

November 9, 2018 HWA Project No. 2007 098- 2012

Ms. Sunny Becker Washington Department of Ecology Toxics Cleanup Program, Northwest Regional Office 3190 - 160th SE Bellevue, WA 98008

Subject: ADDITIONAL SOIL AND GROUND WATER SAMPLING BOTHELL RIVERSIDE SITE HVOC AREA Riverside HVOC Site Bothell, Washington

Dear Ms. Becker:

This memorandum summarizes additional soil and ground water sampling, and evaluation of hydraulic control at the Riverside Site HVOC area.

ADDITIONAL SAMPLING

On October 24 and 25, 2018, HWA advanced and sampled eight soil borings at the Riverside Site HVOC area, at locations selected in discussions with Department of Ecology. The objectives of the explorations included exploring 1) the apparent upgradient source area around RMW-12, 2) the area in and near the 180th street roadway at the east end of the HVOC area, and 3) the area slightly downgradient of RMW-7. Figure 1 shows the boring locations.

Borings were advanced with a direct push drilling rig to depths of 20 to 25 feet below grade. At each boring, one unsaturated soil sample was submitted for analysis of halogenated volatile organic compounds (HVOCs) based on field screening results. At each boring, a temporary ground water monitoring well was installed and one shallow (first encountered) reconnaissance ground water sample was collected and submitted for HVOC analysis. Boring logs are attached to this report.

Temporary PVC well screen and casing was left in each hole for one to four hours prior to measuring stabilized ground water levels. Ground elevations at each boring were surveyed relative to the existing surveyed monitoring wells, in order to prepare a ground water gradient map (see below).

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the soil and ground water results. Figures 2 and 3 show the new boring ground water results, along with the most recent HVOC data from the monitoring wells.

21312 30th Drive SE Suite 110 Bothell, WA 98021-7010 Tel: 425.774.0106 Fax: 425.774.2714 www.hwageo.com

Boring	Depth	Date Sampled	Tetrachlor o-ethene (mg/kg)	Trichloro- ethene (mg/kg)	(cis) 1,2- Dichloro- ethene (mg/kg)	Vinyl chloride (mg/kg)
		Cleanup Levels*	0.05	0.03	160 (B)	175
RB-25-13	13	10/24/2018	0.46	0.052	<.0016	<.0016
RB-26-8.5	8.5	10/24/2018	<0.00094	<0.00094	<0.00094	<0.00094
RB-27-10	10	10/24/2018	<0.0011	<0.0011	<0.0011	<0.0011
RB-28-10	10	10/24/2018	0.0017	<0.00078	<0.00078	<0.00078
RB-29-8	8	10/24/2018	<0.00082	<0.00082	<0.00082	<0.00082
RB-30-9	9	10/24/2018	<0.00077	<0.00077	<0.00077	<0.00077
RB-31-7.75	7.75	10/25/2018	<0.0010	<0.0010	<0.0010	<0.0010
RB-32-15	15	10/25/2018	<0.00080	<0.00080	<0.00080	<0.00080

Table 1 Soil Analytical Results

Bold - analyte detected at concentration greater than the laboratory reporting limit < - Not detected at laboratory reporting limit

< - Not detected at laboratory reporting lim

Highlighted – Value exceeds cleanup level

*Cleanup Levels: Ecology MTCA Method A / B soil cleanup levels, Chapter 173-340 WAC

Boring	Screened Interval (ft bgs)	Date Sampled	Depth to Water	Tetrachloro- ethene (μg/L)	Trichloro- ethene (µg/L)	(cis) 1,2- Dichloro- ethene (µg/L)	Vinyl chloride (µg/L)
		Site Clean	up Levels*	0.69	2.5	16 (B)	0.25
RB-25	15-25	10/24/2018	17.5	200	88	92	1
RB-26	15-25	10/24/2018	16.6	2.4	1.6	3.5	<0.02
RB-27	15-25	10/24/2018	14.8	29	19	7.1	1
RB-28	10-20	10/24/2018	15.3	15	6.4	4.7	0.34
RB-29	15-25	10/24/2018	19.7	2.6	1	1.4	<0.02
RB-30	15-25	10/24/2018	18.8	0.56	1.3	8.1	0.28
RB-31	15-25	10/25/2018	15.6	63	11	43	13
RB-32	15-25	10/25/2018	17.9	110	44	76	<0.02

Table 2 Ground Water Analytical Results

Bold - analyte detected at concentration greater than the laboratory reporting limit

< - Not detected at laboratory reporting limit

Highlighted – Value exceeds cleanup level

*Site specific cleanup Levels:

- Tetrachloroethene: Surface Water Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)- Human Health Fresh Water Clean Water Act § 304
- Trichloroethene: Surface Water ARARs- Human Health Fresh Water Clean Water Act §
 304
- (cis) 1,2- Dichloroethene: Ground Water, Method B, Non-carcinogen, Standard Formula Value
- Vinyl chloride: Practical Quantitation Limits / Reporting Limits Achievable by Local Accredited Labs

November 9, 2018 HWA Project No. 2007 098

Of the eight borings, only one had HVOCs in soil exceeding cleanup levels; RB-25, near the presumed source area. All eight borings had at least one ground water HVOC exceeding site cleanup levels, with RB-25 showing the highest overall HVOC concentrations. Results indicate a source area in the vicinity of RB-25 and MW-12, likely extending under the SR-522 roadway. Soil and ground water samples from prior borings in and north of the roadway suggest the source area does not extend past the north edge of SR-522, and is relatively localized. The limits of the HVOC ground water plume based on the new borings are similar to those previously interpreted, i.e., within the capture area of the existing extraction wells.

The observed HVOC concentration gradients (similar for PCE, TCE, DCE and VC) suggest the plume centerline extends from the source area near RB-25 and RMW-12, through EW-3, then turns to the east towards RMW-7 and EW-6. Of the six extraction wells, EW-3 historically has had the highest HVOC concentrations and exhibited the greatest variability. This plume migration pattern might be due to a combination of geology (localized more permeable layers) and local gradients induced by pumping (e.g., EW-5 is currently out of service and not pumping). Elevated HVOC concentrations downgradient (south) of the northern line of pumping wells (EW-1 through -4) may suggest the plume is migrating past these extraction wells, particularly at EW-3, although HVOCs in RMW-7 south of the wells were elevated prior to any pumping, and concentrations at RMW-7 have been steady or overall decreasing, suggesting that any breakthrough at or near EW-3 has not appreciably increased HVOCs in ground water near the river.

Elevated concentrations of vinyl chloride (higher than in the source area) around RMW-7 and RB-31 may be due to natural biodegradation of the existing PCE in this area, possibly due to the presence of more peaty and organic soils. Organic soils may enhance natural biodegradation of PCE to TCE and DCE, but the reductive dechlorination process would likely "stall out" at the final step from vinyl chloride to ethene, which is biologically and physically (kinetically) more difficult.

HYDRAULIC CONTROL

Introduction

Ground water cleanup to address HVOC impacts to surface water (i.e., the Sammamish River) was initiated in 2014, per the Focused Feasibility Study (HWA, 2012) and Interim Action Work Plan (HWA, 2013). This included design and installation of a ground water pump-and-treat system to capture and treat HVOC-impacted ground water at the Riverside Site HVOC area. The treatment system was designed to maintain hydraulic control of HVOC-impacted ground water discharging to the Sammamish River. Per the Interim Action Work Plan:

November 9, 2018 HWA Project No. 2007 098

> The cleanup method selected for this interim action was gradient control via pumping, with treatment via discharge to sanitary sewer. In situ and reactive barrier methods were ruled out due to the high potential for adversely impacting the nearby river. Gradient control via a series of pumping wells was determined to be the preferred option for capturing the HVOC plume before it reaches the river. Discharge of the pumped ground water to sanitary sewer, for treatment at an off site wastewater treatment plant was the preferred treatment option due to its simplicity, reliability, and straightforward permitting requirements.

Achieving hydraulic control of the ground water involves a sufficient number, location, and spacing of wells, with pumping rates that are designed to modify the gradient such that impacted ground water flows into the wells, not into the river. Well spacing and pumping rates were initially determined via a capture zone analysis using numerical ground water modeling. Actual pumping rates are adjusted during operation of the system based on well performance and water levels.

Confirmation of ground water capture was evaluated via an interference pumping test in 2015, as described in the Remedial Investigation report. The test included continuously measuring ground water levels in pumping and monitoring wells during periods of pumping and non-pumping.

2018 Gradient Study

Because there are not enough permanent monitoring wells near the pumping wells to create a ground water gradient map accurately depicting the capture area, HWA measured ground water levels in all existing monitoring wells and the eight temporary wells installed on October 26, 2018. All locations were surveyed for relative ground elevation and the ground water measurements normalized to a common site datum. Figure 3 shows the interpreted ground water gradient. At the time of these measurements, extraction wells EW-1, -2, -3, -4, and -6 were pumping, with total system discharge around 11,000 gallons per day. Well EW-5 is not pumping due to a damaged and stuck pump, which would require pulling the casing and redrilling the well to repair. The measured ground water levels show an overall gradient to the south/southwest, towards and perpendicular to the river, as would be expected for shallow ground water adjacent to a river, and as previously measured. The ground water levels also show drawdown (depression of the water table) around the original four extraction wells EW-1, -2, -3, and -4, with a localized cone of depression around EW-6. This gradient suggests that upgradient ground water from somewhere east of EW-1 to RMW-6 (west of EW-4), which encompasses the east-west extents of the HVOC plume, is effectively captured by the pumping wells.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Per discussions with Ecology, the City will explore alternative cleanup remedies for the Riverside HVOC plume, likely focusing on the apparent source area, but possibly

November 9, 2018 HWA Project No. 2007 098

including additional extraction wells (e.g., near EW-3, or replacing the damaged EW-5 well), if the pump and treat system is to be maintained. If so, selection of a remedy will also require consideration of potential impacts of the pump and treat system.

The King County Industrial Waste Division has notified the City that they expect the City to cease discharge to sanitary sewer by summer 2019. If the pump and treat system is to remain in service, the best alternative is filtration through granular activated carbon, with discharge to storm drain. Due to the iron fouling issues, using disposable (not refillable) carbon canisters is recommended. Other forms of treatment (e.g., air stripping) would also be very costly to maintain due to the biofouling issues.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely, HWA GEOSCIENCES INC.

Arnie Sugar, LG, LHG

Arnie Sugar, LG, LHG Principal Hydrogeologist

Attachments: Figure 1 Site and exploration plan

Figure 2 October 2018 ground water PCE results

Figure 3 October 2018 ground water Vinyl Chloride results

Figure 4 Ground water gradient, October 2018

Boring logs









RELATIVE DENSITY OR CONSISTENCY VERSUS SPT N-VALUE

	COHESIONLESS SO	DILS	COHESIVE SOILS		
Density	N (blows/ft)	Approximate Relative Density(%)	Consistency	N (blows/ft)	Approximate Undrained Shear Strength (psf)
Very Loose	0 to 4	0 - 15	Very Soft	0 to 2	<250
Loose	4 to 10	15 - 35	Soft	2 to 4	250 - 500
Medium Dense	10 to 30	35 - 65	Medium Stiff	4 to 8	500 - 1000
Dense	30 to 50	65 - 85	Stiff	8 to 15	1000 - 2000
Very Dense	over 50	85 - 100	Very Stiff	15 to 30	2000 - 4000
			Hard	over 30	>4000

USCS SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

MAJOR DIVISIONS				GROUP DESCRIPTIONS		
Coarse Grained Soils	Gravel and Gravelly Soils	Clean Gravel (little or no fines)	GW GP	/ Well-graded GRAVEL Poorly-graded GRAVEL		
	More than 50% of Coarse	Gravel with Fines (appreciable	GN	Silty GRAVEL		
	on No. 4 Sieve	amount of fines)	GC	Clayey GRAVEL		
	Sand and Sandy Soils 50% or More of Coarse Fraction Passing No. 4 Sieve	Clean Sand (little or no fines)	Š Š Š Š	Well-graded SAND		
More than			SP	Poorly-graded SAND		
on No. 200 Sieve Size		Sand with Fines (appreciable amount of fines)	SM	Silty SAND		
			sc//	Clayey SAND		
Fine Grained Soils	Silt and Clay	Liquid Limit Less than 50%	ML	SILT		
			CL	Lean CLAY		
				Organic SILT/Organic CLAY		
50% or More Passing No. 200 Sieve Size	Silt and Clay	Liquid Limit 50% or More	MH	Elastic SILT		
			СН	Fat CLAY		
			он	Organic SILT/Organic CLAY		
Highly Organic Soils				PEAT		

TEST SYMBOLS

%F	Percent Fines
AL	Atterberg Limits: PL = Plastic Limit LL = Liquid Limit
CBR	California Bearing Ratio
CN	Consolidation
DD	Dry Density (pcf)
DS	Direct Shear
GS	Grain Size Distribution
К	Permeability
MD	Moisture/Density Relationship (Proctor)
MR	Resilient Modulus
PID	Photoionization Device Reading
PP	Pocket Penetrometer Approx. Compressive Strength (tsf)
SG	Specific Gravity
TC	Triaxial Compression
ΤV	Torvane
	Approx. Shear Strength (tsf)
UC	Unconfined Compression
5	SAMPLE TYPE SYMBOLS
X	2.0" OD Split Spoon (SPT)
	(140 lb. hammer with 30 in. drop)
	Shelby Tube
	3-1/4" OD Split Spoon with Brass Rings
\bigcirc	Small Bag Sample
	Large Bag (Bulk) Sample
	Core Run
\square	Non-standard Penetration Test (3.0" OD split spoon)
	GROUNDWATER SYMBOLS
$\underline{\nabla}$	Groundwater Level (measured at time of drilling)
Ţ	Groundwater Level (measured in well or

COMPONENT DEFINITIONS

COMPONENT	SIZE RANGE
Boulders	Larger than 12 in
Cobbles	3 in to 12 in
Gravel Coarse gravel Fine gravel	3 in to No 4 (4.5mm) 3 in to 3/4 in 3/4 in to No 4 (4.5mm)
Sand Coarse sand Medium sand Fine sand	No. 4 (4.5 mm) to No. 200 (0.074 mm) No. 4 (4.5 mm) to No. 10 (2.0 mm) No. 10 (2.0 mm) to No. 40 (0.42 mm) No. 40 (0.42 mm) to No. 200 (0.074 mm)
Silt and Clay	Smaller than No. 200 (0.074mm)

NOTES: Soil classifications presented on exploration logs are based on visual and laboratory observation. Soil descriptions are presented in the following general order:

Density/consistency, color, modifier (if any) GROUP NAME, additions to group name (if any), moisture content. Proportion, gradation, and angularity of constituents, additional comments. (GEOLOGIC INTERPRETATION)

Please refer to the discussion in the report text as well as the exploration logs for a more complete description of subsurface conditions.



BOTHELL RIVERSIDE HVOC SITE FALL 2018 BORINGS BOTHELL, WASHINGTON

COMPONENT PROPORTIONS

PROPORTION RANGE	DESCRIPTIVE TERMS	
< 5%	Clean	
5 - 12%	Slightly (Clayey, Silty, Sandy)	
12 - 30%	Clayey, Silty, Sandy, Gravelly	
30 - 50%	Very (Clayey, Silty, Sandy, Gravelly)	
Components are arranged in order of increasing quantities.		

MOISTURE CONTENT

open hole after water level stabilized)



LEGEND OF TERMS AND SYMBOLS USED ON EXPLORATION LOGS

PROJECT NO.: 2007-098-T2052 FIGURE: 1

LEGEND 2007-098-T2052 11/9/18



PROJECT NO.: 2007-098-T2052 FIGURE:



PROJECT NO.: 2007-098-T2052 FIGURE:



PROJECT NO .: 2007-098-T2052 FIGURE:



PROJECT NO.: 2007-098-T2052 FIGURE:



PROJECT NO.: 2007-098-T2052 FIGURE:



PROJECT NO.: 2007-098-T2052 FIGURE:



PROJECT NO.: 2007-098-T2052 FIGURE:



HWAGEOSCIENCES INC.

Bothell, Washington

PAGE: 1 of 1

BORCOR 2007-098-T2052 FALL 2018.GPJ 11/9/18

2007-098-T2052 FIGURE: PROJECT NO .: