PEROIDIC REVIEW REPORT
FEBRUARY 1, 2015 THROUGH JANUARY 31, 2016

STRIPPIT, INC.
AKRON, NEW YORK
NYSDEC SITE NUMBER: 915053

Prepared by:	Day Environmental, Inc. 1563 Lyell Avenue Rochester, New York 14606
Prepared for:	Strippit, Inc. 12975 Clarence Center Road Akron, New York 14001
Date:	February 2016
Project No.:	5204R-16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figures:

Appendices:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Strippit, Inc. is located at 12975 Clarence Center Road in Akron, New York. Historically an approximate 2-acre area on the Strippit, Inc. property (designated herein as the Site) was used to dispose of various materials including suspected hazardous waste until 1979, when disposal ceased. As a result, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) listed the disposal area as an in-active hazardous waste site (NYSDEC Site No. 9-15-053). Subsequently, various studies were completed to evaluate that nature and extent of contamination, and to develop/implement an Interim Remedial Measure (IRM). This IRM was completed in 1994 and it included the consolidation of waste materials and the covering of these waste materials with a composite soil/geomembrane cover. Subsequently, a post-closure monitoring program consisting of site inspections to evaluate the condition of the landfill cover and groundwater monitoring to assess the effectiveness of the IRM was implemented beginning in 1995. The post-closure monitoring has been on-going on a routine basis since 1995, with reports submitted to the NYSDEC annually, or more frequently (as warranted).

This Periodic Review Report (PRR) describes the monitoring conducted during the reporting period between February 1, 2015 and January 31, 2016 to assess the condition and function of the remedial activities conducted at the Site. Based on the monitoring completed during the reporting period, the Engineering Controls implemented at the Site (i.e., construction of a soil/geomembrane cover and installation of a groundwater monitoring network to evaluate the effectiveness of the cover system) are functioning as designed and modifications are not required at this time. However, some additional monitoring/remedial actions are recommended as outlined below.

- During monitoring events conducted on July 15, 2015 and January 27, 2016 some minor water seepage was observed in isolated locations at the base of the landfill. This seepage should be monitored during the upcoming reporting period. Unless this seepage increases or evidence of erosion of the soil cover is detected due to this seepage, no remedial activities would be warranted.

- Cracking was observed in the soil cover in an area on the north side of the landfill. The nature and extent of this cracking appeared similar to that observed during previous reporting periods. However, as a precaution it is recommended that the cracks be filled with topsoil and re-seeded when weather permits. These areas should be monitored, and the remedial efforts completed documented, during the upcoming reporting period.

- It is recommended that drainage ways on the northwestern portion of the Site be cleared of accumulated vegetation as a precautionary measure.

- While the pH levels measured in monitoring wells GW-2, GW-4 and GW-5 during the July 15, 2015 monitoring event and GW-5 during the July 15, 2015 and January 27, 2016 monitoring events were outside the acceptable Class GA range of 6.5 to 8.5 s.u., the pH levels exhibited an apparent downward trend during the reporting period. Specifically, the pH levels measured in each of the monitoring wells on January 27, 2016 were between1.5 s.u. (GW-1) and 2.69 s.u. (GW-4) lower than those measured during the July 15, 2015 monitoring event.

- The concentrations of metals measured in the samples collected during the reporting period are generally within the range of concentrations historically detected. However, the magnesium concentrations measured in samples collected from monitoring well GW-1 have increased in each of the last five reporting periods. Remedial actions are not recommended at this time to address possible groundwater impacts; however, the magnesium concentrations measured during the upcoming reporting period should be evaluated to assess if more frequent monitoring and/or remediation is warranted.

The next monitoring event is tentatively scheduled to occur on or around July 6, 2016. The next sampling event would occur on or around January 11, 2017.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Strippit, Inc. (Strippit) is located at 12975 Clarence Center Road in Akron, New York. A Locus Plan is included as Figure 1. An approximate 2-acre area located behind (south) of the Strippit facility was historically used to dispose of various materials including suspected hazardous waste until 1979, when disposal ceased. This former disposal area is defined herein as (the Site).

Beginning in 1981, several studies were completed by various parties to evaluate the nature and extent of contamination at the Site. In accordance with an Interim Remedial Measure (IRM) work plan dated October 1993 prepared by Day Engineering, P. C. [an affiliate of Day Environmental, Inc. (DAY)], an IRM that generally consisted of the consolidation of waste materials at the Site and the covering of these materials with a composite soil and geomembrane liner was conducted in the summer of 1994. The results of the previous studies, including the history of the Site, and the IRM implemented to address impacts at the Site are included in the document titled *Record of Decision, Houdaille Industrial – Strippit Division Site, Town of Newstead, Erie County, Site Number 9-15-053* dated March 1995 prepared by the NYSDEC (the ROD).

As documented in the ROD, the Site received a No Further Action designation, however, post-closure monitoring and maintenance was required to evaluate the effectiveness of the IRM. Specific post-closure monitoring and maintenance requirements are described in a document prepared by DAY titled *Post-Closure Monitoring and Maintenance Plan; Interim Remedial Measure; Strippit, Inc.; Akron, New York* dated February 1995 (the Post-Closure Plan). The Post-Closure Plan was reviewed and approved by the NYSDEC prior to implementation.

In accordance with a June 24, 1998 letter prepared by the NYSDEC, the frequency of groundwater sampling outlined in the Post-Closure Plan was reduced from quarterly to bi-annually. During the remaining two quarters, a limited monitoring event that included the measurement of groundwater levels and field parameters (e.g., pH, specific conductivity, etc.), and completion of a site inspection was conducted.

In accordance with an August 21, 2002 letter prepared by the NYSDEC, the testing program outlined in the Post-Closure Plan was further modified to include testing for the following parameters:

- Indicator Parameters: pH, specific conductance, turbidity and temperature
- Total barium, iron, magnesium, and manganese
- Total Phenols

In accordance with a February 10, 2010 letter prepared by the NYSDEC, the frequency of groundwater sampling outlined in the Post-Closure Plan was reduced from bi-annually to annually.

The testing program outlined in the Post-Closure Plan was further modified to include testing for the following parameters:

- Indicator Parameters: pH, specific conductance, turbidity and temperature
- Total barium, iron, magnesium, and manganese

Further, the frequency of the limited monitoring event that included the measurement of groundwater levels and field parameters (e.g., pH, specific conductivity, etc.) and completion of a site inspection was reduced from quarterly to bi-annually (i.e., the groundwater sampling event and one additional event per year).

In accordance with a March 24, 2009 letter prepared by the NYSDEC, a Periodic Review Report (i.e., this document) describing work completed during the preceding calendar year is required for the Site. This report is to be submitted in mid-March of the following year (i.e., the Periodic Review Report (PRR) for calendar year 2015 is due on, or before, March 1, 2016). The PRR includes the following items:

- Identification of the Engineering Controls required by the remedy for the Site, and the results of observations completed to assess the effectiveness of these controls;
- Inspection forms generated for the Site during the reporting period;
- A summary of monitoring data generated during the reporting period;
- Historic data summary tables and graphical representations of contaminants of concern by media (i.e., groundwater); and,
- Copies of the required laboratory data deliverables for samples collected during the reporting period.

The PRR also includes an evaluation consisting of the following:

- The compliance of the remedy with the requirements of the ROD;
- Conclusions regarding Site contamination based on inspections and/or data generated by the Monitoring Plan for the media being monitored;
- Recommendations regarding necessary changes to the remedy and/or Monitoring Plan; and,
- The overall performance and effectiveness of the remedy.

2.0 ENGINEERING CONTROL EVALUATION

The Engineering Controls at the Site consist of a cover system (i.e., landfill cap consisting of multiple layers of soil and a geomembrane liner) over the former disposal area and a groundwater monitoring well network to evaluate the effectiveness of the landfill cap. The approximate boundary of the former disposal area and the locations of the groundwater monitoring wells installed at the Site are depicted on Figure 2.

The integrity of the Engineering Controls at the Site and monitoring well network were evaluated on the following dates during the reporting period: July 15, 2015 and January 27, 2016. Copies of the observation reports completed during each semi-annual monitoring event are included in Appendix A.

During previous reporting periods, an approximate 1,600 square foot area on the north face of the landfill cap (i.e., approximately 100 feet west of monitoring well GW-4) was found to contain animal burrows with areas of cracking and erosion. In June/July 2010, repairs were made to this area (i.e., animal holes were filled with a low permeability soil, linear parting features (cracks and fissures) were repaired, and the area was covered with topsoil and re-seeded). The repair area appeared to be in generally good condition during the monitoring events conducted on July 15, 2015 and January 27, 2016. As such, additional repair of this area does not appear to be warranted at this time. [Note: During the January 27, 2016 monitoring event, patches of snow (typically 1-inch thick or less) covered portions the ground surface limiting complete observation of the repair area.]

During monitoring events conducted in 2014, two areas of possible landfill cover degradation were observed on the north slope of the landfill. These areas include:

- An area located between 200 and 300 feet to the west of monitoring well GW-4 where evidence of cracking of the landfill cover (i.e., a series of shallow trenches approximately 2 to 3 inches wide and extending north-south on the northern slope of the landfill cap in lines approximately 10 to 15 feet in length) was observed. The apparent cracking extended 2 to 3 inches into the soil cap of the landfill, but did not appear to compromise the cover system.
- A second area of possible cracking of the landfill cover located between approximately 90 and 150 feet to the west of monitoring well GW-4. This approximate 1-inch deep and 6-inch wide linear depression was observed along an approximate 50 to 70 foot section of the top of the northern slope of the landfill cap. However, since the linear depression was not a straight line, but followed the edge of the top of the landfill slope, and abruptly terminated at either end without further evidence of a trail in either direction, it is unlikely that the linear depression was caused by animals. This area of possible cracking did not appear to compromise the cover system.

During the July 15, 2015 and January 27, 2016 monitoring events, the cracking appeared similar to what was observed during previous monitoring events. Furthermore, the cracks did not increase in size or depth since the initial observations made in 2014. However, during both monitoring events seepage and standing water was observed at the base of landfill in this area. This seepage appeared

to be relatively minor and did not appear to contribute to the erosion of the soil cover on the landfill cap.

No evidence of settlement was observed on or at the perimeter of the landfill cap.

During the July 15, 2015 monitoring event, vegetation on and around the landfill cap was observed to be present and apparently healthy.

Groundwater monitoring wells and the gas well were observed to be in generally good and functioning condition. The bailer cord was replaced in monitoring wells GW-1 and GW-3 during the July 15, 2015 monitoring event.

Drainage ways located to the north and northwest of the landfill cap were observed to be functioning (i.e., not blocked). However, vegetation (i.e., small trees and brush) was observed in the drainage ways in the northwestern portion of the Site, and although it did not block water flow, it is recommended that this vegetation be cleared as a preventative measure.

3.0 GROUNDWATER MONITORING DURING REPORTING PEROID

During each semi-annual monitoring event (i.e., conducted on July 15, 2015 and January 27, 2016) the depth to groundwater was measured from a monitoring point elevation established on the top of each monitoring well casing using an electronic tape water level indicator. In addition, a sample of the groundwater was collected from each monitoring point and the pH was also measured using a Horriba model U-22 water quality meter. The groundwater depths, elevations, and pH measurements made during the monitoring events completed during this reporting period are presented in the following table.

WELL	TOP OF CASING ELEVATION (ft.)	GROUNDWATER ELEVATION (ft.) /**pH** (su) July 15, 2015		GROUNDWATER ELEVATION (ft.) /**pH** (su) January 27, 2016		Groundwater Elevation variation during reporting period (ft.)	Historic pH Values (su)		
							Average	Max	Min
GW-1	754.32	713.88	**8.40**	712.77	**6.90**	1.11	8.90	11.59	5.90
GW-2	770.62	719.02	**10.20**	718.10	**7.64**	0.92	10.41	12.23	7.23
GW-3	742.59	709.56	**8.28**	708.31	**6.73**	1.25	7.53	11.32	5.57
GW-4	752.24	714.67	**9.63**	713.55	**6.94**	1.12	9.07	10.92	6.08
GW-5	771.26	719.07	**11.47**	718.20	**8.81**	0.87	10.25	12.27	6.99

Groundwater contour maps, developed based upon the groundwater elevations calculated using the measurements obtained during the July 15, 2015 and the January 27, 2016 monitoring events, are included as Figure 3 and Figure 4 (respectively). As shown, despite the seasonal variation in groundwater elevation as summarized above, groundwater flow is generally to the north-northwest.

As indicated in the above table, the pH levels measured during the reporting period are within the range of historic pH values measured for each location. With the exception of the pH levels measured in GW-3, GW-4 and GW-5 measured during the July 15, 2015 monitoring event, the pH levels measured during the reporting period were below the historic average for their respective location. The pH levels measured in monitoring wells GW-2, GW-4 and GW-5 during the July 15, 2015 monitoring event are elevated (indicating alkaline conditions) and outside the acceptable Class GA range of 6.5 to 8.5 s.u. The pH level measured in GW-5 on January 27, 2016 was also outside the Class GA range of 6.5 to 8.5 s.u. [Note: The pH levels measured in each of the monitoring wells on January 27, 2016 were between1.5 s.u. (GW-1) and 2.69 s.u. (GW-4) lower than those measured during the July 15, 2015 monitoring event.]

Groundwater Sampling

Groundwater samples were collected and submitted for analytical laboratory testing on January 27, 2016. The samples were collected in general accordance with the procedures outlined in the approved post-closure monitoring and maintenance plan. A Site Plan, showing the location of the monitoring wells is included as Figure 2. Groundwater sampling initially included the measurement

of static water levels in each of the monitoring wells installed at the Site (designated GW-1 through GW-5) followed by the purging of the wells to remove a minimum of 3 well volumes (or until wells were dry). The monitoring wells were then allowed to recover so that "fresh" water was retained for testing. Groundwater samples were collected for testing using a dedicated bailer, which is permanently stored above the water within each well casing.

A portion of the groundwater collected from each location was tested in the field for the following parameters using the equipment listed below.

- Specific conductance, temperature, pH, ORP and turbidity: Horiba U-22 Multi-Parameter Water Quality Monitoring System.

In addition to the field-testing, samples were also collected for analytical laboratory testing. These samples were placed in sample containers provided by Paradigm Environmental Services, Inc. (Paradigm), the analytical laboratory. Paradigm also added the necessary preservatives to the sample containers that were provided for the sampling event.

The sample containers were filled by placing approximately equal amounts of sample from the bailer into each container until the container was filled. When the containers were filled they were placed in a plastic cooler containing ice and stored in a locked field vehicle until they were delivered to Paradigm for analytical laboratory testing. Chain-of-custody documentation was maintained throughout the sample collection process.

Copies of the monitoring well sample logs prepared for the January 27, 2016 sampling event are included in Appendix B. These logs summarize in-situ measurements, groundwater depths, purging information and other relative data.

Analytical Laboratory Results

The samples collected during the January 27, 2016 monitoring event were analyzed by Paradigm for the following parameters.

- Barium, Iron, Magnesium and Manganese via USEPA Method 6010

A copy of the analytical laboratory report for this sample event prepared by Paradigm and executed chain-of-custody documentation are included in Appendix B. Tables summarizing historic test results for the groundwater samples collected from the monitoring wells at the Site are presented in Appendix C.

The majority of the parameters detected in the samples collected during the January 27, 2016 sample event were measured at concentrations below Class GA standards established in NYSDEC TOGS 1.1.1 [data source 1998 and amended by NYSDEC Table 1, dated August 1, 2001 (TOGS)] potable groundwater supplies. Specifically:

- Concentrations of total barium in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the January 27, 2016 sample event were below the TOGS standard of 1.0 mg/l.

- Concentrations of total iron in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 (0.401 mg/l), GW-2 (0.609 mg/l), GW-3 (1.37 mg/l) and GW-5 (0.803 mg/l) during the January 27, 2016 monitoring event exceeded the TOGS standard of 0.3 mg/l. The total iron concentration measured in the sample collected from monitoring well GW-4 was 0.248 mg/l.
- With the exception of the total magnesium concentration measured in the sample collected from GW-1 (i.e., 62.2 mg/l), concentrations of total magnesium in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the January 27, 2016 sample event were below the TOGS standard of 35 mg/l.
- Concentrations of total manganese in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the January 27, 2016 sample event were below the TOGS standard of 0.3 mg/l.

Graphic representations of historic variations in concentrations of total barium, total iron, total magnesium, and total manganese, are included as Figure 5 though Figure 8 (respectively). The concentrations presented in these graphs represent analytical laboratory results for groundwater samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 between April 1995 and January 2016.

Total barium was not detected above a detection limit of 0.1 mg/l in samples collected from any of the monitoring wells sampled during the reporting period. As indicated by Figure 5, concentrations of total barium detected in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the reporting period were comparable to those measured during recent monitoring events. Historically, the highest barium concentrations have been measured in samples collected from upgradient monitoring well GW-2. But the concentrations of total barium in the samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 have historically been below the TOGS standard of 1.0 mg/l.

As indicated by Figure 6, the concentrations of total iron detected in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-3 through GW-5 during the reporting period are generally consistent with historic concentrations. However, the total iron concentrations measured in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 and GW-2 were less than those measured during the preceding three reporting periods. For example, the total iron concentration measured in the sample collected from monitoring well GW-1 on January 27, 2016 was 0.401 mg/l compared to total iron concentrations of 1.5 mg/l, 2.13 mg/l and 1.83 mg/l measured in 2013, 2014 and 2015, respectively. Historically, the concentrations of total iron measured in samples from groundwater monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 fluctuate with no apparent trend evident. The historic concentrations of total iron measured in samples from groundwater monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 often exceed the TOGS standard of 0.3 mg/l.

The concentrations of total magnesium detected in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the reporting period are generally consistent with historic concentrations (refer to Figure 7). Although the magnesium concentrations are variable, with the possible exception of GW-1, concentrations have generally decreased with time. The highest magnesium concentrations have consistently been detected in samples collected from downgradient monitoring wells GW-1 (i.e., generally samples collected from this location contained the highest magnesium concentrations), GW-3 and GW-4. The magnesium concentrations in upgradient monitoring wells GW-2 and GW-5 have historically been lower than those detected in the downgradient monitoring wells. With the exception of the total magnesium concentration measured in the sample collected

from GW-1 (i.e., 62.2 mg/l), the magnesium concentrations in the samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 were below the TOGS standard of 35 mg/l during the January 27, 2016 monitoring event. [Note: The total magnesium concentrations measured in samples collected from GW-1 during the last five reporting periods have increased in concentrations (i.e., 41.5 mg/l, 44.0 mg/l, 53.5 mg/l, 57.6 mg/l. and 62.2 mg/l between 2012 and 2016).]

As indicated by Figure 8, concentrations of total manganese detected in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the reporting period are generally consistent with historic concentrations. Historically, the concentrations of total manganese measured in samples from groundwater monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 fluctuate with no apparent trend evident. Since June 1999, concentrations of total manganese in groundwater samples collected from GW-1 through GW-5 have been below the TOGS standard of 0.3 mg/l.

4.0 INSTITUTIONAL AND ENGINEERING CONTROLS CERTIFICATION FORM

A completed and signed copy of the Institutional and Engineering Controls Certification Form for the reporting period of February 1, 2015 through January 31, 2016 is included in Appendix D.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions are based upon the findings of the work completed during this reporting period.

- The integrity of the Engineering Controls at the Site (i.e., a cover system over the former disposal area and a groundwater monitoring well network to evaluate the effectiveness of the landfill cap) was evaluated on the following dates during the reporting period: July 15, 2015 and January 27, 2016. This evaluation indicated that the cover system was functioning as designed. Some minor water seepage at the base of the landfill was observed, and minor cracking to the landfill cover was observed in areas noted during previous monitoring event. However, visible degradation of the landfill cover since the previous reporting period was not observed.
- Monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 were observed to be in good working condition, and each well had a lockable cap and was fitted with a lock, which was locked before and after the January 27, 2016 monitoring event. The bailer cords in wells GW-1 and GW-3 were worn and they were replaced during the July 15, 2015 monitoring event as a precautionary measure.
- The June/July 2010 landfill cover repair [i.e., animal holes were filled with a low permeability soil, linear parting features (cracks and fissures) were repaired, and the area was covered with topsoil and re-seeded] area appeared to be in generally good condition during the reporting period and additional repair in this area does not appear warranted at this time.
- Groundwater elevations varied seasonally (i.e., the groundwater elevations measured on January 27, 2016 ranged from about 0.87 feet (GW-5) to 1.25 feet (GW-3) lower than those measured on July 15, 2015). However, groundwater flow directions remained consistent throughout the reporting period (i.e., flowing generally from south-southeast to north-northwest). Based on this groundwater flow pattern monitoring wells GW-2 and GW-5 are located in hydraulically upgradient positions and the remaining monitoring wells (GW-1, GW-3 and GW-4) are located in hydraulically downgradient positions at the Site.
- The pH concentrations measured in the samples collected from GW-2, GW-4 and GW-5 on July 15, 2015 (i.e., pH = 10.20 s.u., pH = 9.63 s.u. and pH = 11.47 s.u., respectively) were elevated (alkaline) and outside the acceptable Class GA range of 6.5 to 8.5 s.u. The pH concentration measured in monitoring well GW-5 on January 27, 2016 (i.e., 8.81 s.u.) was also outside the acceptable Class GA range. The pH concentrations measured during the reporting period were within the historic range of pH values measured in samples tested between April 1995 and January 2016. However, the pH levels measured in monitoring wells GW-3, GW-4 and GW-5 on July 15, 2015 were above the historic average for their respective location. [Note: The pH levels measured in each of the monitoring wells on January 27, 2016 were lower than the pH levels measured in the same wells on July 15, 2015 (i.e., ranging between 1.5. s. u. and 2.69 s. u. lower).]
- Concentrations of total barium in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the January 27, 2016 sample event were below the TOGS standard of 1 mg/l and the reported concentrations were comparable to those measured during previous

monitoring events. Total barium concentrations measured in samples from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 appear to be stabilized or decreasing over time.

- With the exception of the sample collected from monitoring well GW-4, the concentrations of total iron in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the January 27, 2016 monitoring event exceeded the TOGS standard of 0.3 mg/l. The concentrations of total iron detected in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 and GW-2 during the reporting period were lower than those measured in each of the three preceding reporting periods, but the total iron concentrations measured in samples from monitoring wells GW-3 through GW-5 were generally consistent with historic concentrations. Historically, the concentrations of total iron measured in samples from groundwater monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 fluctuate with no apparent trend evident, although the iron concentrations since about December 2008 have exhibited relatively stabilized conditions.

- With the exception of the total magnesium concentration measured in the sample collected from GW-1 (i.e., 62.2 mg/l), concentrations of total magnesium in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the January 27, 2016 sample event were below the TOGS standard of 35 mg/l. The concentrations of total magnesium measured in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 fluctuate historically, but higher magnesium concentrations are typically measured in downgradient monitoring wells GW-1, GW-3 and GW-4. The magnesium concentrations measured in samples collected from monitoring well GW-1 have increased in concentration each of the last five reporting periods (i.e., from 41.5 mg/l in 2012 to 52.2 mg/l in 2016).

- Concentrations of total manganese in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the January 27, 2016 sample event were below the TOGS standard of 0.3 mg/l. The concentrations of total manganese detected in samples collected from monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 during the reporting period are generally consistent with historic concentrations. Historically the concentrations of total manganese measured in samples from groundwater monitoring wells GW-1 through GW-5 fluctuate with no apparent trend evident.

Based upon the monitoring conducted during the reporting period, the Engineering Controls implemented at the Site are functioning as designed and modifications are not required at this time. However, some minor water seepage at the base of the landfill and minor cracking in the landfill cover should continue to be monitored during the upcoming landfill inspection events. In addition, although surface water drainage exiting the landfill area does not appear to be restricted, it is recommended that the drainage pathways in the northwestern portion of the Site be cleared of vegetation to preclude potential flow obstructions in the future.

While the pH levels measured in monitoring wells GW-2, GW-4 and GW-5 during the July 15, 2015 monitoring event and GW-5 during the July 15, 2015 and January 27, 2016 monitoring events were outside the acceptable Class GA range of 6.5 to 8.5 s.u., the pH levels exhibited an apparent downward trend during the reporting period. Specifically, the pH levels measured in each of the monitoring wells on January 27, 2016 were between1.5 s.u. (GW-1) and 2.69 s.u. (GW-4) lower than those measured during the July 15, 2015 monitoring event.

The concentrations of metals measured in the samples collected during the reporting period are generally within the range of concentrations historically detected. However, the magnesium concentrations measured in samples collected from monitoring well GW-1 have increased in each of the last five reporting periods. Remedial actions are not recommended at this time to address possible groundwater impacts; however, the magnesium concentrations measured during the upcoming reporting period should be evaluated to assess if more frequent monitoring and/or remediation is warranted.

The next monitoring event is scheduled for around July 6, 2016. The next sampling event would occur on or around January 11, 2017

FIGURES



Drawing Produced From: 3-D TopoQuads, DeLorme Map Co., referencing USGS quad maps Wolcottsville (NY) 1995; Akron (NY) 1995; Lancaster (NY) 1982; & Corfu (NY) 1984. Site Lat/Long: N43d-0.6' – W78d-30.25'

DATE **2-11-2015** DRAWN BY **CAH** SCALE **1" = 2000'**	day DAY ENVIRONMENTAL, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS ROCHESTER, NEW YORK 14606	PROJECT TITLE **STRIPPIT, INC.** **AKRON, NEW YORK** **PEROIDIC REVIEW REPORT** DRAWING TITLE **PROJECT LOCUS MAP**	PROJECT NO. **5022R-15** **FIGURE 1**



NOTES:

1. This drawing produced from a drawing provided by Deborah A. Naybor, PLS, PC. entitled "Topographic Map Of Part Of Lot 5, TWP. 12, Range 5, Section 6, Town Of Newstead, County Of Erie, New York" dated 3/4/93 & revised 3/26/93.
2. No boundary survey was performed by Deborah A. Naybor, PLS, PC.

LEGEND:

- GW-1 ⊕ — Monitoring Well Designation
- o — Existing Gas Well
- — — — — Approximate Limits Of Former Disposal Area

DATE: 2-19-2015	DAY ENVIRONMENTAL, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS ROCHESTER, NEW YORK 14606 NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10170	PROJECT TITLE: Strippit, Inc. Akron, NY Periodic Review Report	PROJECT NO.: 5022R-15
DRAWN BY: RJM/Tw		DRAWING TITLE: Site Location Map	FIGURE 2
SCALE: 1" = 100'			



NOTES:

1. This drawing produced from a drawing provided by Deborah A. Naybor, PLS, PC. entitled "Topographic Map Of Part Of Lot 5, TWP. 12, Range 5, Section 6, Town Of Newstead, County Of Erie, New York" dated 3/4/93 & revised 3/26/93.
2. No boundary survey was performed by Deborah A. Naybor, PLS, PC.

LEGEND

GW-1 713.88 — Groundwater Monitoring Well With Groundwater Elevation Obtained On July 15, 2015.

Potentiometric Contour Line For July 15, 2015 Created By Golden Software Inc., Surfer8 Program

Apparent Direction Of Groundwater Flow

DATE 2-22-2016	DAY ENVIRONMENTAL, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS ROCHESTER, NEW YORK 14606 NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10016-0710	PROJECT TITLE Strippit, Inc. Akron, NY Periodic Review Report	PROJECT NO. 5022R-15
DRAWN BY RJM		DRAWING TITLE Groundwater Potentiometric Contour Map For July 15, 2015	FIGURE 3
SCALE 1" = 100'			



NOTES:

1. This drawing produced from a drawing provided by Deborah A. Naybor, PLS, PC. entitled "Topographic Map Of Part Of Lot 5, TWP. 12, Range 5, Section 6, Town Of Newstead, County Of Erie, New York" dated 3/4/93 & revised 3/26/93.
2. No boundary survey was performed by Deborah A. Naybor, PLS, PC.

LEGEND

GW-1 712.77 — Groundwater Monitoring Well With Groundwater Elevation Obtained On January 27, 2016.

Potentiometric Contour Line For January 27, 2016 Created By Golden Software Inc., Surfer8 Program

Apparent Direction Of Groundwater Flow

DATE: 2-22-2016	DAY ENVIRONMENTAL, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS ROCHESTER, NEW YORK 14606 NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10016-0710	PROJECT TITLE: Strippit, Inc. Akron, NY Periodic Review Report DRAWING TITLE: Groundwater Potentiometric Contour Map For January 27, 2016	PROJECT NO.: 5022R-15 FIGURE 4
DRAWN BY: RJM			
SCALE: 1" = 100'			

Ref1: GW Contours 1-27-2016.dwg Ref2: Time Plotted: Monday, February 22, 2016 11:06:49 AM Ref3: File Name: P:\Drawings\Strip\5022R-15 Files\5022R Strippit-05.dwg Layout: Layout1 Pen Setting File: 800psFullcolor.ctb

Figure 5

12975 Clarence Center Road
Akron, New York
NYSDEC Site #915053

Summary of Detected Barium (total) - Groundwater Samples 4/95 - 1/16



Figure 6

12975 Clarence Center Road
Akron, New York
NYSDEC Site #915053

Summary of Detected Iron (total) - Groundwater Samples 4/95 - 1/16



Figure 7

12975 Clarence Center Road
Akron, New York
NYSDEC Site #915053

Summary of Detected Magnesium (total) - Groundwater Samples 4/95 - 1/16



Figure 8

12975 Clarence Center Road
Akron, New York
NYSDEC Site #915053

Summary of Detected Manganese (total) - Groundwater Samples 4/95 - 1/16



APPENDIX A

SITE INSPECTION REPORTS:
JULY 15, 2015 AND JANUARY 27, 2016

LONG-TERM MONITORING REPORT
INTERIM REMEDIAL MEASURE
STRIPPIT, INC.
AKRON, NEW YORK

Date of Inspection: July 15, 2015

Inspected By: C. Hampton

Summary of Observation:
General Condition of Cover: Good - vegetation appears healthy - Minor cracking area does not appear to be increasing in area or depth - former settlement area appears stable

Evidence of Erosion, sloughing or other degradation: ☐ Yes ☒ No

Explain (include measurement & site sketch):
Evidence of erosion, sloughing / general degradation not observed

Evidence of cracking: ☒ Yes ☐ No

Explain (include measurements and site sketch):
Minor cracking or linear animal burroughs observed in North face of landfill (refer to previous monitoring events) - cracking does not appear to be expanding/deepening compared to previous observations

Evidence of water seepage: ☒ Yes ☐ No

Explain: Standing water observed @ base of the north face of landfill; may be due (in part) to rain event on 7/14/15 (Note: parking lot pot holes generally dry compared to edge of landfill)

Evidence of Settlement: ☐ Yes ☒ No

Explain: Evidence of settlement not observed

Condition of monitoring wells and gas wells: Functioning

Condition of Vegetative Cover: Present; appearantly healthy

Condition of drainage ways (discuss amount of water/sediments present, vegetative growth unusual staining, blockage, etc.). Standing water present in drainage ways located to north west of land fill; vegetative growth continues to clog portions of this drainage ways. However, Brush/trees growing on east edge of drainage way are sufficently large to choke-out smaller growths - may be beneficial to leave this tree growth?

Additional Comments: None

Action Item(s) Required: None

Action Item(s) completed since last inspection: - Replaced bailer cords in GW-1 and GW-3

Signatures: 7/15/15

S/fieldforms/strippit.log



NOTES:

1. This drawing produced from a drawing provided by Deborah A. Naybor, PLS, PC. entitled "Topographic Map Of Part Of Lot 5, TWP. 12, Range 5, Section 6, Town Of Newstead, County Of Erie, New York" dated 3/4/93 & revised 3/26/93.
2. No boundary survey was performed by Deborah A. Naybor, PLS, PC.

LEGEND:

GW-1 ◆ Monitoring Well Designation

o Existing Gas Well

— — — — Approximate Limits Of Former Disposal Area

DATE 2-19-2015 DRAWN BY RJM/Tw SCALE 1" = 100'	**day** DAY ENVIRONMENTAL, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS ROCHESTER, NEW YORK 14606 NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10170	PROJECT TITLE Strippit, Inc. Akron, NY Periodic Review Report DRAWING TITLE Site Location Map – July 15, 2015 Landfill Monitoring	PROJECT NO. 5022R-15 FIGURE 2

LONG-TERM MONITORING REPORT
INTERIM REMEDIAL MEASURE
STRIPPIT, INC.
AKRON, NEW YORK

Date of Inspection: January 27, 2016

Inspected By: C. Hampton

Summary of Observation:
General Condition of Cover: Generally in good condition. Area of cracking and water seepage (as previously documented) observed; but does not appear to be expanding/worsening

Evidence of Erosion, sloughing or other degradation: ☐ Yes ☒ No

Explain (include measurement & site sketch):
cover & vegetation intact over areas observed; as visible under patches of snow cover (i.e. less than 1-inch thick)

Evidence of cracking: ☒ Yes ☐ No

Explain (include measurements and site sketch):
- linear cracking observed on North slope of the landfill; as previously documented - size of cracks nor area of cracking not observed to have increased since last observation event

Evidence of water seepage: ☒ Yes ☐ No

Explain: - seepage at base of north slope of landfill in area previously documented; seep water cut a channel through snowbank at edge of pavement

Evidence of Settlement: ☐ Yes ☒ No

Explain: Area of previous settlement appears stable (i.e., north slope of landfill - eastern portion)

Condition of monitoring wells and gas wells: monitoring wells functioning; bailers & ropes in good condition. Gas wells appear in good condition - pressure noted on gauges.

Condition of Vegetative Cover: Dormant. Appears to be present over landfill area

Condition of drainage ways (discuss amount of water/sediments present, vegetative growth unusual staining, blockage, etc.). Drainage ways on northwest portion of landfill clogged with small trees and brush; as previously documented

Additional Comments: None

Action Item(s) Required: None

Action Item(s) completed since last inspection: None

Signatures:

S/fieldforms/strippit.log

APPENDIX B

MONITORING WELL SAMPLE LOGS,

PARADIGM ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC. REPORT

AND

CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY DOCUMENTATION:

JANUARY 27, 2016 SAMPLE EVENT

DAY ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
MONITORING WELL SAMPLING LOG

WELL GW-1

SECTION 1 - SITE INFORMATION

SITE LOCATION: Strippit, Inc. **JOB #:** 5204R-16

Akron, New York **DATE :** 1/27/16

SAMPLE COLLECTOR(S): C. Hampton

WEATHER CONDITIONS: Overcast/Snow **PID IN WELL (PPM):** N/M **LNAPL** N/D **DNAPL** N/D

SECTION 2 - PURGE INFORMATION

DEPTH OF WELL [FT]: 57.85 (MEASURED FROM TOP OF CASING - T.O.C.)

STATIC WATER LEVEL (SWL) [FT]: 41.55 (MEASURED FROM T.O.C.)

THICKNESS OF WATER COLUMN [FT]: 16.30 (DEPTH OF WELL - SWL)

CALCULATED VOL. OF H_2O PER WELL CASING [GAL]: 2.66 **CASING DIA.:** 2"

CALCULATIONS:

CASING DIA. (FT)	WELL CONSTANT(GAL/FT)
¾" (0.0625)	0.023
1" (0.0833)	0.041
1¼" (0.1041)	0.063
2" (0.1667)	0.1632
3" (0.250)	0.380
4" (0.3333)	0.6528
4½" (0.375)	0.826
6" (0.5000)	1.4688
8" (0.666)	2.611

CALCULATIONS
VOL. OF H_2O IN CASING = DEPTH OF WATER COLUMN X WELL CONSTANT

CALCULATED PURGE VOLUME [GAL]: 7.98 (3 TIMES CASING VOLUME)

ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED [GAL]: 7.5 (dry)

PURGE METHOD: Bailer **PURGE START:** 10:50 **END:** 11:20

SECTION 3 - SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION AND TEST PARAMETERS

SAMPLE ID #	DATE / TIME	SAMPLING METHOD	ANALYTICAL SCAN(S)
GW-1	1-27-16 / 16:15	Bailer	Ba, Fe, Mn, Mg

SECTION 4 - WATER QUALITY DATA

SWL (FT)	TEMP (°C)	pH	CONDUCTIVITY (S/m)	TURBIDITY (NTU)	DO (mg/L)	ORP (mV)	VISUAL
52.86	9.8	6.90	68.6	31.5	N/M	-116	Clear

N/M = Not Measured
ND = Not Detected

DAY ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
MONITORING WELL SAMPLING LOG

WELL GW-2

SECTION 1 - SITE INFORMATION

SITE LOCATION: Strippit, Inc. **JOB #:** 5204R-16

Akron, New York **DATE :** 1/27/16

SAMPLE COLLECTOR(S): C. Hampton

WEATHER CONDITIONS: Overcast/Snow **PID IN WELL (PPM):** N/M **LNAPL** N/D **DNAPL** N/D

SECTION 2 - PURGE INFORMATION

DEPTH OF WELL [FT]: 77.90 (MEASURED FROM TOP OF CASING - T.O.C.)

STATIC WATER LEVEL (SWL) [FT]: 52.52 (MEASURED FROM T.O.C.)

THICKNESS OF WATER COLUMN [FT]: 25.38 (DEPTH OF WELL - SWL)

CALCULATED VOL. OF H_2O PER WELL CASING [GAL]: 4.14 **CASING DIA.:** 2"

CALCULATIONS:

CASING DIA. (FT)	WELL CONSTANT(GAL/FT)
¾" (0.0625)	0.023
1" (0.0833)	0.041
1¼" (0.1041)	0.063
2" (0.1667)	0.1632
3" (0.250)	0.380
4" (0.3333)	0.6528
4½" (0.375)	0.826
6" (0.5000)	1.4688
8" (0.666)	2.611

CALCULATIONS
VOL. OF H_2O IN CASING = DEPTH OF WATER COLUMN X WELL CONSTANT

CALCULATED PURGE VOLUME [GAL]: 12.4 (3 TIMES CASING VOLUME)

ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED [GAL]: 4.2 (dry)

PURGE METHOD: Bailer **PURGE START:** 10:30 **END:** 10:45

SECTION 3 - SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION AND TEST PARAMETERS

SAMPLE ID #	DATE / TIME	SAMPLING METHOD	ANALYTICAL SCAN(S)
GW-2	1-27-16 / 16:25	Bailer	Ba, Fe, Mn, Mg

SECTION 4 - WATER QUALITY DATA

SWL (FT)	TEMP (°C)	pH	CONDUCTIVITY (S/m)	TURBIDITY (NTU)	DO (mg/L)	ORP (mV)	VISUAL
70.63	9.7	7.64	30.4	104.0	N/M	-41	Clear/ Slightly Cloudy

N/M = Not Measured
ND = Not Detected

DAY ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
MONITORING WELL SAMPLING LOG

WELL GW-3

SECTION 1 - SITE INFORMATION

SITE LOCATION: Strippit, Inc. **JOB #:** 5204R-16

Akron, New York **DATE :** 1/27/16

SAMPLE COLLECTOR(S): C. Hampton

WEATHER CONDITIONS: Overcast/Snow **PID IN WELL (PPM):** N/M **LNAPL** N/D **DNAPL** N/D

SECTION 2 - PURGE INFORMATION

DEPTH OF WELL [FT]: 50.90 (MEASURED FROM TOP OF CASING - T.O.C.)

STATIC WATER LEVEL (SWL) [FT]: 34.28 (MEASURED FROM T.O.C.)

THICKNESS OF WATER COLUMN [FT]: 16.62 (DEPTH OF WELL - SWL)

CALCULATED VOL. OF H_2O PER WELL CASING [GAL]: 2.71 **CASING DIA.:** 2"

CALCULATIONS:

CASING DIA. (FT)	WELL CONSTANT(GAL/FT)
¾" (0.0625)	~~0.023~~
1" (0.0833)	0.041
1¼" (0.1041)	~~0.063~~
2" (0.1667)	0.1632
3" (0.250)	0.380
4" (0.3333)	0.6528
4½" (0.375)	0.826
6" (0.5000)	1.4688
8" (0.666)	2.611

CALCULATIONS
VOL. OF H_2O IN CASING = DEPTH OF WATER COLUMN X WELL CONSTANT

CALCULATED PURGE VOLUME [GAL]: 8.1 (3 TIMES CASING VOLUME)

ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED [GAL]: 8.5

PURGE METHOD: Bailer **PURGE START:** 11:20 **END:** 11:45

SECTION 3 - SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION AND TEST PARAMETERS

SAMPLE ID #	DATE / TIME	SAMPLING METHOD	ANALYTICAL SCAN(S)
GW-3	1-27-16 / 16:00	Bailer	Ba, Fe, Mn, Mg

SECTION 4 - WATER QUALITY DATA

SWL (FT)	TEMP (°C)	pH	CONDUCTIVITY (S/m)	TURBIDITY (NTU)	DO (mg/L)	ORP (mV)	VISUAL
34.21	10.7	6.73	29.8	79.3	N/M	-84	Clear

N/M = Not Measured
ND = Not Detected

DAY ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
MONITORING WELL SAMPLING LOG

WELL GW-4

SECTION 1 - SITE INFORMATION

SITE LOCATION: Strippit, Inc. **JOB #:** 5204R-16

Akron, New York **DATE :** 1/27/16

SAMPLE COLLECTOR(S): C. Hampton

WEATHER CONDITIONS: Overcast/Snow **PID IN WELL (PPM):** N/M **LNAPL** N/D **DNAPL** N/D

SECTION 2 - PURGE INFORMATION

DEPTH OF WELL [FT]: 46.30 (MEASURED FROM TOP OF CASING - T.O.C.)

STATIC WATER LEVEL (SWL) [FT]: 38.69 (MEASURED FROM T.O.C.)

THICKNESS OF WATER COLUMN [FT]: 7.61 (DEPTH OF WELL - SWL)

CALCULATED VOL. OF H_2O PER WELL CASING [GAL]: 1.24 **CASING DIA.:** 2"

CALCULATIONS:

CASING DIA. (FT)	WELL CONSTANT(GAL/FT)
¾" (0.0625)	~~0.023~~
1" (0.0833)	0.041
1¼" (0.1041)	~~0.063~~
2" (0.1667)	0.1632
3" (0.250)	0.380
4" (0.3333)	0.6528
4½" (0.375)	0.826
6" (0.5000)	1.4688
8" (0.666)	2.611

CALCULATIONS
VOL. OF H_2O IN CASING = DEPTH OF WATER COLUMN X WELL CONSTANT

CALCULATED PURGE VOLUME [GAL]: 3.7 (3 TIMES CASING VOLUME)

ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED [GAL]: 4.0

PURGE METHOD: Bailer **PURGE START:** 11:45 **END:** 12:00

SECTION 3 - SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION AND TEST PARAMETERS

SAMPLE ID #	DATE / TIME	SAMPLING METHOD	ANALYTICAL SCAN(S)
GW-4	1-27-16 / 15:30	Bailer	Ba, Fe, Mn, Mg

SECTION 4 - WATER QUALITY DATA

SWL (FT)	TEMP (°C)	pH	CONDUCTIVITY (S/m)	TURBIDITY (NTU)	DO (mg/L)	ORP (mV)	VISUAL
38.99	9.8	6.94	40.7	49.9	N/M	38	Clear

N/M = Not Measured
ND = Not Detected

DAY ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
MONITORING WELL SAMPLING LOG

WELL GW-5

SECTION 1 - SITE INFORMATION

SITE LOCATION: Strippit, Inc. **JOB #:** 5204R-16

Akron, New York **DATE :** 1/27/16

SAMPLE COLLECTOR(S): C. Hampton

WEATHER CONDITIONS: Overcast/Snow **PID IN WELL (PPM):** N/M **LNAPL** N/D **DNAPL** N/D

SECTION 2 - PURGE INFORMATION

DEPTH OF WELL [FT]: 73.75 (MEASURED FROM TOP OF CASING - T.O.C.)

STATIC WATER LEVEL (SWL) [FT]: 53.06 (MEASURED FROM T.O.C.)

THICKNESS OF WATER COLUMN [FT]: 20.69 (DEPTH OF WELL - SWL)

CALCULATED VOL. OF H_2O PER WELL CASING [GAL]: 3.38 **CASING DIA.:** 2"

CALCULATIONS:

CASING DIA. (FT)	WELL CONSTANT(GAL/FT)
¾" (0.0625)	0.023
1" (0.0833)	0.041
1¼" (0.1041)	0.063
2" (0.1667)	0.1632
3" (0.250)	0.380
4" (0.3333)	0.6528
4½" (0.375)	0.826
6" (0.5000)	1.4688
8" (0.666)	2.611

CALCULATIONS
VOL. OF H_2O IN CASING = DEPTH OF WATER COLUMN X WELL CONSTANT

CALCULATED PURGE VOLUME [GAL]: 10.1 (3 TIMES CASING VOLUME)

ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED [GAL]: 4.0 (dry)

PURGE METHOD: Bailer **PURGE START:** 10:05 **END:** 10:25

SECTION 3 - SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION AND TEST PARAMETERS

SAMPLE ID #	DATE / TIME	SAMPLING METHOD	ANALYTICAL SCAN(S)
GW-5	1-27-16 / 16:35	Bailer	Ba, Fe, Mn, Mg

SECTION 4 - WATER QUALITY DATA

SWL (FT)	TEMP (°C)	pH	CONDUCTIVITY (S/m)	TURBIDITY (NTU)	DO (mg/L)	ORP (mV)	VISUAL
64.60	9.2	8.81	50.4	52.3	N/M	-62	Clear

N/M = Not Measured
ND = Not Detected

PARADIGM

Analytical Report For

Day Environmental, Inc.

For Lab Project ID

160376

Referencing

Stripp 5204R-16 (Strippit)

Prepared

Monday, February 01, 2016

Any noncompliant QC parameters or other notes impacting data interpretation are flagged or documented on the final report or are noted below.

Certifies that this report has been approved by the Technical Director or Designee

179 Lake Avenue • Rochester, NY 14608 • (585) 647-2530 • Fax (585) 647-3311 • ELAP ID# 10958

PARADIGM ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

Lab Project ID: 160376

Client: **Day Environmental, Inc.**

Project Reference: Stripp 5204R-16 (Strippit)

Sample Identifier:	GW-1		
Lab Sample ID:	160376-01	**Date Sampled:**	1/27/2016
Matrix:	Groundwater	**Date Received:**	1/28/2016

Metals

Analyte	Result	Units	Qualifier	Date Analyzed
Barium	< 0.100	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:21
Iron	**0.401**	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:21
Magnesium	**62.2**	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:21
Manganese	**0.0967**	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:21

Method Reference(s): EPA 6010C
EPA 3005A
Preparation Date: 1/28/2016
Data File: 012916a

PARADIGM
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

Lab Project ID: 160376

Client: **Day Environmental, Inc.**

Project Reference: Stripp 5204R-16 (Strippit)

Sample Identifier:	GW-2		
Lab Sample ID:	160376-02	**Date Sampled:**	1/27/2016
Matrix:	Groundwater	**Date Received:**	1/28/2016

Metals

Analyte	Result	Units	Qualifier	Date Analyzed
Barium	< 0.100	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:25
Iron	**0.609**	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:25
Magnesium	**7.58**	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:25
Manganese	< 0.0150	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:25

Method Reference(s): EPA 6010C
EPA 3005A
Preparation Date: 1/28/2016
Data File: 012916a

PARADIGM
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

Lab Project ID: 160376

Client: **Day Environmental, Inc.**

Project Reference: Stripp 5204R-16 (Strippit)

Sample Identifier:	GW-3		
Lab Sample ID:	160376-03	**Date Sampled:**	1/27/2016
Matrix:	Groundwater	**Date Received:**	1/28/2016

Metals

Analyte	Result	Units	Qualifier	Date Analyzed
Barium	< 0.100	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:29
Iron	**1.37**	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:29
Magnesium	**28.0**	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:29
Manganese	**0.0836**	mg/L		1/29/2016 12:29

Method Reference(s): EPA 6010C
EPA 3005A
Preparation Date: 1/28/2016
Data File: 012916a

PARADIGM
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

Lab Project ID: 160376

Client: **Day Environmental, Inc.**

Project Reference: Stripp 5204R-16 (Strippit)

Sample Identifier:	GW-4		
Lab Sample ID:	160376-04	**Date Sampled:**	1/27/2016
Matrix:	Groundwater	**Date Received:**	1/28/2016

Metals

Analyte	Result	Units	Qualifier	Date Analyzed
Barium	< 0.100	mg/L		1/29/2016 14:41
Iron	**0.248**	mg/L		1/29/2016 14:41
Magnesium	**16.2**	mg/L		1/29/2016 14:41
Manganese	< 0.0150	mg/L		1/29/2016 14:41

Method Reference(s): EPA 6010C
EPA 3005A
Preparation Date: 1/28/2016
Data File: 012916a

PARADIGM
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

Lab Project ID: 160376

Client: **Day Environmental, Inc.**

Project Reference: Stripp 5204R-16 (Strippit)

Sample Identifier:	GW-5		
Lab Sample ID:	160376-05	**Date Sampled:**	1/27/2016
Matrix:	Groundwater	**Date Received:**	1/28/2016

Metals

Analyte	Result	Units	Qualifier	Date Analyzed
Barium	< 0.100	mg/L		1/29/2016 14:45
Iron	**0.803**	mg/L		1/29/2016 14:45
Magnesium	**9.14**	mg/L		1/29/2016 14:45
Manganese	**0.0266**	mg/L		1/29/2016 14:45

Method Reference(s): EPA 6010C
EPA 3005A
Preparation Date: 1/28/2016
Data File: 012916a

Analytical Report Appendix

The reported results relate only to the samples as they have been received by the laboratory.

Each page of this document is part of a multipage report. This document may not be reproduced except in its entirety, without the prior consent of Paradigm Environmental Services, Inc.

All soil/sludge samples have been reported on a dry weight basis, unless qualified "reported as received". Other solids are reported as received.

Low level Volatiles blank reports for soil/solid matrix are based on a nominal 5 gram weight. Sample results and reporting limits are based on actual weight, which may be more or less than 5 grams.

The Chain of Custody provides additional information, including compliance with sample condition requirements upon receipt. Sample condition requirements are defined under the 2003 NELAC Standard, sections 5.5.8.3.1 and 5.5.8.3.2.

NYSDOH ELAP does not certify for all parameters. Paradigm Environmental Services or the indicated subcontracted laboratory does hold certification for all analytes where certification is offered by ELAP unless otherwise specified. Aliquots separated for certain tests, such as TCLP, are indicated on the Chain of Custody and final reports with an "A" suffix.

Data qualifiers are used, when necessary, to provide additional information about the data. This information may be communicated as a flag or as text at the bottom of the report. Please refer to the following list of analyte-specific, frequently used data flags and their meaning:

"<" = Analyzed for but not detected at or above the quantitation limit.
"E" = Result has been estimated, calibration limit exceeded.
"Z" = See case narrative.
"D" = Sample, Laboratory Control Sample, or Matrix Spike Duplicate results above Relative Percent Difference limit.
"M" = Matrix spike recoveries outside QC limits. Matrix bias indicated.
"B" = Method blank contained trace levels of analyte. Refer to included method blank report.
"J" = Result estimated between the quantitation limit and half the quantitation limit.
"L" = Laboratory Control Sample recovery outside accepted QC limits.
"P" = Concentration differs by more than 40% between the primary and secondary analytical columns.
"NC" = Not calculable. Applicable to RPD if sample or duplicate result is non-detect or estimated (see primary report for data flags). Applicable to MS if sample is greater or equal to ten times the spike added. Applicable to sample surrogates or MS if sample dilution is 10x or higher.
"" = Indicates any recoveries outside associated acceptance windows. Surrogate outliers in samples are presumed matrix effects. LCS demonstrates method compliance unless otherwise noted.*
"(1)" = Indicates data from primary column used for QC calculation.
"A" = denotes a parameter for which ELAP does not offer approval as part of their laboratory certification program.
"F" = denotes a parameter for which Paradigm does not carry certification, the results for which should therefore only be used where ELAP certification is not required, such as personal exposure assessment.

GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS
LABORATORY SERVICES

These Terms and Conditions embody the whole agreement of the parties in the absence of a signed and executed contract between the Laboratory (LAB) and Client. They shall supersede all previous communications, representations, or agreements, either verbal or written, between the parties. The LAB specifically rejects all additional, inconsistent, or conflicting terms, whether printed or otherwise set forth in any purchase order or other communication from the Client to the LAB. The invalidity or unenforceability in whole or in part of any provision, tern or condition hereof shall not affect in any way the validity or enforceability of the remainder of the Terms and Conditions. No waiver by LAB of any provision, term, or condition hereof or of any breach by or obligation of the Client hereunder shall constitute a waiver of such provision, term, or condition on any other occasion or a waiver of any other breach by or obligation of the Client. This agreement shall be administered and interpreted under the laws of the state which services are procured.

Warranty. Recognizing that the nature of many samples is unknown and that some may contain potentially hazardous components, LAB warrants only that it will perform testing services, obtain findings, and prepare reports in accordance with generally accepted analytical laboratory principles and practices at the time of performance of services. LAB makes no other warranty, express or implied.

Scope and Compensation. LAB agrees to perform the services described in the chain of custody to which these terms and conditions are attached. Unless the parties agree in writing to the contrary, the duties of LAB shall not be construed to exceed the services specifically described. LAB wi use LAB default method for all tests unless specified otherwise on the Work Order.
Payment terms are net 30 days from the date of invoice. All overdue payments are subject to an interest charge of one and one-half percent (1-1/2%) per month or a portion thereof. Client shall also be responsible for costs of collection, including payment of reasonable attorney fees if such expense is incurred. The prices, unless stated, do not include any sale, use or other taxes. Such taxes will be added to invoice prices when required.

Prices. Compensation for services performed will be based on the current Lab Analytical Fee Schedule or on quotations agreed to in writing by the parties. Turnaround time based charges are determined from the time of resolution of all work order questions. Testimony, court appearances or data compilation for legal action will be charged separately. Evaluation and reporting of initial screening runs may incur additional fees.

Limitations of Liability. In the event of any error, omission, or other professional negligence, the sole and exclusive responsibility of LAB shall be to re-perform the deficient work at its own expense and LAB shall have no other liability whatsoever. All claims shall be deemed waived unless made in writing and received by LAB within ninety (90) days following completion of services.
LAB shall have no liability, obligation, or responsibility of any kind for losses, costs, expenses, or other damages (including but not limited to any special, direct, incidental or consequential damages) with respect to LAB's services or results.
All results provided by LAB are strictly for the use of its clients and LAB is in no way responsible for the use of such results by clients or third parties. All reports should be considered in their entirety, and LAB is not responsible for the separation, detachment, or other use of any portion of these reports. Client may not assign the lab report without the written consent of the LAB.
Client covenants and agrees, at its/his/her sole expense, to indemnify, protect, defend, and save harmless the LAB from and against any and all damages, losses, liabilities, obligations, penalties, claims, litigation, demands, defenses, judgments, suits, actions, proceedings, costs, disbursements and/or expenses (including, without limitation attorneys' and experts' fees and disbursements) of any kind whatsoever which may at any time be imposed upon, incurred by or asserted or awarded against client relating to, resulting from or arising out of (a) the breach of this agreement by this client, (b) the negligence of the client in handling, delivering or disclosing any hazardous substance, (c) the violation of the Client of any applicable law, (d) non-compliance by the Client with any environmental permit or (e) a material misrepresentation in disclosing the materials to be tested.

Hazard Disclosure. Client represents and warrants that any sample delivered to LAB will be preceded or accompanied by complete written disclosure of the presence of any hazardous substances known or suspected by Client. Client further warrants that any sample containing any hazardous substance that is to be delivered to LAB will be packaged, labeled, transported, and delivered properly and in accordance with applicable laws.

Sample Handling. Prior to LAB's acceptance of any sample (or after any revocation of acceptance), the entire risk of loss or of damage to such sample remains with Client. Samples are accepted when receipt is acknowledged on chain of custody documentation. In no event will LAB have any responsibility for the action or inaction of any carrier shipping or delivering any sample to or from LAB premises.
Client authorizes LAB to proceed with the analysis of samples as received by the laboratory, recognizing that any samples not in compliance with all current DOH-ELAP-NELAP requirements for containers, preservation or holding time will be noted as such on th final report.
Disposal of hazardous waste samples is the responsibility of the Client. If the Client does not wish such samples returned, LAB may add storage and disposal fees to the final invoice. Maximum storage time for samples is 30 days after completion of analysis unless modified by applicable state or federal laws. Client will be required to give the LAB written instructions concerning disposal of these samples.
LAB reserves the absolute right, exercisable at any time, to refuse to receive delivery of, refuse to accept, or revoke acceptance of any sample, which, in the sole judgment of LAB (a) is of unsuitable volume, (b) may be or become unsuitable for or may pose a risk in handling, transport, or processing for any health, safety, environmental or other reason whether or not due to the presence in the sample of any hazardous substance, and whether or not such presence has been disclosed to LAB by Client or (c) if the condition or sample date make the sample unsuitable for analysis.

Legal Responsibility. LAB is solely responsible for performance of this contract, and no affiliated company, director, officer, employee, or agent shall have any legal responsibility hereunder, whether in contract or tort including negligence.

Assignment. LAB may assign its performance obligations under this contract to other parties, as it deems necessary. LAB shall disclose to Client any assignee (subcontractor) by ELAP ID # on the submitted final report.

Force Majeure. LAB shall have no responsibility or liability to the Client for any failure or delay in performance by LAB, which results in whole or in part from any cause or circumstance beyond the reasonable control of LAB. Such causes and circumstances shall include, but not limited to, acts of God, acts or orders of any government authority, strikes or other labor disputes, natural disasters, accidents, wars, civil disturbances, difficulties or delays in transportation, mail or delivery services, inability to obtain sufficient services or supplies from LAB's usual suppliers, or any other cause beyond LAB's reasonable control.

Law. This contract shall be continued under the laws of the State of New York without regard to its conflicts of laws provision.

179 Lake Avenue, Rochester, NY 14608 Office (585) 647-2530 Fax (585) 647-3311

1 of 2

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

REPORT TO:			INVOICE TO:			LAB PROJECT ID
CLIENT: Day Environmental, Inc.			CLIENT: SAME			160376
ADDRESS: 1563 Lyell Avenue			ADDRESS:			Quotation #:
CITY: Rochester	STATE: NY	ZIP: 14606	CITY:	STATE:	ZIP:	
PHONE: 585 454 0210			PHONE:			Email:
ATTN: C. Hampton			ATTN:			

PROJECT REFERENCE
Stripp 5204R-16
(Strippit)

Matrix Codes:
AQ - Aqueous Liquid; **NQ** - Non-Aqueous Liquid; **WA** - Water; **WG** - Groundwater; **DW** - Drinking Water; **WW** - Wastewater; **SO** - Soil; **SL** - Sludge; **SD** - Solid; **PT** - Paint; **WP** - Wipe; **CK** - Caulk; **OL** - Oil; **AR** - Air

REQUESTED ANALYSIS

	DATE COLLECTED	TIME COLLECTED	COMPOSITE	GRAB	SAMPLE IDENTIFIER	MATRIX CODES	NUMBER OF CONTAINERS	Barium	Iron	Magnesium	Manganese	REMARKS	PARADIGM LAB SAMPLE NUMBER
1	1-27-16	16:15		X	GW-1	WG	1	X	X	X	X		01
2	1-27-16	16:25		X	GW-2	WG	1	X	X	X	X		02
3	1-27-16	16:00		X	GW-3	WG	1	X	X	X	X		03
4	1-27-16	15:30		X	GW-4	WG	1	X	X	X	X		04
5	1-27-16	16:35		X	GW-5	WG	1	X	X	X	X		05
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													

Turnaround Time		Report Supplements			
Availability contingent upon lab approval; additional fees may apply.					
Standard 5 day	X	Batch QC		Basic EDD	
Rush 3 day		Category A		NYSDEC EDD	
Rush 2 day		Category B			
Rush 1 day					
Other please indicate:		Other please indicate:		Other EDD please indicate:	

Charles Hampton	1-27-16 / 16:40	Total Cost:
Sampled By	Date/Time	
Relinquished By	1-28-16 / 09:15	
	Date/Time	
Received By	1/28/16 9:15 AM	P.I.F.
	Date/Time	
Received @ Lab By	1/28/16 09:52	
	Date/Time	

3°C iced 1/28/16 09:22

Chain of Custody Supplement

Client: Day Environmental **Completed by:** Glen Pezzulo

Lab Project ID: 160376 **Date:** 1/28/16

Sample Condition Requirements

Per NELAC/ELAP 210/241/242/243/244

Condition	NELAC compliance with the sample condition requirements upon receipt: Yes	No	N/A
Container Type	X		
Comments			
Transferred to method-compliant container			X
Headspace (<1 mL)			X
Comments			
Preservation	X		
Comments			
Chlorine Absent (<0.10 ppm per test strip)			X
Comments			
Holding Time	X		
Comments			
Temperature			X
Comments	3°C iced		
Sufficient Sample Quantity	X		
Comments			

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF DETECTED PARAMETERS

12975 CLARANCE CENTER RD
AKRON, NEW YORK
NYSDEC SITE #915053

POST CLOSURE MONITORING SUMMARY OF DETECTED GROUNDWATER PARAMETERS

GW-1

SAMPLING DATES 4/95 THROUGH 1/16

TEST PARAMETER	UNITS	SAMPLE ROUND																			
		4/11/1995	7/12/1995	10/16/1995	1/22/1996	5/8/1996	8/6/1996	10/29/1996	2/6/1997	6/9/1997	9/15/1997	12/16/1997	3/13/1998	6/11/1998	12/14/1998	6/23/1999	12/15/1999	6/22/2000	1/11/2001	7/3/2001	12/12/2001
barium, total	mg/L	0.079	0.123	0.070	0.130	0.054	0.040	0.058	0.041	0.062	0.033	0.035	0.023	0.032	0.095	0.041	0.036	0.025	0.027	0.025	0.023
iron, total	mg/L	1.460	6.820	2.530	8.340	0.150	0.170	2.960	1.000	5.910	0.985	1.210	0.229	0.676	8.660	1.960	0.724	***0.100***	0.522	0.246	0.188
magnesium, total	mg/L	54.000	52.000	56.800	68.800	62.900	71.200	64.800	65.600	66.300	69.300	78.000	65.800	64.500	59.800	63.600	57.700	52.700	43.400	44.300	39.100
manganese, total	mg/L	0.038	0.171	0.080	0.240	0.039	0.024	0.085	0.041	0.158	0.030	0.049	0.019	0.069	0.255	0.084	0.049	0.033	0.030	0.041	0.027
total phenols	mg/L					0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.005***	0.030	0.029	***0.002***	***0.002***	0.004	***0.002***	**0.002**	**0.002**

TEST PARAMETER	UNITS	SAMPLE ROUND																			
		6/20/2002	1/10/2003	6/10/2003	1/22/2004	6/29/2004	12/30/2004	6/8/2005	12/29/2005	7/14/2006	3/8/007	9/25/2007	4/23/2008	10/22/2008	6/2/2009	1/12/2010	1/11/2011	1/12/2012	1/16/2013	1/15/2014	1/14/2015	1/27/2016
barium, total	mg/L	**0.020**	0.034	0.037	0.031	0.028	0.026	0.033	0.031	0.042	0.022	0.048	0.050	0.040	0.025	0.076	0.036	0.0520J	***0.100***	***0.100***	***0.100***	***0.100***
iron, total	mg/L	**0.100**	0.419	0.284	0.237	***0.100***	0.204	0.238	0.286	1.650	0.103	2.830	***0.100***	***0.100***	1.130	6.060	1.930	5.100	1.500	2.13	1.830	0.401
magnesium, total	mg/L	38.700	47.700	49.700	13.100	39.100	33.200	32.100	51.700	11.300	2.180	45.300	2.060	2.250	50.500	60.800	45.000	41.500	44.000	53.5	57.600	62.2
manganese, total	mg/L	0.290	0.061	0.143	***0.010***	***0.102***	0.052	0.053	0.171	0.063	**0.010**	0.200	***0.010***	***0.010***	0.094	0.199	0.104	0.145	0.075	0.0940	0.1670	0.0967
total phenols	mg/L	0.008	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	0.002	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	0.011	***0.002***	0.003	0.002	0.002	***0.002***						

Notes:
- values shown in **BOLD** and SHADED print indicate parameter was "not detected" at the detection limit presented on this table
- J = estimated value
- values left blank indicate sample was either not collected or not tested
- soluble metals and volatile organic compounds have not been tested since June 20, 2002 (as approved in a letter from the NYSDEC dated August 21, 2002).
- As outlined in a letter dated February 10, 2010 by the NYSDEC, testing of total phenols is no longer required.

12975 CLARANCE CENTER RD
AKRON, NEW YORK
NYSDEC SITE #915053

POST CLOSURE MONITORING SUMMARY OF DETECTED GROUNDWATER PARAMETERS

GW-2

SAMPLING DATES 4/95 THROUGH 1/16

TEST PARAMETER	UNITS	SAMPLE ROUND																			
		4/11/1995	7/12/1995	10/16/1995	1/22/1996	5/8/1996	8/6/1996	10/29/1996	2/6/1997	6/9/1997	9/15/1997	12/16/1997	3/13/1998	6/11/1998	12/14/1998	6/23/1999	12/15/1999	6/22/2000	1/11/2001	7/3/2001	12/12/2001
barium, total	mg/L	0.210	0.211	0.210	0.180	0.118	0.130	0.139	0.127	0.108	0.110	0.099	0.091	0.118	0.107	0.146	0.172	0.122	0.176	0.159	0.145
iron, total	mg/L	0.250	0.490	1.440	1.260	0.090	0.180	0.260	0.410	***0.100***	0.319	9.350	0.194	0.247	0.431	1.230	2.230	1.270	2.360	0.566	3.110
magnesium, total	mg/L	1.030	0.360	0.910	1.360	0.470	2.510	2.800	0.342	***0.500***	***0.500***	23.300	0.222	0.393	0.404	1.140	1.860	1.580	1.660	0.342	2.930
manganese, total	mg/L	0.006	0.150	0.020	0.040	***0.005***	***0.005***	0.030	0.009	***0.010***	***0.020***	0.224	***0.010***	***0.010***	***0.010***	0.025	0.040	0.040	0.042	***0.010***	0.064
total phenols	mg/L					0.005	0.020	0.008	0.005	***0.005***	***0.020***	***0.002***	***0.005***	0.008	0.008	***0.002***	***0.002***	0.002	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***

TEST PARAMETER	UNITS	SAMPLE ROUND																			
		6/20/2002	1/10/2003	6/10/2003	1/22/2004	6/29/2004	12/30/2004	6/8/2005	12/29/2005	7/14/2006	3/8/2007	9/25/2007	4/23/2008	10/22/2008	6/2/2009	1/12/2010	1/11/2011	1/12/2012	1/16/2013	1/15/2014	1/14/2015	1/27/2016
barium, total	mg/L	0.131	0.125	0.164	0.140	0.125	0.127	0.184	0.170	0.128	0.108	0.153	0.101	0.088	0.085	0.078	0.079	0.0900J	***0.100***	***0.188***	***0.100***	***0.100***
iron, total	mg/L	1.630	0.169	1.450	***0.100***	0.277	1.550	3.050	4.500	0.559	0.512	3.360	***0.100***	***0.100***	1.200	0.263	0.653	1.500	1.000	10.5	3.32	0.609
magnesium, total	mg/L	1.700	0.611	2.250	0.175	0.692	1.990	2.820	4.320	0.917	0.694	4.320	0.165	0.200	2.760	3.460	2.930	5.850	4.000	15.6	9.35	7.58
manganese, total	mg/L	0.033	0.010	0.031	**0.010**	0.013	0.029	0.057	0.086	0.011	0.010	0.065	***0.100***	***0.100***	0.024	***0.010***	0.013	0.045	0.020	0.236	0.0699	***0.015***
total phenols	mg/L	0.007	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	0.003	***0.002***	0.003	0.002	0.004	***0.002***						

Notes:
- values shown in **BOLD** and SHADED print indicate parameter was "not detected" at the detection limit presented on this table
- J = estimated value
- values left blank indicate sample was either not collected or not tested
- soluble metals and volatile organic compounds have not been tested since June 20, 2002 (as approved in a letter from the NYSDEC dated August 21, 2002).
- As outlined in a letter dated February 10, 2010 by the NYSDEC, testing of total phenols is no longer required.

12975 CLARANCE CENTER RD
AKRON, NEW YORK
NYSDEC SITE #915053

POST CLOSURE MONITORING SUMMARY OF DETECTED GROUNDWATER PARAMETERS

GW-3

SAMPLING DATES 4/95 THROUGH 1/16

TEST PARAMETER	UNITS	SAMPLE ROUND																			
		4/11/1995	7/12/1995	10/16/1995	1/22/1996	5/8/1996	8/6/1996	10/29/1997	2/6/1997	6/9/1997	9/15/1997	12/16/1997	3/13/1998	6/11/1998	12/14/1998	6/23/1999	12/15/1999	6/22/2000	1/11/2001	7/3/2001	12/12/2001
barium, total	mg/L	0.065	0.173	0.165	0.090	0.078	0.086	0.078	0.083	0.072	0.076	0.087	0.063	0.069	0.071	0.078	0.084	0.064	0.087	0.068	0.060
iron, total	mg/L	1.560	6.710	13.550	4.090	4.230	1.300	2.000	2.370	2.255	3.800	4.650	1.720	1.380	1.810	1.960	3.150	0.250	4.790	1.690	0.943
magnesium, total	mg/L	28.300	68.700	72.550	32.450	30.950	32.700	16.650	32.900	30.350	35.800	39.350	28.700	27.550	24.600	32.150	31.600	26.300	31.600	26.800	25.000
manganese, total	mg/L	0.120	0.456	0.660	0.210	0.142	0.141	0.128	0.148	0.001	0.120	0.195	0.097	0.011	0.079	0.128	0.111	0.067	0.170	0.082	0.082
total phenols	mg/L					***0.005***	0.140	***0.005***	***0.005***	***0.005***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.050***	***0.050***	***0.001***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***

TEST PARAMETER	UNITS	SAMPLE ROUND																			
		6/20/2002	1/10/2003	6/10/2003	1/22/2004	6/29/2004	12/30/2004	6/8/2005	12/29/2005	7/14/2006	3/8/2007	9/25/2007	4/23/2008	10/22/2008	6/2/2009	1/12/2010	1/11/2011	1/12/2012	1/16/2013	1/15/2014	1/14/2015	1/27/2016
barium, total	mg/L	0.066	0.068	0.093	0.064	0.079	0.086	0.067	0.103	0.078	0.067	0.062	0.055	0.062	0.061	0.070	0.073	0.072J	***0.100***	***0.100***	***0.100***	***0.100***
iron, total	mg/L	1.830	0.897	4.850	0.571	1.610	2.740	0.999	4.640	1.870	0.583	0.388	0.268	0.416	0.573	0.935	1.470	1.090	1.700	1.57	1.28	1.37
magnesium, total	mg/L	26.600	27.700	33.700	27.300	27.300	27.000	24.200	32.200	29.000	24.900	26.700	22.500	24.300	26.100	26.600	26.000	26.500	28.000	26.6	27.1	28.0
manganese, total	mg/L	0.120	0.083	0.175	0.072	0.261	0.112	0.097	0.178	0.119	0.077	0.085	0.061	0.068	0.066	0.089	0.096	0.081	0.092	0.0809	0.0709	0.0836
total phenols	mg/L	0.004	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	0.014	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	0.003	***0.002***	***0.002***	0.003	***0.002***	***0.002***						

Notes:
- values shown in **BOLD** and SHADED print indicate parameter was "not detected" at the detection limit presented on this table
- J = estimated value
- values left blank indicate sample was either not collected or not tested
- soluble metals and volatile organic compounds have not been tested since June 20, 2002 (as approved in a letter from the NYSDEC dated August 21, 2002).
- As outlined in a letter dated February 10, 2010 by the NYSDEC, testing of total phenols is no longer required.

12975 CLARANCE CENTER RD
AKRON, NEW YORK
NYSDEC SITE #915053

POST CLOSURE MONITORING SUMMARY OF DETECTED GROUNDWATER PARAMETERS

GW-4

SAMPLING DATES 4/95 THROUGH 1/16

TEST PARAMETER	UNITS	SAMPLE ROUND																			
		4/11/1995	7/12/1995	10/16/1995	1/22/1996	5/8/1996	8/6/1996	10/29/1996	2/6/1997	6/9/1997	9/15/1997	12/16/1997	3/13/1998	6/11/1998	12/14/1998	6/23/1999	12/15/1999	6/22/2000	1/11/2001	7/3/2001	12/12/2001
barium, total	mg/L	0.179	0.099	0.120	0.130	0.044	0.044	0.054	0.071	0.058	0.060	0.055	0.055	0.055	0.081	0.059	0.078	0.065	0.058	0.116	0.072
iron, total	mg/L	12.020	6.720	11.900	9.850	***1.000***	0.043	2.140	2.870	1.290	1.320	0.766	0.286	1.510	4.420	1.580	4.000	0.110	1.430	8.190	3.130
magnesium, total	mg/L	77.900	48.300	66.000	49.400	39.700	38.800	49.100	46.150	39.000	33.750	42.300	36.000	35.900	31.000	40.100	27.700	25.200	32.100	35.700	17.200
manganese, total	mg/L	0.320	0.162	0.320	0.240	0.022	0.022	0.086	0.076	0.034		0.023	***0.010***	0.072	0.094	0.039	0.086	***0.010***	0.027	0.106	0.074
total phenols	mg/L					***0.005***	***0.005***	***0.005***	0.012	***0.005***	***0.020***	0.003	***0.005***	***0.005***	0.002	0.002	0.002	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***

TEST PARAMETER	UNITS	SAMPLE ROUND																			
		6/20/2002	1/10/2003	6/10/2003	1/22/2004	6/29/2004	12/30/2004	6/8/2005	12/29/2005	7/14/2006	3/8/2007	9/25/2007	4/23/2008	10/22/2008	6/2/2009	1/12/2010	1/11/2011	1/12/2012	1/16/2013	1/15/2014	1/14/2015	1/27/2016
barium, total	mg/L	0.052	0.062	0.075	0.036	0.043	0.063	0.070	0.067	0.048	0.032	0.039	0.040	0.033	0.059	0.063	0.068	0.060J	***0.100***	***0.100***	***0.100***	***0.100***
iron, total	mg/L	0.155	0.182	0.919	0.302	0.078	0.183	0.300	0.373	0.757	**0.100**	**0.100**	**0.100**	**0.100**	0.122	0.505	0.405	0.265	0.310	0.159	0.328	0.248
magnesium, total	mg/L	17.300	15.200	14.700	1.970	1.460	7.170	9.000	9.010	2.740	0.564	1.750	0.577	1.040	17.600	24.700	15.300	15.800	14.000	22.2	13.5	16.2
manganese, total	mg/L	***0.010***	***0.010***	0.022	***0.010***	***0.010***	***0.010***	***0.010***	***0.010***	*0.019*	***0.010***	***0.010***	***0.010***	***0.010***	***0.010***	0.010	***0.010***	***0.015***	***0.020***	***0.015***	***0.015***	***0.015***
total phenols	mg/L	0.002	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***						

Notes:
- values shown in **BOLD** and SHADED print indicate parameter was "not detected" at the detection limit presented on this table
- J = estimated value
- values left blank indicate sample was either not collected or not tested
- soluble metals and volatile organic compounds have not been tested since June 20, 2002 (as approved in a letter from the NYSDEC dated August 21, 2002).
- As outlined in a letter dated February 10, 2010 by the NYSDEC, testing of total phenols is no longer required.

12975 CLARANCE CENTER RD
AKRON, NEW YORK
NYSDEC SITE #915053

POST CLOSURE MONITORING SUMMARY OF DETECTED GROUNDWATER PARAMETERS

GW-5

SAMPLING DATES 4/95 THROUGH 1/16

TEST PARAMETER	UNITS	SAMPLE ROUND																			
		4/11/1995	7/12/1995	10/16/1995	1/22/1996	5/8/1996	8/6/1996	10/29/1996	2/6/1997	6/9/1997	9/15/1997	12/16/1997	3/13/1998	6/11/1998	12/14/1998	6/23/1999	12/15/1999	6/22/2000	1/11/2001	7/3/2001	12/12/2001
barium, total	mg/L	0.172	0.600	0.180	0.230	0.053	0.055	0.090	0.114	0.053	0.067	0.148	0.065	0.071	0.146	0.068	0.076	0.050	0.073	0.042	0.082
iron, total	mg/L	23.000	1.730	24.700	34.300	***0.510***	0.280	1.330	8.670	1.300	4.930	1.660	1.820	2.220	17.700	3.230	4.210	0.527	5.100	0.443	7.970
magnesium, total	mg/L	32.200	9.710	32.800	42.500	2.530	2.490	3.050	18.600	3.650	8.000	1.640	5.380	9.300	23.600	5.850	7.150	3.970	7.850	1.450	13.900
manganese, total	mg/L	0.485	0.038	0.620	0.760	0.011	0.008	0.030	0.218	0.024	0.080	0.035	0.037	0.105	0.382	0.068	0.088	0.036	0.106	***0.010***	0.198
total phenols	mg/L					***0.005***	***0.005***	***0.005***	***0.005***	***0.005***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.005***	0.081	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***		***0.002***	***0.002***

TEST PARAMETER	UNITS	SAMPLE ROUND																			
		6/20/2002	1/10/2003	6/10/2003	1/22/2004	6/29/2004	12/30/2004	6/8/2005	12/29/2005	7/14/2006	3/8/2007	9/25/2007	4/23/2008	10/22/2008	6/2/2009	1/12/2010	1/11/2011	1/12/2012	1/16/2013	1/15/2014	1/14/2015	1/27/2016
barium, total	mg/L	0.051	0.050	0.053	0.057	0.042	0.054	0.063	0.052	0.054	0.033	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.047	0.042	0.054	0.047J	**0.100**	**0.100**	**0.100**	**0.100**
iron, total	mg/L	1.770	0.209	1.540	1.320	0.433	1.890	2.710	1.870	2.340	0.157	**0.100**	**0.100**	**0.100**	3.200	0.737	2.310	2.56M	1.400	3.82	1.16	0.803
magnesium, total	mg/L	6.130	8.850	4.000	4.350	4.950	3.360	5.540	3.830	5.230	0.498	0.471	0.311	0.267	10.900	3.170	5.210	5.460	2.900	14.8	4.68	9.14
manganese, total	mg/L	0.039	0.010	0.037	0.029	0.030	0.044	0.051	0.039	0.045	**0.010**	**0.010**	**0.010**	**0.010**	0.059	0.016	0.056	0.055	0.031	0.0872	0.0304	0.0266
total phenols	mg/L	***0.002***	0.003	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	***0.002***	0.004	***0.002***	***0.002***						

Notes:

- values shown in **BOLD** and SHADED print indicate parameter was "not detected" at the detection limit presented on this table
- J = estimated value
- D = Duplicate results outside QC limits. May indicate non-homogenous matrix
- M = Matrix spike recoveries outside QC limits. Matrix bias indicated.
- values left blank indicate sample was either not collected or not tested
- soluble metals and volatile organic compounds have not been tested since June 20, 2002 (as approved in a letter from the NYSDEC dated August 21, 2002).
- As outlined in a letter dated February 10, 2010 by the NYSDEC, testing of total phenols is no longer required.

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL AND ENGINEERING CONTROLS CERTIFICATION FORM

Enclosure 2
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
Site Management Periodic Review Report Notice
Institutional and Engineering Controls Certification Form

Site Details **Box 1**

Site No. 915053

Site Name Houdaille Industries; Strippit Division

Site Address: 12975 Clarence Center Road Zip Code: 14001
City/Town: Akron
County: Erie
Site Acreage: 2.5

Reporting Period: February 1, 2015 to January 31, 2016

	YES	NO
1. Is the information above correct?	☒	☐
If NO, include handwritten above or on a separate sheet.		
2. Has some or all of the site property been sold, subdivided, merged, or undergone a tax map amendment during this Reporting Period?	☐	☒
3. Has there been any change of use at the site during this Reporting Period (see 6NYCRR 375-1.11(d))?	☐	☒
4. Have any federal, state, and/or local permits (e.g., building, discharge) been issued for or at the property during this Reporting Period?	☒	☐
If you answered YES to questions 2 thru 4, include documentation or evidence that documentation has been previously submitted with this certification form. A copy of the 2015 Annual Certification Report for SPDES Permit No. NYR00B074 is attached.		
5. Is the site currently undergoing development?	☐	☒

Box 2

	YES	NO
6. Is the current site use consistent with the use(s) listed below? Closed Landfill	☒	☐
7. Are all ICs/ECs in place and functioning as designed?	☒	☐

IF THE ANSWER TO EITHER QUESTION 6 OR 7 IS NO, sign and date below and DO NOT COMPLETE THE REST OF THIS FORM. Otherwise continue.

A Corrective Measures Work Plan must be submitted along with this form to address these issues.

Signature of Owner, Remedial Party or Designated Representative Date

SITE NO. 915053

Box 3

Description of Institutional Controls

Parcel	Owner	Institutional Control
47.18-1-33./A	Strippit LVD	Monitoring Plan O&M Plan

A No Further Action Record of Decision (ROD) was issued in March 1995. This ROD did not require a Deed Restriction. Post-closure maintenance and monitoring are required that includes cover system integrity inspections and groundwater quality sampling to ensure long term effectiveness of the remedy and to provide early detection should failure occur.

Box 4

Description of Engineering Controls

Parcel	Engineering Control
47.18-1-33./A	Cover System Fencing/Access Control

A Part 360 cover system that consists of 40-mil HDPE and associated soil/topsoil. The site is fenced.

Box 5

Periodic Review Report (PRR) Certification Statements

1. I certify by checking "YES" below that:

   a) the Periodic Review report and all attachments were prepared under the direction of, and reviewed by, the party making the certification;

   b) to the best of my knowledge and belief, the work and conclusions described in this certification are in accordance with the requirements of the site remedial program, and generally accepted engineering practices; and the information presented is accurate and compete.

YES	NO
☒	☐

2. If this site has an IC/EC Plan (or equivalent as required in the Decision Document), for each Institutional or Engineering control listed in Boxes 3 and/or 4, I certify by checking "YES" below that all of the following statements are true:

   (a) the Institutional Control and/or Engineering Control(s) employed at this site is unchanged since the date that the Control was put in-place, or was last approved by the Department;

   (b) nothing has occurred that would impair the ability of such Control, to protect public health and the environment;

   (c) access to the site will continue to be provided to the Department, to evaluate the remedy, including access to evaluate the continued maintenance of this Control;

   (d) nothing has occurred that would constitute a violation or failure to comply with the Site Management Plan for this Control; and

   (e) if a financial assurance mechanism is required by the oversight document for the site, the mechanism remains valid and sufficient for its intended purpose established in the document.

YES	NO
☒	☐

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 2 IS NO, sign and date below and DO NOT COMPLETE THE REST OF THIS FORM. Otherwise continue.

A Corrective Measures Work Plan must be submitted along with this form to address these issues.

_____ _____

Signature of Owner, Remedial Party or Designated Representative — Date

IC CERTIFICATIONS
SITE NO. 915053

Box 6

SITE OWNER OR DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

I certify that all information and statements in Boxes 1,2, and 3 are true. I understand that a false statement made herein is punishable as a Class "A" misdemeanor, pursuant to Section 210.45 of the Penal Law.

I Ray Chojnowski (print name) at 12975 Clarence Center Road, Akron, New York 14001 (print business address),

am certifying as Owner Representative (Owner or Remedial Party)

for the Site named in the Site Details Section of this form.

Ray Chojnowski
Signature of Owner, Remedial Party, or Designated Representative Rendering Certification

2/25/16
Date

IC/EC CERTIFICATIONS

Box 7

Qualified Environmental Professional Signature

I certify that all information in Boxes 4 and 5 are true. I understand that a false statement made herein is punishable as a Class "A" misdemeanor, pursuant to Section 210.45 of the Penal Law.

I Raymond L. Kampff (print name) at Day Environmental, Inc., 1563 Lyell Avenue, Rochester, New York 14606 (print business address)

am certifying as a Qualified Environmental Professional for the Owner (Owner or Remedial Party)

Signature of Qualified Environmental Professional, for the Owner or Remedial Party, Rendering Certification	Stamp (Required for PE)	Date
		2-25-2016

8812243503

Annual Certification Report
SPDES Multi-Sector General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity (GP-12-01-001)

The owner/operator shall complete this Annual Certification Report form by answering the following questions, describing improvements to the facility's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), providing copies of monitoring results on appropriate Discharge Monitoring Reports forms and signing the certification at the end of this form. This completed report is to be submitted each calendar year by February 28th of the following year to:

MSGP Permit Coordinator
NYSDEC, Bureau of Water Compliance
625 Broadway, Albany, NY, 12233-3506

SECTION I: FACILITY INFORMATION:

Permit I.D. No.: NYR00 B074 **Report for Calendar Year:** 2015

Owner Name

Stripit, Inc

Facility Name

SECTION II: GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. List the number of stormwater outfalls at the facility that are from areas of industrial activity..... 002

2. Is the facility claiming any monitoring waiver(s)? ..... ○ Yes ⊘ No

If yes, which waiver(s) are you claiming?

○ Adverse Climatic Conditions*
○ Alternate Certification of "Not Present" or "No Exposure"
○ Inactive or Unstaffed Site*
○ Representative Outfall*

* If you are claiming a monitoring waiver the appropriate monitoring waiver form must be included with your Discharge Monitoring Report form.

3. Is the information provided in your original Notice of Intent (NOI) submission still accurate and up to date? If not, please submit a Notice of Modification (NOM) to update the facility information ..... ⊘ Yes ○ No

4. Has a comprehensive Site Compliance Inspection and Evaluation been conducted at the facility in the past year? ... ⊘ Yes ○ No

5. Is the facility's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) kept up to date and modified when necessary? ..... ⊘ Yes ○ No

SECTION III: QUARTERLY VISUAL MONITORING:

1. Have the required quarterly visual examinations of stormwater at the facility been performed during this reporting period (See Part.IV.1.a of the MSGP)? ..... ⊘ Yes ○ No

2. Did any of the quarterly visual examinations result in observations of color, odor, clarity, floating solids, settled solids, suspended solids, foam, oil sheen, or other indicators of stormwater pollution and contamination? (If yes, question 2.A, 2.B, and 2.C below must be answered) ..... ○ Yes ⊘ No

A. Were corrective and follow up actions taken (See Part IV.B.1.a.(5) of the MSGP)? ..... ○ Yes ○ No

B. Has the facility's SWPPP been updated to include modification to existing BMPs or installation of new BMPs to prevent stormwater pollution and contamination from reoccurring (See Part IV.B.1.a.(5)(c) of the MSGP)?..... ○ Yes ○ No

C. Was a follow up visual inspection conducted to ensure corrective and follow up actions were successful (See Part IV.B.1.a.(5)(d) of the MSGP)? ..... ○ Yes ○ No

SECTION IV: ANNUAL DRY WEATHER FLOW MONITORING:

1. Was the annual dry weather flow inspection performed during this reporting period (See Part IV.B.1.b of the MSGP)? ☑ Yes ○ No

2. Were any non-stormwater dischargers or indicators of non-stormwater discharges identified? (If no, proceed to Section IV) ○ Yes ☑ No

3. Was the source of the non-stormwater discharge identified? (If no, proceed to question 5) ○ Yes ○ No

4. Is the source an allowable non-stormwater discharge (i.e., discharge covered by another SPDES permit or an allowable non-stormwater discharge covered in Part I.C.3 of the MSGP)? (If yes, question 4.A. below must be answered; if no, proceed to question 5) ○ Yes ○ No

A. Has the facility's SWPPP been updated to address the newly identified allowable non-stormwater discharge(s) (See Part IV.B.1.b.(3)(d) of the MSGP)? ○ Yes ○ No

5. Were corrective and follow up actions taken to eliminate the unauthorized non-stormwater discharge (See Part IV.B.1.b.(3) of the MSGP)? ○ Yes ○ No

6. Were corrective and follow up actions successful in eliminating the unauthorized non-stormwater discharge? ○ Yes ○ No

Note: If it is not possible to eliminate the non-authorized stormwater discharge the owner/operator must notify the Department with 14 days.

SECTION V: STORMWATER MONITORING - BENCHMARK PARAMETERS:

1. Is the owner/operator required to monitor stormwater at the facility for benchmark parameters (See Part IV.B.1.c)? (If no, proceed to Section V) ○ Yes ☑ No

2. Were there any monitoring problems? (Answer "Yes" if storm event criteria was not met or if the laboratory indicated quality assurance/quality control problems) ○ Yes ○ No

3. Were any of the sampling results from this year higher than the benchmark cut-off concentrations listed in the permit? (If yes, questions 3.A and 3.B below must be answered) ○ Yes ○ No

A. Were corrective and follow up actions taken (See Part IV.B.1.c.(6) of the MSGP)? ○ Yes ○ No

B. Has the facility's SWPPP been updated to include modification to existing BMPs or installation of new BMPs to prevent the benchmark exceedance from reoccurring (See Part IV.B.1.c.(6)(c) of the MSGP) ? ○ Yes ○ No

Note: If you had a benchmark exceedance your Corrective Action Form with follow up sample results are due by July 31 (See Part IV.B.1.c.(6)(d)(iii) of the MSGP).

SECTION VI: STORMWATER MONITORING - COAL PILE RUNOFF:

1. Is the owner/operator required to conduct compliance monitoring for storm water discharges from coal piles (See Part IV.B.1.d of the MSGP? (If no, proceed to Section VI) ○ Yes ☑ No

2. Were there any monitoring problems? (Answer "Yes" if storm event criteria was not meet or if the laboratory indicated quality insurance assurance/quality control problems) ○ Yes ○ No

3. Were any of the sampling results from this year higher than the effluent limitations listed in Table IV-1 of the MSGP? (If yes, questions 3.A and 3.B. below must be answered) ○ Yes ○ No

A. Were corrective and follow up actions taken (See Part IV.B.1.d.(6) of the MSGP)? ○ Yes ○ No

B. Has the facility's SWPPP been updated to include modification to existing BMPs or installation of new BMPs to prevent the effluent limitation exceedance from reoccurring (See Part IV.B.1.d.(6) of the MSGP)? ○ Yes ○ No

Note: If you had a effluent limitation exceedance your Corrective Action Form with follow up sample results are due by July 31 (See Part IV.B.1.e.(5)(e)(ii) of the MSGP).

SECTION VII: STORMWATER MONITORING - COMPLIANCE MONITORING

1. Is the owner/operator required to conduct compliance monitoring for storm water discharges subject to Point Source Category Effluent Limitations (See Part IV.B.1.e of the MSGP)? (If no, proceed to Section VII) ..... ○ Yes ☑ No

2. Were there any monitoring problems? (Answer "Yes" if storm event criteria was not meet of if the laboratory indicated quality insurance assurance/quality control problems) ..... ○ Yes ○ No

3. Were any of the sampling results from this year higher than the effluent limitations listed in the permit? (If yes, questions 3.A and 3.B. below must be answered) ..... ○ Yes ○ No

A. Were corrective and follow up actions taken (See Part IV.B.1.e.(5) of the MSGP)? ..... ○ Yes ○ No

B. Has the facility's SWPPP been updated to include modification to existing BMPs or installation of new BMPs to prevent the effluent limitation exceeding from reoccurring (See Part IV.B.1.e.(5)(c) of the MSGP? ..... ○ Yes ○ No

Note: If you had an effluent limitation exceedance your Corrective Action Form with follow up sample results are due by July 31 (See Part IV.B.1.e.(5)(e)(ii) of the MSGP).

SECTION VIII: STORMWATER MONITORING - DISCHARGES TO IMPAIRED WATERBODIES:

1. Is the owner/operator required to conduct compliance monitoring for discharges to impaired waterbodies (See Part IV.B.1.g of the MSGP)? (If no, proceed to Section VIII)..... ○ Yes ☑ No

2. Were there any monitoring problems? (Answer "Yes" if storm event criteria was not meet of if the laboratory indicated quality insurance assurance/quality control problems) ..... ○ Yes ○ No

3. Were any of the sampling results from this year higher than the benchmark cut-off concentrations or effluent limitations listed in the permit? (If yes, questions 3.A and 3.B below must be answered). ..... ○ Yes ○ No

A. Were corrective and follow up actions taken (See Part IV.B.1.g.(6) of the MSGP)? ..... ○ Yes ○ No

B. Has the facility's SWPPP been updated to include modification to existing BMPs or installation of new BMPs to prevent the benchmark cutoff concentrations or effluent limitations exceedance from reoccurring (See Part IV.B.1.g.(6)(c) of the MSGP)? ..... ○ Yes ○ No

C. Did the follow-up quarterly sample show the corrective and follow up actions to be successful? ..... ○ Yes ○ No

SECTION IX: SUMMARY:

Provide a brief description of any facility changes; problems identified during comprehensive compliance evaluations, quarterly visual observations or monitoring results; and actions taken to improve the quality of the stormwater discharge.

Problems identified during quarterly visual observations -
1)Roll off dumpster located on asphalt parking lot near outfall 002 observed to contain empty drums, empty 5-gallon buckets, smaller (paint type,)empty containers, and sorbent pad w/ apparent chemical residue. Dumpster is not covered, and sheen observed in standing water (assumed stormwater) in at least one of the empty containers w/in the dumpster. Release to asphalt not observed at time of observations.
2) Landfill drainage swale clogged with small trees and brush.

CERTIFICATION

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

Ray — Owner/Operator First Name (please print or type) — MI — Date

Chojnowski — Owner/Operator Last Name (please print or type) — Owner/Operator Signature