2-dibromo-3 chloropropane (34). These analytes are not detected in the associated samples and quantitation limits for bromomethane, methylene chloride, 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene, and 1,2-dibromo-3-chloropropane are qualified as estimated (UJ) in CHA-1, CISTERN, MW-2, MW-3, OW-27, and OW-28 collected on November 8, 2007.

The RSD between initial calibration RRFs for the initial calibration associated with samples collected on December 13, 2007, is above the USEPA Region 2 control limit of 20 for methylene chloride (45). Methylene chloride is not detected in the associated samples and quantitation limits for methylene chloride are qualified as estimated (UJ) in CHA-1, CISTERN, MW-2, MW-3, OW-27, and OW-28 collected on December 13, 2007.

Continuing Calibration

Percent differences between initial and continuing calibration RRFs for the continuing calibration associated with samples collected on November 8, 2007, are above the USEPA Region 2 control limit of 20 for bromomethane (53), acetone (-25), 2-butanone (-31), methyl acetate (-49), cyclohexane (-22), and methylcyclohexane (-22). These analytes were not detected in the associated samples and quantitation limits for bromomethane, acetone, 2-butanone, methyl acetate, cyclohexane, and methylcyclohexane are qualified as estimated (UJ) in CHA-1, CISTERN, MW-2, MW-3, OW-27, and OW-28 collected on November 8, 2007.

The percent differences between initial and continuing calibration RRFs for the continuing calibration associated with a subset of samples collected on December 13, 2007, are above the USEPA Region 2 control limit of 20.0 for bromomethane (-23), chloroethane (-50), 2-butanone (20.2), and trichlorofluoromethane (-26). These analytes were not detected in the associated samples and quantitation limits for bromomethane, chloroethane, 2-butanone, and trichlorofluoromethane are qualified as estimated (UJ) in CHA-1, CISTERN, MW-2, MW-3, and OW-27 collected on December 13, 2007.

The percent differences between initial and continuing calibration RRFs for the continuing calibration associated with sample OW-28 collected on December 13, 2007, are above the USEPA Region 2 control limit of 20 for chloroethane (-40), 1,1,1-trichloroethane (-22), carbon tetrachloride (-26), dichlorodifluoromethane (-37), methyl acetate (-47), and trichlorofluoromethane (-34). These analytes were not detected in sample OW-28 and quantitation limits for chloroethane, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, carbon tetrachloride, dichlorodifluoromethane, methyl acetate, and trichlorofluoromethane are qualified as estimated (UJ) in sample OW-28 collected on December 13, 2007.

2.2 Volatile Organic Compounds - Soil

RSDs between initial calibration RRFs for the initial calibration associated with all soil samples are above the USEPA Region 2 control limit of 20.0 for carbon tetrachloride (24) and bromoform (20.4). These analytes are not detected in the samples, and quantitation limits for carbon tetrachloride and bromoform are qualified as estimated (UJ) in all soil samples.

The percent differences between initial and continuing calibration RRFs for the continuing calibration associated with a subset of soil samples are above the USEPA Region 2 control limit of 20.0 for acetone


(28), 2-butanone (20.2), dichlorodifluoromethane (-23), and methyl acetate (35). These analytes were not detected in the associated samples and quantitation limits for acetone, 2-butanone, dichlorodifluoromethane, and methyl acetate are qualified as estimated (UJ) in samples TP-5 (8 ¹/₂'), TP-1 (7'), TP-2 (3'), and TP-6 (7').

The percent differences between initial and continuing calibration RRFs for the continuing calibration associated with sample TP-12 (4-5) are above the USEPA Region 2 control limit of 20 for 1,1dichloroethane (-25), carbon tetrachloride (-23), dichlorodifluoromethane (-23), and isopropylbenzene (-26). These analytes were not detected in the associated sample, and quantitation limits for 1,1dichloroethane, carbon tetrachloride, dichlorodifluoromethane, and isopropylbenzene are qualified as estimated (UJ) in sample TP-12 (4-5).

QC Blanks

Acetone (6 ug/kg) and methylene chloride (5 ug/kg) were detected in the method blanks associated with soil samples analyzed on October 23 and October 25, 2007. Methylene chloride (3 ug/kg) was detected in the method blank associated with soil samples analyzed on October 24, 2007. Action levels were calculated at ten times the applicable blank detections and compared to associated sample data. The low level detection of acetone in TP-12 (4-5) was below the action level and is qualified as non-detected (U). Low level detections of methylene chloride in samples TP-1 (7'), TP-2 (3'), TP-5 (8 ¹/₂'), TP-6 (7'), TP-12 (4-5), TP-10 (4), TP-13 (4-5), TP-14 (5), TP-20 (4), TP-7 (7'), TP-8 (4), and TP-9 (6) are below the action levels and were qualified as non-detected (U).

Surrogates

Percent recoveries for the surrogate 1,2-dichloroethane-d4 in diluted analyses of samples TP-11 (3) (134) and TP-9 (6) (131) were above the QAPP specified control limits of 70-130 indicating potential high biases. Positive detections of acetone were reported from the diluted analyses of TP-11 (3) and TP-9 (6); these results were qualified as estimated (J) and may represent potential high biases for acetone.

2.3 Methyl Cellosolve

Surrogates

The percent recovery (12 %) of the surrogate for sample TP-9 (6) is below the laboratory control limits. Methyl cellosolve was not detected in the sample and the quantitation limit was qualified as estimated (UJ) in sample TP-9 (6) and is biased low.

2.4 TCLP Semivolatile Organic Compounds

Initial Calibration

The RSD between initial calibration RRFs for the initial calibration associated with TCLP sample TP-9 (DRUM) was above the USEPA Region 2 control limit of 20 for pentachlorophenol (28). Pentachlorophenol was not detected in the associated sample and the quantitation limit for pentachlorophenol was qualified as estimated (UJ) in TP-9 (DRUM).

The RSDs between initial calibration RRFs for the initial calibration associated with TCLP sample TP-6 $(2 \frac{1}{2})$ were above the USEPA Region 2 control limit of 20 for pentachlorophenol (22) and pyridine (32).



Pentachlorophenol and pyridine were not detected in the associated sample and quantitation limits for pentachlorophenol and pyridine were qualified as estimated (UJ) in TP-6 (2 ¹/₂).

2.4 TCLP Metals

QC Blanks

Lead (6.5 - 54.5 ug/L) was reported in the method blanks associated with the TCLP metals samples. Action levels were calculated at five times the applicable blank concentration and compared to sample data. The low level detection of lead in sample TP-9 (DRUM) was below the action level and was qualified as non-detected (U).

Initial Calibration

Percent recoveries of mercury (70, 75, 75) in the contract required detection limit standard were below the control limits of 80-120 indicating potential low biases for mercury results near the reporting limit. Mercury was not detected in the samples and quantitation limits for mercury were qualified as estimated (UJ) in TP-6 ($2\frac{1}{2}$) and TP-9 (DRUM).

References:

MACTEC, 2006. "Alexander Schmigel Site Quality Assurance Project Plan"; Appendix A – Quality Assurance/Quality Control, 2006.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), 2000. "Analytical Services Protocols (ASP)"; June 2000.

NYSDEC, 2002. "Guidance for the Development of Date Usability Summary Reports (DUSR)", Draft DER-10 Technical Guidance for Site Investigation and Remediation-Appendix 2B"; Division of Environmental Remediation; December 2002.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 1996. "Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste"; Laboratory Manual Physical/Chemical Methods; Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response; Washington, DC; SW-846; November 1986; Revision 4 -December 1996.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 1999. "USEPA Region II Standard Operating Procedure for the Validation of Organic Data Acquired using SW-846 Method 8260B"; USEPA Region II; HW-24; Revision 1; June 1999a.

USEPA, 1999. "USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review"; Office of Emergency and Remedial Response; EPA-540/R-99/008; October 1999b.

USEPA, 2004. "USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Data Review"; Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation; EPA-540-R-04-004; October 2004.

Data validator: Julie Ricardi

Date: 3/31/08

Senior Chemist: Chris Ricardi, NRCC-EAC

Chris Ricard



Date: 4/30/08



		Methyl Cellosolve	Hazardous	
Field Sample ID	VOC		Characteristics (1)	Sample Date
CHA-1	Х	Х		11/8/2007
CISTERN	X	Х		11/8/2007
MW-2	X	Х		11/8/2007
MW-3	Х	X		11/8/2007
OW-27	Х	Х		11/8/2007
OW-28	X	X		11/8/2007
TRIP BLANK	Х			11/8/2007
CHA-1	Х	X		12/13/2007
CISTERN	Х	X		12/13/2007
MW-2	Х	X		12/13/2007
MW-3	Х	X		12/13/2007
OW-27	Х	Х		12/13/2007
OW-28	Х	X		12/13/2007
TRIP BLANK	Х			12/13/2007
TP-1 (7')	Х	X		10/22/2007
TP-10 (4)	Х	Х		10/23/2007
TP-11 (3)	Х	X		10/23/2007
TP-12 (4-5)	Х	X		10/23/2007
TP-13 (4-5)	X	Х		10/23/2007
TP-14 (5)	Х	Х		10/23/2007
TP-2 (3')	X	Х		10/22/2007
TP-20 (4)	Х	X		10/23/2007
TP-5 (8 ½')	X	Х		10/22/2007
TP-6 (2 ¹ /2')			Х	10/22/2007
TP-6 (7')	Х	X		10/22/2007
TP-7 (7')	X	Х		10/22/2007
TP-8 (4)	X	X		10/23/2007
TP-9 (6)	Х	X		10/23/2007
TP-9 (DRUM)			X	10/23/2007

(1) Hazardous Characteristics = TCLP VOC, TCLP SVOC, TCLP Pesticides, TCLP Herbicides, TCLP Metals, Reactive Cyanide, Reactive Sulfide, Flashpoint, Corrosivity (pH)

		Field Sample ID	TP-1 (7')	TP-10(4)	TP-11(3)	TP-12(4-5)
		Location	TP-1	TP-10	TP-11	TP-12
		Sample Date	10/22/2007	10/23/2007	10/23/2007	10/23/2007
		SDG	A07C236	A07C236	A07C236	A07C236
Units	Method	Parameter Name				
ug/kg	SW8015	2-Methoxyethanol	5600 U	5800 U	5900 U	6100 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroeth	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	7 U	5 U	2 J	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1-Dichloroethane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1-Dichloroethene	7 U	5 U	14	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichloroethane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichloropropane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	2-Hexanone	36 U	24 U	25 U	26 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Acetone	36 UJ	7200	3200 J	36 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Benzene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromodichloromethane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromoform	7 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromomethane	14 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Carbon Disulfide	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Carbon tetrachloride	7 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chlorobenzene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloroethane	14 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloroform	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloromethane	14 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Cyclohexane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Dibromochloromethane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U

		Field Sample ID	TP-1 (7')	TP-10(4)	TP-11(3)	TP-12(4-5)
		Location	TP-1	TP-10	TP-11	TP-12
		Sample Date	10/22/2007	10/23/2007	10/23/2007	10/23/2007
		SDG	A07C236	A07C236	A07C236	A07C236
Units	Method	Parameter Name				
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Dichlorodifluoromethane	7 UJ	5 U	5 U	5 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Ethylbenzene	7 U	5 U	2 J	2 J
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Isopropylbenzene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	MEK (2-Butanone)	36 UJ	24 U	6 J	6 J
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methyl acetate	7 UJ	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methylcyclohexane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methylene chloride	8 U	5 U	90	7 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	MIBK (Methyl isobutyl ketone)	36 U	24 U	18 J	26 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Styrene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Tetrachloroethene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Toluene	7 U	5 U	42	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	trans-1,2-DCE	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Trichloroethene	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Trichlorofluoromethane	7 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Vinyl chloride	14 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Xylenes, Total	22 U	15 U	5 J	16 U

		Field Sample ID	TP-13(4-5)	TP-14(5)	TP-2 (3')	TP-20(4)
		Location	TP-13	TP-14	TP-2	TP-20
		Sample Date	10/23/2007	10/23/2007	10/22/2007	10/23/2007
		SDG	A07C236	A07C236	A07C236	A07C236
Units	Method	Parameter Name				
ug/kg	SW8015	2-Methoxyethanol	5100 U	5600 U	5600 U	5400 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroeth	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1-Dichloroethane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1-Dichloroethene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichloroethane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichloropropane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	2-Hexanone	28 U	25 U	32 U	29 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Acetone	6 J	25 U	32 UJ	120
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Benzene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromodichloromethane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromoform	6 UJ	5 UJ	6 UJ	6 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromomethane	11 U	10 U	13 U	12 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Carbon Disulfide	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Carbon tetrachloride	6 UJ	5 UJ	6 UJ	6 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chlorobenzene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloroethane	11 U	10 U	13 U	12 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloroform	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloromethane	11 U	10 U	13 U	12 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Cyclohexane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Dibromochloromethane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U

		Field Sample ID	TP-13(4-5)	TP-14(5)	TP-2 (3')	TP-20(4)
		Location	TP-13	TP-14	TP-2	TP-20
		Sample Date	10/23/2007	10/23/2007	10/22/2007	10/23/2007
		SDG	A07C236	A07C236	A07C236	A07C236
Units	Method	Parameter Name				
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Dichlorodifluoromethane	6 U	5 U	6 UJ	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Ethylbenzene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Isopropylbenzene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	MEK (2-Butanone)	28 U	25 U	32 UJ	29 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methyl acetate	6 U	5 U	6 UJ	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methylcyclohexane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methylene chloride	7 U	6 U	8 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	MIBK (Methyl isobutyl ketone)	28 U	25 U	32 U	29 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Styrene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Tetrachloroethene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Toluene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	trans-1,2-DCE	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Trichloroethene	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Trichlorofluoromethane	6 U	5 U	6 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Vinyl chloride	11 U	10 U	13 U	12 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Xylenes, Total	17 U	15 U	19 U	17 U

		Field Sample ID	TP-5 (8 1/2')	TP-6 (7')	TP-7 (7')	TP-8(4)
			12-5	12-0	12-7	12-8
		Sample Date	10/22/2007 A07C236	10/22/2007 A07C236	10/22/2007 A07C236	10/23/2007 A07C236
Units	Method	Parameter Name	/10/ 0200	1010200	//0/0200	/10/0200
ug/kg	SW8015	2-Methoxyethanol	5900 U	5500 U	5300 U	5400 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroeth	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1-Dichloroethane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1-Dichloroethene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichloroethane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichloropropane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	2-Hexanone	28 U	28 U	27 U	28 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Acetone	28 UJ	28 UJ	27 U	47
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Benzene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromodichloromethane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromoform	6 UJ	6 UJ	5 UJ	6 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromomethane	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Carbon Disulfide	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Carbon tetrachloride	6 UJ	6 UJ	5 UJ	6 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chlorobenzene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloroethane	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloroform	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloromethane	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Cyclohexane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Dibromochloromethane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U

		Field Sample ID	TP-5 (8 1/2')	TP-6 (7')	TP-7 (7')	TP-8(4)
		Location Sample Date	1P-5 10/22/2007	1P-6 10/22/2007	1P-/ 10/22/2007	1P-8 10/23/2007
		SDG	A07C236	A07C236	A07C236	A07C236
Units	Method	Parameter Name				
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Dichlorodifluoromethane	6 UJ	6 UJ	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Ethylbenzene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Isopropylbenzene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	MEK (2-Butanone)	28 UJ	28 UJ	27 U	28 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methyl acetate	6 UJ	6 UJ	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methylcyclohexane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methylene chloride	8 U	7 U	9 U	10 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	MIBK (Methyl isobutyl ketone)	28 U	28 U	27 U	28 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Styrene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Tetrachloroethene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Toluene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	trans-1,2-DCE	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Trichloroethene	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Trichlorofluoromethane	6 U	6 U	5 U	6 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Vinyl chloride	11 U	11 U	11 U	11 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Xylenes, Total	17 U	17 U	16 U	17 U

		Field Sample ID	TP-9(6)
		Location	TP-9
		Sample Date	10/23/2007
		SDG	A07C236
Units	Method	Parameter Name	
ug/kg	SW8015	2-Methoxyethanol	61000 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroeth	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1-Dichloroethane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,1-Dichloroethene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichloroethane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,2-Dichloropropane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	2-Hexanone	27 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Acetone	27000 J
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Benzene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromodichloromethane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromoform	5 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Bromomethane	11 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Carbon Disulfide	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Carbon tetrachloride	5 UJ
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chlorobenzene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloroethane	11 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloroform	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Chloromethane	11 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Cyclohexane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Dibromochloromethane	5 U

		Field Sample ID	TP-9(6)
		Location	TP-9
		Sample Date	10/23/2007
		SDG	A07C236
Units	Method	Parameter Name	
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Dichlorodifluoromethane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Ethylbenzene	17
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Isopropylbenzene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	MEK (2-Butanone)	6 J
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methyl acetate	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methylcyclohexane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Methylene chloride	7 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	MIBK (Methyl isobutyl ketone)	52
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Styrene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Tetrachloroethene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Toluene	22
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	trans-1,2-DCE	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Trichloroethene	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Trichlorofluoromethane	5 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Vinyl chloride	11 U
ug/kg	SW8260/5035	Xylenes, Total	31

		Field Sample ID	TP-6 (2 1/2')	TP-9(DRUM)
		Location	TP-6	QC
		Sample Date	10/22/2007	10/23/2007
		SDG	A07C236	A07C236
Units	Method	Parameter Name		
deg F	SW1010	FLASH POINT	176 U	176 U
mg/kg	SWSECT7.3	H2S Released From Waste	10 U	10 U
mg/kg	SWSECT7.3	HCN Released From Waste	10 U	10 U
mg/L	SW8081	Chlordane	0.002 U	0.002 U
mg/L	SW8081	Endrin	0.0002 U	0.0002 U
mg/L	SW8081	gamma-BHC (Lindane)	0.0002 U	0.00012 J
mg/L	SW8081	Heptachlor	0.0002 U	0.00017 J
mg/L	SW8081	Heptachlor epoxide	0.0002 U	0.0002 U
mg/L	SW8081	Methoxychlor	0.0002 U	0.0002 U
mg/L	SW8081	Toxaphene	0.004 U	0.004 U
mg/L	SW8151	2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	0.002 U	0.002 U
mg/L	SW8151	2,4-D	0.002 U	0.002 U
mg/L	SW8270	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	0.04 U	0.04 U
mg/L	SW8270	2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	0.02 U	0.02 U
mg/L	SW8270	2,4,6-trichlorophenol	0.02 U	0.02 U
mg/L	SW8270	2,4-Dinitrotoluene	0.02 U	0.02 U
mg/L	SW8270	2-Methylphenol	0.02 U	0.02 U
mg/L	SW8270	4-Methylphenol	0.02 U	0.02 U
mg/L	SW8270	Hexachlorobenzene	0.02 U	0.02 U
mg/L	SW8270	hexachlorobutadiene	0.02 U	0.02 U
mg/L	SW8270	hexachloroethane	0.02 U	0.02 U
mg/L	SW8270	m-Cresol	0.04 U	0.04 U
mg/L	SW8270	Nitrobenzene	0.02 U	0.02 U
mg/L	SW8270	Pentachlorophenol	0.04 UJ	0.04 UJ
mg/L	SW8270	Pyridine	0.1 UJ	0.1 U
pH units	SW9045	CORROSIVITY		6.76
ug/L	SW6010	Arsenic	10 U	10 U
ug/L	SW6010	Barium	618	50.3
ug/L	SW6010	Cadmium	11.3	1 U
ug/L	SW6010	Chromium	4 U	4 U
ug/L	SW6010	Lead	13300	10.8 U
ug/L	SW6010	Selenium	15 U	15 U
ug/L	SW6010	Silver	3 U	3 U
ug/L	SW7470	Mercury, dissolved	0.2 UJ	0.2 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	1,1-Dichloroethene	10 U	10 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dichloroethane	10 U	10 U
ug/L	SW8260	Benzene	10 U	13
ug/L	SW8260	Carbon tetrachloride	10 U	10 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chlorobenzene	10 U	10 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chloroform	10 U	10 U
ug/L	SW8260	MEK (2-Butanone)	50 U	38 J
ug/L	SW8260	Tetrachloroethene	10 U	10 U
ug/L	SW8260	Trichloroethene	10 U	10 U
ug/L	SW8260	Vinyl chloride	10 U	10 U

		Field Sample ID	CHA-1 11/07	CISTERN 11/07	MW-2 11/07	MW-3 11/07	OW-27 11/07
		Location	CHA-1	CISTERN	MW-2	MW-3	OW-27
		Sample Date	11/8/2007	11/8/2007	11/8/2007	11/8/2007	11/8/2007
		SDG	A07D027	A07D027	A07D027	A07D027	A07D027
Units	Method	Parameter Name					
ug/L	SW8015	2-Methoxyethanol	2000 U	2000 U	2000 U	2000 U	2000 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1-Dichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1-Dichloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dichloropropane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	2-Hexanone	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/L	SW8260	Acetone	5 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	Benzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Bromodichloromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Bromoform	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Bromomethane	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	Carbon Disulfide	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Carbon tetrachloride	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chloroform	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chloromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Cyclohexane	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	Dibromochloromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U

		Field Sample ID	CHA-1 11/07	CISTERN 11/07	MW-2 11/07	MW-3 11/07	OW-27 11/07
		Location	CHA-1	CISTERN	MW-2	MW-3	OW-27
		Sample Date	11/8/2007	11/8/2007	11/8/2007	11/8/2007	11/8/2007
		SDG	AU/DU2/	A07D027	AU/DU2/	AU/D02/	A07D027
Units	Method	Parameter Name					
ug/L	SW8260	Dichlorodifluoromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Ethylbenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Isopropylbenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	MEK (2-Butanone)	5 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	Methyl acetate	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Methylcyclohexane	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	Methylene chloride	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	MIBK (Methyl isobutyl ketone)	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/L	SW8260	Styrene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Tetrachloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Toluene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	trans-1,2-DCE	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Trichloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Trichlorofluoromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Vinyl chloride	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Xylenes, Total	3 U	3 U	3 U	3 U	3 U

		Field Sample ID	OW-28 11/07	Trip Blank 11/07	CHA-1 12/07	CISTERN 12/07	MW-2 12/07
		Location	OW-28	QC	CHA-1	CISTERN	MW-2
		Sample Date	11/8/2007	11/8/2007	12/13/2007	12/13/2007	12/13/2007
		SDG	A07D027	A07D027	A07E495	A07E495	A07E495
Units	Method	Parameter Name					
ug/L	SW8015	2-Methoxyethanol	2000 U		2000 U	2000 U	2000 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1-Dichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1-Dichloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	1 UJ	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	1 UJ	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dichloropropane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	2-Hexanone	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/L	SW8260	Acetone	5 UJ	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/L	SW8260	Benzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Bromodichloromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Bromoform	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Bromomethane	1 UJ	1 U	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	Carbon Disulfide	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Carbon tetrachloride	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	Chloroform	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chloromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Cyclohexane	1 UJ	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Dibromochloromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U

		Field Sample ID	OW-28 11/07	Trip Blank 11/07	CHA-1 12/07	CISTERN 12/07	MW-2 12/07
		Location	OW-28	QC	CHA-1	CISTERN	MW-2
		Sample Date	11/8/2007	11/8/2007	12/13/2007	12/13/2007	12/13/2007
11			A07D027	AU/DUZ/	AU7 E495	AU/E495	AU/E495
Units	Method	Parameter Name					
ug/L	SW8260	Dichlorodifluoromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Ethylbenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Isopropylbenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	MEK (2-Butanone)	5 UJ	5 U	5 UJ	5 UJ	5 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	Methyl acetate	1 UJ	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Methylcyclohexane	1 UJ	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Methylene chloride	1 UJ	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	MIBK (Methyl isobutyl ketone)	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/L	SW8260	Styrene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Tetrachloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Toluene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	trans-1,2-DCE	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Trichloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Trichlorofluoromethane	1 U	1 U	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ
ug/L	SW8260	Vinyl chloride	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Xylenes, Total	3 U	3 U	3 U	3 U	3 U

		Field Sample ID	MW-3 12/07	OW-27 12/07	OW-28 12/07	TRIP BLANK 12/07
		Location	MW-3	OW-27	OW-28	QC
		Sample Date	12/13/2007	12/13/2007	12/13/2007	12/13/2007
		SDG	A07E495	A07E495	A07E495	A07E495
Units	Method	Parameter Name				
ug/L	SW8015	2-Methoxyethanol	2000 U	2000 U	2000 U	
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 UJ	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1-Dichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,1-Dichloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dichloroethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,2-Dichloropropane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	2-Hexanone	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/L	SW8260	Acetone	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/L	SW8260	Benzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Bromodichloromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Bromoform	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Bromomethane	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Carbon Disulfide	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Carbon tetrachloride	1 U	1 U	1 UJ	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chlorobenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chloroethane	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chloroform	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Chloromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Cyclohexane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Dibromochloromethane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U

		Field Sample ID	MW-3 12/07	OW-27 12/07	OW-28 12/07	TRIP BLANK 12/07
		Location	MW-3	OW-27	OW-28	QC
		Sample Date	12/13/2007	12/13/2007	12/13/2007	12/13/2007
		SDG	A07E495	A07E495	A07E495	A07E495
Units	Method	Parameter Name				
ug/L	SW8260	Dichlorodifluoromethane	1 U	1 U	1 UJ	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Ethylbenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Isopropylbenzene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	MEK (2-Butanone)	5 UJ	5 UJ	5 U	5 U
ug/L	SW8260	Methyl acetate	1 U	1 U	1 UJ	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Methylcyclohexane	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Methylene chloride	1 U	1 U	1 UJ	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	MIBK (Methyl isobutyl ketone)	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
ug/L	SW8260	Styrene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Tetrachloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Toluene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	trans-1,2-DCE	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Trichloroethene	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Trichlorofluoromethane	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 UJ	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Vinyl chloride	1 U	1 U	1 U	1 U
ug/L	SW8260	Xylenes, Total	3 U	3 U	3 U	3 U