

SUMMARY OF MODEL TOXICS CONTROL ACT-RELATED ACTIVITIES  
AT THE SURPLUS YARD OPERATED BY PANAMA MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT  
3126 HILL AVENUE  
EVERETT, WA 98206  
(JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1997)

Report Prepared for:

Panama Machinery & Equipment, Inc.

by:

Kintu Enterprises  
9225 NE 128th Lane  
Kirkland, WA 98034

February 21, 1997

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	.....
..... Page 1	
Summary of Results	.....
..... Page 3	
Recommendations	.....
..... Page 7	
Figures and Tables	.....
..... Page 10	
Table 1 -Historical Data from the Surplus Yard Above Method A Levels for Industrial Soils	
Table 2 - Historical Data from the Surplus Yard Above Method A Levels for              Residential Soils	
Table 3 -Analytical Results f22-----°rom Soil Samples (January 21-23, 1997)	
Table 4 -Analytical Results from Groundwater Samples (February 3, 1997)	
Table 5 -Results of Analysis of Volatiles and Cresols from Subsurface Contaminated              Soils in the Area of the Guillotine Shearer	
Figure 1 - Site Vicinity Map	
Figure 2 - Surplus Yard Site Map	
Figure 3 - Sample Grid and Surface Sample Locations	
Figure 4 - Groundwater Monitoring Well Locations	
ATTACHMENT A - Field Notes, and Driller/Well Installation Logs	
ATTACHMENT B - Laboratory Data Sheets	
ATTACHMENT C - Summary if Historical Data from the Surplus Yard (1992- 1995)	

## INTRODUCTION

This report documents recently completed environmental activities at the surplus or scrap yard under lease to Panama Machinery and Equipment, Inc., doing business as (d.b.a.) Everett Steel Companies (Panama). These activities consisted of:

The excavation, removal and disposal of 433 tons of contaminated soil from existing stock piles, solid waste in containers and petroleum-stained surface soils

The collection and analysis of samples of surface soil across the surplus yard

The installation and sampling of three groundwater monitoring wells in the southern half of the surplus yard

Panama undertook these activities in response to requirements of the Washington State Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). There are six basic steps in the cleanup process under MTCA:

1. Site Discovery
2. Initial Investigation (Site hazard assessment by recipients of early notice letters)
3. Site Hazard Assessment (Ranking of sites by Ecology)
4. Detailed Site Study (RI/FS)
5. Cleanup Action Plan
6. Cleanup and Monitoring

In addition, interim actions, generally measures designed to reduce or control sources of contamination pending completion of the plan for final cleanup, may be taken at any point in the process.

Everett Steel Companies is named on the Washington State Department of Ecology's list of Confirmed or Suspected Contaminated Sites (CSCS) at two sites involving the surplus yard. Inclusion on the list of CSCS indicates the receipt of early notice letters. According to the MTCA process, Panama, as Everett Steel Companies, is not necessarily a party potentially responsible for cleanup (PLP), but the findings place the onus on Panama to investigate as if it had been determined to be a PLP. Panama was obligated as a next step to conduct a site hazard assessment at both sites. Site hazard assessment includes sampling of soil, groundwater, and other media suspected of contamination based on information provided in the site discovery step to determine if there is a need for further investigation. The removal and disposal of stock piles of contaminated soil, stained surface soils, and solid wastes was necessary to 1) remove known volumes of above ground contamination that exceeds MTCA Method A cleanup levels for industrial soils, 2) reduce known

and suspected sources of contaminants to subsurface soil, surface water, and groundwater on the surplus yard, and 3) clear the way for representative sampling of surface soils for site hazard assessment.

The surplus yard was first included on the CSCS as Site #2805. An Ecology inspector visited the surplus yard on March 30, 1993 and identified soil and surface water contaminated by petroleum. Panama received an early notice letter from Ecology on April 17, 1993 stating that soil and surface water were contaminated by petroleum. The letter further states that Ecology suspects that soil, surface water, groundwater and sediments are contaminated by priority pollutant metals, non-priority pollutant metals, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and non-halogenated solvents. The early notice letter represents site discovery. In response, Panama initiated a phased response under the Independent Remedial Action Program (IRAP) as permitted under MTCA. Prior to the activities just completed, the phased approach consisted of sampling stock piles of soils, stained soils, and solid wastes in containers, sampling deeper soils and attempting to sample groundwater, and clearing the surplus yard of salvageable materials.

The surplus yard is also Site #2806 on the CSCS. A tenant of a building adjacent to the southeastern corner of the surplus yard, Quantum Wood Windows, installed a monitoring well as part of an environmental audit. The monitoring well was sampled on July 29, 1993, and results showed three metals (arsenic, lead, and chromium) above MTCA Method A cleanup levels. A report of the findings written by Quantum Wood Windows consultant opines that Quantum Wood Windows is not the likely source of the contamination, and states that there is a scrap yard immediately to the northwest of the property. Ecology sent Everett Steel Companies an early notice letter on June 28, 1996 and added a site on the CSCS named Everett Steel Companies/ Quantum Wood Windows. The site is included due to confirmed groundwater contamination by priority pollutant metals in the monitoring well at Quantum Wood Windows. Currently, Ecology is in the process of assessing the hazard posed by the site using the Washington Ranking Model and is awaiting the results of a hazard assessment by the PLPs. The Snohomish County Health Department has made periodic inquiries to Panama since 1993 about groundwater contamination based on the results from the one sample at Quantum Wood Windows.

What follows is a summary of the results of the interim action and site hazard assessments, and recommendations for next steps. Detailed descriptions of field activities and original laboratory data sheets are included as Attachments A and B. Historical data (1992-1995) from the surplus yard is included as Attachment C.

## SUMMARY OF RESULTS

### Excavation and Disposal of Contaminated Soils and Solid Waste

The objectives of the excavation and removal of contaminated soils and solid waste were to 1) remove contaminated stock piles, stained soils, and solid wastes in containers known to exceed the MTCA Method A cleanup levels for industrial soils identified in 1993, 2) reduce known and suspected sources of contaminants to subsurface soil, surface water, and groundwater on the surplus yard, and 3) clear the ground to permit representative samples of surface soils to be collected as part of the site hazard assessment. Stock piled soils, stained surface soils, and solid waste exceeded the MTCA Method A residential cleanup levels for arsenic, cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury and total petroleum hydrocarbons (Table 1), and the Method A industrial cleanup levels for cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury and total petroleum hydrocarbons (Table 2).

The soil and solid waste were removed from seven areas of existing stock piles, containers of solid waste, or stained surface soil (Figures 1 and 2). The original estimated volume to be removed was 360 tons. The actual volume of contaminated soil was found to be significantly greater after excavation began. Excavation and removal were halted at 433 tons because of budgetary constraints and the need to conduct further investigation to define the extent of subsurface contamination. Two identified areas caused the significant discrepancy between the original estimate and what was observed. The largest stock pile, composed of metal shavings, petroleum stained soil and burning table debris, fills a topographic depression that is deeper than previously estimated. It also contained several boulder-sized concretions of burning table debris inside the pile that added significantly to the weight of what was removed. Approximately 90% of the material removed came from the largest stock pile.

Petroleum contamination in the area of the former guillotine shearer was found to extend to approximately three feet in depth over at least 2,000 square feet. In several places, petroleum contamination two feet below the surface exhibited a strong odor. The volume, depth and concentration of hydrocarbon contamination were unexpected based on earlier samples and operational history. Additional investigation into past operation revealed there had been a spill of approximately 1,500 gallons of hydraulic fluid in the mid 1980s, the result of a broken hydraulic line. An attempt was made to include the deeper contaminated soils in the volume of soils being removed. This effort was curtailed when it became apparent that removing the volume of subsurface soil would significantly exceed the approved budget. Also, determining the extent of petroleum contamination will require additional field investigation. An attempt was made to establish the lateral extent of petroleum contamination in the field using the back hoe. Significant staining was observed approximately ten feet from the western fence line. Concrete and other obstructions prevented exploration at the fence line. Potential off-site migration of petroleum should be part of the next phase of investigation. The southern limit of petroleum contamination was not determined either. Surplus steel approximately 70 meters south of the footing of the shearer obstructed further exploration using the back hoe. Excess excavated soils were replaced pending further investigation.

All other areas were completely excavated. Contaminated soils were sent to a sanitary landfill owned and operated by Waste Management, Inc.:

Columbia Ridge Landfill  
18177 Cedar Springs Lane  
Arlington, OR 97812  
tel: 541-454-2030

#### Surface Soil Sampling Across the Site

After the completion of removal activities, surface soil samples were collected and analyzed to 1) confirm removal of the stock piles, stained soils, and solid waste, and 2) to assess the degree to which the soils across the site are contaminated as suspected by Ecology. The sampling strategy consisted of dividing the site into thirteen sectors biased towards known areas of contamination in the western and southern portions of the surplus yard, and divided into equal grids in the eastern portion of the site where no known areas of contamination exist (Figure 3). Composite samples were collected to represent area contamination. The numbers of samples do not comport with Ecology's guidance regarding statistically-based numbers of samples for area contamination, but that rigor is not required at this stage in the MTCA process. Samples were collected from a depth of approximately 6 inches to avoid bias from atmospheric fallout. Analytes selected were TPH-D, TPH-O, PCBs, and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act metals (because they include the priority pollutant metals that have historically been found in the surplus yard, as well as the metals on the MTCA Method A list). An expanded list of analytes may be required if additional investigation is warranted. Details regarding field activities are included in Attachment A.

Table 3 summarizes the analytical results, and Figure 3 shows the locations of samples. Contaminants of concern are TPH-D, TPH-O, arsenic, cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury, and PCBs. The distribution of contaminants above MTCA Method A cleanup levels for residential and industrial scenarios is:

TPH-D was detected in surface soils in five sectors from the middle of the site to the southern end. TPH-D was not detected in soils at the depth of the groundwater monitoring wells screens. The level is the same for residential and industrial scenarios.

TPH-O was detected in surface soils in twelve of the thirteen sectors. TPH-O was not detected in soils at the depth of the groundwater monitoring wells screens. The level is the same for residential and industrial scenarios.

Arsenic was detected in one sector above the cleanup level for industrial soils, near the former paint shed, and in three sectors above the cleanup level for residential soils, the additional two sectors located in the eastern portion of the site. Arsenic was not detected in soils at the depth of the groundwater monitoring wells screens.

Cadmium was detected in four sectors above the cleanup level for industrial soils, principally in the eastern and southern areas of the site. It was detected in six sectors above the cleanup level for residential soils, the additional two sectors located near the shearer in the middle of the

site. Cadmium was not detected in soils at the depth of the groundwater monitoring wells screens.

Chromium was not detected above the cleanup level for industrial soils. It was detected in seven sectors above the cleanup level for residential soils, in the eastern and southern portions of the site, and near the shearer in the middle of the site. Chromium was not detected in soils at the depth of the groundwater monitoring wells screens.

Lead was detected in five sectors above the cleanup level for industrial soils, principally in the eastern and southern areas of the site, and near the shearer. It was detected in nine sectors above the cleanup level for residential soils, the additional four sectors located in the southern half of the site. Lead was not detected in soils at the depth of the groundwater monitoring wells screens.

Mercury was detected in eight sectors above the cleanup level for industrial and residential soils, in the eastern and southern areas of the site, and near the shearer. The cleanup levels are the same for both scenarios. Mercury was not detected in soils at the depth of the groundwater monitoring wells screens.

PCBs were detected in two sectors above the cleanup level for industrial soils in the eastern portion of the site. PCBs were not detected in soils at the depth of the groundwater monitoring wells screens.

These results demonstrate that there is widespread contamination of surface soils in the surplus yard. A significant range of contaminants were detected in the eastern portion of the site where no known sources of contamination exist. Furthermore, several of the contaminants, PCBs, mercury, lead, and arsenic are not associated with known past activities by Panama in the surplus yard. The concentrations and distributions of contaminants as well as questions regarding the provenance of some strongly suggest the need for further study before taking further remedial action.

Anecdotal information supports a strategy of additional investigation before taking further remedial action:

There was once a ditch down the spine of the surplus yard. The surplus yard was graded in the 1970s which could have spread contaminants. Transformers were explicitly rejected from the scrap yard. No cars were scrapped in the surplus yard. Surrounding properties have had major environmental releases in the past. Arsenic and lead contamination is prevalent in the general area of Everett.

#### Groundwater Sampling in the Southern Portion of the Site

Three permanent, four-inch diameter groundwater monitoring wells were installed in the southern portion of the site to assess the presence of contamination in groundwater beneath the surplus yard in the area adjacent to the monitoring well at Quantum Wood Windows. The monitoring wells were installed in a triangular orientation to assess the direction of groundwater flow relative to the monitoring well at Quantum Wood Windows by measuring static water levels in the three wells.

In addition to analyzing samples for contamination and identifying the direction of groundwater flow, the yield of the wells was assessed and specific conductance of the groundwater was measured during development and purging to determine if an alternative usage scenario would be feasible. Ecology requires an assumption that all groundwater may be used as a source of drinking water unless yield is too low (less than 0.5 gallons per minute) or water quality parameters are too poor (extremely high dissolved solids).

Figure 4 illustrates the locations of the three monitoring wells and the well at Quantum Wood Windows. Drilling and well logs are included in Attachment A. At the time of measurement, groundwater appeared to flow to the southeast, in the direction of Quantum Wood Windows. In addition, the results of analysis show concentrations of arsenic, chromium, and lead above MTCA Method A levels (Table 4) in the well PMW-2 located next to the former large stock pile, and concentration of lead above MTCA cleanup levels in well PMW-3 in the southeastern portion of the site. The contaminants detected are the same as those that were detected in the monitoring well at Quantum Wood Windows in 1993. The well located adjacent to the contamination from the shearer had no analytes above MTCA cleanup levels. The sample from well PMW-2 also contained TPH, though at a level below the MTCA Method A limit. It was the only detection of TPH in groundwater.

The original plan was to sample the well at Quantum Wood Windows at the same time the other three wells were sampled. Access included stipulations by Quantum Wood Windows to which Panama could not agree, therefore only the wells on the surplus yard were sampled.

The monitoring wells recovered too quickly after purging to have yields less than 0.5 gallons per minute, and the measurements of specific conductance were all in the normal range of dissolved solids content. As such, the groundwater probably does not meet the parameters necessary for Ecology to consider a usage lower than drinking water. The issue of seasonality, however, has not been addressed. As stated earlier in this report, groundwater appears to be perched and much deeper during the dry season. The only monitoring well in the area that has been measured during the dry season is the one at Quantum Wood Windows, which had a static water level of fifteen feet below the surface. A till layer at approximately twenty-five feet below ground surface appears to serve as the bottom of the zone containing this groundwater. The water levels in the three monitoring wells on the surplus yard ranged from three to five feet below ground surface (refer to well logs in Attachment A and Table 4). Further investigation to determine seasonality could affect Ecology's view of the usability of the groundwater beneath the surplus yard.

There are several reasons for additional investigation of groundwater:

The presence of contaminants above MTCA cleanup levels in two of the three monitoring wells requires further investigation under MTCA.

The direction of groundwater flow and past data from the monitoring well at Quantum Wood Windows suggest the surplus yard may be the source for off-site migration of contaminated groundwater.



Quantum Wood Windows has not demonstrated that it is not responsible for contamination of groundwater beneath its operation.

Arsenic, lead, and chromium may be the result of a source other than past activities by Panama at the surplus yard.

The presence of TPH in one monitoring well, and the significant volume and high concentration of near surface TPH contaminated soil suggest downward migration is occurring.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the site hazard assessments of the surplus yard in connection with Sites #2805 and 2806 on the CSCS list are that there is soil contamination over the majority of the surface of the surplus yard above MTCA Method A cleanup levels for TPH, several metals, and PCBs. There is evidence of subsurface TPH contamination in the vicinity of the former shearing operation to a depth of approximately three feet over an undetermined surface area. Off-site migration of TPH from the area of the shearer beyond the western fence line is possible. Groundwater contamination above MTCA Method A cleanup levels was detected in two of three monitoring wells. Lead, chromium and arsenic were detected in one well, and lead in another. Moreover, the direction of groundwater flow indicates the possibility that the surplus yard is the source of the same three contaminants detected in an off-site monitoring well to the southeast.

These findings should be investigated further. It is recommended, however, that Panama discontinue independent remedial action and enter into an Agreed Order with Ecology for a focused remedial investigation and feasibility study. There are several reasons to pursue this strategy:

An Agreed Order will provide Panama with assurance that it is doing what is required by MTCA, and not a voluntary action that could be rejected by Ecology after the fact.

An Agreed Order provides ongoing access to Ecology during the process of investigation that can help contain costs by containing the scope of investigation.

An Agreed Order facilitates cost recovery from other PLPs.

Panama cannot connect several detected contaminants in soil or groundwater samples to any of its past or present operations. An Agreed Order allows Panama to name other PLPs.

Quantum Wood Windows is listed with Everett Steel Companies in connection with confirmed groundwater contamination (Site #2806), and should share the costs of sampling on its property. Quantum Wood Windows has not done sufficient investigation to demonstrate that Panama is the cause of contamination in groundwater in its monitoring well.

The scope of the focused remedial investigation, feasibility study and cleanup action plan should include:

Request for an Agreed Order under WAC 173-340-530.

#### Focused Remedial Investigation

Identification of natural or manmade background levels of contaminants of concern in soil and groundwater

Investigation of other plausible sources of the detected contaminants in soil and groundwater (e.g., other local contamination, the imported fill, the property owner)

Investigation of the source and pathway of contaminants in groundwater and surface water (if applicable) across the site

Representative sampling of surface soils and subsurface soils to the limit of assumptions regarding direct exposure (fifteen feet below ground surface) and analysis for known and suspected contaminants

Determination of the lateral extent of petroleum contamination in the vicinity of the former shearing operation

Risk Assessment to determine cleanup levels appropriate to the site, and therefore to determine appropriate remedial alternatives (new policy regarding risk-based cleanup levels for TPH will be used)

Identification of Applicable and Relevant and Appropriate requirements that may determine site-specific cleanup levels

A determination of the need for remedial action (including No Further Action)

#### Focused Feasibility Study and Cleanup Action Plan

An evaluation and ranking of focused remedial action alternatives

A Cleanup Action Plan

Negotiating the removal of the surplus yard from the list of CSCS

FIGURES AND TABLES

ATTACHMENT A:  
FIELD NOTES

## ATTACHMENT A:

### FIELD NOTES

#### Excavation and Removal Activities

##### Excavation of Stock Piles of 1313-----Contaminated Soil and Stained Surface Soil

Seven areas of stock piled soil, stained soil, and contained solid waste were identified for removal and disposal. The majority of these stockpiles contain one or more of the following: burning table cuttings, metal shavings, spent steel shot, petroleum product, or paint chips.

On January 20, 21, and 22, 1997 a representative of Boateng & Associates monitored the excavation and loading of the waste material stockpiles, and petroleum stained soils. Four hundred and thirty-three tons of contaminated soil and solid waste was removed from the site in 16 truckloads. Disposal subcontractor services were provided by Advanced Environmental Technical Services (AETS) of Tukwila, Washington. AETS profiled the waste for disposal, excavated the soils and solid wastes at the direction of the Boateng representative, transported the materials by truck to its sanitary solid waste landfill, Columbia Ridge in Arlington, Oregon.

During the excavation of petroleum-stained soils in the vicinity of the guillotine shearer, it was discovered that the extent of petroleum contamination extended deeper, (approximately 3-4 feet), and encompasses an area much larger than the surficial staining indicated. Representative soil samples were collected from the western and southern excavation sidewalls and stockpiled material to aid in determining the nature of the petroleum product, these samples are identified as PM-GEX-1,2, and 3 (see Tables 3 and 5).

#### Removal of Solid Waste in Containers

Solid waste stored in several containers and debris bins was removed from the containers for disposal along with the stock piled soil. One bin containing anchor chain black was disposed of entirely since the weathered bituminous material could not be effectively removed from the container.

On January 23, 1997, the Boateng sampling team returned to the site to collect surface soil samples from the upper 6 inches of soil across the site. The project site was divided into thirteen sectors. Each sector was sampled at two random locations. Effort was made to avoid biasing the samples with obviously contaminated soil. The two random samples were then homogenized to form a single composited sample with a total of 13 samples being submitted to the analytical laboratory, On-Site Environmental in Redmond, WA. These soil samples are identified as PM-SC-1 through 13 (see Table 3).

#### Groundwater Monitoring Wells

#### Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation

On February 3, 1997, three 4-inch diameter groundwater monitoring wells, PMW-1, PMW-2 and PMW-3, were installed by Cascade Drilling, Inc. (Cascade) of Woodinville, Washington. Well drilling was accomplished using a Central Mining Equipment, CME 75 continuous flight hollow-stem auger drill rig (with 8-inch-outside-diameter augers). The hollow-stem auger drilling method was chosen due to the high mobility of equipment, the shallow nature of the borings, and the speed of drilling and well installation.

Split spoon samples were collected at 5-foot drill intervals for visual soil description, photoionization detector (PID) screening, and laboratory analysis. One additional sample from each boring was collected near the expected water table (7 feet) to visually determine the presence of free-phase petroleum hydrocarbons. The drill augers and associated equipment were decontaminated by steam-cleaning prior to drilling each well to minimize the potential for cross-contamination. The locations of the monitoring wells (PMW-1, PMW-2 and PMW-3), as well as the existing Quantum Wood Windows groundwater monitoring well, are illustrated in Figure 3. The PMW-1, PMW-2 and PMW-3 boring logs are included at the end of this attachment.

#### Monitoring Well Construction

Monitoring well drilling and construction were conducted in accordance with Minimum Standards for Construction and Maintenance of Wells, Chapter 173-160 Washington Administrative Code (WAC).

The following details apply to the construction of the new monitoring wells :

Wells were installed to a depth of 20 feet below the surface grade.

Wells were constructed with 10 feet of 4-inch-diameter schedule 40 PVC screen and 10 feet of blank casing.

Well screen openings were 0.01-inch, machine-cut slots with a minimum of 44 slots per foot.

The annular space between the aquifer sands and the PVC casing was filled with #2/12 LoneStar, Lapis Lustre Monterey Sand to approximately 3 feet above the top of the screen. The annular space above the top of the sand pack was filled with approximately 6 feet of medium-sized bentonite chips.

From the top of the bentonite seal to surface the remaining annular space was filled with ready-mix concrete.

The wells were completed above the ground surface. 8-inch-diameter and three foot high steel "stick-up" access covers were installed over the PVC well casing riser and set into concrete to provide a water resistant enclosure. In addition, the PVC well casing riser is equipped with a locking, water-tight cap.

#### Well Development

The completed wells were developed to equilibrate them with surrounding groundwater and to ensure their ability to provide representative samples of groundwater. The wells were developed by surging the well at the screened interval using a 3.5 inch diameter PVC bailer. Following the surging activities the wells were bailed by hand to remove silt and fine sands that may have accumulated in the well sump. The surging action corrects the borehole skinning

effect commonly associated with hollow-stem auger drilling. Well development continued until water drawn from the well was generally free of fine sand. All wells exhibited a water level drawdown due to the rate of water removal and quickly recovered to near the initial static water level measurement a short time after bailing had ceased.

Investigation Derived 1515-----Waste (IDW)

Sources of investigation derived wastes generated during the installation and sampling of the monitoring wells include: soil cuttings from the drilling operation, drilling and sampling equipment decontamination water, well development water, and well purge water from the groundwater sampling event. Soil cuttings from the drilling operation have been placed on top of plastic sheeting and in covered stockpiles near the monitoring wells. Waste water is temporarily being stored on site in unlined steel 17-H, DOT-approved, 55-gallon drums pending disposal. All drums were labeled with indelible ink identifying the contents, source of contents, and their status as non-hazardous waste.

#### Sample Collection

Soil and groundwater sampling occurred during two separate sampling events. The newly installed monitoring wells were allowed to equilibrate with ambient groundwater conditions for 2-days before groundwater samples were collected. Soil and groundwater sampling activities were conducted under th1515-----  
"e guidelines established in the site specific Health and Safety Plan.

#### Soil Sampling

Six soil boring samples were collected on February 3, 1997. Two samples were collected from each monitoring well at depth intervals of 5 and 15 feet. These samples were then submitted to the analytical laboratory for evaluation of total petroleum hydrocarbon and metals content.

All soil samples were visually inspected in the field by a Boateng geologist, then described and logged on the field well log form. Soil core samples were collected at 5-foot drill intervals using a standard penetration, split barrel sampler, 18 inches in length and with a 2.5-inch inside diameter. Soils were described in the field in general accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS). The USCS designation described on the boring logs is an approximation based on the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) visual manual soil description method (ASTM D 2487). The boring log1515--  
As are included at the end of Attachment A.

The sampling depths of interest were at 5 feet below grade where the water table was expected to be encountered, and mid-well screen approximately 15 feet below grade. Soil samples from the borings were collected from this zone since many petroleum products are less dense than water and tend to "float" on the groundwater table.

All soil samples were screened in the field for traces of total volatile organics (VOCs) with a photoionization detector (PID) equipped with an 10.7 electron volt lamp and calibrated with 100 parts per million (ppm) isobutylene

reference gas. Field screening of soil samples with the PID indicated that none of the soil samples from the soil borings contained volatile hydrocarbons measured in the vapor headspace while the sample was confined in an airtight plastic bag

Soil samples were immediately placed into laboratory-supplied, precleaned 4-ounce glass jars with screw-down, Teflon-lined septum top lids. The sample jar was filled to capacity to reduce the amount of headspace in the containers. This sample container was labeled with the site name, project number, time, date, sample collector's name, and type of analysis requested. The soil sample was immediately placed into a chilled ice chest and transported under chain-of-custody protocol to the analytical laboratory for chemical analyses.

#### Groundwater Sampling

Groundwater samples were collected on February 3, 1997. Three groundwater monitoring wells were sampled, PMW-1, PMW-2, and PMW-3.

Prior to collecting groundwater samples from the monitoring wells, standing water in the well casing was purged. This was done to ensure that groundwater samples were representative of ambient groundwater. Three well casing volumes were removed from each monitoring well prior to collecting groundwater samples. The actual volumes ranged from 32 gallons purged from PMW-2 to 38 gallons purged from PMW-1. All wells were purged using a 3.5-inch-diameter PVC bailer. Significant water level drawdown was noticed in the monitoring wells except well PMW-3. All wells were allowed to recover to approximate static water level conditions prior to sampling. Field data logs showing field measurements and well purging data are included at the end of this attachment.

Sample containers were carefully filled to minimize overfilling which would result in the loss of preservatives placed in the containers by the laboratory. Groundwater samples were placed in appropriate containers which were supplied by the laboratory and handled in a manner similar to that of the soil samples. All samples were immediately placed into a chilled ice chest and transported to the analytical laboratory under chain-of-custody protocol.

#### HYDROGEOLOGY

##### Well Head Survey

The elevation of the tops of the well casings were surveyed on February 3rd. The elevation survey was accomplished using an auto level, with the top of casing elevation surveyed relative to an arbitrary reference elevation bench mark of 100 feet established on the concrete slab immediately west of well PMW-3.

##### Groundwater Flow

The slope of the water table is the hydraulic gradient under which groundwater movement or flow generally takes place. Shallow groundwater elevations beneath the subject site were determined by subtracting the measured depth to groundwater from the surveyed reference elevation on the well casing, resulting



in the relative elevation of groundwater in a particular well or point. The water level data used to establish the inferred groundwater flow direction was taken from information recorded during the February 3, 1997 groundwater sampling event.

Shallow groundwater beneath the site (see Figure 3) is believed to flow in a southeast direction.

ATTACHMENT B  
LABORATORY DATA SHEETS

ATTACHMENT C:  
SUMMARY OF HISTORICAL DATA  
FROM THE SURPLUS YARD  
(1992-1995)

[illegible]



[illegible]

[illegible]

2222~2222222222222222u222222222222-w2222\2222222222222222222222222222  
2222~2222222222222222-f222222222222 ≤2222\2222222222222222222222222222

2323~^23232323232323 -  
232323232323""'2323\`232323232323232323232323232323232323~^2323232323232323~^2323232323  
23%2323\`232323232323232323232323232323232323~^2323232323232323%-  
232323232323'/2323\`232323232323232323232323232323232323~^2323232323232323'[2323232323  
23)]2323\`232323232323232323232323232323232323~^2323232323232323)â23232323232323+ã2323\`23  
23232323232323232323232323232323~^2323232323232323+Σ23232323232323-  
π2323\`232323232323232323232323232323232323~^2323232323232323-  
Â23232323232323/\u03022323\`232323232323232323232323232323232323~^232323232323232302323232323  
232"2323\`232323232323232323232323232323232323~^232323232323232323.232323232323=2323\`23  
232323232323232323232323232323232323~^232323232323232323\_\_\_\_\_

---

\23232323232323\_\_\_\_\_  
z2323\`2323232323232323232323232323

2424242424~2424242424242424~242424242424ä2424`24242424242424242424



2525252525~2525252525252525ä252525252525@2525`25252525252525252525

[illegible]

2727272727~2727272727272727□272727272727÷2727`27272727272727272727

28\_\_\_\_\_28282828~2828282828282828 /282828282828  
Ê2828\282828282828282828282828

29\_\_\_\_\_29292929~~2929292929292929 Ê292929292929

---

2929`2929292929292929292929

30\_\_\_\_\_

30303030~3030303030303030

303030303030

3030\30303030303030303030

31

---

31313131~3131313131313131

313131313131

23131\3131313131313131313131

3232323232~32323232323232326323232323232B3232`32323232323232323232



333333333~^333333333333333B33333333333`3333\333333333333333333333

3434343434~3434343434343434d343434343434p3434`34343434343434343434

3535353535~3535353535353535p353535353535e3535`35353535353535353535

3636363636~36363636363636361363636363636û3636`36363636363636363636

3737373737~3737373737373737û3737373737°3737\373737373737373737

3838383838~3838383838383838;3838383838383838`38383838383838383838

3939393939~^3939393939393939Ã393939393939İ3939\`39393939393939393939

40 40404040~4040404040404040Ó404040404040`4040`40404040404040404040



41      41414141~4141414141414141`4141414141414141`414141414141414141

42 42424242~4242424242424242424242424242(4242`424242424242424242424242

43 43434343~4343434343434343(434343434343F4343`43434343434343434343

44

4444444~4444444444444J4444444444V4444\444444444444444444

45

45454545~4545454545454545V454545454545t4545`454545454545454545454545



47474747~4747474747474747-x474747474747-Ñ4747`47474747474747474747











52525252525252\_\_\_\_\_



54545454545454 545454545454ÚYî545454Kintu  
Enterprises5454545454DSET545454Ç54~545454.54H54545454









58-58585858585858 585858585858ÚYÄ585858Kintu Enterprises  
5858585858DSET585858Ç58~585858.58H58585858

















```
66666666666666        66#666666666666666666666666ï66666666666666666666`666666
```

67676767676767 67%676767676767676767676767İ67676767676767676767\676767

68686868686868      68'686868686868686868686868ı68686868686868686868'686868

69696969696969 69) 696969696969696969696969İ6969696969696969\696969

[illegible]



72727272727272

[illegible]





74Úxÿ7474











80-808080808080



8148181818181



















90ÚX`9090









95-959595959595

964969696969696





9898 98~98

---

98989898~989898  
98  
98989898~98989898 ~98989898

99999999~9999 999999 ~~~9999999999999999~9999 999999 ~~~999999Â99999999~99  
99999999

~~~~1001001006100100100100100~100100 100100100  
~~~~100100100100100100100100~100100 100100100  
~~~~100100100100100-100100100~100100100100100  
~~~~100100100 100100100100100~100100  
100100100  
~~~~100100100100100 100100100~100100

101101101  
~ ~ ~ 101101101 ————— 101101#101101101 ~ ~ 101101101101101  
~ ~ ~ 101101101j101101\$101      101 ~ ~ 101 —————  
101101101101

~::~102102102102102%102102102~102\$102102102102~::~102102102  
102102&102102102~102\$102 102102102~::~102102102\_\_\_\_\_

102102'102102102~102102

102102102 ~::~102102102\_\_\_\_\_102102,102

102~102102102102102102~::~102102102\_\_\_\_\_1021020102

102~102102102102102102~::~102102102\_\_\_\_\_1021025102

102~102102102102102102~::~102102102\_\_\_\_\_102-102:102

102~102102102102102102~::~102102102\_\_\_\_\_102102>102

102~102102102102102102~::~102102102\_\_\_\_\_102 102B102

102~102102102102102102~::~102102102

103!103

103    103~103————103103103103~103103103103"103

104104104~104  
104104104104~104104104



105#105

106 106~106  
106106106106  
~106106106106\$106106106106~106

107 107107107~::~107107107107%107107107107~107

```

108108108108~108108108108&108108108108~108,108108108108~108108108108'108
108108108~108,108108108108~108108108W108(108108108~108108108108108~108
108108V108)108(108      108108108-----
108108108108-~108108108(108*108+108108108~108(108      108108108~108108108-
108+108108 108~108108108108108 ~108108108108,108)108108108~108108108108108
~108108108-----
108-108-108108108~108
108108108108~108108108108.1081108108108~1080108108108108~108108108108/108
2108108108~1080108108108108~10810810810801087108108108~1085108108108108~
10810810810811083108108108~108:108108108108~10810810810821086108108108~108:
108108108108~1081081081083108.108108108~1085108108108108~1081081081084108
8108108108~108>108108108108~10810810810851089108108108~108>108108108108~
1081081081086108?108108108~108B108108108108~1081081081087108/108108108~108B
108108108108~1081081081088108108108108~108$108
108108108~1081081081089108;108108108~108$108

```

109109109~::~109109109\_\_\_\_\_

---

109:109109 109~109\_\_\_\_\_109109109109

~109:109109109109;109!109109109~109109109109109

~::109109109109<1094109109109~109

109109109109~109,109109109109=109"109109109~109109109109109

---

~109109`1098~109109109109\_\_\_\_\_

109HASHÅ&

109<Å&109-Å&1109"Å&

109!å

\$/109»\_\_\_\_\_Œó109/»\_\_\_\_\_Œö109.»·ÃΣ109 OT`1090

OUϕ1093 OXÑ1096 OYá1097 O\_T1095 OÄW1094 ;Ã∞109' ;î≥109& ...1U109 ...1h109 ...1y109 ...1

ö109 ...1`109 W109À-SÛ109À-W\$109 À-^t109ÄüÀ-109ÄßÛo109Äî1U109\*ŒÀ1Q109) ·¥fi,,109&

109

...1U109

...1^110\$ ...1h110  
...1q110% ...1y110 W110  
•Ûq110

•Ûz111# ,Ç ·1112 ,£%1111/Ç111-A&

112+A&  
112;A & 112=J...1U112J...1X1129J...1h112J...1k1128KßÜo112L:†Q112hπ—/112112j#0a112————  
rßÈ1112(z´·o112}Bod112————  
1121122112112112112112 112CHAR112ÚY112°~112112112112~112112112112112112112112112



113113113113113113113113113113~113113113113

˘˘114114114114114114114114˘˘114114114˘˘114114114114114114114114˘˘114114114

~115115115115115115"115~f115115115

$\sim 116116116116116116$  —————  
 $116 \sim 116116116116 \sim 116116116116116 \ddot{A} 116116116116116116$  —————  
 $116116116 \sim 116116116$  —————  
 $116116116116116 \sim 116116116$

$\sim 117117117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $117117117117117 \sim 117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $\sim 117117117117117117117117 \sim 117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $117117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $\sim 117117117117117117 \quad 117 \sim 117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $\sim 117117117117117117117'117 \sim 117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $\sim 117117117117117117117G117 \sim 117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $\sim 117117117117117117117117117 \sim 117$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 $117$ \_\_\_\_\_

~118118118118118118118~118  
118118

---

[illegible]

~120120120120120120120120~120120120



~121121121  
121121 121~121  
121  
~121121121121121121121~121  
121121 ~121121121121121121121"121~fl121121121

~122122122122122122122~122  
122 ~122122122122122 122fl122  
122  
122122122ö122~122122122122  
122HASH122122122122122122122Ñ122122 122122  
122122  
122122

123123123—  
123123—1231231232123123—123123  
123123  
123123123 123123

124"124124%124  
1243124  
124U124

125f125125

126126"

```

127127"127 127127127R127_____~127127127127
127CELL127ÚY127127~127127127-
~127127127127127127127127127127127~127127127;127127-
~127127127127127127127127127~127127127127127127127127127127127127127127127127127127
127127127127"127_____~127127127127_____
127HASH127127127127127127~127
127127127127127127127127^127_____~127127127127 127GRPH127ÚY

```

128İ~128128128~128128128128128128128128128128128128~128128128;128128~128128128  
128128128128128128128~128128128128128128128128128128128128128128128128128128128  
128128128128128"128~128128128128~  
128HASH128128128128128~128~128128128128~128128128  
128



129!129

1291291129 129RULR129ÚY-

[illegible]

[illegible]

131\$131.131Q131.1311131.131ê131.131¥131.131ÿ131.131,131.  
131.D131.h131.å131.∞131.ÓÛ÷ëB131Ûÿ'+ëJ131Ûté÷ëZ131Ût,+ì%+~131131131131÷-  
131131131131131131131131131131131131131131131131131

132\$132.132H132.1321132.132ê132.132¥132.132ÿ132.132,132.  
132.D132.h132.å132.∞132.ÓÛ+ëB132Ûy`+ëJ132Ûté+ëZ132Ût,+i%+~132132132—————  
132132~132132132132132132132132132132132132132132132132132132132

133\$133.133H133.133l133.133ê133.133¥133.133ÿ133.133,133.  
133.D133.h133.å133.∞133.ÓÛ+ëB133Ûy`+ëJ133Ûté+ëZ133Ût,+ì%+~133133133133133,133  
133133;133133133133\$133133133133133

134\$134.134H134.134l134.134ê134.134¥134.134ÿ134.134,134.  
134.D134.h134.å134.∞134.ÓÛ+ëB134Ûy`+ëJ134Ûté+ëZ134Ût,+ì%+134~::~134134~134134134  
134;134~Ó134134134134134134

135\$135.135H135.135l135.135ê135.135¥135.135ÿ135.135,135.  
135.D135.h135.å135.∞135.ÓÛ+ëB135Ûy`+ëJ135Ûté+ëZ135Ût,+ì%+~135135135135,135135  
135135;135135135135135135135135135135

136\$136.136H136.136l136.136ê136.136¥136.136ÿ136.136,136.  
136.D136.h136.å136.∞136.ÓÛ+ëB136Ûy`+ëJ136Ûté+ëZ136Ût,+ì%+~136136136136136~136  
136136136;136136136136136136136136136136136



137\$137.137H137.137l137.137ê137.137¥137.137ÿ137.137,137.  
137.D137.h137.å137.∞137.ÓÛ+ëB137Ûy`+ëJ137Ûté+ëZ137Ût,+ì%+~137137137137,137137  
137137@137137137137137137137137137137137

138\$138.138H138.1381138.138ê138.138¥138.138ÿ138.138,138.  
138.D138.h138.å138.∞138.ÓÛ+ëB138Ûy`+ëJ138Ûté+ëZ138Ût,+ì%+~138138138—————  
138138~138138138138@138138138138138138138138138138138

139\$139.139H139.139l139.139ê139.139¥139.139ÿ139.139,139.  
139.D139.h139.å139.∞139.ÓÛ+ëB139Ûy`+ëJ139Ûté+ëZ139Ût,+ì%+~139139139139,139139  
139139;139139139139139139139139139139

140\$140.140H140.140l140.140ê140.140¥140.140ÿ140.140,140.  
140.D140.h140.å140.∞140.Z»140□^`+ó+ëP140□`Æ140ÚZ»+ó++ëf~140140140140140~140140  
140140;140140140140140140140140140140140

141\$141.141H141.1411141.141ê141.141¥141.141ÿ141.141,141.  
141.D141.h141.å141.∞141.Z»141□^`+ó+ëP141□`Æ141ŮZ»+ó++ëf~141141141141,141141141  
141;141141141141141141141141141141141

142\$142.142H142.142l142.142ê142.142¥142.142ÿ142.142,142.  
142.D142.h142.å142.∞142.142142142142142142□142142142142142142ÚZÃ142Û|Û142Û]142°+  
ëf~142142142142142~142142142142;142142142142142142142142142142

143\$143.143H143.143l143.143ê143.143¥143.143ÿ143.143,143.  
143.D143.h143.å143.∞143.143143143143143143□143143143143143143143ÚZÃ143Ô|Ô143Ú]143°+  
ëf~143143143143,143143143143;143143143143143143143143143143143143

144\$144.144H144.144l144.144ê144.144¥144.144ÿ144.144,144.  
144.D144.h144.å144.∞144.Z%144□^`144ÚZ¯+ëP144□`Æ144ÚZ%144ÚZ¯++ëf~144144144144144  
~144144144144;144144144144144144144144144144



145\$145.145H145.145l145.145ê145.145¥145.145ÿ145.145,145.  
145.D145.h145.å145.∞145.z%145□^`145ÚZ¯+ëP145□`Æ145ÚZ%145ÚZ¯++ëf~145145145145,  
145145145145;145145145145145145145145145145145

146\$146.146H146.146l146.146ê146.146¥146.146ÿ146.146,146.  
146.D146.h146.å146.∞146.z,146□^`146Ú[~+146—————v|@Äöp146Ú[¥146  
146146

˘˘˘˘˘147147147147147˘147147147147;147147147147147147147147147147

148\$148.148H148.148l148.148ê148.148¥148.148ÿ148.148,148.  
148.D148.h148.å148.∞148.z,148□^`148Ú[~+148—————v|@Äöp148Ú[¥148  
148148

~~~~~149149149149,149149149149;149149149149149149149149149149

150\$150.150H150.150l150.150ê150.150¥150.150ÿ150.150,150.  
150.D150.h150.å150.∞150.\_h150□^`150Ů[¥+ëP150□`Æ150Ů\_h150Ů[¥++ëf~150150150150150  
~150150150150;150150150150150150150150150150150

151\$151.151H151.1511151.151ê151.151¥151.151ÿ151.151,151.  
151.D151.h151.å151.∞151.\_h151□^`151Ú[¥+ëP151□`Æ151Ú\_h151Ú[¥++ëf~151151151151,  
151151151151;151151151151151151151151151151151

152\$152.152H152.1521152.152ê152.152¥152.152ÿ152.152,152.  
152.D152.h152.å152.∞152.[Ä152□^`152Ú[Ë+ëP152□`Æ152Ú[Ä152Ú[Ë++ëf~`152152152152152  
~152152152152;152152152152152152152152152152152



153\$153.153H153.153l153.153ê153.153¥153.153ÿ153.153,153.  
153.D153.h153.å153.∞153.[Ä153□^`153Ú[Ë+ëP153□`Æ153Ú[Ä153Ú[Ë++ëf~153153153

154154154154154154154154154154\$154154154154154154154154154154154154154154154154  
154  
154  
154  
154~~~~~154,154154154;\_  
154154154154\$154154154154154

155\$155.155H155.155l155.155ê155.155¥155.155ÿ155.155,155.  
155.D155.h155.å155.∞155.ÓÛ+ëB155Ûy`+ëJ155Ûté+ëZ155Ût,+ì%+~155155155155,~155155  
155;155155155155\$155155155155155

156\$156.156H156.156l156.156ê156.156¥156.156ÿ156.156,156.  
156.D156.h156.å156.∞156.ÓÛ+ëB156Ûy`+ëJ156Ûté+ëZ156Ût,+ì%+~156156156156156~156  
156156¿156156156156\$156156156156156

157\$157.157H157.157l157.157ê157.157¥157.157ÿ157.157,157.  
157.D157.h157.å157.∞157.ÓÛ+ëB157Ûy`+ëJ157Ûté+ëZ157Ût,+ì%+~157157157157157~157  
157157157@157  
157  
157  
157  
157HASHÄ157~157Ä~157Δ~©é157«€®`157...E0À157...E4{157...E;K157...Σ®ß157...ø-F157  
'/È157 '3ô157 ':i157 ôß≈157 °-d157

À,,-F158Ã~-d158 Ã~-F158-158158158158158\_\_\_\_\_158158~158~158158158158  
0158158158 Ø-F158 Ø-O158ü-f158ü-o158\_\_\_\_\_

Ú^ÿ158`j^158@158~158 @~158Iø-F158J°-d158

159159159ñ159C159\*159159159—  
159LKUP159159159159159—159—  
159159159159159 159 159  
159#159!159"159(159\$159+159%159&159

160'160

160



[illegible]

[illegible]