



000017533

**VOLUME II**  
**DRAFT**  
**APPENDICES TO**  
**POND WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**INTERIM MEASURES/INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTION**  
**DECISION DOCUMENT**

U S DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

EG&G ROCKY FLATS, INC

NOVEMBER 22, 1993

ADMIN RECORD

A-DU06-000190

## LIST OF APPENDICES

### APPENDIX

- A Big Dry Creek Segment 4 and 5 Stream Standards
- B Analyte Concentrations for Combined Operable Units 1 8, 10 14 and 16 and Lower South Interceptor Ditches
- C Current Surface Water and Sediment Sampling and Monitoring Requirements
- D Supplemental Information for Risk Assessment
- E Potential Benchmarks
- F Description of Retained Options
- G Evaluation of Personnel Exposure from Proposed Alternatives
- H Standard Operating Procedures for Pond Water Management

Document Classification  
Review Waiver per RFP  
Classification Office

**APPENDIX A  
BIG DRY CREEK  
SEGMENT 4 AND 5 STREAM STANDARDS**

APPENDIX A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Stream Classifications and Water Quality Standards

Table 1A	Site-specific Organic Chemical Standards Segments 2, 3, 4 and 5, Big Dry Creek ( $\mu\text{g/l}$ )
Table 2	Site-specific Radionuclide Standards (in Picocuries/Liter)
Table 3	Temporary Modifications Big Dry Creek, Segment 5

## APPENDIX A

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### Stream Classifications and Water Quality Standards

- Table 1A Site-specific Organic Chemical Standards Segments 2, 3, 4 and 5, Big Dry Creek  
( $\mu\text{g/l}$ )
- Table 2 Site-specific Radionuclide Standards (in Picocuries/Liter)
- Table 3 Temporary Modifications Big Dry Creek, Segment 5

STREAM CLASSIFICATIONS and WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

Region: 3	Stream Segment Description	Design	Classifications	NUMERIC STANDARDS				TEMPORARY MODIFICATIONS AND QUALIFIERS	
				PHYSICAL and BIOLOGICAL	INORGANIC	METALS			
1	Mainstem of Big Dry Creek including all tributaries, lakes and reservoirs, from the source to the confluence with the South Platte River, except for specific listings in Segment 2, 3, 4, and 5.	UP	Aq Life Varm 2 Recreation 2 Water Supply Agriculture	D.O. ≥ 5.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 F Cell=2000/100ml					
				Mn(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=0 04 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ac)=0 019 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ch)=0 011 CH=0 005	S=0 002 B=0 75 NO <sub>3</sub> =0 5 NO <sub>2</sub> =10 Cl <sub>2</sub> =250 SO <sub>4</sub> =250	As(ac)=50(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS CrVI(ac)=50(Trec) Cu(ac)=TVS	Fe(ch)=300(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=50(dis) Mn(ch)=1000(Trec) Ni(ch)=0 01(Tot)	Ni(ac)=TVS Se(ac)=16(Trec) Ag(ac)=TVS Zn(ac)=TVS	See attached Tables 1A and 2 for additional standards for segment 2. Also, Mercury-4 ug/l.
2	Standley Lake		Aq Life Varm 1 Recreation 1 Water Supply Agriculture	D.O. ≥ 5.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 F Cell=200/100ml					
				Mn(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=0 04 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ac)=0 019 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ch)=0 011 CH=0 005	S=0 002 B=0 75 NO <sub>3</sub> =0 5 NO <sub>2</sub> =10 Cl <sub>2</sub> =250 SO <sub>4</sub> =250	As(ac)=50(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS CrIII(ac)=50(Trec) CrVI(ac)=TVS Cu(ac)=TVS	Fe(ch)=300(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=50(dis) Mn(ch)=1000(Trec) Ni(ch)=0 01(Tot)	Ni(ac)=TVS Se(ac)=16(Trec) Ag(ac)=TVS Zn(ac)=TVS	See attached Tables 1A and 2 for additional standards for segment 2. Also, Mercury-4 ug/l.
3	Great Western Reservoir		Aq Life Varm 1 Recreation 1 Water Supply Agriculture	D.O. ≥ 5.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 F Cell=200/100ml					
				Mn(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=0 10 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ac)=0 019 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ch)=0 011 CH=0 005	S=0 002 B=0 75 NO <sub>3</sub> =0 5 NO <sub>2</sub> =10 Cl <sub>2</sub> =250 SO <sub>4</sub> =250	As(ac)=50(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS CrIII(ac)=50(Trec) CrVI(ac)=TVS Cu(ac)=TVS	Fe(ch)=300(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=50(dis) Mn(ch)=1000(Trec) Ni(ch)=0 01(Tot)	Ni(ac)=TVS Se(ac)=16(Trec) Ag(ac)=TVS Zn(ac)=TVS	See attached Tables 1A and 2 for additional standards for segment 2. Also, Mercury-4 ug/l.
4	Mainstem and all tributaries to Woman and Rabbit Creeks from source to Standley Lake and Great Western Reservoir except for specific listings in Segment 5.	UP	Aq Life Varm 2 Recreation 2 Water Supply Agriculture	D.O. ≥ 5.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 F Cell=2000/100ml					
				Mn(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=0 10 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ac)=0 019 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ch)=0 011 CH=0 005	S=0 002 B=0 75 NO <sub>3</sub> =0 5 NO <sub>2</sub> =10 Cl <sub>2</sub> =250 SO <sub>4</sub> =250	As(ac)=50(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS CrIII(ac)=50(Trec) CrVI(ac)=TVS Cu(ac)=TVS	Fe(ch)=300(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=50(dis) Mn(ch)=1000(Trec) Ni(ch)=0 01(Tot)	Ni(ac)=TVS Se(ac)=16(Trec) Ag(ac)=TVS Zn(ac)=TVS	See attached Tables 1A and 2 for additional standards for segment 2. Also, Mercury-4 ug/l.
5	Mainstem of North and South Mainstem Creeks, including all lakes and reservoirs, from their sources to the outlets of Pined, A-2 and B-2, on Pined Creek, and Pined C-2, on Woman Creek. All three ponds are located on Rocky Flats property	UP	Aq Life Varm 2 Recreation 2 Water Supply Agriculture	D.O. ≥ 5.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 F Cell=2000/100ml					
				Mn(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=0 10 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ac)=0 019 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ch)=0 011 CH=0 005	S=0 002 B=0 75 NO <sub>3</sub> =0 5 NO <sub>2</sub> =10 Cl <sub>2</sub> =250 SO <sub>4</sub> =250	As(ac)=50(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS CrIII(ac)=50(Trec) CrVI(ac)=TVS Cu(ac)=TVS	Fe(ch)=300(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=50(dis) Mn(ch)=1000(Trec) Ni(ch)=0 01(Tot)	Ni(ac)=TVS Se(ac)=16(Trec) Ag(ac)=TVS Zn(ac)=TVS	Before these standards have the quality of ambient water until 12/31/82 until 12/31/83 Table 3 for temporary modifications until 4/1/85. See attached Tables 1A and 2 for additional standards for segment 2. Also, Mercury-4 ug/l.
6	Upper Big Dry Creek and South Upper Big Dry Creek from their source to Standley Lake	UP	Aq Life Varm 2 Recreation 2 Water Supply Agriculture	D.O. ≥ 5.0 mg/l pH=6.5-9.0 F Cell=2000/100ml					
				Mn(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=0 10 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ac)=0 019 Cl <sub>2</sub> (ch)=0 011 CH=0 005	S=0 002 B=0 75 NO <sub>3</sub> =0 5 NO <sub>2</sub> =10 Cl <sub>2</sub> =250 SO <sub>4</sub> =250	As(ac)=50(Trec) Cd(ac)=TVS CrIII(ac)=50(Trec) CrVI(ac)=TVS Cu(ac)=TVS	Fe(ch)=300(dis) Fe(ch)=1000(Trec) Pb(ac)=TVS Mn(ch)=50(dis) Mn(ch)=1000(Trec) Ni(ch)=0 01(Tot)	Ni(ac)=TVS Se(ac)=16(Trec) Ag(ac)=TVS Zn(ac)=TVS	Before these standards have the quality of ambient water until 12/31/82 until 12/31/83 Table 3 for temporary modifications until 4/1/85. See attached Tables 1A and 2 for additional standards for segment 2. Also, Mercury-4 ug/l.

Taken from:

Colorado Department of Health-Water Quality Control Commission, Classification and Numeric Standards South Platte River Basin, Laramie River Basin, Republican River Basin, Smoky Hill River Basin 3.8.0 19c

TABLE 1A  
 SITE-SPECIFIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL STANDARDS  
 SEGMENTS 2, 3, 4, AND 5, BIG DRY CREEK<sup>1</sup>  
 (ug/l)

PARAMETER <sup>2</sup>	STANDARD <sup>3</sup>	PQL <sup>4,5</sup>
Acenaphthylene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Acrylonitrile <sup>6</sup>	0 058	5
Aldrin	0 00013	0 1 <sup>9</sup>
Anthracene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	1 0
Atrazine <sup>6</sup>	3 0	0 5 <sup>10</sup>
Benzidine	0 00012	10
Benzo (a) anthracene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Benzo (a) pyrene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Benzo (b) fluoranthene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Benzo (k) fluoranthene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Benzo (g,h,i) perylene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Bromodichloromethane (HM) <sup>7</sup>	0 3	1 0
Bromoform (HM) <sup>7</sup>	4	1 0
Chlordane <sup>11</sup>	0 00058	1 0
Chloroform (HM) <sup>7</sup>	6 0	1 0
Chloroethyl ether (BIS-2)	0 03	10
Chloromethyl ether (BIS) <sup>8</sup>	0 0000037	10
Chlorophenol	2000	50
Chrysene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
DDT	0 00059	1
Demeton	0 1	1 0 <sup>9</sup>
Dibenzo (a,h) anthracene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Dibromochloromethane (HM) <sup>7</sup>	6	1 0
Dichlorobenzidine	0 039	10
Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4,D)	70	1 0
Dieldrin	0 00014	0 1 <sup>9</sup>
Dioxin (2,3,7,8 TCDD)	0 000000013	0 01 <sup>13</sup>

Endosulfan	0 056	0 1 <sup>9</sup>
Endrin	0 0023	0 1 <sup>9</sup>
Fluoranthene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	42	10
Fluorene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0.0028	10
Guthion	0 01	1 5
Heptachlor <sup>11</sup>	0 00021	0 05 <sup>9</sup>
Hexachlorobenzene <sup>6</sup>	0 00072	10
Hexachlorobutadiene <sup>6</sup>	0 45	10
Hexachlorocyclohexane, Alpha <sup>11</sup>	0 0039	0 05 <sup>9</sup>
Hexachlorocyclohexane, Beta <sup>11</sup>	0.014	0 05 <sup>9</sup>
Hexachlorocyclohexane, Gamma <sup>11</sup>	0 019	0 05 <sup>9</sup>
Hexachlorocyclohexane, Technical	0 012	0 2 <sup>9</sup>
Hexachloroethane <sup>6</sup>	1.9	10
Indeno (1,2,3-cd) pyrene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Malathion	0 1	0 2 <sup>9</sup>
Methoxychlor	0 03	0 5 <sup>9</sup>
Methyl bromide (HM) <sup>7</sup>	48	10
Methyl chloride (HM) <sup>7</sup>	5 7	10
Methylene chloride (HM) <sup>7</sup>	4 7	10
Mirex	0 001	0 1 <sup>9</sup>
Napthalene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Nitrosodibutylamine N <sup>6</sup>	0 0064	10
Nitrosodiethylamine N <sup>6</sup>	0 0008	10
Nitrosodimethylamine N	0 00069	10
Nitrosodiphenylamine N <sup>6</sup>	4 9	10
Nitrosopyrrolidine N <sup>6</sup>	0 016	10
Parathion <sup>8</sup>	0 4	
PCBs	0 000044	1
Phenanthrene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Pyrene (PAH) <sup>12</sup>	0 0028	10
Simazine	4 0	0 5 <sup>10</sup>
Tetrachloroethylene <sup>6</sup>	0 8	1 0 <sup>9</sup>

Tetrachoroethane 1,1,2,2 <sup>6</sup>	0.17	1
Toxaphene	0.0002	5
Trichloroethane 1,1,2 <sup>6</sup>	0.6	1 <sup>9</sup>
Trichlorophenol 2,4,6 <sup>11</sup>	2.0	50 <sup>9</sup>

- 1 In the absence of specific numeric standards for non-naturally occurring organics, the narrative standard "free from toxics" (section 3 1 11(1)(d)) shall be interpreted and applied in accordance with the provisions of (section 3 12.7(1)(c)(iv)), so that the standard is interpreted consistently for surface and ground waters
- 2 All parameters are derived from the, basin-wide tables in 5 CCR 1002-8, §§ 3 8 5(2)(a) and (e) (10-91) or the site-specific Table 1 from 5 CCR 1002-8, § 3 8 5 (3/90), except as noted
- 3 The standard adopted is the statewide standard from the Basic Standards and Methodologies for Surface Water, 5 CCR 1002-8, § 3 1 0, if a statewide standard exists for the listed parameter, or is the lowest standard found in §§ 3 8 5(2)(a) and (e) (10-91), if no statewide standard exists for the listed parameter
- 4 PQL's are detection levels based on the Colorado Department of Health's laboratory's best judgment for Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrophotometry (GC/MS) unless otherwise noted
- 5 The PQL adopted is the statewide PQL from the Basic Standards and Methodologies for Surface Water, 5 CCR § 3 2 0, if a statewide PQL exists for the listed parameter, or is the lowest detection level found in § 3 8 5 (2)(e) (10-91), if no statewide PQL exists for the listed parameter
- 6 The standard for this parameter does not change, but the PQL differs from the GC detection limits listed in § 3 8 5(2)(e)
- 7 The basin-wide standards provide one standard for all halomethanes (HM) See 5 CCR 1002-8, § 3 8 5(2)(e) (10-91), Additional Organic Chemical Standards table Halomethanes is actually a group of chemicals Thus, the standard for halomethanes is deleted and the statewide standards, 5 CCR 1002-8, § 3 1 0 (11-91), for the individual chemicals are adopted as site specific standards
- 8 There is no statewide organic chemical standard for this parameter
- 9 Gas Chromatography (GC) PQL.
- 10 PQL is not published in existing state regulations Obtained by DOE/EG&G via personal communication with CDH
- 11 Both the standard and the PQL change
- 12 The original site-specific standards provided one standard for all Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) See, 5 CCR 1002, § 3 8 5 (3-90), Table 1 PAH

statewide standards for individual chemicals constituting PAH, 5 CCR 1002-8, § 3.10 (11-91), are adopted as site-specific standards

13 The dioxin PQL is retained from 5 CCR 1002-8, § 3.8.5(e), Additional Organics Table

**Table 2**  
**SITE SPECIFIC RADIONUCLIDE STANDARDS\***  
**(in Picocuries/Liter)**

The radionuclides listed below shall be maintained at the lowest practical level and in no case shall they be increased by any cause attributable to municipal, industrial, or agricultural practices to exceed the site specific numeric standards

**A Ambient based site-specific standards**

	Segment 2 <u>Standley Lake</u>	Segment 3 <u>Great Western Reservoir</u>	Segment 4 Segment 5 <u>Woman Creek</u>	Segment 4 Segment 5 <u>Walnut</u>
Gross Alpha	6	5	7	11
Gross Beta	9	12	5	19
Plutonium	03	03	05	05
Americium	03	03	05	05
Tritium	500	500	500	500
Uranium	3	4	5	10
<b>B Other site-specific standard applicable to segments 2,3,4 and 5</b>				
Curium	244	60		
Neptunium	237	30		

\*Statewide standards also apply for radionuclides not listed above

**Table 3  
Temporary Modifications  
Big Dry Creek, Segment 5**

<u>parameter</u>	<u>ug/l</u>
carbon tetrachloride	18
tetrachloroethane	76
trichloroethylene	66
copper (TR)	23
iron (TR)	13,200
lead (TR)	28
zinc (TR)	350
manganese (D)	560
Tr = total recoverable	D = dissolved
also,	
ammonia (un-ionized)	1 8 mg/l (March 1-June 30) 0 7 mg/l (July 1-April 31)

All temporary modifications apply until April 1, 1996

**APPENDIX B  
ANALYTE CONCENTRATIONS FOR  
COMBINED OPERABLE UNITS 1-8, 10-14 AND 16  
AND LOWER SOUTH INTERCEPTOR DITCHES**

**ANALYTE CONCENTRATIONS FOR COMBINED OPERABLE UNITS 1 & 10-14 AND 16  
AND UPPER AND LOWER SOUTH INTERCEPTOR DITCHES\*\***

Paramter	Groundwater (mg/L)		Surface Water (mg/L)		Soils (mg/kg)		Sediments (mg/kg)	
	Maximum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Potential ARAR
	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum
<b>METALS (TOTAL AND DISSOLVED)</b>								
Aluminum	4.75 BR (B)	5.0	293 (A)	0.200	70600 (B)	40	24800 (A)	40
Antimony	0.208 (E)	0.01	0.416 (A)	0.060	39.6 (G)	12	42.1 (A)	12
Arsenic	1.6 J BR (B)	0.05	1.03 (A)	0.010	37 (B)	2	13 (A)	2
Barium	0.9321 (B)	0.200	87.6 (E)	0.200	1899 (B)	40	300 (A)	40
Beryllium	0.029 (E)	0.005	0.09 (E)	0.005	15.5 (C)	1.0	15.5 (A)	1.0
Cadmium	0.0352 BR (F)	0.005	25 (A)	0.005	27.4 (G)	1.0	2.3 (C)(E)	1.0
Calcium	1900 BR (F)	5.000	51200 (E)	5.000	312000 (E)	2000	32000 (C)	2000
Cesium	0.4 (G)	1.000	12 (A)	1.000	274 (C)	200	43.38 (C)	2.0
Chromium	0.172 BR (F)	0.010	0.298 (A)	0.010	58 (C)	2.0	12 (C)	10
Cobalt	0.14 (E)	0.050	0.489 (A)	0.050	36 BR (E)	10	40.4 (A)	5.0
Copper	0.9515 (E)	0.025	0.908 (E)	0.025	30.62 (C)	5.0	33300 (A)	20
Iron	57.1 (F)	0.100	3220 (A)	0.100	67200 BR (E)	20	68.4 (A)	1.0
Lead	0.21 J BR (B)	0.005	0.516 (A)	0.005	45.6 (C)	1.0	27.8 (C)(E)	20
Lithium	0.7 (E)	0.100	85.2 (A)	0.100	47 (E)	20	5970 (A)	2000
Magnesium	788 (F)	5.000	7540 (E)	5.000	6490 BR (E)	2000	1390 (A)	3.0
Manganese	6 (F)	0.015	27.7 (A)	0.015	3540 (C)	3.0	0.72 (C)	0.2
Mercury	0.006 (E)	0.0002	3.97 (E)	0.0002	114 (C)	0.2	42 (E)	40
Molybdenum	1.92 BR (B)	0.200	0.333 (A)	0.200	38.65 (C)	40	34 (C)	8.0
Nickel	11.7 (E)	0.040	0.646 (A)	0.040	71 BR (E)	8.0	67000 (E)	2000
Potassium	633 BR (F)	5.000	4260 (A)	5.000	4440 (G)	2000	21.3 (A)	1.0
Selenium	3.2 (E)	0.005	0.55 (A)	0.005	1.5 (C)	1.0		
Silicon	10.7 (F)							

= Present in laboratory blank  
 - No data available for OUS or OU15 at the present time  
 - These are based on human health and environmental risk assessment criteria developed for screening purposes as discussed in Section 4.2 or applicable state or federal requirements  
 J - Analyzed (including some weathered bedrock)  
 BR - Bedrock (including some weathered bedrock)  
 + - Medium concentration may be a one-time measurement. Values include both recent and historic data. Letter in parentheses indicates reference source from list at end of table.  
 + + - Value given is detection or quantitation limit for analysis in accordance with Statement of Work for General Radiochemistry and Routine Analytical Services Protocol (G R R A S P) v 1.1 1990. EG&G Rocky Flats Environmental Restoration Program  
 (a) - Plutonium 238 + 239 + 240  
 (b) - Radium 226 + 228  
 Final Treatability Studies Plan  
 Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado  
 E040/1872240/R01 4-2 07 13-91/MTZ

**ANALYTE CONCENTRATIONS FOR COMBINED OPERABLE UNITS 1 8 10-14, AND 16  
AND UPPER AND LOWER SOUTH INTERCEPTOR DITCHES\*\*  
(Continued)**

Parameter	Groundwater (mg/L)		Surface Water (mg/L)		Soils (mg/kg)		Sediments (mg/kg)	
	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum
<b>METALS (TOTAL AND DISSOLVED) (Continued)</b>								
Silver	0.13 (B)	0.010	0.148 (A)	0.010	40.9 (C)	2.0	49.1 (A)	2.0
Sodium	924 (F)	5.000	17300 (E)	5.000	3680 (C)	2000	670 (E)	2000
Strontium	7.7 (B)	0.200	11.9 (A)	0.200	226 (C)	40	179 (E)	40
Thallium	0.016 (E)	0.050					13 (E)	2.0
Tin	1.121 (E)	0.200	1.53 (A)	0.200	33.8 (C)	40	1080 (A)	40
Vanadium	0.092 (B)	0.050	1.65 (A)	0.050	108 (C)	10	58.4 (C)	10
Zinc	4.39 (B)	0.020	28.7 (E)	0.020	195 (G)	4.0	735 (C)	4.0

= Present in laboratory blank  
 = No data available for OU9 or OU15 at the present time  
 = These are based on human health and environmental risk assessment criteria developed for screening purposes as discussed in Section 4.2 or applicable state or federal requirements  
 J Analyzed below detection limit  
 BR Bedrock (including some weathered bedrock)  
 + Maximum concentration may be a one-time measurement. Values include both recent and historic data. Letter in parentheses indicates reference source from list at end of table.  
 + Value given is detection or quantitation limit for analyte in accordance with Statement of Work for General Radiochemistry and Routine Analytical Services Protocol (G.R.A.S.P.) v.1.1 1990 EG&G Rocky Flats Environment Restoration Program  
 (a) Plutonium 238 + 239 + 240  
 (b) Radium 226 + 228  
 Rockwell Remediation Services, Inc.  
 Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado  
 EG&G/RSZ/24000001 6-1 07 23-9 1/8/97/2





**ANALYTE CONCENTRATIONS FOR COMBINED OPERABLE UNITS 1 8 10-14, AND 18  
AND UPPER AND LOWER SOUTH INTERCEPTOR DITCHES\*\*  
(Continued)**

Parameter	Groundwater (pCi/L)			Surface Water (pCi/L)			Soils (pCi/g)			Sediments (pCi/g)		
	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR
<b>RADIONUCLIDES (TOTAL AND DISSOLVED)</b>												
Americium 241	2.3 (E)	0.01	30	90 (A)	0.01	30	2273 (B)	0.02	0.02	0.04 (E)	0.02	0.02
Cesium 137	3.1 (E)	1	25	25 (E)	1	15	3.1 (B)	0.1	0.1	3.2 (A)	0.1	0.1
Gross Alpha	811 (F)	2	15	1900 (A)	2	15	480 (B)	4	4	7.7 (A)	4	5
Gross Beta	368 (F)	4	50	3800 (A)	4	50	49.9 (G)	10	10	50 (C)	10	50
Plutonium 239 + 240	4.6 (G)	0.01	15(a)	120 (A)	0.01	15(a)	20455 (B)	0.03	0.03	3.3 (A)	0.03	0.9
Radium 226	0.8 (E)(G)	0.5	30	30 (A)	0.5	5(b)	1.6 (G)	0.5	0.5	1.3 (C)	0.5	0.5
Radium 228	4.59 (G)	1.0	37	24 (A)	0.5	5(b)	2.6 (G)	0.5	0.5	2.3 (A)	0.5	0.5
Strontium 89 + 90	5.7 (G)	1.0	3.2	37 (C)	1.0	8	1.9 (E)	1	1	0.5 (C)	1	1
Strontium 90	7710 (F)	400	20000	13000 (A)	400	500	1.41 (G)	1	1	0.99 (A)	1	1
Tritium	723 (G)	0.6	861	861 (A)	0.6	500	3260 (G)	400	400	580 (E)	400	400
Uranium 233 + 234	9 (F)	0.6	65.5	65.5 (A)	0.6	0.3	60 (E)	0.3	0.3	2.1 (A)	0.3	0.3
Uranium 235	0.009 (G)	0.6	1.192	1.192 (G)	0.6	0.3	1.01 (G)	0.3	0.3	1.34 (A)	0.3	0.3
Uranium 235 + 236	190 (F)	0.6	386	386 (A)	0.6	0.3	3000 (E)	0.3	0.3	2.7 (C)(A)(E)	0.3	0.3
Uranium 238	63.7 (B)	0.6	1023	1023 (A)	0.6	5	4 (BR)(E)	0.3	0.3	4.8 (E)	0.3	0.3
Uranium (Total)												

- Present in laboratory blank  
 - No data available for OU9 or OU15 at the present time  
 - These are based on human health and environmental risk assessment criteria developed for screening purposes as discussed in Section 4.2, or applicable state or federal requirements  
 - Analyzed below detection limit  
 BR = Bedrock (including some weathered bedrock)  
 + = Maximum concentration may be a one-time measurement  
 + = Value given is detection or quantitation limit for analysis in accordance with Statement of Work for General Radiochemistry and Routine Analytical Services Protocol (G R R A S P) v 1.1 1990 EG&G Rocky Flats Environmental Restoration Program  
 (a) = Plutonium 238 + 239 + 240  
 (b) = Radium 226 + 228  
 Rock Y isobility Studies Plot  
 Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado  
 EG&G/15722468/RT-4.2 07-23-91/09/72

**ANALYTE CONCENTRATIONS FOR COMBINED OPERABLE UNITS 1-8 10-14, AND 16  
AND UPPER AND LOWER SOUTH INTERCEPTOR DITCHES\*\*  
(Continued)**

Parameter	Groundwater (ug/L)			Surface Water (ug/L)			Soils (ug/kg)			Sediments (ug/kg)		
	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR
<b>VOLATILES</b>												
1,1-Dichloroethane	344 (E)	5	7	50 (A)	5	7	32 (C)	5	12000			
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	4800 (E)	5	200	143 (C)	5	200	110 (C)	5	7000000			
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	30250 (E)	5	28	42 (C)	5	28	250 (B)	5	120000			
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	14740 (E)	5		440 (G)	5		62 (C)	5				
1,2-Dichloroethane	16000 (E)	5	5		5	5	120 (B)	5	7700			
1,2-Dichloroethane (Total)	5070 (E)	5	70	56 (C)	5	70	140 (C)	5				
1,2-Dichloropropane	5 (F)	5	5									
1,3-Dichloropropene	110 (G)	10		24 (E)	10		6 J (C)	5	3900			
2-Butanone	975 (B)	10					390 (E)	10				
2-Chloroethylvinylether	35 (B)	10					31 J (B)	10				
4-Methyl-2-Pentanone	1300 (B)	10	4000	15 (A)	10	4000	68 BR (E)	10				
Acetone	83 J (E)	5	5	180 (A)	10	5	2400 (C)	10	8000000			
Benzene	7 J (G)	5	5	83 (A)	5	5						
Bromodichloromethane	21 (G)	5		2 J (C)	5							
Bromomethane	28000 (E)	5	5	19 (A)	5	5	40 (G)	5	5400			
Carbon Disulfide				1005 (C)	5	5	180 (C)	5				
Carbon Tetrachloride				94 (A)	5	100	150 (C)	55				
Chlorobenzene												8000000

- Present in laboratory blank  
 - No data available for OUS or OU15 at the present time  
 - These are based on human health and environmental risk assessment criteria developed for screening purposes as discussed in Section 4.2 or applicable state or federal requirements  
 - Analyzed below detection limit  
 - Bedrock (including some weathered bedrock)  
 - Maximum concentration may be a one-time measurement. Values in parentheses indicates reference source from list at end of table  
 - Value given is detection or quantitation limit for analyses in accordance with Statement of Work for General Radiochemistry and Routine Analytical Services Protocol (G R R A S P ) v 1.1 1990 EG&G Rocky Flats Environment Restoration Program.  
 - Plutonium: 238 + 239 + 240  
 - Radium: 226 + 228  
 - Final Remedial Status Plan  
 - Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado  
 EG&G/SP22450/RCT 4-2 07 24-91/RWT/2

**ANALYTE CONCENTRATIONS FOR COMBINED OPERABLE UNITS 1-8, 10-14 AND 16  
AND UPPER AND LOWER SOUTH INTERCEPTOR DITCHES\*\*  
(Continued)**

Parameter	Groundwater (ug/L)		Surface Water (ug/L)		Soils (ug/kg)		Sediments (ug/kg)		
	Maximum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Potential ARAR	
	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	
<b>VOLATILES (Continued)</b>									
Chloroethane	17 (F)	10	20 (A)	10	50 (B)	10	18 (C)	5	110000
Chloroform	5427 (B)	5	82 (A)	5	130 (B)	5	60 (E)	10	8000000
Chloromethane	4J (G)		12.5 (A)	10	780 (B)	5	1	J (C)	5
Ethylbenzene	6 (E)	5	12.5 (A)	5	590 (BR (E))	5	22 (E)	5	93000
Methylene Chloride	1500 (E)	5	44 (C)	5	17 (J (B))	5			
Styrene	9 (B)	5	280 (A)	5	10000 (B)	5	8 (C)	5	140000
Tetrachloroethene	528000 (B)	5	12 (E)	5	640 (B)	5	6 (J (E))	5	20000000
Toluene	270 (J (E))	5	2500 (C)	5	17000 (B)	5	39 (C)	5	64000
Trichloroethane	221880 (B)	5	25 (A)	10	3300 (B)	5	5 (J (C))	10	200000000
Vinyl Acetate	39 (J (E))		13 (A)	5			7 (J (C))	5	
Vinyl Chloride	930 (B)	10							
Xylenes (Total)	4 (J (B))	5							

= Present in laboratory blank  
 = No data available for OUG or OUI5 at the present time  
 = These are based on human health and environmental risk assessment criteria developed for screening purposes as discussed in Section 4.2 or applicable state or federal requirements  
 = Analyzed below detection limit  
 = Bedrock (including some weathered bedrock)  
 J BR = Maximum concentration may be a one-time measurement. Values in parentheses indicates reference source from list at end of table.  
 + = Value given is detection or quantitation limit for analysis in accordance with Statement of Work for General Radiochemistry and Routine Analytical Services Protocol (G R A S P) v 1.1 1990 EG&G Rocky Flats Environmental Restoration Program  
 + + = Radium 226 + 228  
 (a) = Plutonium 238 + 239 + 240  
 (b) = Radium 226 + 228  
 Final T. Security Studies Plan  
 Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado  
 EG&G/SP724880CT 4-2 07 23-91/07/12

**ANALYTE CONCENTRATIONS FOR COMBINED OPERABLE UNITS 1 8 10-14 AND 16  
AND UPPER AND LOWER SOUTH INTERCEPTOR DITCHES\*\*  
(Continued)**

Parameter	Groundwater (ug/L)			Surface Water (ug/L)			Soils (ug/kg)			Sediments (ug/kg)		
	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR
<b>SEMIVOLATILES (TOTAL, UG/L)</b>												
Acenaphthene												
Anthracene												
Benzo (a) Anthracene												
Benzo (b) Fluoranthene												
Benzo (k) Fluoranthene												
Benzo (g,h,i) Perylene												
Benzo (k) Pyrene												
Bi (2 ethylhexyl) Phthalate	100	J BR (D)	10	220	(A)	10	15000					83000
Chrysene												
Diethyl Phthalate												
D-n-Butyl Phthalate	170	J BR (D)	10	40								600000000
Di n-Octyl Phthalate	58	J BR (D)	10									80000000
Fluoranthene												
Fluorene												
Indeno (1 2 3 cd) Pyrene												
2 Methylnaphthalene												
2 Methylphenol												
N Nitrosodiphenylamine	100	J BR (D)	10	15	(A)	10						
Phenanthrene				43	(A)	10						
				370	(B)							
				370	(E)							

= Present in laboratory blank  
 = No data available for OUS or OUI5 at the present time  
 = These are based on human health and environmental risk assessment criteria developed for screening purposes as discussed in Section 4.2 or applicable state or federal requirements  
 = Analyzed below detection limit  
 = Sediment (including some weathered bedrock)  
 = Maximum concentration may be a one-time measurement. Values in parentheses indicates reference source from list at end of table  
 = Value given is detection or quantitation limit for analysis in accordance with Statement of Work for General Radiochemistry and Routine Analytical Services Protocol (G R A S P ) v 1 1 1990 EG&G Rocky Flats Environmental Restoration Program  
 (a) = Plutonium 238 + 239 + 240  
 (b) = Radium 226 + 228  
 RJA T Analytical Services Firm  
 Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado  
 EGR/75972/09/R07 4-2 DT 23-91/RF12

**ANALYTE CONCENTRATIONS FOR COMBINED OPERABLE UNITS 1 8 10-14 AND 16  
AND UPPER AND LOWER SOUTH INTERCEPTOR DITCHES\*\*  
(Concluded)**

Parameter	Groundwater (ug/L)		Surface Water (ug/L)		Soils (ug/kg)			Sediments (ug/kg)		Potential ARAR
	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Potential ARAR	Maximum	Minimum	
<b>SEMI VOLATILES (TOTAL UG/L) (Continued)</b>										
Phenol			18	(A)	10		3500	270	J (E)	330
Pyrene										

**REFERENCES**

**NOTE** Analytical data received prior to October 1988 not subjected to validation procedure. Some of the contaminant values reported in this table have not yet been validated and the analyte list may be changed after the data are validated.

(A) EG&G February 22, 1991a Surface Water and Sediment Geochemical Characterization Report, Draft Copy  
 (B) U.S. DOE April 2, 1990c Final Phase II Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Workplan (Abluvial) OUZ Draft Copy  
 (C) U.S. DOE January 11, 1991a Proposed Surface Water Interim Remedial Action Plan/Environmental Assessment and Decision Document South Walnut Creek Basin OUZ Final Draft  
 (D) U.S. DOE January 24, 1991b Phase II Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Workplan (Bedrock) OUZ Draft Copy  
 (E) U.S. DOE October 1990d Phase III Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Workplan 881 Hillside Area OUI Final Draft  
 (F) EG&G March 1, 1991b 1990 Annual RCRA Groundwater Monitoring Report for Regulated Units at Rocky Flats Plant, Draft Copy  
 (G) EG&G May 1991 Unpublished data (See NOTE to references)

- Present in laboratory blank  
 - No data available for OUS or OUI15 at the present time  
 - These are based on human health and environmental risk assessment criteria developed for screening purposes as discussed in Section 4.2 or applicable state or federal requirements  
 J Analyzed below detection limit  
 BR Bedrock (including some weathered bedrock)  
 + Maximum concentration may be a one-time measurement. Values in parentheses indicate reference source from list at end of table  
 + Value given as detection or quantitation limit for analysis in accordance with Statement of Work for General Radiochemistry and Routine Analytical Services Protocol (G R R A S P) v 1.1 1990 EG&G Rocky Flats Environmental Restoration Program  
 (a) = Plutonium 238 + 239 + 240  
 (b) = Radium 226 + 228  
 Final Remedial Action Plan  
 Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado  
 EG&G/RT-188/RT-4-2 07-23-91/RT-2

**APPENDIX C**  
**CURRENT SURFACE WATER AND SEDIMENT**  
**SAMPLING AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

## APPENDIX C

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table 1	Summary of NPDES-FFCA Compliance Sampling
Table 2	Summary of Agreement in Principle Compliance Sampling
Table 3	Summary of Operational Monitoring for DOE Orders
Table 4	Summary of Surface Water and Sediment Sampling for the Los Alamos National Laboratory Research Program
Table 6	Sample Volume, Container and Preservation Requirements for Analytes in the Event-Related Surface Water Monitoring Program

Table 1 --Summary of NPDES/FFCA Compliance Sampling			
LOCATION	ANALYTES	FREQUENCY	
Pond A 3	Nitrate	daily during discharge	
	Flow	daily during discharge	
Pond B-3	5-Day Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD5)	daily	
	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	daily	
	Nitrate	daily	
	Total Residual Chlorine (TRC)	daily	
	Flow	daily	
Pond A-4	Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)	quarterly at discharge	
	Non Volatile Suspended Solids (NVSS)	daily during discharge	
	Total Chromium	monthly during discharge	
	Flow	daily during discharge	
STP	pH	daily during discharge	
	Total Residual Chlorine (TRC)	daily during discharge	
	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	three times per week	
	Fecal Coliform	three times per week	
	Total Phosphorous	three times per week	
	Carbonaceous 5-Day BOD	three times per week	
	Flow	daily	
	Visible Oil and Grease	daily	
	Target Analyte List Metals	two times per month	
	Volatile Organic Analytes (CLP)	two times per month	
	Total Chromium	weekly	
	Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)	quarterly	
	Pond B 5	Total Residual Chlorine (TRC)	daily during discharge when Pond B 3 is bypassed
		Nitrate	Same as TRC
Whole Effluent Toxicity		quarterly at discharge	
Non-Volatile Suspended Solids		daily during discharge	
Total Chromium		monthly at discharge	
Flow		daily during discharge	
Pond C 2	Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)	quarterly at discharge	
	Non Volatile Suspended Solids (NVSS)	daily during discharge	
	Total Chromium	monthly at discharge	
	Flow	daily during discharge	

Taken from EG&G (1993) RFP Surface Water and Sediment Monitoring Program Summary January 1993

Table 2 --Summary of Agreement in Principle (AIP) Compliance Sampling		
LOCATION	ANALYTES	FREQUENCY
Pond A-3	Plutonium Uranium, Americium	weekly composite
	Tritium	daily during discharge
	gross alpha/beta	daily during discharge
	pH	daily during discharge
	Field Parameters	daily during discharge
Pond A-4	Plutonium, Uranium, Americium	weekly composite
	Tritium	daily during discharge
	gross alpha/beta	daily during discharge
	pH	daily during discharge
	Nitrate	daily during discharge
	Tot Suspended Solids/Tot Dissolved Solids	daily during discharge
	Field Parameters	daily during discharge
Pond B-5	Plutonium Uranium, Americium	weekly composite
	Tritium	daily during discharge
	gross alpha/beta	daily during discharge
	pH	daily during discharge
	Nitrate	daily during discharge
	Tot Suspended Solids/Tot Dissolved Solids	daily during discharge
	Field Parameters	daily during discharge
Pond C-2	Plutonium Uranium Americium	weekly composite
	Tritium	daily during discharge
	gross alpha/beta	daily during discharge
	pH	daily during discharge
	Nitrate	daily during discharge
	Tot Suspended Solids/Tot Dissolved Solids	daily during discharge
	Field Parameters	daily during discharge
Ponds A-4 B-5 & C-2	TSS TDS Anions, Nitrate Alkalinity	PredischARGE Splits with
	Gross alpha/beta	Colorado Department of
	Total Radionuclides (Pu U, Am etc )	Health (CDH), and weekly
	Semivolatile Organic Analytes (Method 625)	splits with CDH during
	Volatile Organic Analytes (Method 502.2)	discharge
	Pesticides (Method 608)	
	Herbicides (Method 615)	
	Triazine Herbicides	
Total and Dissolved Metals (TAL-CLP)		
Building 124	Plutonium, Uranium, Americium	monthly composite
Raw Water	TSS TDS Anions Nitrate Alkalinity	weekly

Taken from EG&G (1993) RFP Surface Water and Sediment Monitoring Program Summary January 1993

<b>Table 3 --Summary of Operational Monitoring for DOE Orders</b>		
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>ANALYTES</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>
<b>STP Effluent</b>	Gross alpha/beta	daily
	Nitrate	daily
	Chemical Oxygen Demand	daily
	Total Organic Carbon	daily
	Dissolved Oxygen	daily
	Tritium	daily
	Amonia	daily
	Hardness	daily
	Plutonium, Americium, Uranium	daily
	Field Parameters	daily
<b>STP Influent</b>	Gross alpha/beta	daily
	pH	daily
	Chemical Oxygen Demand	daily
	Total Organic Carbon	daily
	Dissolved Oxygen	daily
	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	daily
	Amonia	daily
	Carbonaceous 5-Day Biological Oxygen Demand	three times per week
	Volatile Organic Analytes (CLP)	two times per month
	Field Parameters	daily
<b>Pond A-4</b>	Plutonium, Uranium, Americium	weekly when not discharging
<b>Pond C-2</b>	Plutonium Uranium Americium	weekly 4 weeks prior to discharge
<b>Pond C-1</b>	Gross alpha/beta	daily
	Flow	daily
	Tritium	daily
	Plutonium, Uranium Americium	weekly composites
	Field Parameters	daily
<b>750/904 Pad</b>	gross alpha/beta	during precipitation events
	pH	during precipitation events
<b>Runoff</b>	Nitrate	during precipitation events
	Cyanide	during precipitation events
	Target Analyte List Metals plus Mercury	during precipitation events
	Volatile Organic Analytes (CLP)	during precipitation events
	Amonia	during precipitation events
	Field Parameters	during precipitation events

Table 3 --Continued		
LOCATION	ANALYTES	FREQUENCY
750 Culvert	gross alpha/beta	weekly
	Total Dissolved Solids	weekly
	Nitrate	weekly
	Tritium	weekly
	pH	weekly
	Field Parameters	weekly
Footing	Gross alpha/beta	quarterly
Drains & Building	Tritium	quarterly
	pH	quarterly
Sumps	Target Analyte List Metals	quarterly
(18 sites)*	Volatile Organic Analytes (method 524.2)*	Three quarterly samples initially on an as-needed basis thereafter, minimum of annual analysis*
	Semi-Volatile Organic Analytes (CLP)*	
	Field Parameters (conductivity temperature)*	quarterly
	TDS Total Nitrates*	quarterly*
Building 124	Volatile Organic Analytes	bi-annually
Water Treatment Plant (Safe Drinking Water Act)	Unregulated Organics	quarterly
	gross alpha/beta	quarterly
	Nitrate	annually, February
	Strontium-90	annually, February
	Tritium	annually, February
	Metals	annually
	Anions, Alkalinity	annually
	Corrosivity	bi-annually
	Copper and Lead	Monthly July to December
	Micro Coliform	monthly
Onsite Tap Water (SDWA)	Total Coliform	quarterly
30 Sites		

\*Changes as per telecom with Leslie Dunstan on November 18 1993

Taken from EG&G (1993) RFP Surface Water and Sediment Monitoring Program Summary January 1993

<b>Table 4 --Summary of Surface-Water and Sediment Sampling for the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) Research Program</b>		
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>ANALYTES</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>
<b>Sewage Treatment Plant, Pond A-4, Pond B-5, Pond C-2</b>	<b>LANL LIST</b>	<b>Monthly</b>
<b>Pond A-1, Pond A-2, Pond A-3, Pond B-1, Pond B-2, Pond B-3, Pond B-4, Pond C-1</b>	<b>LANL LIST</b>	<b>Quarterly</b>
<b>Stream Water per Project Manager</b>	<b>LANL LIST</b>	<b>40 per year</b>
<b>Sediment Samples per Project Manager</b>	<b>LANL LIST</b>	<b>40 per year</b>

Taken from EG&G (1993) RFP Surface Water and Sediment Monitoring Program Summary January 1993

Table 6 - Sample Volume, Container, and Preservation Requirements for Analytes in the Event-Related Surface-Water Monitoring Program.					
Class of Analytes	Volume of Individual Samples from Auto-sampler	Volume Required for Analytical Methods	Preservative	Container	Analytical Methods
<b>Total</b>					
<b>Target Analyte List (TAL) Metals</b>	1 Liter	100 ml	Nitric Acid to pH < 2	Polyethylene	CLP-Metals SW846-GFAA
<b>Total</b>					
<b>Non-TAL Metals</b>	1 Liter	100 ml	Nitric Acid to pH < 2	Polyethylene	CLP & SW846 ICPAES & GFAA
<b>Total</b>					
<b>Radionuclides</b>	4 Liters	4 Liters	Nitric Acid to pH < 2	Polyethylene	GRRASP
-Pu U, Am					
-Gross Alpha					
-Gross Beta					
Tritium (only at GS11 GS12 and GS13)					
<b>Water-Quality Parameters</b>					
Anions	1 Liter for all constituents plus 250 ml for Total P	1 Liter plus 250 ml	Cool to 4 degrees	Polyethylene	300 0
Alkalinity			"	Polyethylene	310 1
-Conductivity			"	Polyethylene	120 1
TSS TDS			"	Polyethylene	160.1 160.2
Nitrate/Nitrite - N			"	Polyethylene	353 1
-Total P			"	Polyethylene	365
<b>BOD</b>	2 Liters	2 liters	Cool to 4 degrees	Poly or Glass	SW846
<b>VOAs</b>	120 ml*	3x40ml	Cool to 4 degrees HCl to pH < 2	Glass VOA Vial	CLP 502.2
(Manually Collected)					
<b>TCL Semi-VOAs</b>	2 L*	2x1 L	Cool to 4 degrees	Amber Glass	624
(Manually Collected)					
<b>Pesticides/PCB</b>	350 ml	350 ml	Cool to 4 degrees	Amber Glass	505
(Manually Collected)					

\*Changes as per written instructions by Greg Wetherbee on November 4 1992

Taken from EG&G (1993) RFP Surface Water and Sediment Monitoring Program Summary January 1993

[GRRASP = General Radiochemistry and Routine Analytical Services Protocol]

**APPENDIX D  
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION  
FOR RISK ASSESSMENT**

APPENDIX D  
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Supplemental Information for Risk Assessment (General)

Supporting Statistical Information for Pond Water Management Risk Assessment

Tables D 1 1 through D 1 8 Human Health Risk Assessment COCs

Tables D 2 1 through D 2 8 Human Health Cancer and Noncancer Risk

Tables 1 through 5 Data Summary Tables

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR  
RISK ASSESSMENT (GENERAL)**

## APPENDIX D SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR RISK ASSESSMENT

This appendix contains supplemental information regarding calculation of RfDo's, background studies and models for chemical carcinogenicity, and effects of radiation on human health

### Calculation of Reference Doses

Oral Reference Dose (RfDo) values (in units of milligrams per kilograms per day [mg/kg/day]) are typically calculated by dividing a NOEL, NOAEL, or LOAEL dose (in units of mg/kg/day) by an uncertainty or safety factor that typically ranges from 10 to 10,000. Thereafter, the RfDo is rounded to one significant figure. The NOEL, NOAEL, and LOAEL are defined as follows:

- NOEL      No Observed Effect Level—The dose at which there are no statistically or biologically significant increases in the frequency or severity of effects between the exposed population and the corresponding control population (i.e., no measurable effects are produced at this dose)
- NOAEL     No Observed Adverse Effect Level—The dose at which there are no statistically or biologically significant increases in the frequency or severity of adverse effects between the exposed population and the corresponding control population. Effects are produced at this dose, but they are not considered adverse.
- LOAEL     Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level—The lowest dose of a chemical in a study or group of studies that produces statistically or biologically significant increases in the frequency or severity of adverse effects between the exposed population and its appropriate control.

RfDo values are derived from the NOEL, NOAEL, or the LOAEL for the critical toxic effect by the consistent, conservative application of uncertainty factors (UFs) and modifying factors (MFs), as follows:

$$\text{RfDo} = \text{CE}/(\text{UF} \times \text{MF}) \quad (1)$$

where

- RfDo = Chronic (or subchronic) Oral Reference Dose (rounded to one significant figure)
- CE = Lowest critical or no effect level (i.e., NOEL, NOAEL, or LOAEL)
- UF = The product of one or more uncertainty factors
- MF = Modifying factor

UFs are generally applied as multiples of 10 (although values less than 10 are sometimes used), with each factor representing a specific range of uncertainty inherent in extrapolating data to derive a "safe concentration" for human exposure.

**APPENDIX D**  
**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR RISK ASSESSMENT**  
(Continued)

To derive the RfDo values, UFs are applied as follows

- If the NOAEL is based on human data, a UF of 10 is usually applied to account for variation in sensitivities among individuals. It is intended to protect sensitive subpopulations (e.g., the elderly and children)
- If the NOAEL is based on animal data, an additional UF of 10 is used to account for the interspecies variability between humans and other animals
- If the NOAEL is derived from a subchronic instead of a chronic study, an additional UF of 10 is applied to extrapolate a subchronic value to a chronic value
- If an LOAEL is used instead of an NOAEL, an additional UF of 10 is used to account for the uncertainty associated with extrapolating from LOAELs to NOAELs

In addition to the UFs listed above, an MF can be arbitrarily applied. MFs range from 1 to 10 and reflect a qualitative professional assessment of additional uncertainties not specifically addressed by the above-mentioned UFs. The default MF value is 10.

Background Studies and Models for Chemical Carcinogenicity

Evidence of chemical carcinogenicity originates primarily from two sources: lifetime studies with laboratory animals and human (epidemiological) studies. For most chemical carcinogens, animal data from laboratory experiments represent the primary basis for the extrapolation. Major assumptions arise from the necessity of extrapolating experimental results across species (from laboratory animals to humans), from high-dose regions (to which laboratory animals are exposed) to low-dose regions (levels to which humans are likely to be exposed in the environment), and, across routes of administration (inhalation versus ingestion). Federal regulatory agencies have traditionally estimated human cancer risks associated with exposure to chemical carcinogens on the administered-dose basis according to the following approach:

- The relationship between the administered dose and the incidence of cancer in animals is based on experimental animal bioassay results
- The relationship between the administered dose and the incidence of cancer in the low-dose range is based on mathematical models
- The dose-response relationship is assumed to be the same for both humans and animals, if the administered dose is measured in the proper units

**APPENDIX D**  
**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR RISK ASSESSMENT**  
(Continued)

Thus, effects from exposure to high (administered) doses are based on experimental animal bioassay results, while effects associated with exposure to low doses of a chemical are generally estimated from mathematical models

For chemical carcinogens, EPA assumes a small number of molecular events can evoke changes in a single cell that can lead to uncontrolled cellular proliferation and tumor induction. This mechanism for carcinogenesis is referred to as stochastic, which means that there is theoretically no level of exposure to a given chemical that does not pose a small, but finite, probability of generating a carcinogenic response. Since risk at low exposure levels cannot be measured directly either in laboratory animals or human epidemiology studies, various mathematical models have been proposed to extrapolate from high to low doses (i.e., to estimate the dose-response relationship at low doses). The three most frequently used models are the one-hit model, the log-probit model, and the multistage model. The one-hit model is based on the premise that a single molecule of a contaminant can be the single event that precipitates tumor induction (Cornfield, 1977). In other words, there is some finite response associated with any exposure. The log-probit model assumes that a response is normally distributed with the logarithm of the dose (Mantel et al., 1971).

This theory seems to have little scientific basis, although some physiological parameters are lognormally distributed. This model usually yields much lower potency estimates due to the implied threshold at lower doses.

Currently, regulatory decisions are based on the output of the linearized multistage model. The basis of the linearized multistage model is that multiple events (versus the single-event paradigm of the one-hit model) may be needed to yield tumor induction. The linearized multistage model reflects the biological variability in tumor frequencies observed in animals or human studies. The dose-response relationship predicted by this model at low doses is essentially linear. Use of this model provides dose-response estimates intermediate between the one-hit and the log-probit models. It should be noted that the slope factors (SFs) calculated for nonradiological carcinogens using the multistage model represent the 95th percentile upper confidence limit on the probability of a carcinogenic response. Consequently, risk estimates based on these SFs are conservative estimates representing upper-bound estimates of risk where there is only a 5 percent probability that the actual risk is greater than the estimated risk.

Most models produce quantitatively similar results in the range of observable data, but yield estimates that can vary by three or four orders of magnitude at lower doses. Animal bioassay data are simply not adequate to determine whether any of the competing models are better than the others. Moreover, there is no evidence to indicate that the precision of low-dose risk estimates increases through the use of more sophisticated models. Thus, if a carcinogenic response occurs at the exposure level studied, it is assumed that a similar response will occur at all lower doses, unless evidence to the contrary exists.

**APPENDIX D**  
**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR RISK ASSESSMENT**  
(Continued)

For radionuclides, human epidemiological data collected from the survivors of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bomb attacks form the basis for the most recent extrapolation put forth by the National Academy of Science (1980). Conversely, for most nonradiological carcinogens, animal data from laboratory studies represent the primary basis for the extrapolation. Furthermore, in the past, risk factors for radionuclides have generally been based on fatalities (i.e., the number of people who actually died from cancer), while SFs for nonradiological carcinogens are based on incidence (i.e., the number of people who developed cancer).

Effects of Radiation on Human Health

Ionizing radiation has sufficient energy to interact with matter and produce an ejected electron and a positively charged ion. These positively charged ions, known as free radicals, are highly reactive and may combine with other elements or compounds within a cell to produce toxins or otherwise disrupt the chemical balance, which results in mutations or other deleterious effects. Radionuclides are characterized by the type and energy level of the radiation emitted. Radiation emissions fall into two major categories: particulate (electrons, alpha particles, beta particles, protons) or electromagnetic (gamma and x-rays) radiation.

The general health effects of radiation can be divided into stochastic and nonstochastic effects, i.e., those health effects related to dose and those not related to the dose. The risk of developing of cancer from exposure to any amount of radiation is a stochastic effect. Examples of nonstochastic effects include acute radiation syndrome and cataract formation, both of which occur only at high levels of exposures.

Radiation can damage cells in different ways. First, the radiation can cause damage to the strands of genetic material, DNA, in the cell. The cell may not be able to recover from this type of damage, or the cell may live on but function abnormally. If the abnormally functioning cell divides and reproduces, a tumor or mutation in the tissue may develop. The rapidly dividing cells that line the intestines and the stomach and the cells that make blood in the bone marrow are very sensitive to this kind of damage. Organ damage results from the damage caused to the individual cells. This type of damage has been reported with doses of 10 to 500 rads. Acute radiation sickness is seen only after doses of greater than 50 rads. This dose is usually only received by personnel in close proximity to serious nuclear accident.

When the cells damaged by radiation are reproductive cells, genetic damage can occur in the offspring of the person exposed. The developing fetus is especially sensitive to radiation. The type of malformation that may occur is related to the stage of fetal development and the cells that are differentiating at the time of exposure. Radiation damage to children exposed while in the womb is related to the dose the pregnant mother received. Mental retardation is another possible effect of fetal radiation exposure.

**APPENDIX D**  
**SUPPORTING STATISTICAL INFORMATION**  
**FOR RISK ASSESSMENT**

---

## APPENDIX D

### SUPPORTING STATISTICAL INFORMATION FOR RISK ASSESSMENT

All information in this introduction and appendix was excerpted or summarized directly from the following EG&G Statistical Application Reports created for the pond water quality risk assessment

SA 93-012 Statistical Determination of Proposed Contaminants of Concern for the Pond Water Quality IM/IRA June 7, 1993

SA-93 014 Summary Statistics for the Pond Water Quality IM/IRA July 30, 1993

SA 93-015 Summary Statistics in Support of the Risk Assessment for the Pond Water Quality IM/IRA July 30, 1993

#### Determination of Proposed Contaminants of Concern (PCOCs)

PCOCs were identified in pond water through a statistical comparison of background and site data. If levels of an analyte were statistically significantly greater in the site data, the analyte was classified as a PCOC and used in the risk assessment process described in Section 2.5 and in Tables D.1.1 through D.1.8.

The statistical determination of PCOCs through comparisons of background and site data were complicated by the presence of nondetects at multiple detection limits. The branching flowchart for selecting appropriate statistical methodology was presented in the Statistical Applications report SA-93-010 for OU 2 and is contained on the following page. In this flowchart, two cases use non-statistical criteria for PCOC determinations. In the first case, for volatile organic analytes/semi volatile organic analytes (VOAs/SVOAs), no background levels are expected, therefore, no background comparison is made. Instead, an administrative convention is used which labels analytes PCOCs if a standard is exceeded or if five percent or more detects are present. In the second case, if fewer than ten percent detects have been observed for both site and background data, statistical comparisons are not practical, therefore, PCOC determination is based only on the exceedance of a standard. In this latter case, the designation is referred to as a "potential COC."

For the remaining cases identified in the chart, statistical comparisons of site and background data are made. For large numbers of non-detects, a nonparametric scores approach was recommended in the OU 2 report. This scores approach reduces to the common Mann-Whitney/Wilcoxon nonparametric rank test for comparing two groups of data when no nondetects are present. It was shown in the OU 2 report that essentially identical PCOC determinations result if the scores test approach is used, even for the cases of no or minimal numbers of nondetects. For this reason, the scores approach was used in this report for all statistical comparisons, primarily to avoid the questionable practice of nondetect replacement and the tedious analysis sequence including sample size considerations, goodness-of-fit testing, data transformations, and variance testing for the many analytes involved. Again, it is emphasized that using the scores approach universally rather than branching to a t test or Mann-Whitney/Wilcoxon test in the flowchart will only very rarely generate a different PCOC conclusion, and in such cases anomalous data such as outliers are likely the cause of the different determination.



---

## SUPPORTING STATISTICAL INFORMATION FOR RISK ASSESSMENT (Continued)

The p-values below 0.05 in Tables D 1.1 through D 1.8 indicate that site values are elevated relative to background or literature comparison values, and the result is a PCOC determination. The statistical source of these p-values is the scores test described above. The 0.05 level for the p-value is the Type I error probability of obtaining a sample which leads to a PCOC determination when in fact the underlying site analyte levels are not elevated relative to background.

### Determination of Mean Values in Summary Statistics

Means for background and site data were calculated to facilitate risk assessment. However, it is crucial to note that means are fairly volatile estimates of the data set in the presence of nondetects and outliers, occurrences which are common in environmental data. It could even be the case that a PCOC determination would be made by the nonparametric ranking methods when the background mean was greater than the site mean. This would occur if extreme outliers were present in the background while the bulk of the site data was in fact elevated relative to the bulk of the background data. Means are highly affected by such outlying values.

In addition, it is essential to note that the mean, median, 85th percentile, and interquartile range values displayed in Tables 1.5 require special treatment for the non-detect values at varying detection limits. For small numbers of non-detects (less than 20 percent), the statistical measures computed should be relatively insensitive to the handling of non-detects. For larger numbers of non-detects, no good method of handling the many non-detects at multiple detection limits exists. The shortcomings of using such statistical measures in these cases should be realized.

The convention for handling the non-detect values when calculating mean values was uniform replacement. For example, if four non-detects were observed at the detection limit value of 100, they were replaced by the values 20, 40, 60, and 80. Note that in many cases this could result in the maximum reported value for an analyte actually being a replacement value for a non-detect. Since this is a poor alternative, any non-detects that were more than twice the maximum detected value for all pond locations were omitted from the summary statistics computation.

---

1

## SUPPORTING STATISTICAL INFORMATION FOR RISK ASSESSMENT (Continued)

### Other Information Not Included in This Text

Not all statistical information generated in support of the risk assessment is included in this appendix due to volume considerations, however the tables included in Section 2.5 and this appendix should provide adequate information for most purposes. Information generated but not included in this appendix follows:

- 1) Box and whisker plots used in PCOC determinations,
- 2) Various tables and graphs involving summary statistics for the ponds including minimum detect and nondetect values,
- 3) Statistical tables and graphs involving distribution tests for normal and lognormal distributions, and
- 4) Printout of the data set

**TABLES D-1 1 THROUGH D-1.8  
HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT COCs**



**Table C**  
(page 2 of 2)

**HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT**      **OC's Site 1 - Ponds A1 and A2**

Contaminant	SITE			SA			GROUND			SCORE TEST P-VALUE	NO OF EXCEEDANCES	POTENTIAL COC	HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS
	CMC STANDARD (ug/l)	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DETECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT DETECT	LOGNORMAL % VUL	MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DETECTION FREQUENCY					
ACETONE	N/A	6.45	1.1	1	10	10								1/10 defects
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	1.8	22.875	220	1	1	100								1 c 1/10 defects, pol lab contact
1,2,3-TRICHLORO BENZENE	N/A	0.0655	0.11	1	11	100								1/11 defects
1,2,4-TRICHLORO BENZENE	N/A	0.0658	0.12	1	12	100								1/12 defects
BENZENE 1,2,4-TRIMETHYL	N/A	0.0564	0.12	1	11	100								1/11 defects
HEXACHLOROBIADENE	0.45	0.07	0.29	1	12	8.33								1/12 defects
NAPHTHALENE	0.0229	0.1483	0.68	1	12	8.33								1 x 1/10 defects
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.8	0.0792	0.68	2	12	16.67								2/12 defects
TRICHLOROETHENE	66	0.0817	0.54	2	12	16.67								2/12 defects
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	10	0.08	0.41	1	12	8.33								1/12 defect
N-BUTYLBENZENE	N/A	0.1491	0.64	1	11	9.09								1/11 defects
ATRAZINE	3	1.0458	3	10	12	83.33								10/12 defects

**NOTES**

- 1 Foust Samuel 1981 "Chemistry of Natural Waters Ann Arbor Science
- 2 Herm John USGS 1989 "Study and Interpretation of the Chemical Characteristics of Natural Water" Water Supply Paper 2254
- 3 EPA 1979 "Water related Environmental Fate of 129 Priority Pollutants Volume I Introduction and Technical Background Metals and Inorganics Pesticides and PCBs NITS/P880-204373
- 4 Feigussen Jack E 1989 "The Heavy Elements Chemistry Environmental and Health Effects"

Table D  
(page 1 of 2)

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT C's Site 2 - Ponds A3 and A4

Contaminant	SITE			BA. EXPOSURE			SCORES			POTENTIAL COC	ESSENTIAL NUTRIENT	LITERATURE VALUE			HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS	
	SAMPLE MEAN (µg/L)	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN (µg/L)	MAX DETECT (µg/L)	DETECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT NONDETECT	SAMPLE MEAN (µg/L)	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL (µg/L)	MAX EXERC (µg/L)			DETECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT NONDETECT			SCORES IF VALUE
<b>RADIOISOTOPES</b>																	
AMERICIUM 241	0.004	0.004	0.00		48		0.004	0.023	0.024				0.4836				NO sig p value sig p value
CESIUM 137	0.046	0.114	1.4		49		0.006	1.138	1.7				0.1799				NO sig p value
PLUTONIUM-239/240	0.005	0.004	0.026		55		0.004	0.017	0.04				0.2312				NO sig p value
STRONTIUM-90	0.353	0.405	0.99		46		0.146	1.893	1.8				0.9905				NO sig p value
IRIDIUM	121.203	183.46	1000		22		51.4.2	1413 Pa	560				0.2299				NO sig p value
URANIUM 233	1.318	1.613	4.38		60		0.4.8	1.164	2.4				0.0001				YES sig p value site-3 BG
URANIUM 235	0.084	0.104	0.284		60		0.04	0.193	0.2				0.0001				YES sig p value site-2 BG
URANIUM 238	1.542	1.83	4.6		59		0.16	1.1	1.82				0.0001				YES sig p value site-3 BG
<b>METALS</b>																	
ALUMINUM	370.029	1563	1100	15	21	28.6	696.294	4804.622	5840	79	110	28.2	0.6968				NO no defect
ANTIMONY	12.648	18.39	N/A	0	21	100	14.23	55.28	26.5	9	91	90.1	0.3699				NO sig p value site-1 2 BG
ARSENIC	1.276	1.917	2	3	21	65.7	1.781	8.183	2.9	10	84	88.1	0.0001	1			NO sig p value site-1 2 BG
BARIUM	84.324	88.61	104	20	21	4.8	67.617	148.877	306	84	100	18.4	0.0001	9			NO no defect
BERYLLIUM	0.628	1.004	1.9	1	21	95.2	0.943	4.756	8.4	6	87	93.1	N/A	1			NO essential nutrient
CAESIUM	1.599	2.134	N/A	0	18	100	1.744	6.426	N/A	0	80	100	0.0001				NO essential nutrient
CALCIUM	45395	47979.5	56700	21	21	0	24924.672	96761.526	74600	126	126	0	0.0001				NO sig p value 1 elevated of 5/20 defect
CESIUM	218.8	1378	1100	1	20	75	247.467	1551.721	480	8	92	91.3	0.014				NO no defect
CHROMIUM	2.269	3.321	2	1	21	95.2	4.234	16.643	18.9	15	91	83.5	0.9747	0.73	10	84	NO no defect
COBALT	2.298	3.326	N/A	0	21	100	2.398	9.256	7.9	6	88	93.2	N/A				NO no defect
COPPER	5.045	9.955	17.2	6	20	70	6.198	28.468	15.5	34	93	63.4	0.7333	0.83	10	105	NO no defect
IRON	237.5	1204	800	16	20	23.6	1335.634	6437.82	26300	118.9	129	7.8	0.9999				NO essential nutrient
LEAD	2.455	5.365	19.1	8	20	60	2.044	8.567	21	37	104	64.4	0.3474	0.1	1.1	30	NO sig p value site max & mean-BG
LITHIUM	13.62	19.407	15.6	11	17	35.3	13.711	63.036	11.6	47	98	52	0.0001	0.075	0.2	37	NO sig p value site mean & max BG
MANGANESE	11530	12897	18000	21	21	0	5219.619	11266.249	16400	106	118	10.2	0.0001				NO essential nutrient
MERCURY	0.096	0.153	N/A	0	24	4.5	99.317	488.154	4060	112.1	123	8.9	0.26	0.01			NO no defect
MOLYBDENUM	6.997	13.271	8.2	3	17	82.4	5.279	23.37	25.1	17	97	87.6	0.3752				NO no defect
NICKEL	7.236	11.161	6.5	5	21	76.2	7.384	33.254	12.1	14	92	84.8	0.2034				NO essential nutrient
PODISSIUM	5485	6571	10100	20	21	4.8	1775.375	5482.96	6700	68	100	32	0.0001				NO essential nutrient
SELENIUM	1.602	2.465	3.4	5	21	76.2	1.378	5.462	2	4	92	95.7	0.0001	0.1	0.2	80	NO sig p value 1 elevated of 5/21 defect
SILICON	2891	3377.864	3550	9	9	0	5861.897	19227.637	11700	39	39	0	0.9984	0.09			NO essential nutrient
SILVER	1.96	2.787	N/A	0	21	100	2.856	11.482	7.9	12	86	86.4	0.9714				NO essential nutrient
SODIUM	38071	42187	52200	21	21	0	17166.929	38052.976	45400	126	127	0.8	0.0001				NO no defect
STRONTIUM	301.7	330.2	360	17	18	5.6	196.594	472.489	408	89	106	16	0.0001	6.3		802	NO no defect
THALLIUM	1.006	1.715	N/A	0	21	100	1.043	3.866	3.4	3	96	96.9	N/A				NO no defect
TIN	13.65	22.73	23.1	1	16	93.8	22.609	92.842	180	17	90	81.1	0.9286				NO no defect
VANADIUM	3.717	5.138	6.1	7	21	66.7	7.836	42.096	18.2	27	92	70.7	0.7333				NO no defect
ZINC	20.33	34.407	105	14	21	33.3	38.291	182.699	480	87.9	129	28.5	0.7955	5	10	45	NO no defect
<b>INORGANICS</b>																	
CYANIDE	2.873	N/A	0.6	1	13	92.3	0.006	0.031	0.0404	3	106	97.2	N/A				NO only 1/13 defects
NITRATE	110.7	N/A	430	4	4	0	0.15	N/A	0.25	1	2	50	0.032				NO sig p value only 1 elevated of 4/4 defect
NITRATE/NITRITE	2.942	3.724	6.2	106	107	0.9	0.389	3.111	4.3	72	128	42.4	0.0001				YES sig p value site-10 BG
NITRITE	0.125	0.196	1.4	51	55	7.3	0.017	0.054	0.058	3	75	96	0.0001				YES sig p value site-10 BG

**Table D**  
(page 2 of 2)

**HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT C's Site 2 - Ponds A3 and A4**

Contaminant	ENVCC 1 AND 2		SITE		BACGROUND		SCORES		NO OF EXCEEDANCES	POTENTIAL COC	HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS
	CONC (ug/l)	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DETECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERC 1 DETECT	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	LOGNORMAL PERC DETECT (ug/l)				
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	0.057	2.6098	17	1	132	0.76			1	YES	NO	only 1/32 detect
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	4.7	2.9621	8	9	132	6.82	4.794	17.62	9	YES	NO	only 9 potential lab onl
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.8	2.621	14	2	132	1.52			2	YES	NO	only 2/132 detect
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHthalATE	1.8	5.409	19	2	33	6.06	N/A		2	YES	NO	not RF wait - related
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	200	0.0688	42	1	16	6.25			0	NO	NO	
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	0.057	0.1381	17	1	16	6.25			1	YES	NO	only 1/16 detect
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.8	0.08	N/A	1	16	6.25			0	NO	YES	7/12 detect
DICAMBIA	N/A	0.475	2.1	7	12	9.33			N/A	YES	NO	only 1/12 detect
DICHLOROPROP	N/A	0.475	1.8	1	12	8.33			N/A	YES	YES	45/76 detect
ATRAZINE	3	0.7281	4.6	45	76	59.21			5	YES	YES	8/54 detect
SIMAZINE	4	0.1563	0.97	8	64	12.5			0	YES	YES	

Table D  
(page 1 of 2)

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT

Site 3 - Ponds B1 and B2

Contaminant	SITE			SA			MA			POTENTIAL			SCORING			HUMAN HEALTH			COMMENTS
	SAMPLE MEAN (µg/L)	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN (µg/L)	MAX DETECT (µg/L)	DICTION REQUR CT	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT NONDETECT	CONFORMAL VOLUME (µg/L)	MAX DEFECT (µg/L)	DICTION REQUR CT	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT NONDETECT	COC	TEST VALUE	MIN	MEAN	MAX	HEALTH COC		
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>																			
AMERICIUM 241	0.021	0.038	0.064		9	9	0.034	0.074		87		0.0007					YES	no detect	
CESIUM-137	0.171	0.171	7.9		12	12	0.096	1.18		76		0.008					NO	no detect	
PLUTONIUM 239/240	0.06	0.079	0.16		14	14	0.004	0.017		83		0.0001					YES	no detect	
STRONTIUM 90	0.179	0.268	0.56		12	12	0.546	1.873		77		0.0096					NO	only 1/6 elevated	
TRITIUM	249.6	504.652	650		6	6	51.467	143.965		53		0.0263					YES	high p value at =2 HC	
URANIUM 233/234	1.137	1.76	2.8		14	14	0.448	1.564		61		0.0001					YES	high p value, elevated	
URANIUM 235	3.997	0.178	14		14	14	1	1		1		1					YES	high p value, elevated	
URANIUM 238	1.654	1.481	1.9		14	14	0.36	1.3		54		0.0001					YES	high p value, elevated	
<b>METALS</b>																			
ALUMINUM	152.6	374.6	638		12	100	695.294	4824.622	348	79	111	26.7	0.9398				NO	no detect	
ANTHRACENE	10.98	17.81	N/A		0	12	14.23	54.76	26.1	91	94.1	N/A	N/A				NO	high p value, elevated	
ARSENIC	2.144	4.813	4.1		6	6	1.781	6.183	2.9	10	64	88.1	0.0001				NO	high p value, elevated	
BARIUM	40.82	240.13	127		8	12	67.617	148.877	306	84	103	18.4	0.9591				NO	no detect	
BERYLLIUM	0.379	0.756	1.6		12	100	0.943	4.746	8.4	6	87	93.1	N/A				NO	no detect	
CADMIUM	1.56	2.751	N/A		0	10	1.744	6.476	N/A	0	80	100	N/A				NO	no detect	
CALCIUM	21900	26786	47400		17	12	24924.672	90161.576	74481	17	17	0	0.9237				NO	essential nutrient	
CESIUM	233.3	821.5	N/A		0	12	247.467	1551.717	430	6	92	91.3	N/A				NO	no detect	
CHROMIUM	1.956	3.028	N/A		0	11	4.204	16.863	18.9	15	91	83.6	0.0003				NO	no detect	
COBALT	1.836	2.836	N/A		0	12	2.398	9.256	7.9	6	88	93.2	N/A				NO	no detect	
COPPER	1.886	2.702	N/A		0	12	6.198	28.468	15.5	34	93	63.4	0.999				NO	no detect	
IRON	271.6	462.6	491		8	12	1335.636	6637.829	26300	118.9	129	7.8	0.9863				NO	essential nutrient	
LEAD	2.171	6.163	11		6	12	2.044	6.567	21	37	104	64.4	0.0036				NO	max-UTL, high p value, mean=BG	
LITHIUM	19.32	26.26	21.6		10	12	13.711	63.036	11.6	47	98	5.7	0.0001				YES	high p value, elevated	
MAGNESIUM	20.42	2299	25600		12	12	5279.619	12666.249	16600	106	118	10.2	0.0001				NO	essential nutrient	
MANGANESE	74.53	114	157		12	12	99.317	488.154	4040	112.1	123	8.9	0.0164				NO	high p value, max-UTL, mean=BG	
MERCURY	0.1	0.191	N/A		0	12	0.638	1.4	0.38	8	94	91.6	N/A				NO	essential nutrient	
MOYBDEXIUM	3.009	4.822	N/A		0	12	5.279	23.37	75.1	12	91	87.6	0.8995				NO	high p value, max-UTL, mean=BG	
NICKEL	4.96	8.855	16.3		12	100	7.384	33.254	12.1	14	92	84.8	0.5				NO	no detect	
POTASSIUM	5366.7	6170	8140		12	12	1775.974	5432.94	6700	68	100	32	0.0001				NO	essential nutrient	
SELENIUM	0.896	1.481	N/A		0	11	1.378	5.462	2	4	97	95.7	N/A				NO	essential nutrient	
SILICON	1101	3756	3580		10	14	861.897	1922.637	11700	39	79	0	1				NO	max-UTL, high p value, only 1/12 detect	
SILVER	6.667	14.29	56.9		12	12	2.856	11.482	7.9	12	88	86.4	0.4396				NO	essential nutrient	
SODIUM	69433	69057	81200		12	12	17165.929	38052.976	45400	126	127	0.6	0.0001				YES	high p value, max-UTL, elevated	
STRONTIUM	273	308.6	301		11	12	472.439	472.439	436	69	106	16	0.0001				YES	no detect	
THALLIUM	0.827	1.158	N/A		0	12	1.043	3.666	3.4	3	96	96.9	N/A				NO	no detect	
TIN	12.7	26.51	N/A		0	11	22.609	92.622	180	17	90	81.1	0.9728				NO	no detect	
TUNGSTEN	2.308	3.53	2.9		12	12	7.636	42.095	18.2	27	92	70.7	0.9732				NO	no detect	
ZINC	6.668	24.09	24.8		2	12	38.291	182.696	480	87.9	123	28.5	0.999				NO	no detect	
<b>NONMETALS</b>																			
CYANIDE	0.008	0.013	N/A		0	14	0.006	0.031	0.0404	3	106	97.2	N/A				NO	no detect	
NITRATE/NITRITE	0.077	0.167	0.28		2	14	0.389	3.111	4.3	72	128	42.4	0.9964				NO	no detect	
NITRITE	0.016	0.035	0.044		2	14	0.012	0.064	0.168	3	75	94	0.0488				NO	no detect	

Table D  
(page 2 of 2)

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT \ s Site 3 - Ponds B1 and B2

Contaminant	WQCC STANDARD			SITE			BACKGROUND			SCORE			HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS	
	(ug/l)	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DTECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT DETECT	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	CONFORMS PPL UR (ug/l)	MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DTECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT DETECT			SCORE EST. VALUE
VOLATILE/SEMI-VOLATILE PESTICIDES															
1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	N/A	2.906	6	1	16	6.25	4.794	17,262	31	16	37.77	15.7	0	NO	4/13 detects
ACETONE	N/A	37,039	240	4	13	30.77							0	YES	2 exceedances, high in volume, although good lab control
METHYL CHLORIDE	4.7	4.875	11	2	16	12.5							2	YES	J/16 detects
TRICHLOROETHENE	66	4.375	11	5	16	31.25							0	YES	only 1/1 detects
cis 1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	70	3.3		1	11	100							0	NO	
1,2,4-TRICHLOROETHENE	N/A	0.0567	0.13	1	12	6.33							0	NO	
CHLOROBENZENE	16	0.3083	1.5	2	12	16.67							0	YES	2/12 detects
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	6	0.2158	0.72	7	12	18.33							0	YES	7/12 detects
HEXACHLOROCYCLOHEPTANE	0.0228	0.12	0.34	1	12	6.33							1	YES	1/12 detects
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.6	0.2133	0.87	7	12	58.33							0	NO	
TOLUENE	1000	0.133	0.5	1	12	6.33							0	NO	
TRICHLOROETHENE	66	3.0775	13	6	12	16.67							0	YES	6/12 detects
VINYL CHLORIDE	2	0.1783	0.94	2	12	16.67							0	YES	2/12 detects
cis 1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	70	0.76	3.4	4	11	36.36							0	YES	4/7 detects
ATRAZINE	3	0.3033	0.65	1	12	6.33							0	NO	1/12 detects

Table 4  
(page 1 of 2)

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT CC's Site 4 Pond B3

Contaminant	SITE		BACTERIOLOGICAL		SAMPLE #	PERCENT NONDETECT	SAMPLE #	PERCENT NONDETECT	SAMPLE #	PERCENT NONDETECT	SCORES	POTENTIAL COC	ESSENTIAL NUTRIENT	LITERATURE USE			HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS	
	SAMPLE MEAN	MAX DETECT	CONCENTRATION	MAX DETECT										MIN	MEAN	MAX			
BARONCEDES																			
AMERICIUM 241	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.009	YES					Ag p value		
CESIUM 137	0.211	1.141	1.141	1.141	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.424	NO					Ag p value, site=BG		
PLUTONIUM 239/240	0.018	0.036	0.036	0.036	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.001	YES							
STRONTIUM-90	0.15	0.319	0.319	0.319	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.9916	NO							
TORIUM	51.5	116.87	116.87	116.87	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.4731	NO							
URANIUM 235	0.279	0.8	0.8	0.8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.8904	NO							
URANIUM 238	0.027	0.07	0.07	0.07	6	0	0	0	0	0	0.6506	NO							
URANIUM 235	0.288	0.607	0.607	0.607	6	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	NO							
METALS																			
ALUMINUM	526.6	2564	2564	2564	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.1119	NO							
ANTIMONY	11.84	31.13	31.13	31.13	5	100	100	100	100	100	N/A	NO							
ARSENIC	0.975	13.19	13.19	13.19	4	0	0	0	0	0	8.81	NO					no detects		
BARIUM	16.49	54.93	54.93	54.93	4	0	0	0	0	0	18.4	NO					no detects		
BERYLLIUM	0.37	0.726	0.726	0.726	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.11	NO					no detects		
CADMIUM	1.867	9.33	9.33	9.33	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	NO					essential nutrient		
CALCIUM	33942	40134	40134	40134	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0357	YES	YES						
CESIUM	1.66	4.196	4.196	4.196	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.543	NO							
CHROMIUM	3.17	9.357	9.357	9.357	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.73	NO							
COBALT	2.07	4.748	4.748	4.748	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.68	NO							
COPPER	4.715	19.944	19.944	19.944	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.374	NO							
IRON	136.7	497.96	497.96	497.96	2	0	0	0	0	0	63.4	NO							
LEAD	3.72	8.958	8.958	8.958	6	0	0	0	0	0	0.997	NO					essential nutrient		
LITHIUM	8.86	17.37	17.37	17.37	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0216	YES					Ag p value, 5/8 d. tech. site insert is within lower range of IR		
MANGANESE	6624	7619	7619	7619	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0081	YES	YES						
MERCURY	43.36	67.01	67.01	67.01	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0106	YES	YES						
MOLYBDENUM	0.11	0.315	0.315	0.315	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.7845	NO					essential nutrient		
NICKEL	4.88	17.22	17.22	17.22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.7618	NO					no detects		
POTASSIUM	6.35	15.75	15.75	15.75	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.1607	NO					no detects		
SELENIUM	13904	17824	17824	17824	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.007	YES	YES						
SILICON	11.4	6.592	6.592	6.592	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0274	NO					essential nutrient		
SODIUM	4413	4874	4874	4874	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.8274	NO					no detects		
STRONTIUM	3000	35657	35657	35657	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.7349	NO					essential nutrient		
THALLIUM	169.6	210.23	210.23	210.23	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0007	YES	YES				Ag p. du. mean=BG		
TIN	10.19	22.546	22.546	22.546	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0093	NO					no detects		
VANADIUM	5.77	18.87	18.87	18.87	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.8332	NO					slightly Ag p. du. mean=BG		
ZINC	45.9	42.03	42.03	42.03	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0371	YES					slightly Ag p. du. mean=BG, site=BG		
INORGANICS																			
CYANIDE	0.025	0.013	0.013	0.013	0	100	100	100	100	100	N/A	NO						no d. techs	
NITRATE	7.32	65.381	65.381	65.381	6	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	N/A						83	
NITRITE	0.034	1.298	1.298	1.298	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0001	NO							
TOTAL																			Ag p. value, site=BG

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT OC's Site 4 - Pond B3

Contaminant	SITE			BACKGROUND					SCORES	NO. OF EXPOSURES	POTENTIAL COC	HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENT					
	CWQC STANDARD (ug/l)	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DURATION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT DETECT	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	CONFORM %						MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DURATION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT DETECT	TU
VOA1 SVOA/ PESTICIDES																		
ACETONE	N/A	8.107	24	1	6	16.7	0.000	4.794	17.202	31	14	80	15.7	0.0846	0	NO	NO	
CHLOROFORM	6	3	5	1	6	16.7									0	NO	NO	
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	4.7	3.667	8	1	6	16.7									1	YES	YES	high p value potential lab contain.
HEPTACHLOR	0.0000	N/A	0	1	6	16.7									0	NO	NO	
alpha BHC	0.0009	N/A	0	1	6	16.7									0	NO	NO	
alpha CHLORDANE	N/A	N/A	0	1	6	16.7									0	NO	NO	
beta BHC	0.014	N/A	0	1	6	16.7									0	NO	NO	
gamma BHC (LINDANE)	0.019	0.0219	0.16	1	6	16.7									0	NO	NO	
gamma CHLORDANE	N/A	0.2192	0.17	1	6	16.7									0	NO	NO	
1,4 DICHLOROBENZENE	76	0.092	0.14	3	5	60									0	YES	YES	3/5 d lect
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	0.3	0.17	0.3	2	6	42									0	YES	YES	2/5 detect
CHLOROFORM	6	2.9	3.4	5	5	100									0	YES	YES	5/5 detect
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.6	0.04	0.06	3	5	60									0	YES	YES	3/5 detect
TRICHLOROETHENE	66	0.078	0.16	4	5	80									0	YES	YES	4/5 d 1 ch
CH 1,2 DICHLOROETHENE	70	0.06	0.17	1	4	26									0	NO	NO	
PROPANE	N/A	0.32	1	1	5	20									0	NO	NO	

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSN COC's Site 5 - Ponds B4 and B5

Table L  
(page 1 of 2)

Contaminant	SITE		BAC GROUND		POTENTIAL COC	ESSENTIAL NUTRIENT	LITERATURE ALUE			HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS				
	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN (ug/l)	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL (ug/l)	MAX RATE 1 (ug/l)			DETECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT NONDETECTS			SCORES EST. P VALUE	MIN	MEAN	MAX
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>															
AMERICIUM 241	0.007	0.015	0.027	26				0.0733				NO	max UTL, hsp p value site-B5		
CESIUM 137	0.097	0.177	0.79	32				0.5349				YES	hg p value site-B5		
PLUTONIUM-239/240	0.009	0.012	0.045	36				0.0005				YES	hg p value site-B5		
STRONTIUM-90	0.321	0.73	3.8	37				0.9997				YES	hg p value site-B5		
TRITIUM	197.83	267.462	1200	23				0.0165				YES	hg p value site-B5		
URANIUM 233,234	0.905	1.079	3.86	33				0.0001				YES	hg p value site 2 BG		
URANIUM 235	0.056	0.077	0.29	36				0.1794				NO	max UTL, hsp p value site BG		
UBANIUM 238	0.174	0.897	2.98	33				0.0201				YES	hg p value site 2 BG		
<b>METALS</b>															
ALUMINUM	336.6	1136	1580	24	19	20.6	695.294	4834.077	16480	79	110	28.2	0.6293	NO	no detect
ANTHRACENE	12.04	16.64	N/A	33	0	180	14.33	1.29	26	9	91	49.1	N/A	NO	no detect
ARSENIC	1.362	2.156	2.7	4	4	63.3	1.781	8.183	2.9	10	84	88.1	0.1905	NO	hg p value mean BG
BARIUM	65.13	80.37	94.7	24	22	8.3	67.617	148.877	306	84	100	18.4	0.0162	YES	hg p value mean BG
BENZENE	0.564	0.887	1	1	1	96	0.943	4.756	8.4	6	87	93.1	N/A	NO	no detect
CADMIUM	1.66	2.27	N/A	22	0	100	1.744	6.076	N/A	0	80	100	N/A	NO	essential nutrient
CALCIUM	45540	45462	62800	25	25	0	24924.577	96761.526	74630	125	125	0	0.0001	YES	essential nutrient
CESIUM	200.3	477	1200	4	4	64.6	247.467	1.51727	400	8	92	91.3	0.1122	NO	no detect
CHROMIUM	3.333	3.333	N/A	0	0	100	4.234	16.863	18.9	15	91	83.5	0.9645	NO	no detect
COBALT	2.665	3.93	4.3	2	2	92	2.398	9.266	7.9	6	88	93.2	N/A	NO	no detect
COPPER	5.412	8.684	12.7	25	12	52	6.196	28.468	15.3	34	93	63.4	0.272	NO	essential nutrient
IRON	261.4	791.3	791	17	17	32	1335.636	6637.819	26300	119	129	7.8	0.9948	NO	essential nutrient
LEAD	2.043	3.712	6	10	10	56.5	2.044	8.567	21	119	104	64.4	0.2861	NO	essential nutrient
LITHIUM	14.36	21.91	36.9	14	22	36.4	13.711	43.036	11.6	47	98	10.2	0.0001	YES	hg p value at detect=2 BG
MAGNESIUM	9194	10096	16700	25	25	0	5279.619	11266.249	16600	106	118	10.2	0.0001	YES	essential nutrient
MANGANESE	89.54	537	255	22	25	12	99.317	488.154	4000	112	123	8.9	0.1098	YES	hg p value site mean & max BG
MERCURY	0.121	0.195	0.7	1	1	96.2	0.14	0.638	1.4	8	94	91.5	N/A	NO	essential nutrient
MOLYBDENUM	7.967	12.38	17	2	2	90.9	5.779	23.37	25.1	12	97	87.6	0.2219	NO	essential nutrient
NICKEL	5.912	9.05	6.2	2	2	25	7.844	33.264	12.1	14	92	84.8	0.7616	NO	essential nutrient
POTASSIUM	9146.8	10864	12100	24	24	4	1175.375	5432.96	6700	68	100	32	0.0001	YES	hg p value site defect BG defect
SELENIUM	1.64	2.392	4.7	5	5	80	1.378	5.462	2	4	92	95.7	0.0007	YES	essential nutrient
SILICON	4122.5	4438.8	4910	8	8	0	5861.897	19227.637	11700	39	39	0	0.9467	NO	essential nutrient
SILVER	2.150	3.139	5.1	2	2	91.7	2.856	11.482	7.9	12	88	86.4	0.6581	NO	essential nutrient
SODIUM	33988	44824	61200	25	25	0	17166.929	36552.976	45400	126	127	0.8	0.0001	YES	hg p value site 1.3 BG
STRONTIUM	255	284.4	396	20	20	91	195.594	472.489	408	89	106	16	0.0001	YES	essential nutrient
THALLIUM	0.961	1.623	2.3	1	1	96	1.043	3.166	3.4	3	96	96.9	N/A	NO	essential nutrient
TIN	12.364	16.969	11.5	1	1	95.5	22.609	92.843	180	17	90	81.1	0.9814	NO	hg p value site 1.3 BG
VANADIUM	4.376	6.318	9.2	9	9	64	7.836	42.095	18.2	27	92	70.7	0.4487	NO	essential nutrient
ZINC	35.324	52.871	87.7	18	18	28	36.291	182.699	480	88	123	28.5	0.006	YES	hg p value mean BG
<b>INORGANICS</b>															
CYANIDE	9.359	9799.112	33.2	5	5	66.6	0.006	0.031	0.0404	3	106	97.2	0.0007	YES	hg p value site 1007BG
NITRATE	2.767	3.642	3.2	3	3	0	0.15	N/A	0.25	1	2	50	0.0416	YES	hg p value site 107BG
NITRATE/NITRITE	3.359	4.975	18.4	94	91	3.2	0.369	3.111	4.3	72	125	42.4	0.0001	YES	hg p value site 107BG
NITRITE	0.407	0.576	2.1	64	64	0	0.112	0.564	0.058	3	75	96	0.0001	YES	hg p value site 107BG

Table D  
(page 2 of 2)

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESS. COC's Site 5 - Ponds B4 and B5

Contaminant	CWCOC STANDARD (ug/l)	SITE				BACKGROUND				SCORES TEST # VALUE	NO OF EXCEEDANCES	POTENTIAL COC	HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS		
		SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DETECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	LOG-NORMAL M UCL (ug/l)	MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DETECTION FREQUENCY						SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT DETECT
ACETONE	N/A	15.36	92	1.2	120	10	4.194	17.262	31	14	89	15.7	0.9651	N/A	YES	12/20 defects
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	4.7	2.797	17	7	121	5.79	17.262	17.262	31	14	89	15.7	0.9651	7	YES	high p value pol lab contamination
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.6	2.6	11	2	121	1.65	6.183	6.183	N/A	0	16	0	N/A	2	YES	only 2/121 defects
BIS (2 ETHYLHEXYL) PHTHALATE	1.6	6.316	20	3	31	9.68								1	YES	3/31 defects
alpha BHC	0.0039	0.0238	0	1	18	5.56								0	NO	lab reported 1/18 defect of 0 ug/l
gamma BHC	N/A	0.2738	0	1	18	17.5								1	YES	lab reported 1/18 defect of 0 ug/l
delta BHC	0.014	0.0248	0	1	18	6.94								0	NO	lab reported 1/18 defect of 0 ug/l
gamma CHLORDANE	0.019	0.0238	0	1	18	5.56								0	NO	lab reported 1/18 defect of 0 ug/l
gamma CHLORDANE	N/A	0.2238	0	1	8	12.5								N/A	NO	lab reported 1/18 defect of 0 ug/l
CHLOROFORM	6	0.7428	2.4	18	29	62.07								0	YES	18/24 defects
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.6	0.1339	0.76	7	28	25								0	YES	7/28 defects
TRICHLOROETHENE	66	0.9831	7.1	8	29	27.14								0	YES	8/29 defects
DICAMBA	N/A	0.2195	0.48	3	22	13.64								N/A	YES	3/22 defects
ATRAZINE	3	0.556	3.83	18	21	83.52								1	YES	18/21 defects
SIMAZINE	4	0.1461	1.3	12	60	15								0	YES	12/60 defects

Table 6

(page 1 of 2)

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT - OC's Site 6 - Ponds C1

Contaminant	SITE		MAG GROUND		SCORING	FORMAL	SAMPLING	MTHANE USE		HUMAN HEALTH	COMMENTS
	LOGNORMAL MEAN	LOGNORMAL MAX	LOGNORMAL MEAN	LOGNORMAL MAX				MIN	MAX		
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>											
AMERICIUM-241	0.009	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.2599	NO				YES	Hg p value site-1.5 BG
CESIUM-137	0.261	1.685	0.096	1.158	0.2398	NO				YES	Hg p value site 1.6 BG
PLUTONIUM-239/240	0.006	0.011	0.004	0.017	0.0266	YES				YES	Hg p value site-1.9 BG
STRONTIUM-90	0.377	0.607	0.366	1.893	0.7997	NO				YES	Hg p value site 1.2 BG
IRIDIUM	187.6	1948.269	330	1403.866	0.1642	NO				YES	
URANIUM-233/234	0.700	1.714	1.1	1.304	0.1642	YES				YES	
URANIUM-235	0.07	0.099	0.098	0.193	0.0341	YES				YES	
URANIUM-238	0.599	0.939	0.88	1.3	0.014	YES				YES	
<b>METALS</b>											
ALUMINUM	531.2	1450.7	1046	4444.622	0.0879	NO				NO	Hg p value only 1/5 defects at BG
ANTIMONY	15.72	68.24	32.2	56.28	0.0131	YES				NO	
ARSENIC	0.96	3.644	0.9	8.183	0.1718	NO				10	
BARIUM	91.32	141.9	120	148.877	0.0309	YES					
BERYLLIUM	0.6	1.491	1.2	4.766	0.0964	NO					
BISMUTH	1.876	67.64	N/A	6.476	N/A	NO					
CADMIUM	44/20	50377	46507	90761.52	74433	YES				YES	essential nutrient
CAESIUM	166	4194	54	141.727	0.1543	NO				NO	essential nutrient
CHROMIUM	1.8	3.701	N/A	4.734	0.6018	NO				NO	no defects
COBALT	1.8	6.111	N/A	9.756	0.912	NO				NO	no defects
COPPER	2.726	4.404	N/A	6.196	0.9599	NO				NO	essential nutrient
IRON	94.84	1343	1734	6637.829	7.8	NO				NO	essential nutrient
LEAD	2.96	7.931	5.4	8.567	0.0154	YES				30	Hg p value due to nondetect in BG with low detection
LITHIUM	5.4	8.034	8.3	13.711	0.0546	NO				NO	essential nutrient
MAGNESIUM	9036	10033	10100	11266.249	16400	YES				NO	Hg p value well within literature range
MANGANESE	136.5	361.9	248	488.154	0.0366	YES				NO	no defects
MERCURY	0.1	0.315	N/A	0.439	0.1677	NO				NO	no defects
MOLYBDENUM	3.59	10.526	6.6	5.219	0.4437	NO				NO	essential nutrient
NICKEL	3.83	10.84	N/A	33.254	0.826	NO				NO	essential nutrient
NIOSIUM	1624	3070.8	2300	5432.96	0.3999	NO				NO	only 1/5 defects, mean BG
SELENIUM	1.33	4.497	1.5	5.442	0.0403	YES				NO	no defects
SILICON	6815	8229	8950	19227.637	0.1677	NO				NO	essential nutrient
SILVER	2.38	6.607	N/A	2.854	0.7349	NO				NO	essential nutrient
SODIUM	22928	26428	26400	30652.916	46400	YES				YES	Hg p value site-1.2 BG
STRONTIUM	241.8	260.4	260	472.439	0.0001	YES				YES	no defects
THALLIUM	1.14	2.899	N/A	3.864	N/A	NO				NO	no defects
TIN	9.26	22.67	N/A	22.699	0.916	NO				NO	no defects
VANADIUM	2.77	7.473	3.9	42.095	0.7444	NO				NO	no defects
ZINC	2.65	6.827	N/A	182.699	0.0969	NO				NO	no defects
<b>ORGANICS</b>											
CYANIDE	0.007	0.014	N/A	0.031	0.0404	NO				NO	no defects
NITRATE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.2	N/A				N/A	no sample data
NITRALE/NITRITE	0.05	0.119	N/A	0.369	3.111	NO				NO	no defects
NITRIE	0.01	0.024	N/A	0.012	0.056	NO				NO	no defects



HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSES AT COC's Site 7 - Pond C2

Contaminant	SITE		RAC GROUND		POTENTIAL		ESSENTIAL		LITERATURE ALE			HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS		
	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/L)	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN (ug/L)	MAX DETECT (ug/L)	DIRECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT NONDETECT	MAX DETECT (ug/L)	DIRECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT NONDETECT	TIT P-ALUE			MIN	MEAN
<b>RADIOISOTOPES</b>															
AMERICIUM 241	0.012	0.018	0.082	19	19	0.004	0.023	0.024	82	0.0736				NO	max UTL, high p value, mean < BG
CESIUM 137	0.004	0.172	0.51	26	26	0.006	1.148	1.14	76	0.4074				YES	high p value site 5 BG
PLUTONIUM 239/240	0.022	0.029	0.13	17	17	0.004	0.017	0.04	83	0.0001				YES	high p value site 3 BG
STRONTIUM 90	0.64	0.51	0.84	24	24	0.346	1.893	1.8	57	0.0065				YES	high p value site 3 BG
TRITIUM	85.109	142.63	540	20	20	51.452	140.365	569	50	0.3507				YES	high p value site 4 BG
URANIUM 233/234	1.211	1.48	2.6	27	27	0.458	1.364	2.9	60	0.0001				YES	high p value site 3 BG
URANIUM 235	0.128	0.165	0.62	27	27	0.04	0.197	0.2	56	0.0001				YES	high p value site 4 BG
URANIUM 238	1.514	1.84	4.16	27	27	0.34	1.1	1.9	4	0.1931				YES	high p value site 4 BG
<b>METALS</b>															
ALUMINUM	176.7	547.5	641	17	22	695.294	4804.672	5640	110	0.9267				NO	no detect
ANTHRACENE	12.99	17.75	N/A	0	72	14.73	56.38	26.4	97	N/A				NO	highly elevated, with BG literature range
ARSENIC	2.636	3.869	4.99	14	72	1.781	8.183	2.9	84	0.0001				YES	high p value site 1.2 BG
BARIUM	83.86	92.25	202	21	72	67.617	148.877	309	100	0.0001				YES	high p value site 1.2 BG
BERYLLIUM	0.095	1.004	0.6	1	22	0.943	4.766	8.4	87	N/A				NO	essential nutrient
CADMIUM	1.702	2.451	2.99	1	21	1.44	6.426	N/A	80	0.0001				NO	essential nutrient
CALCIUM	45259	51047	109000	22	22	24924.572	96761.525	74600	125	0.0001				YES	essential nutrient
CESIUM	198.4	361	1100	4	23	247.467	1.51727	400	97	0.0613				NO	no detect
CHROMIUM	2.807	3.667	N/A	0	72	4.234	16.843	18.9	15	0.9745				NO	highly elevated, with BG literature range
COBALT	2.788	4.291	N/A	0	27	2.386	9.264	7.9	6	N/A				NO	no detect
COPPER	4.184	7.331	11.6	6	22	6.198	28.468	15.5	93	0.8684				NO	no detect
IRON	272.045	728.3	1140	18	22	1335.635	6437.879	26300	119	0.9943				NO	essential nutrient
LEAD	5.898	11.96	75	7	22	2.044	8.587	21	37	0.3823				NO	essential nutrient
LITHIUM	13.54	17.86	13.6	1	18	34.9	13.711	11.6	98	0.0001				NO	only 1 detect elevated out of 772 detect
MAGNESIUM	14304	15095	17000	22	22	5279.619	11265.249	16600	118	0.0001				NO	high p value, mean < BG
MANGANESE	241.4	1563	1000	19	22	99.317	488.154	4060	123	0.0012				NO	essential nutrient
MERCURY	0.12	0.207	0.5	2	22	5.279	23.37	25.1	94	0.2641				NO	max UTL, high p value
MOLYBDENUM	9.203	18.81	35	2	18	7.384	33.254	12.1	92	0.6925				NO	essential nutrient
NICKEL	6.277	10.52	7	2	22	1775.375	5437.96	6700	48	0.0001				NO	high p value, site 1.3 BG
PODISSIUM	6265	6904	11700	21	22	4.5	5.462	2	4	0.0007				YES	essential nutrient
SELENIUM	1.85	2.865	10.2	4	22	1.378	5.462	2	4	0.0007				YES	high p value, site 1.3 BG
SILICON	910	N/A	910	1	1	361.877	19227.537	11700	39	0.9544				NO	max UTL, high p value
SILVER	2.027	2.965	3.17	1	27	2.865	11.482	7.9	88	0.9314				NO	essential nutrient
SODIUM	48968	52075	61000	22	22	17165.929	38650.976	45400	126	0.0001				NO	essential nutrient
STRONTIUM	331.5	355.5	400	18	20	195.594	417.439	408	89	0.0001				YES	high p value, site 1.7 BG
THALLIUM	0.025	1.913	N/A	0	22	1.043	3.846	3.4	96	N/A				NO	no detect
TIN	12.15	18.38	N/A	0	18	22.659	92.862	189	17	0.9769				NO	no detect
VANADIUM	3.309	4.945	6	4	22	7.835	42.095	18.2	27	0.9707				NO	no detect
ZINC	413.9	88.5	396	11	22	38.297	182.699	480	88	0.684				NO	max UTL, high p value
<b>INORGANICS</b>															
CYANIDE	5.175	10.53	N/A	0	10	0.006	0.031	0.0404	3	N/A				NO	no detect
NITRATE	104.4	N/A	310	3	3	0.15	N/A	0.25	1	0.0416				YES	high p value, only 1/2 detect in BG
NITRATE/NITRIE	0.255	0.321	3.1	18	64	0.399	3.111	4.3	72	0.9993				NO	no detect
NITRIE	0.008	0.024	0.024	3	51	0.012	0.054	0.058	75	N/A				NO	no detect

Table 7

(page 2 of 2)

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSES. JT COC's Site 7 - Pond C2

Contaminant	CWCDC STANDARD		SITE		MAC GROUND		SCORES		POTENTIAL COC	HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS							
	(ug/l)	(ug/l)	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DETECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLES	% PERCENT DETECT	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)				MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DETECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLES	% PERCENT DETECT	SCORE VALUE	NO. OF EXCEEDANCES	
NOA/STVAO/PESTICIDES																		
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	4.7	2.882	2.882	10	7	105	6.67	2.882	17.26	31	14	89	157	0.9907	7	YES	NO	High P value, pot lab contaminant
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.9	2.586	2.586	13	1	105	0.95	8.704	11.82	N/A	0	16	0	0.0144	1	YES	NO	only 1/105 detects
BIS(2-ETHYLENYL)PHTHALATE	1.8	8.304	8.304	44	4	21	17.39	8.704	11.82	N/A	0	16	0	0.0144	4	YES	NO	pot lab contaminant
1,1,1 TRICHLOROETHANE	200	0.1468	0.1468	0.83	2	22	9.09	66.18							0	YES	YES	2772 detects
ATRAZINE	3	0.2109	0.2109	1	45	68	66.18								0	YES	YES	46/68 detects

Table 8

(page 1 of 2)

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT C's Site 8 - Landfill Pond

Contaminant	SITE		BACTERIOLOGICAL		SCORING		POTENTIAL COC	ESSENTIAL INTRINSIC	ITERATIVE ANAL			HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS	
	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	CONCENTRATION % FOR MEAN (ug/l)	MAX DETECT (ug/l)	DETECTION FREQUENCY	SAMPLE MEAN (ug/l)	PERCENT NONDETECT			SCORE AT AUR	MIN	MEAN			MAX
<b>RADIOISOTOPES</b>														
AMERICIUM-241	0.006	0.001	0.001	13	17	23.5	0.004	0.023	0.024	82	0.023	NO	NO	Ag p value at 1.6 BG
CESIUM 137	0.159	0.321	0.6	12	17	82.4	0.004	1.158	1.7	76	0.129	NO	NO	Ag p value at 1.6 BG
PLUTONIUM 239/240	0.006	0.006	0.013	13	17	53.3	0.004	0.017	0.04	83	0.006	YES	YES	Ag p value at 1.6 BG
STRONTIUM-90	0.93	1.207	1.71	9	15	67.0	0.546	1.893	1.8	57	0.004	YES	YES	Ag p value at 0.9 BG
TRITIUM	484.691	770.894	1500	8	8	100	51.462	1403.865	550	55	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p value at 0.9 BG
URANIUM 233/234	0.255	0.317	0.434	9	16	81.3	0.458	1.344	2.69	60	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p value at 0.9 BG
URANIUM-235	0.034	0.073	0.084	9	16	100	0.04	0.193	0.2	56	0.031	NO	NO	Ag p value at 0.9 BG
URANIUM-238	0.103	0.168	0.3	9	16	100	0.36	1.13	1.82	54	0.095	NO	NO	Ag p value at 0.9 BG
<b>METALS</b>														
ALUMINUM	2615	32636	26000	13	17	23.5	695.294	4404.027	5400	79	26.2	YES	YES	max-U.L. hig p. val. only 1 elevated of 13/17 defects
ANTIMONY	19.23	26.5	27.7	3	17	82.4	14.23	55.28	26.5	91	0.004	YES	YES	Ag p value due to higher detection limit in the than BG
ARSENIC	2.64	4.65	4.6	7	15	53.3	1.781	8.183	2.9	84	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p value, but site bottom / the BG literature range
BARIUM	637.4	737.5	1550	17	17	100	67.617	148.877	306	84	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p value, site 9 BG
BERYLLIUM	0.791	1.534	N/A	0	17	100	0.943	4.754	8.4	87	N/A	NO	NO	no defects
CADMIUM	2.543	4.48	7.6	0	16	81.3	1.744	6.428	N/A	90	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p value, site has 3/16 defects, at in lower range 111
CALCIUM	181412	181956	212000	17	17	100	24924.572	96781.526	74000	126	0.001	YES	YES	essential nutrient
CELESIUM	262.9	655.6	N/A	0	17	100	247.467	1551.721	400	92	N/A	NO	NO	no defects
CHROMIUM	8.966	27.59	29.6	5	17	70.6	4.224	16.863	18.9	91	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p. val. 3 elevated of 8/17 defects, site 27BG
COPPER	7.419	12.65	19.1	8	16	50	9.256	7.9	6	88	0.024	YES	YES	Ag p. val. at 3 BG
COPPER	12.076	25.79	94.9	6	17	70.6	6.198	28.648	15.4	93	0.264	YES	YES	max-U.L. hig p. val. only 1 elevated of 8/17 defects
IRON	78473	86208	150000	17	17	100	1335.636	6637.829	26300	119	7.8	YES	YES	essential nutrient
LEAD	4.159	6.298	10.4	13	17	23.5	2.044	8.607	21	104	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p. val. but site lower part / the BG literature range
LITHIUM	66.72	156.86	107	13	17	23.5	13.711	63.036	11.6	98	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p. val. site 2 BG
MANGANESE	34682	37048	49000	17	17	100	5279.519	11255.249	16000	172	10.2	YES	YES	essential nutrient
MERCURY	0.108	0.187	0.28	1	17	94.1	0.14	0.638	1.4	94	N/A	NO	NO	Ag p. val. above literature range, at 16 BG
MOLYBDENUM	10.07	24.56	28.5	5	17	70.6	5.279	23.37	25.1	97	0.005	YES	YES	no p. test, only 1/17 defects, mean BG
NICKEL	11.75	19.7	31	4	17	76.5	7.384	33.264	12.1	14	0.0012	YES	YES	Ag p. val. at 2 BG
POTASSIUM	6404.7	7454.7	11700	16	17	59	1775.315	5437.96	6700	68	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p. val. 2 elevated out of 4/17 defects, site 1.6 BG
SELENIUM	2.122	4.14	7	1	17	94.1	1.378	5.462	2	4	0.001	YES	YES	essential nutrient
SILICON	10385	11494	13000	10	10	100	5851.897	19227.637	11700	39	0	YES	YES	Ag p. val. at 1, is well within the BG liter. for values
SILVER	5.182	9.182	16.7	6	17	70.6	2.856	11.482	7.9	88	0.0012	YES	YES	Ag p. val. at 2 BG
STRONTIUM	71006	76550.9	110000	17	17	100	17166.929	38052.976	45400	126	0.8	YES	YES	no d. facts
STRONTIUM	906.5	1062	1370	16	17	11.8	195.504	472.439	408	104	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p. val. at 4.5 BG
THALLIUM	0.866	1.226	N/A	0	17	100	1.043	3.866	3.4	3	N/A	NO	NO	essential nutrient
TIN	49.2	127.204	240	7	17	58.8	22.659	92.860	189	17	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p. val. at 2 BG
VANADIUM	26.02	50.854	211	10	17	12	7.834	42.194	18.2	27	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p. val. at 3 BG
ZINC	3194.6	4009	10000	17	17	100	38.291	182.699	480	86	0.001	YES	YES	Ag p. val. at 80 BG
<b>ORGANICS</b>														
CYANIDE	0.005	0.02	0.007	1	19	94.7	0.005	0.031	0.004	3	N/A	YES	YES	only 1/19 defects
NITRATE/NITRITE	0.184	0.184	N/A	0	1	100	0.15	N/A	0.25	1	0	NO	NO	d 1 ci
NITRITE	0.029	0.054	0.043	6	12	50	0.012	0.054	0.058	75	0.001	NO	NO	

Table 8

(page 2 of 2)

HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT Site 8 - Landfill Pond

Contaminant	CRISC STANDARD (µg/l)	SAMPLE MEAN (µg/l)	MAX (µg/l)	SITE DETECTION EFFICIENCY		SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT DETECT	SAMPLE MEAN (µg/l)	NORMAL # OF UR (µg/l)	MAX DEFECT (µg/l)	SITE DETECTION EFFICIENCY	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT DETECT	SCORES SI	NO OF ICE DANCES	POTENTIAL OC	HUMAN HEALTH COC	COMMENTS
				MAX (µg/l)	SI													
VOLATILE PETROLES																		
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	N/A	6.332	10	10	17	17	76.47								0	YES	YES	13/17 detects
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	N/A	4.335	14	14	17	17	35.29								0	YES	YES	6/17 det cl
2-BUTANONE	N/A	10.65	76	76	3	17	17.65								0	YES	YES	3/17 detects
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	N/A	9.03	12	12	17	17	11.76								0	YES	YES	2/17 detects
ACETONE	N/A	34.91	120	120	5	16	31.25								0	YES	YES	13/17 detects
CARBON DIOXIDE	N/A	2.706	6	6	17	17	5.88								0	NO	YES	8/16 detects
CHLOROETHANE	N/A	15.24	34	34	10	17	58.82								0	YES	YES	14/17 detects
ETHYL BENZENE	681	12.97	19	19	14	17	82.33								0	YES	YES	14/17 detects
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	47	16.62	190	190	5	17	29.41	4.794	17.262	31	14	14	15.7	0.9644	5	NO	NO	high p value, potential lab contaminant
TOLUENE	1000	44.32	88	88	16	17	86.24								0	YES	YES	15/17 detects
TOTAL XYLENES	N/A	14.76	24	24	13	17	76.47								0	YES	YES	13/17 detects
VINYL ACETATE	N/A	7.588	49	49	1	17	5.88								0	NO	NO	
XYLENE	N/A	6.107	8	8	2	3	66.67								0	YES	YES	2/3 detects
2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE	N/A	22.333	29	29	3	3	100								0	YES	YES	3/3 detects
4-METHYLPHENOL	N/A	11	24	24	1	3	33.33								0	NO	NO	
NAPHTHALENE	0.028	20.67	29	29	3	3	100								3	YES	YES	3/3 detects

**TABLES D-2 1 THROUGH D-2.8  
HUMAN HEALTH CANCER AND NONCANCER RISK**

**TABLE D-2.1**  
**HUMAN HEALTH CANCER AND NONCANCER RISKS Site 1 - Ponds A1 and A2**

CONTAMINANT	SAMPLE MEAN CONCENTRATION	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATION	AVERAGE DAILY INTAKE	ORAL SLOPE FACTOR	ORAL REFERENCE DOSE	CANCER RISK	RELATIVE RISK CONTRIBUTION	HAZARD QUOTIENT	RADIATION DOSE CONVERSION FACTOR	COMMITTED EFFECTIVE DOSE RATE EQUIVALENT
	(pCi/l)	(pCi/l)	(pCi/day)	SF <sub>o</sub> (risk/pCi)	(mrem/day)	(LECR)	(%)	(HQ)	(mrem/pCi)	(mrem/year)
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>										
AMERICIUM 241	0.018	0.034	0.065	2.4E-10	N/A	8.6E-08	3.4%	N/A	3.6E-03	0.087
PLUTONIUM 239/240	0.022	0.028	0.054	2.3E-10		6.8E-08	2.7%		3.5E-03	0.069
URANIUM 233/234	3.346	3.872	7.426	1.6E-11		6.5E-07	25.5%		2.9E-04	0.783
URANIUM 235	0.203	0.313	0.600	1.6E-11		5.3E-08	2.1%		2.7E-04	0.058
URANIUM 238	4.917	5.765	11.056	2.8E-11		1.7E-06	66.4%		2.5E-04	1.027
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.6E-06</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.025</b>
<b>METALS, INORGANICS VOA/SVOA/PESTICIDES</b>										
	(ug/l)	(ug/l)	(mg/kg day)	SF <sub>o</sub> (risk/(mg/kg day))	RfD <sub>o</sub> (mg/kg-day)	(LECR)	(%)	(HQ)		
LITHIUM	44.777	48.778	1.3E-03		0.6			0.018	N/A	N/A
STRONTIUM	339.615	394.417	1.1E-02		0.01	1.4E-07	3%	0.001		
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.0792	0.23	6.3E-06	5.20E-02		4.2E-08	1%			
TRICHLOROETHENE	0.0817	0.328	9.0E-06	1.10E-02		4.7E-06	96%	0.001		
ATRAZINE	1.0458	1.815	5.0E-05	2.22E-01						
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4.9E-06</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0.020</b>		

**TABLE D-2.2**  
**HUMAN HEALTH CANCER AND NONCANCER RISKS Site 2 - Ponds A3 and A4**

CONTAMINANT	SAMPLE MEAN CONCENTRATION (pCi/l)	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN EXPOSURE PT CONCENTRATION (pCi/l)	AVERAGE DAILY INTAKE (pCi/day)	ORAL SLOPE FACTOR SFO (risk/pCi)	ORAL REFERENCE DOSE (mg/kg day)	CANCER RISK (LECR)	RELATIVE RISK CONTRIBUTION (%)	HAZARD QUOTIENT (HQ)	RADIATION DOSE CONVERSION FACTOR (mrem/pCi)	COMMITTED EFFECTIVE DOSE RATE EQUIVALENT (mrem/year)
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>										
URANIUM 233 234	1 378	1 613	3 093	1 6E 11		2 7E-07	32 8%	N/A	2 9E-04	0 326
URANIUM 235	0 084	0 104	0 199	1 6E 11		1 7E-08	2 1%		2 7E-04	0 019
URANIUM 238	1 542	1 83	3 510	2 8E 11		5 4E-07	65 1%		2 5E 04	0 326
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>8 3E-07</b>	<b>100 0%</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0 672</b>
<b>METALS INORGANICS VOA/SVOA/PESTICIDES</b>										
BARIIUM	84 324	88 61	2 4E 03		RfD 7 00E-02					
NITRATE/NITRITE	2 942	3 724	1 0E-04		1 60E+00					
NITRITE	0 125	0 196	5 4E 06		1 00E-01					
DICAMBA	0 475	3 5	9 6E 05		3 00E-02		90%			
ATRAZINE	0 7281	1 525	4 2E-05	2 22E-01	3 50E-02	4 0E-06	10%			
SIMAZINE	0 1563	0 308	8 4E-06	1 20E-01	2 00E-03	4 3E-07				
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>4 4E-06</b>	<b>100 0%</b>	<b>0 043</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**TABLE D-2.3**  
**HUMAN HEALTH CANCER AND NONCANCER RISKS Site 3 - Ponds B1 and B2**

CONTAMINANT	SAMPLE MEAN CONCENTRATION (pCi/l)	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATION (pCi/l)	AVERAGE DAILY INTAKE (pCi/day)	ORAL SLOPE FACTOR SFO (risk/pCi)	ORAL REFERENCE DOSE (LECR)	CANCER RISK (LECR)	RELATIVE RISK CONTRIBUTION (%)	HAZARD QUOTIENT (HQ)	RADIATION DOSE CONVERSION FACTOR (mrem/pCi)	COMMITTED EFFECTIVE DOSE RATE EQUIVALENT (mrem/year)
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>										
AMERICIUM 241	0.021	0.038	0.073	2.4E-10	N/A	9.6E-08	9%	N/A	3.6E-03	0.097
PLUTONIUM 239/240	0.05	0.079	0.152	2.3E-10		1.9E-07	18%		3.5E-03	0.196
URANIUM 233 234	1.37	1.76	3.375	1.6E-11		3.0E-07	28%		2.9E-04	0.356
URANIUM 235	0.092	0.125	0.240	1.6E-11		2.1E-08	2%		2.7E-04	0.023
URANIUM 238	1.254	1.481	2.840	2.8E-11		4.4E-07	42%		2.5E-04	0.264
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.0E-06</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.936</b>
<b>METALS INORGANICS VOAS/VOA/PESTICIDES</b>										
LITHIUM	19.32	25.25	6.9E-04							
STRONTIUM	273	308.8	8.5E-03							
ACETONE	37.038	156.6	4.3E-03							
TRICHLOROETHENE	4.375	5.48	1.5E-04	1.10E-02		7.1E-07	5%			
cis 1,2 DICHLOROETHENE	3.3	1.631	4.5E-05							
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	0.3083	1.103	3.0E-05	1.30E-01		1.7E-06	12%			
CHLOROFORM	0.2158	0.708	1.9E-05	6.10E-03		5.1E-08	0%			
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.2133	1.857	5.1E-05	5.20E-02		1.1E-06	8%			
TRICHLOROETHENE	3.0775	8.35	2.3E-04	1.10E-02		1.1E-06	8%			
VINYL CHLORIDE	0.1783	0.414	1.1E-05	1.9		9.2E-06	66%			
cis 1,2 DICHLOROETHENE	0.75	3.4	9.3E-05							
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.4E-05</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0.542</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**TABLE D-2.4**  
**HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT COC's Site 4 - Pond B3**

CONTAMINANT	SAMPLE MEAN CONCENTRATION	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATION	AVERAGE DAILY INTAKE	ORAL SLOPE FACTOR	ORAL REFERENCE DOSE	CANCER RISK	RELATIVE RISK CONTRIBUTION	HAZARD QUOTIENT	RADIATION DOSE CONVERSION FACTOR	COMMITTED EFFECTIVE DOSE RATE EQUIVALENT
	( $\mu\text{g/l}$ )	( $\mu\text{Ci/l}$ )	( $\mu\text{Ci/day}$ )	SFo (risk/ $\mu\text{Ci}$ )		(LECR)	(%)	(HQ)	(mrem/pCi)	(mrem/yeel)
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>										
AMERICIUM 241	0.027	0.070	0.134	2.4E-10		1.8E-07	65.8%	N/A	3.6E-03	0.178
PLUTONIUM 239/240	0.018	0.038	0.073	2.3E-10		9.2E-08	34.2%		3.5E-03	0.094
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.7E-07</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.272</b>
<b>METALS INORGANICS</b>										
VOA/SVOA/PESTICIDES										
				SFo (risk/(mg/kg day))	RfDo (mg/kg day)	(LECR)	(%)	(HQ)		
NITRITE	0.636	1.298	2.489		1.00E-01					
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	0.092	0.243	0.466	2.40E-02	8.00E-01	6.8E-08	7%	0.0004	N/A	N/A
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	0.17	0.714	1.369	6.20E-02	2.00E-02	5.2E-07	52%	0.001		
CHLOROFORM	2.9	3.809	7.305	6.10E-03	1.00E-02	2.7E-07	27%	0.010		
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.04	0.122	0.234	5.20E-02	1.00E-02	7.4E-08	8%	0.000		
TRICHLOROETHENE	0.078	0.442	0.848	1.10E-02		5.7E-08	6%	0.000		
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9.9E-07</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0.012</b>		

**TABLE D-2.5**  
**HUMAN HEALTH CANCER AND NONCANCER RISKS Site 5 - Ponds B4 and B5**

CONTAMINANT	SAMPLE MEAN CONCENTRATION (pCi/l)	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATION (pCi/l)	AVERAGE DAILY INTAKE (pCi/day)	ORAL SLOPE FACTOR SFO (risk/pCi)	ORAL REFERENCE DOSE (mg/kg day)	CANCER RISK (LECR)	RELATIVE RISK CONTRIBUTION (%)	HAZARD QUOTIENT (HQ)	RADIATION DOSE CONVERSION FACTOR (mem/pCi)	COMMITTED EFFECTIVE DOSE RATE EQUIVALENT (mrem/year)
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>										
PLUTONIUM 239/240	0 009	0 012	0 023	2 3E 10	N/A	2 9E-08	4 5%	N/A	3 5E-03	0 030
TRITIUM	197 830	287 482	551 335	5 4E 14		1 6E-07	25 6%		6 4E-08	0 013
URANIUM 233 234	0 906	1 079	2 069	1 6E 11		1 8E-07	28 5%		2 9E-04	0 218
URANIUM 238	0 774	0 897	1 720	2 8E 11		2 6E-07	41 4%		2 5E 04	0 160
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6 4E-07</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0 421</b>
<b>METALS INORGANICS VOA/SVOA/PESTICIDES</b>										
	(ug/l)	(ug/l)	(mg/kg day)	SFO (risk/(mg/kg day))	RfD (mg/kg day)	(LECR)	(%)	(HQ)		
LITHIUM	14 36	21 91	6 0E-04		6 00E-01			0 013	N/A	N/A
STRONTIUM	255	284 4	7 8E 03		2 00E-02	3 5E-06	46%	0 020		
CYANIDE	9 359	14 752	4 0E-04	2 00E-02	1 60E+00			0 0001		
NITRATE	2 767	3 642	1 0E 04		1 60E+00			0 000		
NITRATE/NITRITE	3 359	4 975	1 4E-04		1 00E-01			0 0002		
NITRITE	0 409	0 576	1 6E-05		1 00E-01			0 006		
ACETONE	15 36	20 3	5 6E-04		2 00E-02	1 0E-06	14%	0 009		
BIS (2 ETHYLHEXYL) PHTHALATE	6 316	6 316	1 7E 04	1 40E 02	1 00E-02	1 4E-07	2%	0 005		
CHLOROFORM	0 743	1 93	5 3E 05	6 10E-03	1 00E-02	1 3E-07	2%	0 001		
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0 134	0 205	5 6E-06	5 20E-02	1 00E-02	1 1E-07	1%			
TRICHLOROETHENE	0 3831	0 823	2 3E-05	1 10E-02	3 00E-02			0 000		
DICAMBA	0 2195	0 385	1 1E-05	2 22E 01	3 50E-02	2 2E-06	30%	0 001		
ATRAZINE	0 556	0 857	2 3E-05	1 20E-01	2 00E-03	3 6E-07	5%	0 004		
SIMAZINE	0 1461	0 256	7 0E-06							
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7 5E-06</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0 058</b>		

**TABLE D-2.6**

**HUMAN HEALTH CANCER AND NONCANCER RISKS Site 6 - Pond C1**

CONTAMINANT	SAMPLE MEAN CONCENTRATION	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATION	AVERAGE DAILY INTAKE	ORAL SLOPE FACTOR	ORAL REFERENCE DOSE	CANCER RISK	RELATIVE RISK CONTRIBUTION	HAZARD QUOTIENT	RADIATION DOSE CONVERSION FACTOR	COMMITTED EFFECTIVE DOSE RATE EQUIVALENT
	(pCi/l)	(pCi/l)	(pCi/day)	SF <sub>o</sub> (risk/pCi)	(mrem/day)	(LECR)	(%)	(HQ)	(mrem/pCi)	(mrem/year)
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>										
PLUTONIUM 239/240	0.006	0.011	0.021	2.3E-10	N/A	2.7E-08	5.2%	N/A	3.5E-03	0.027
URANIUM 233/234	0.796	1.214	2.328	1.6E-11		2.0E-07	39.6%		2.9E-04	0.246
URANIUM 235	0.07	0.099	0.190	1.6E-11		1.7E-08	3.2%		2.7E-04	0.018
URANIUM 238	0.599	0.909	1.743	2.8E-11		2.7E-07	52.0%		2.5E-04	0.162
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5.1E-07</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.453</b>
<b>METALS INORGANICS VOA/SVOA/PESTICIDES</b>										
				SF <sub>o</sub> (risk/(mg/kg day))	RfD <sub>o</sub> (mg/kg day)	(LECR)	(%)	(HQ)		
BARIUM	91.32	121.9	3.3E-03		7.00E-02			0.048	N/A	N/A
STRONTIUM	241.8	260.4	7.1E-03		6.00E-01			0.012	N/A	N/A
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.00E+00</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0.060</b>		

**TABLE D-2.7**

**HUMAN HEALTH CANCER AND NONCANCER RISKS Site 7 - Pond C2**

CONTAMINANT	SAMPLE MEAN CONCENTRATION	LOGNORMAL 95% UCL FOR MEAN EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATION	AVERAGE DAILY INTAKE	ORAL SLOPE FACTOR	ORAL REFERENCE DOSE	CANCER RISK	RELATIVE RISK CONTRIBUTION	HAZARD QUOTIENT	RADIATION DOSE CONVERSION FACTOR	COMMITTED EFFECTIVE DOSE RATE EQUIVALENT
	(pCi/l)	(pCi/l)	(pCi/day)	SF <sub>o</sub> (risk/pCi)	N/A	(LECR)	(%)	(HQ)	(mrem/pCi)	(mrem/year)
<b>RADIONUCLIDES</b>										
PLUTONIUM 239/240	0.022	0.029	0.056	2.3E-10	N/A	7.0E-08	7.8%	N/A	3.5E-03	0.072
URANIUM 233/234	1.211	1.48	2.838	1.6E-11		2.5E-07	27.8%		2.9E-04	0.299
URANIUM 235	0.128	0.185	0.355	1.6E-11		3.1E-08	3.5%		2.7E-04	0.034
URANIUM 238	1.514	1.849	3.546	2.8E-11		5.4E-07	60.8%		2.5E-04	0.329
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8.9E-07</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.735</b>
<b>METALS INORGANICS VOA/SVOA/PESTICIDES</b>										
	(ug/l)	(ug/l)	(mg/kg day)	SF <sub>o</sub> (risk/(mg/kg day))	RfD <sub>o</sub> (mg/kg day)	(LECR)	(%)	(HQ)		
BARIUM	83.86	92.25	2.5E-03		7.0E-02			0.036		
SELENIUM	1.85	2.885	7.9E-05		5.0E-03			0.016	N/A	N/A
STRONTIUM	331.5	355.6	9.7E-03		6.0E-01			0.016		
NITRATE	104.4	N/A	2.9E-03		1.6E+00		68%	0.002		
1,1,1 TRICHLOROETHANE	0.1468	0.26	7.1E-06	1.9E+00	3.5E-02	5.8E-06	32%	0.001		
ATRAZINE	0.2109	1.047	2.9E-05	2.2E-01		2.7E-06				
					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8.5E-06</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0.071</b>		



**Table 1 Total Radiochemistry**  
(first of five pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	CMQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range	
BACKGROUND	AMERICIUM-241	82	0 05	0	0 0044	0 0029	0 01	0 008	
	CESIUM-137	76	80	0	0 0961	0 0659	0 3	0 3039	
	GROSS ALPHA	67	11	5 97	3 4365	1	3	1 5964	
	GROSS BETA	63	19	3 17	4 6234	3	5 5	2 441	
	PLUTONIUM-239/240	83	0 05	0	0 0044	0 0019	0 01	0 0049	
	STRONTIUM-89,90	57	8	0	0 5458	0 5	0 92	0 64	
	TRITIUM	53	500	3 77	51 4518	71 7449	200	210	
	URANIUM-233,234	60	10	0	0 4577	0 3055	0 7865	0 2897	
	URANIUM-235	58	10	0	0 0396	0	0 1	0 0779	
	URANIUM-238	54	10	0	0 3601	0 2	0 6584	0 3	
	A1/A2	AMERICIUM-241	9	0 05	11 11	0 0181	0 0091	0 0371	0 012
		CESIUM-137	12	80	0	0 1075	0 018	0 53	0 2775
		GROSS ALPHA	8	11	12 5	6 3954	6 15	8 1	4 3955
		GROSS BETA	10	19	10	13 5209	13	17 69	4 84
PLUTONIUM-239/240		14	0 05	0	0 0217	0 0193	0 035	0 02	
STRONTIUM-89,90		12	8	0	0 5888	0 68	0 81	0 3184	
TRITIUM		4	500	0	55 75	69 5	130	138 5	
URANIUM-233,234		14	10	0	3 3456	3 25	4 1	1 395	
URANIUM-235		14	10	0	0 2034	0 26	0 3206	0 2356	
URANIUM-238		14	10	0	4 9166	4 9705	6 5	1 854	

**Table 1: Total Radiochemistry**  
(Second of five pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	CMQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range	
A3/A4	AMERICIUM-241	48	0 05	0	0 0042	0 0033	0 0082	0 0052	
	CESIUM-137	49	80	0	0 0681	0 0274	0 17	0 1883	
	GROSS ALPHA	332	11	0 3	3 7708	3 6875	6 076	2 7755	
	GROSS BETA	332	19	0 3	6 083	5 3865	8 161	2 8635	
	PLUTONIUM-239/240	55	0 05	0	0 0046	0 003	0 0098	0 0069	
	STRONTIUM-89,90	46	8	0	0 3533	0 31	0 56	0 25	
	TRITIUM	22	500	4 55	121 2927	83 3024	181 7035	98	
	URANIUM-233,234	60	10	0	1 3781	1 2815	2 2495	0 9574	
	URANIUM-235	60	10	0	0 0842	0 0729	0 1488	0 0735	
	URANIUM-238	59	10	0	1 5419	1 231	3 007	0 95	
	B1/B2	AMERICIUM-241	9	0 05	11 11	0 0214	0 0142	0 045	0 0246
		CESIUM-137	12	80	0	0 371	0 115	0 685	0 238
		GROSS ALPHA	6	11	0	2 4188	2 245	4 2	1 385
GROSS BETA		8	19	12 5	8 5875	6 8815	9 2	1 7905	
PLUTONIUM-239/240		14	0 05	35 71	0 0488	0 6374	0 06	0 0383	
STRONTIUM-89,90		12	8	0	0 1786	0 18	0 29	0 1298	
TRITIUM		6	500	16 67	248 5	215	650	386	
URANIUM-233,234		14	10	0	1 3701	1 2095	2 2	0 827	
URANIUM-235		14	10	0	0 0816	0 1018	0 13	0 065	
URANIUM-238		14	10	0	1 2537	1 1825	1 8	0 63	

**Table 1 Total Radiochemistry**  
(Third of five pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
83	AMERICIUM-241	5	0 05	20	0 027	0 023	0 062	0 0155
	CESIUM-137	5	80	0	0 211	-0 0432	1 15	0 132
	GROSS ALPHA	3	11	0	0 3296	0 51	0 69	0 9012
	GROSS BETA	4	19	25	17 2075	14 455	32 02	13 015
	PLUTONIUM-239/240	5	0 05	0	0 0181	0 015	0 0399	0 0026
	STRONTIUM-89,90	5	8	0	0 1495	0 18	0 31	0 165
	TRITIUM	2	500	0	51 5	51 5	160	217
	URANIUM-233,234	6	10	0	0 2794	0 2281	0 93	0 335
	URANIUM-235	6	10	0	0 0272	0 0223	0 0635	0 055
	URANIUM-238	6	10	0	0 2881	0 1705	0 93	0 1125
84/85	AMERICIUM-241	28	0 05	0	0 0071	0 0051	0 022	0 0088
	CESIUM-137	32	80	0	0 0966	0 013	0 3937	0 2694
	GROSS ALPHA	185	11	0	3 6247	3 288	5 848	3 416
	GROSS BETA	186	19	0	7 6701	7 8205	9 004	2 06
	PLUTONIUM-239/240	36	0 05	0	0 0089	0 0059	0 0174	0 0079
	STRONTIUM-89,90	30	8	0	0 2597	0 2016	0 45	0 2405
	TRITIUM	23	500	8 7	197 8304	124 5024	310	193 3164
	URANIUM-233,234	35	10	0	0 9056	0 72	1 46	0 6238
	URANIUM-235	35	10	0	0 0547	0 0428	0 1105	0 0808
	URANIUM-238	35	10	0	0 7736	0 61	1 114	0 3257

Table 1 Total Radiochemistry  
(Fourth of five pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
C1	AMERICIUM-241	4	0 05	0	0 0077	0 0032	0 0233	0 0134
	CESIUM-137	5	80	0	0 2612	0 11	0 92	0 5041
	GROSS ALPHA	3	7	0	2 0793	1 828	4 2	3 99
	GROSS BETA	4	5	50	7 076	6 84	12	8 528
	PLUTONIUM-239/240	6	0 05	0	0 0063	0 005	0 0142	0 004
	STRONTIUM-89,90	5	8	0	0 3765	0 41	0 53	0 0875
	TRITIUM	2	500	0	187 5	187.5	330	285
	URANIUM-233,234	6	5	0	0 7965	0 8735	1 1	0 622
	URANIUM-235	6	5	0	0 0704	0 0744	0 098	0 0457
	URANIUM-238	6	5	0	0 5993	0 8129	0 89	0 51
	C2	AMERICIUM-241	19	0 05	5 26	0 0117	0 0052	0 017
CESIUM-137		26	80	0	0 094	0 046	0 404	0 1711
GROSS ALPHA		160	7	10 63	4 4328	4 335	6 6195	3 028
GROSS BETA		159	5	96 86	7 0018	6 84	8 015	1 397
PLUTONIUM-239/240		32	0 05	12 5	0 022	0 0127	0 045	0 0169
STRONTIUM-89,90		24	8	0	0 4519	0 3973	0 67	0 2406
TRITIUM		20	500	5	65 1089	76 8401	159 9391	132 3759
URANIUM-233,234		27	5	0	1 2115	1 2	1 796	0 98
URANIUM-235		27	5	0	0 1277	0 0953	0 2202	0 1482
URANIUM-238		27	5	0	1 5136	1 3	2	1 0063

Table 1. Total Radiochemistry  
(fifth of five pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	CMQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
LANDFILL	AMERICIUM-241	13	0 05	0	0 0064	0 004	0 0123	0 0053
	CESIUM-137	12	80	0	0 1586	0 1908	0 42	0 3053
	GROSS ALPHA	8	11	0	3 8331	3 2	4 6	2 5955
	GROSS BETA	8	19	0	9 5318	9 4655	12 67	5 235
	PLUTONIUM-239/240	13	0 05	0	0 0063	0 0061	0 009	0 0035
	STRONTIUM-89,90	9	8	0	0 9296	0 89	1 18	0 44
	TRITIUM	8	500	12 5	484 6911	364 9144	500	211 85
	URANIUM-233,234	9	10	0	0 2549	0 23	0 43	0 19
	URANIUM-235	9	10	0	0 0338	0 05	0 08	0 052
	URANIUM-238	9	10	0	0 1028	0 07	0 1737	0 097

Table 2. Total Metals  
(First of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
	ALUMINIUM	110	28.18		0.00	0	695.2936	180.0000	1450.0000	549.1000
	ANTIMONY	91	90.11	14	2.20	0	14.2297	9.4000	28.1333	13.1306
	ARSENIC	84	86.10	50	0.00	0	1.7810	1.0000	3.1250	1.4929
	BARIUM	103	18.45	1000	0.00	0	67.8185	57.4000	85.7000	26.9412
	BERYLLIUM	87	93.10	0.0076	6.90	0	0.9425	0.4888	1.9000	0.6471
	CADMIUM	80	100.00	1.5	0.00	0	1.7438	1.5581	2.9905	1.4071
	CALCIUM	125	0.00		0.00	0	24924.5720	23000.0000	33960.0000	10300.0000
	CELESTINE	92	91.30		0.00	1	247.4870	173.9130	471.4286	341.3043
	CHROMIUM	91	83.52	50	0.00	0	4.2341	3.0000	7.3000	4.2857
	COBALT	88	93.18		0.00	16	2.3979	1.7888	3.7143	1.8659
	COPPER	93	63.44	16.05	0.00	0	6.1984	4.6266	11.7847	6.8092
	IRON	129	7.75	1000	27.91	0	1335.6364	561.0000	1700.0000	952.0000
	LEAD	104	64.42	6.46	3.85	0	2.0438	1.2583	3.6000	1.8542
	LITHIUM	98	52.04		0.00	0	13.7107	4.3800	28.5714	6.6236
	MAGNESIUM	118	10.17		0.00	0	5279.6186	5090.0000	7140.0000	1720.0000
	MANGANESE	123	8.94	1000	1.63	0	99.3171	32.2000	125.0000	70.4000
	MERCURY	94	91.49	0.01	8.51	0	0.1397	0.1086	0.1855	0.1084
	MOLYBDENUM	97	87.63		0.00	21	5.2789	3.7182	8.6667	5.0526
	NICKEL	92	84.78	125	0.00	0	7.3842	4.7029	13.1000	6.8435
	POTASSIUM	100	32.00		0.00	0	1775.3750	1455.2941	3100.0000	1389.5000

**Table 2 Total Metals**  
(Second of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQCC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range	
BACKGROUND	SELENIUM	92	95 65	10	0 00	0	1 3777	0 9488	2 5000	1 2833	
	SILICON	39	0 00		0 00	0	5861 8974	4930 0000	10000 0000	4820 0000	
	SILVER	88	86 36	0 59	13 64	0	2 8562	2 3077	5 1000	2 9860	
	SODIUM	127	0 79		0 00	0	17166 9291	15400 0000	24800 0000	9400 0000	
	STRONTIUM	106	16 04		0 00	0	195 5943	140 0000	222 2222	49 6567	
	THALLIUM	96	96 88	0 012	3 13	16	1 0431	0 8944	1 7889	0 9834	
	TIN	90	81 11		0 00	0	22 6094	13 4111	35 0000	17 6667	
	VANADIUM	92	70 65		0 00	0	7 8359	3 5313	14 9000	6 5701	
	ZINC	123	28 46	45	20 33	0	36 2911	16 0000	67 6000	24 6000	
	A1/A2	ALUMINUM	13	38 46		0 00	0	209 6346	61 0000	320 0000	116 5000
		ANTIMONY	13	100 00	14	0 00	0	9 3923	6 8000	20 4800	5 5733
		ARSENIC	13	23 08	50	0 00	0	3 9154	4 1000	6 8000	4 6000
BARIUM		13	0 00	1000	0 00	0	50 4769	53 0000	60 9000	13 4000	
BERYLLIUM		13	100 00	0 0076	0 00	0	0 3692	0 3000	0 7143	0 2143	
CADMIUM		8	100 00	1 5	0 00	0	1 4625	1 3500	2 2000	1 0500	
CALCIUM		13	0 00		0 00	0	27984 6154	25800 0000	43200 0000	13400 0000	
CESIUM		13	92 31		0 00	0	153 4615	120 0000	375 0000	216 6667	
CHROMIUM		13	100 00	50	0 00	0	1 5385	1 4500	2 7500	0 8667	
COBALT		13	100 00		0 00	0	1 5115	1 4266	2 8800	1 0095	
COPPER		11	90 91	16 05	0 00	0	2 0682	1 8600	3 7000	1 7700	

**Table 2 Total Metals**  
(Third of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQCC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
A1/A2	IRON	13	46 15	1000	7 69	0	211 1846	120 0000	248 0000	100 0000
	LEAD	13	69 23	6 46	7 69	0	2 0231	0 9333	4 1000	1 2000
	LITHIUM	13	0 00		0 00	0	44 7769	45 0000	51 1000	6 5000
	MAGNESIUM	13	0 00		0 00	0	30046 1538	30000 0000	35100 0000	3900 0000
	MANGANESE	13	0 00	1000	0 00	0	128 1788	46 0000	422 0000	49 0000
	MERCURY	13	92 31	0 01	7 69	0	0 1200	0 1077	0 1846	0 0823
	MOLYBDENUM	13	84 62		0 00	0	2 9115	2 8887	5 0000	2 7000
	NICKEL	13	53 85	125	0 00	0	5 9892	4 9000	9 8000	3 6000
	POTASSIUM	13	0 00		0 00	0	7883 0789	7850 0000	8870 0000	700 0000
	SELENIUM	13	84 62	10	0 00	0	1 4000	1 1429	2 8571	1 2000
	SILICON	14	21 43		0 00	0	1075 8929	532 5000	2380 0000	1874 0000
	SILVER	13	100 00	0 59	0 00	0	1 9462	1 6000	3 5714	1 8905
	SODIUM	13	0 00		0 00	0	171384 6154	170000 0000	209000 0000	35000 0000
	STRONTIUM	13	0 00		0 00	0	339 8154	330 0000	432 0000	94 0000
	THALLIUM	13	92 31	0 012	7 69	2	1 5455	1 0867	3 0000	1 4887
	TIN	12	100 00		0 00	0	7 7456	6 7187	11 8400	4 8317
	VANADIUM	13	48 15		0 00	0	3 3692	3 2000	6 6000	1 6200
ZINC	13	76 92	45	0 00	0	5 7000	3 3333	19 0000	3 3000	

**Table 2 Total Metals**  
(Fourth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CMQCC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
A3/A4	ALUMINUM	21	28.57		0.00	0	320.0286	307.0000	630.0000	506.2000
	ANTIMONY	21	100.00	14	0.00	0	12.6476	9.3333	24.6500	10.9000
	ARSENIC	21	85.71	50	0.00	0	1.2762	1.0000	2.0000	0.9056
	BARIUM	21	4.76	1000	0.00	0	84.3238	82.8000	100.0000	12.2000
	BERYLLIUM	21	95.24	0.0076	4.76	0	0.6262	0.4667	0.8667	0.4333
	CADMIUM	18	100.00	1.5	0.00	0	1.5889	1.3750	2.5000	1.0000
	CALCIUM	21	0.00		0.00	0	45395.2381	45500.0000	51700.0000	6300.0000
	CESIUM	20	75.00		0.00	0	218.8000	65.8333	450.0000	219.0476
	CHROMIUM	21	95.24	50	0.00	0	2.2690	2.0000	3.5000	1.5500
	COBALT	21	100.00		0.00	1	2.2575	1.7071	3.6250	1.8619
	COPPER	20	70.00	16.05	5.00	0	5.0450	2.4250	12.8000	6.6750
	IRON	21	23.81	1000	0.00	0	237.5357	142.0000	480.0000	367.2000
	LEAD	20	60.00	6.46	5.00	0	2.4550	1.4500	3.1000	2.1472
	LITHIUM	17	35.29		0.00	0	13.6206	9.6000	16.6667	6.4000
	MAGNESIUM	21	0.00		0.00	0	11530.4782	11400.0000	14200.0000	3260.0000
	MANGANESE	22	4.55	1000	0.00	0	53.2091	39.2000	92.5000	61.4000
	MERCURY	24	100.00	0.01	0.00	0	0.0958	0.0913	0.1652	0.0957
MOLYBDENUM	17	82.35		0.00	1	6.5989	6.5000	13.0000	5.9167	
NICKEL	21	76.19	125	0.00	0	7.2357	4.9500	15.3333	4.1667	
POTASSIUM	21	4.76		0.00	0	5435.7143	4130.0000	7900.0000	3930.0000	

**Table 2 Total Metals**  
(Fifth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
A3/A4	SELENIUM	21	76.19	10	0.00	0	1.6024	1.5000	2.5000	1.4500
	SILICON	9	0.00		0.00	0	2891.1111	2950.0000	3450.0000	920.0000
	SILVER	21	100.00	0.59	0.00	0	1.9595	1.5000	2.9500	1.4667
	SODIUM	21	0.00		0.00	0	38071.4286	38300.0000	47700.0000	15600.0000
	STRONTIUM	18	5.56		0.00	0	301.6667	295.0000	360.0000	77.0000
	THALLIUM	21	100.00	0.012	0.00	3	1.0056	0.8333	1.5000	0.9500
	TIN	16	93.75		0.00	0	13.8531	8.1250	26.8667	12.8667
	Vanadium	21	66.67		0.00	0	3.7187	2.5000	4.5000	1.8000
	ZINC	21	33.33	45	9.52	0	20.3266	14.5500	29.0000	14.5000
	ALUMINUM	12	50.00		0.00	0	152.6458	84.2000	350.0000	187.9000
	ANTIMONY	12	100.00	14	0.00	0	10.9833	8.7867	20.4800	8.8033
	ARSENIC	9	44.44	50	0.00	0	2.1444	1.9000	3.6000	1.7667
B1/B2	BARIUM	12	33.33	1000	0.00	0	40.8167	41.8500	79.3000	49.6500
	BERYLLIUM	12	91.67	0.0076	8.33	0	0.3792	0.2813	0.5000	0.2825
	CADMIUM	10	100.00	1.5	0.00	0	1.5600	1.5667	2.2000	0.7000
	CALCIUM	12	0.00		0.00	0	21900.0000	19000.0000	30000.0000	8250.0000
	CESIUM	12	100.00		0.00	0	233.3333	225.0000	450.0000	300.0000
	CHROMIUM	11	100.00	50	0.00	0	1.9545	1.8333	3.2800	1.9000
	COBALT	12	100.00		0.00	0	1.8375	1.4200	2.8800	1.2700
	COPPER	12	100.00	16.05	0.00	0	1.8875	1.6750	3.6000	1.3100

**Table 2 Total Metals**  
(Sixth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
B1/82	IRON	12	33 33	1000	0 00	0	271 8333	239 0000	470 0000	206 0000
	LEAD	12	50 00	6 46	8 33	0	2 1708	0 9167	4 8000	2 0667
	LITHIUM	12	16 67		0 00	0	19 3167	16 5500	23 6000	10 0000
	MAGNESIUM	12	0 00		0 00	0	20141 6667	21450 0000	24500 0000	8550 0000
	MANGANESE	12	0 00	1000	0 00	0	74 5250	55 8500	138 0000	70 4500
	MERCURY	12	100 00	0 01	0 00	0	0 1000	0 1000	0 1692	0 0923
	MOLYBDENUM	12	100 00		0 00	1	3 0091	2 9000	4 5600	2 9000
	NICKEL	12	91 67	125	0 00	0	4 9500	3 8167	9 8000	3 1667
	POTASSIUM	12	0 00		0 00	0	5366 6667	5315 0000	6410 0000	1425 0000
	SELENIUM	11	100 00	10	0 00	0	0 8955	0 8250	1 3333	0 5000
	SILICON	14	28 57		0 00	0	1101 3571	845 0000	2140 0000	1473 5000
	SILVER	12	91 67	0 59	8 33	0	6 6667	2 2208	4 5333	1 8333
	SODIUM	12	0 00		0 00	0	62433 3333	63300 0000	73200 0000	16100 0000
	STRONTIUM	12	8 33		0 00	0	273 0000	245 5000	301 0000	58 0000
	THALLIUM	12	100 00	0 012	0 00	1	0 8273	0 7000	1 2667	0 5667
TIN	11	100 00		0 00	0	12 7000	7 8000	25 9333	8 6333	
VANADIUM	12	91 67		0 00	0	2 3083	2 2083	4 3333	1 9183	
ZINC	12	83 33	45	0 00	0	6 6583	4 1500	22 0000	4 8750	

Table 2 Total Metals  
(Seventh of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
	ALUMINIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	526.6000	520 0000	1000 0000	481 0000
	ANTIMONY	5	100 00	14	0 00	0	11 8400	8 5333	21 1000	10 0667
	ARSENIC	4	100 00	50	0 00	0	0 9750	0 8000	2 0000	1 0500
	BARIUM	5	20 00	1000	0 00	0	16 4900	16 0000	30 0000	12 7000
	BERYLLIUM	5	100 00	0 0076	0 00	0	0 3700	0 3333	0 6667	0 1500
	CADMIUM	3	100 00	1 5	0 00	0	1 8667	2 2000	2 3000	1 2000
	CALCIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	33940 0000	36000 0000	40000 0000	5500 0000
	CESIUM	5	80 00		0 00	0	165 0000	125 0000	375 0000	200 0000
	CHROMIUM	5	60 00	50	0 00	0	3 1700	2 7500	6 4000	1 4000
	COBALT	5	80 00		0 00	0	2 0700	2 1000	3 6500	1 2000
	COPPER	4	50 00	16 05	0 00	0	4 7125	4 6000	7 3000	4 3750
	IRON	5	80 00	1000	0 00	0	138 2000	79.5000	254.0000	152.5000
	LEAD	5	0 00	6 46	20 00	0	3 7200	3 6000	6 6000	2.3000
	LITHIUM	5	40 00		0 00	0	8 8600	9 1000	18 0000	9 0633
	MAGNESIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	6824 0000	6380.0000	8100 0000	580.0000
	MANGANESE	5	0 00	1000	0 00	0	43 3600	37.0000	63 0000	21 3000
	MERCURY	5	100.00	0 01	0 00	0	0.1600	0 1000	0 1667	0.0667
	MOLYBDENUM	5	100 00		0 00	0	4 8600	5 0000	9 0000	3 1000
	NICKEL	5	80 00	125	0 00	0	6 3500	5 3500	9 8000	4 3000
	POTASSIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	13404 0000	14000 0000	16000 0000	2500 0000

**Table 2 Total Metals**  
(Eighth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
B3	SELENIUM	5	100 00	10	0 00	0	1 1400	0 7333	2 6867	0 7333
	SILICON	6	0 00		0 00	0	4413 3333	4525 0000	5010 0000	500 0000
	SILVER	5	100 00	0 59	0 00	0	2 3800	2 5000	3 7500	2 1500
	SODIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	30300 0000	32000 0000	36000 0000	5200 0000
	STRONTIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	169 6000	158 0000	230 0000	22 0000
	THALLIUM	5	100 00	0 012	0 00	0	1 1400	0 9333	2 0000	0 7000
	TIN	5	100 00		0 00	0	10 1900	7 4000	19 4500	5 6000
	VANADIUM	5	40 00		0 00	0	5 7000	4 8000	9 7000	4 5000
	ZINC	5	20 00	45	60 00	0	45 9000	46 5000	59 9000	14 4000
	B4/B5	ALUMINIUM	24	20 83		0 00	0	336 6292	241 5000	500 0000
ANTIMONY		25	100 00	14	0 00	0	12 0440	8 8000	21 1000	10 1667
ARSENIC		24	83 33	50	0 00	0	1 3625	1 1000	2 4000	1 1500
BARIUM		24	8 33	1000	0 00	0	65 1312	66 7000	83 6000	15 9500
BERYLLIUM		25	96 00	0 0076	4 00	0	0 5640	0 4500	0 9000	0 5000
CADMIUM		22	100 00	1 5	0 00	0	1 8795	1 4187	2 6250	1 2500
CALCIUM		25	0 00		0 00	0	42540 0000	41800 0000	48000 0000	7800 0000
CESIUM		26	84 62		0 00	0	200 3077	61 2500	437 5000	216 6667
CHROMIUM		25	100 00	50	0 00	0	2 3220	2 0000	3 5000	1 7000
COBALT		25	92 00		0 00	1	2 6646	1 9333	4 3000	2 5583
COPPER	25	52 00	16 05	0 00	0	5 4120	4 5000	10 4000	6 2000	

Table 2 Total Metals  
(Ninth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVOC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
B4/BS	IRON	25	32.00	1000	0.00	0	261.3640	206.0000	515.0000	364.1000
	LEAD	23	56.52	6.46	0.00	0	2.0435	1.8000	3.6000	2.5857
	LITHIUM	22	38.38		0.00	1	14.3643	9.9000	32.2000	11.3667
	MAGNESIUM	25	0.00		0.00	0	9193.6000	6360.0000	14200.0000	1030.0000
	MANGANESE	25	12.00	1000	0.00	0	89.5220	70.2000	175.0000	80.9000
	MERCURY	26	98.15	0.01	3.85	0	0.1212	0.1000	0.1760	0.1020
	MOLYBDENUM	22	90.91		0.00	2	7.9675	6.5000	15.1667	9.5583
	NICKEL	25	92.00	125	0.00	0	5.9120	4.6000	10.0000	5.2500
	POTASSIUM	25	4.00		0.00	0	9146.8000	10100.0000	11900.0000	3640.0000
	SELENIUM	25	80.00	10	0.00	0	1.6400	1.1429	3.2000	1.6190
	SILICON	6	0.00		0.00	0	4122.5000	4045.0000	4560.0000	630.0000
	SILVER	24	91.67	0.59	8.33	0	2.1521	1.7708	3.7500	2.1375
	SODIUM	25	0.00		0.00	0	33988.0000	33000.0000	44900.0000	9900.0000
	STRONTIUM	22	9.09		0.00	0	255.0000	228.5000	370.0000	40.0000
THALLIUM	25	98.00	0.012	4.00	6	0.9605	0.8000	2.0000	1.0000	
TIN	22	95.45		0.00	1	12.3643	10.0000	19.4500	6.5000	
VANADIUM	25	64.00		0.00	0	4.3700	3.5000	6.7000	3.1000	
ZINC	25	28.00	45	20.00	0	35.3240	36.8000	52.9000	19.6000	

Table 2 Total Metals  
(Tenth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
C1	ALUMINIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	531 2000	411 0000	1040 0000	180 0000
	ANTHONY	5	80 00	14	20 00	0	15 7200	12 8000	32 2000	14 1000
	ARSENIC	5	80 00	50	0 00	0	0 9600	0 9000	2 0000	0 4000
	BARIUM	5	0 00	1000	0 00	0	91 3200	94 2000	120 0000	17 8000
	BERYLLIUM	5	60 00	0 0076	40 00	0	0 6000	0 5000	1 2000	0 3333
	CADMIUM	2	100 00	1 5	0 00	0	1 8250	1 8250	2 3000	0 9500
	CALCIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	44420 0000	46800 0000	48500 0000	3200 0000
	CESIUM	5	80 00		0 00	0	165 0000	125 0000	375 0000	200 0000
	CHROMIUM	5	100 00	50	0 00	0	1 8000	1 3667	2 7500	1 5833
	COBALT	5	100 00		0 00	0	1 8500	1 3333	3 6500	1 2000
	COPPER	4	100 00	16 05	0 00	0	2 2250	2 1333	3 1333	1 3833
	IRON	5	0 00	1000	40 00	0	904 8000	970 0000	1230 0000	370 0000
	LEAD	5	0 00	6 46	0 00	0	2 9600	2 9000	5 4000	1 7000
	LITHIUM	5	20 00		0 00	0	5 4000	4 4000	8 3000	2 0000
	MAGNESIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	9036 0000	8540 0000	10100 0000	1700 0000
	MANGANESE	5	0 00	1000	0 00	0	136 5200	135 0000	240 0000	105 0000
	MERCURY	5	100 00	0 01	0 00	0	0 1000	0 1000	0 1667	0 0667
MOLYBDENUM	5	80 00		0 00	0	3 5900	2 8500	6 6000	3 0000	
NICKEL	5	100 00	125	0 00	0	3 8300	2 5000	7 3500	3 3500	
POTASSIUM	5	40 00		0 00	0	1524 0000	1366 6667	2300 0000	670 0000	

Table 2 Total Metals  
(Eleventh of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQCC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
C1	SELENIUM	5	80 00	10	0 00	0	1 3300	1 3333	2 6667	0 9000
	SILICON	7	0 00		0 00	0	6815 7143	7050 0000	7330 0000	1380 0000
	SILVER	5	100 00	0 59	0 00	0	2 3800	2 5000	3 7500	2 1500
	SODIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	22920 0000	22000 0000	26400 0000	5500 0000
	STRONTIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	241 8000	241 0000	260 0000	28 0000
	THALLIUM	5	100 00	0 012	0 00	0	1 1400	0 9333	2 0000	0 7000
	TIN	5	100 00		0 00	0	9 2500	6 5000	19 4500	4 3667
	VANADIUM	5	80 00		0 00	0	2 7700	3 2500	3 9000	1 9000
	ZINC	5	100 00	45	0 00	0	2 6500	3 1000	3 6000	0 6500
	C2	ALUMINUM	22	22 73		0 00	0	176 7250	141 5000	365 0000
ANTHONY		22	100 00	14	0 00	0	12 3884	10 1667	22 2000	9 3333
ARSENIC		22	38 38	50	0 00	0	2 4384	2 4500	4 4000	2 0000
BARIUM		22	0 00	1000	0 00	0	83 8638	81 4000	90 3000	10 1000
BERYLLIUM		22	95 45	0 0076	4 55	0	0 5955	0 5478	0 8571	0 4762
CADMIUM		21	95 24	1 5	4 76	0	1 7024	1 5000	2 7000	1 5000
CALCIUM		22	0 00		0 00	0	45259 0909	41850 0000	56000 0000	16200 0000
CESIUM		23	82 61		0 00	0	198 3913	50 0000	400 0000	275 0000
CHROMIUM		22	100 00	50	0 00	0	2 4091	2 0000	4 2000	1 8000
COBALT		22	100 00		0 00	1	2 7881	2 2222	4 5000	1 7000
COPPER	22	72 73	16 05	0 00	0	4 1841	3 0000	7 6000	4 4500	

Table 2 Total Metals  
(Twelfth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
	IRON	22	18 18	1000	4 55	0	272 0455	220 0000	466 0000	206 3000
	LEAD	22	68 18	6 46	18 18	0	5 5977	1 0750	7 4000	2 3444
	LITHIUM	18	38 89		0 00	1	13 5559	9 2000	16 6667	4 7000
	MAGNESIUM	22	0 00		0 00	0	14304 0909	14350 0000	16400 0000	2600 0000
	MANGANESE	22	13 64	1000	0 00	0	241 4114	94 5500	629 0000	245 0000
	MERCURY	22	90 91	0 01	9 09	0	0 1205	0 1050	0 1800	0 1100
	MOLYBDENUM	18	88 89		0 00	2	9 2031	5 7500	17 3333	10 0417
	NICKEL	22	90 91	125	0 00	0	6 2773	4 5500	10 0000	6 8000
	POTASSIUM	22	4 55		0 00	0	6265 0000	6005 0000	7070 0000	1320 0000
	SELENIUM	22	81 82	10	4 55	0	1 8500	1 4643	2 8571	1 5000
	SILICON	1	0 00		0 00	0	910 0000	910 0000	910 0000	0 0000
	SILVER	22	95 45	0 59	4 55	0	2 0273	1 7946	3 1250	2 0000
	SODIUM	22	0 00		0 00	0	48968 1818	48600 0000	57300 0000	13900 0000
	STRONTIUM	20	10 00		0 00	0	331 4500	326 0000	380 0000	44 5000
	THALLIUM	22	100 00	0 012	0 00	8	0 9250	0 6833	1 4500	0 9333
	TIN	18	100 00		0 00	1	12 1471	9 7500	15 0000	6 8333
	VANADIUM	22	81 82		0 00	0	3 3091	2 1667	3 7500	1 9500
	ZINC	22	50 00	45	13 64	0	40 3932	6 8500	28 9000	14 8000

C2

Table 2 Total Metals  
(Thirteenth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CMQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
LANDFILL	ALUMINUM	17	23 53		0 00	0	2814 9059	301 0000	4090 0000	1283 3333
	ANTIMONY	17	82 35	14	17 65	1	19 2344	15 0000	30 0000	15 9167
	ARSENIC	15	53 33	50	0 00	0	2 8400	2 4000	4 6000	1 8000
	BARIUM	17	0 00	1000	5 88	0	637 4118	584 0000	780 0000	69 0000
	BERYLLIUM	17	100 00	0 0076	0 00	0	0 7912	0 4500	1 2500	0 5714
	CADMIUM	16	81 25	1 5	18 75	1	2 5433	1 7000	3 9000	2 4000
	CALCIUM	17	0 00		0 00	0	151411 7647	142000 0000	185000 0000	7000 0000
	CESIUM	17	100 00		0 00	1	252 9375	193 7500	437 5000	307 2500
	CHROMIUM	17	70 59	50	0 00	0	8 9588	5 0000	21 8000	8 8000
	COBALT	16	50 00		0 00	3	7 4192	5 8000	15 9000	1 9333
	COPPER	17	70 59	16 05	11 76	0	12 0765	5 0000	16 6667	7 5000
	IRON	17	0 00	1000	100 00	0	78478 4706	75000 0000	84300 0000	12500 0000
	LEAD	17	23 53	6 46	17 65	0	4 1588	3 0000	9 5000	3 5000
	LITHIUM	17	23 53		0 00	0	46 2176	38 7000	75 0000	10 1000
	MAGNESIUM	17	0 00		0 00	0	34682 3529	33000 0000	41600 0000	2800 0000
	MANGANESE	17	0 00	1000	100 00	0	1819 4116	1570 0000	1840 0000	280 0000
	MERCURY	17	94 12	0 01	5 88	0	0 1076	0 1000	0 1750	0 1000
MOLYBDENUM	17	70 59		0 00	5	10 0708	6 5833	21 3000	13 8063	
NICKEL	17	76 47	125	0 00	0	11 7500	9 8000	21 6000	9 2500	
POTASSIUM	17	5 88		0 00	0	6404 7059	6100 0000	7970 0000	850 0000	

**Table 2. Total Metals**  
(Fourteenth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQCC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter Quartile Range
LANDFILL	SELENIUM	17	94.12	10	0.00	1	2.1219	0.9500	3.7500	1.6250
	SILICON	10	0.00		0.00	0	10385.0000	10300.0000	11900.0000	1500.0000
	SILVER	17	70.59	0.59	29.41	0	5.6824	4.0000	11.1000	4.2333
	SODIUM	17	0.00		0.00	0	71005.8824	67100.0000	83300.0000	11800.0000
	STRONTIUM	17	11.76		0.00	0	905.4706	872.0000	1150.0000	95.0000
	THALLIUM	17	100.00	0.012	0.00	3	0.8679	0.7500	1.3333	0.5667
	TIN	17	58.82		0.00	1	49.2062	37.1000	75.0000	46.3250
	VANADIUM	17	41.18		0.00	0	25.0265	14.4000	27.3000	18.7000
	ZINC	17	0.00	45	100.00	0	3194.6471	2360.0000	3110.0000	440.0000

Table 3 Dissolved Metals  
(First of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQC-Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
	ALUMINUM	104	61.54	87	7.69	0	65.6784	31.4500	100.0000	39.9788
	ANTIMONY	65	77.94		0.00	8	15.4842	12.3000	23.7229	11.4071
	ARSENIC	66	95.45		0.00	0	1.5795	0.9345	2.5000	1.0545
	BARIUM	117	36.75		0.00	0	51.1179	43.4000	67.8000	25.8500
	BERYLLIUM	61	90.16		0.00	0	1.4328	0.7692	2.1000	1.3487
	CADMIUM	49	95.92		0.00	0	1.9582	1.8000	3.1816	1.6606
	CALCIUM	125	0.00		0.00	0	24639.5200	22800.0000	33900.0000	10800.0000
	CESIUM	89	89.86		0.00	47	82.7955	68.6687	200.0000	105.8333
	CHROMIUM	61	88.52		0.00	0	4.1869	2.9500	7.4571	3.7831
	COBALT	58	98.28		0.00	10	3.8104	2.1250	6.9375	3.3173
	COPPER	97	62.89		0.00	0	7.2402	5.0000	13.8000	8.6500
	IRON	125	33.60	300	14.40	0	150.9772	69.9000	298.0000	145.7000
	LEAD	87	81.61		0.00	0	1.3534	0.9333	2.5000	1.4000
	LITHIUM	91	56.04		0.00	0	19.6725	4.9000	56.2500	25.1250
	MAGNESIUM	122	14.75		0.00	0	5056.9672	5035.0000	6780.0000	1950.0000
	MANGANESE	121	25.62	50	17.36	0	36.5832	14.3000	56.6000	32.2500
	MERCURY	54	85.19		0.00	0	0.1319	0.1170	0.1957	0.1149
	MOLYBDENUM	65	89.23		0.00	6	30.8475	17.0633	73.5294	50.6324
	NICKEL	57	94.74		0.00	0	8.8860	5.5500	16.1816	10.0333
	POTASSIUM	97	37.11		0.00	0	1609.4227	1280.0000	2727.2727	1485.0000

**Table 3 Dissolved Metals**  
(Second of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non Detect	CHQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range	
BACKGROUND	SELENIUM	57	98 25		0 00	1	1 6071	1 2250	2 6667	1 2429	
	SILICON	42	4 76		0 00	0	5887 8571	4840 0000	10000 0000	5210 0000	
	SILVER	70	90 00		0 00	5	2 6954	2 0667	4 4667	2 3000	
	SODIUM	124	0 81		0 00	0	17485 8871	15800 0000	26100 0000	8800 0000	
	STRONTIUM	110	23 64		0 00	0	210 4291	141 0000	333 3333	53 0000	
	THALLIUM	69	97 10		0 00	0	2 0217	1 2667	3 5714	1 7571	
	TIN	75	78 67		0 00	0	66 0113	27 4000	82 0513	56 5000	
	VANADIUM	78	83 33		0 00	9	3 1667	2 3125	5 7375	2 4375	
	ZINC	111	40 54		0 00	0	17 5239	9 0000	27 0000	16 1000	
	A1/A2	ALUMINUM	11	81 82	87	0 00	0	33 8455	21 6000	64 8000	49 6667
		ANTIMONY	13	100 00		0 00	0	9 3923	8 8000	20 4800	5 5733
		ARSENIC	12	16 67		0 00	0	4 0167	4 5500	5 9000	4 0000
		BARIUM	13	0 00		0 00	0	43 6615	48 3000	60 0000	15 1000
BERYLLIUM		13	100 00		0 00	0	0 3769	0 3571	0 7143	0 2143	
CADMIUM		12	91 67		0 00	0	1 3875	1 4250	2 2000	0 9125	
CALCIUM		13	0 00		0 00	0	27792 3077	25500 0000	43300 0000	12800 0000	
CESIUM		13	92 31		0 00	0	150 0000	82 5000	375 0000	212 5000	
CHROMIUM		13	92 31		0 00	0	1 6038	1 6400	2 7500	1 4333	
COBALT		13	100 00		0 00	0	1 5115	1 4286	2 8800	1 0095	
COPPER		12	75 00		0 00	0	2 7825	2 2900	4 5000	2 7883	

Table 3 Dissolved Metals  
(Third of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CMQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	65th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
A1/A2	IRON	12	66.67	300	0.00	0	18.6500	16.0000	31.5000	18.9500
	LEAD	13	61.54		0.00	0	1.3462	0.9000	2.6000	1.5000
	LITHIUM	13	0.00		0.00	0	43.4385	44.1000	51.2000	11.9000
	MAGNESIUM	13	0.00		0.00	0	30269.2308	31000.0000	34100.0000	2900.0000
	MANGANESE	13	23.08	50	15.38	0	62.6077	15.3000	190.0000	40.4000
	MERCURY	13	92.31		0.00	0	0.1415	0.1077	0.1846	0.0923
	MOLYBDENUM	13	69.23		0.00	0	3.6423	2.8500	6.8000	3.0867
	NICKEL	13	76.92		0.00	0	4.4077	3.3333	9.8000	2.9333
	POTASSIUM	13	0.00		0.00	0	7676.9231	7600.0000	8600.0000	900.0000
	SELENIUM	13	100.00		0.00	0	1.2538	0.8800	2.8571	1.1429
	SILICON	14	21.43		0.00	0	935.1071	478.0000	1840.0000	1195.5000
	SILVER	13	100.00		0.00	0	1.9462	1.6000	3.5714	1.8995
	SODIUM	13	0.00		0.00	0	17397.6923	180000.0000	200000.0000	22000.0000
	STRONTIUM	13	0.00		0.00	0	345.5385	340.0000	442.0000	125.0000
	THALLIUM	13	100.00		0.00	0	3.0385	1.2867	9.0000	2.2000
	TIN	13	100.00		0.00	0	7.4192	6.9333	11.8400	5.2133
VANADIUM	13	61.54		0.00	0	2.8500	3.0000	3.8000	1.9667	
ZINC	11	100.00		0.00	0	3.0182	2.0000	7.5000	2.4000	

Table 3 Dissolved Metals  
(Fourth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQCC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
A3/A4	ALUMINUM	32	68.75	87	0.00	0	23.8234	18.3333	36.0000	19.1333
	ANTIMONY	32	93.75		0.00	0	13.9141	10.6667	25.0000	13.1750
	ARSENIC	32	81.25		0.00	0	1.4281	1.0625	2.6000	1.3750
	BARIUM	32	3.13		0.00	0	77.2453	74.5000	91.4000	16.2000
	BERYLLIUM	32	96.88		0.00	0	0.5406	0.4600	0.8400	0.4100
	CADMIUM	30	96.67		0.00	0	1.6300	1.4250	2.5385	1.3846
	CALCIUM	32	0.00		0.00	0	43712.5000	44350.0000	51700.0000	10450.0000
	CESIUM	28	92.86		0.00	1	90.0370	50.0000	142.8571	75.0000
	CHROMIUM	32	100.00		0.00	0	2.4219	2.0250	4.5000	1.6321
	COBALT	32	96.88		0.00	1	2.9742	1.8000	5.1429	2.3500
	COPPER	32	78.13		0.00	0	5.0008	2.4857	10.7500	3.1071
	IRON	30	73.33	300	0.00	0	14.0825	4.9500	28.2000	13.2500
	LEAD	32	71.88		0.00	0	1.0125	0.8438	1.9000	1.0000
	LITHIUM	25	36.00		0.00	2	12.1370	8.4000	14.5000	7.4000
	MAGNESIUM	32	0.00		0.00	0	10944.3750	10500.0000	13600.0000	3665.0000
	MANGANESE	35	20.00	50	17.14	0	28.5329	11.0000	54.5000	41.8000
MERCURY	33	84.85		0.00	0	0.3133	0.1143	0.1929	0.1071	
MOLYBDENUM	25	84.00		0.00	2	9.0630	6.5000	14.8571	8.0429	
NICKEL	32	90.63		0.00	0	6.6797	4.4875	14.2000	7.2929	
POTASSIUM	32	3.13		0.00	0	6488.7500	7135.0000	9290.0000	4150.0000	

Table 3. Dissolved Metals  
(Fifth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CHQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
A3/A4	SELENIUM	32	78 13		0.00	0	1 7969	1 5528	3 4000	1 6944
	SILICON	9	0 00		0.00	0	2426 6567	2230 0000	3260 0000	850 0000
	SILVER	32	96 88		0.00	0	2 0734	1 7222	3 7500	1 8389
	SODIUM	32	0 00		0.00	0	37703 1250	36250 0000	48400 0000	10650 0000
	STRONTIUM	26	11 54		0.00	0	286 3077	274 0000	348 0000	90 0000
	THALLIUM	31	100 00		0.00	0	1 8468	0 8571	3 3333	1 6500
	TIN	24	95 83		0.00	2	13 3273	7 8000	25 0000	8 0000
	VANADIUM	32	84 38		0.00	1	2 5129	2 9000	4 2857	2 3714
	ZINC	32	46 88		0.00	0	17 8422	10 2500	30 9000	14 4500
	ALUMINUM	9	88 89	87	0.00	0	38 4989	33 8000	64 8000	21 6000
	ANTIMONY	12	91 67		0.00	0	12 1333	10 2950	20 4800	10 4800
	ARSENIC	11	45 45		0.00	0	1 7636	1 1000	4 1000	2 9250
B1/B2	BARIUM	11	45 45		0.00	0	34 8192	28 8000	70 6000	52 7500
	BERYLLIUM	11	100 00		0.00	0	6 3182	0 3125	0 5000	0 2500
	CADMIUM	10	100 00		0.00	0	1 5900	1 5687	2 2000	0 7000
	CALCIUM	12	0 00		0.00	0	20866.8667	18700 0000	26100 0000	7550 0000
	CELESIUM	12	100 00		0.00	1	209 0909	200 0000	400 0000	300 0000
	CHROMIUM	12	100 00		0.00	0	1 8750	1 7367	3 2800	1 6200
	COBALT	12	100 00		0.00	0	1 8375	1 4200	2 8800	1 2700
	COPPER	12	83 33		0.00	0	2 5750	2 0150	3 7600	2 2375

Table 3. Dissolved Metals  
(Sixth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CWQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
91/82	IRON	12	50.00	300	0.00	0	35 4750	32 4250	63 5000	24 7000
	LEAD	12	58.33		0.00	0	2 7625	0 8250	3 1500	1 1500
	LITHIUM	11	27.27		0.00	0	16 5455	12 7000	21 0000	9 3500
	MAGNESIUM	12	0.00		0.00	0	19891 6667	22500 0000	23800 0000	8750 0000
	MANGANESE	11	36.36	50	0.00	0	18 2091	5 9000	43 0000	30 7500
	MERCURY	12	100.00		0.00	0	0 1000	0 1000	0 1892	0 0923
	MOLYBDENUM	12	91.67		0.00	0	7 4208	3 1167	8 8000	3 7833
	NICKEL	12	91.67		0.00	0	4 2542	3 7500	7 1333	3 6417
	POTASSIUM	12	8.33		0.00	0	4991 6667	5230 0000	6790 0000	2055 0000
	SELENIUM	12	100.00		0.00	0	0 8667	0 7700	1 3333	0 4800
	SILICON	14	14.29		0.00	0	1112 3214	639 5000	2360 0000	1434 0000
	SILVER	12	100.00		0.00	0	2 1333	2 0875	4 0000	1 5583
	SODIUM	12	8.33		0.00	0	60254 1667	65000 0000	74400 0000	13250 0000
	STRONTIUM	12	8.33		0.00	0	289 0633	241 0000	295 0000	48 5000
	THALLIUM	12	91.67		0.00	0	1 0333	1 0000	1 5000	0 9083
	TIN	12	100.00		0.00	0	12 2583	8 2333	25 9333	7 6367
VANADIUM	12	91.67		0.00	0	2 2167	1 9500	4 3333	1 5300	
ZINC	12	83.33		0.00	0	4 2750	2 8125	7 0000	3 8250	

Table 3. Dissolved Metals  
(Seventh of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CHQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
	ALUMINUM	4	75 00	87	25 00	0	88 8000	54 0000	220 0000	118 8000
	ANTIMONY	5	80 00		0 00	0	13 5400	14 0000	21 1000	8 5333
	ARSENIC	5	100 00		0 00	0	0 8500	0 6000	2 0000	0 6500
	BARIUM	5	40 00		0 00	0	13 8200	12 0000	30 0000	13 9500
	BERYLLIUM	5	100 00		0 00	0	0 3700	0 3333	0 6667	0 1500
	CADMIUM	3	100 00		0 00	0	1 8667	2 2000	2 3000	1 2000
	CALCIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	33780 0000	34000 0000	43000 0000	8600 0000
	CESIUM	5	100 00		0 00	0	183 0000	125 0000	375 0000	210 0000
	CHROMIUM	5	100 00		0 00	0	2 0500	2 0500	3 4500	1 4167
	COBALT	5	100 00		0 00	0	1 8500	1 3333	3 6500	1 2000
	COPPER	5	40 00		0 00	0	5 8900	2 7000	17 0000	2 6000
	IRON	5	40 00	300	0 00	0	60 3800	37 0000	186 0000	38 0000
	LEAD	5	40 00		0 00	0	1 8700	1 5000	3 0000	2 4000
	LITHIUM	5	40 00		0 00	0	8 2200	7 9000	19 0000	7 3333
	MAGNESIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	6618 0000	6510 0000	8500 0000	660 0000
	MANGANESE	5	0 00	50	20 00	0	40 3000	33 0000	66 0000	8 7000
	MERCURY	5	100 00		0 00	0	0 1000	0 1000	0 1667	0 0667
	MOLYBDENUM	5	40 00		0 00	0	9 4300	6 6500	16 0000	10 1000
	NICKEL	5	100 00		0 00	0	4 9100	4 9000	9 8000	2 8500
	POTASSIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	13128 0000	14100 0000	15000 0000	2100 0000

**Table 3 Dissolved Metals**  
(Eighth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CMQCC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
83	SELENIUM	5	100.00		0.00	0	1.1400	0.7333	2.6667	0.7333
	SILICON	6	0.00		0.00	0	4330.0000	4535.0000	4710.0000	550.0000
	SILVER	5	100.00		0.00	0	2.3600	2.5000	3.7500	2.1500
	SODIUM	5	0.00		0.00	0	30220.0000	31000.0000	36000.0000	6400.0000
	STRONTIUM	5	0.00		0.00	0	168.6000	156.0000	230.0000	19.0000
	THALLIUM	4	100.00		0.00	0	0.6750	0.6500	0.9333	0.3833
	TIN	5	100.00		0.00	0	10.1900	7.4000	19.4500	5.6000
	VANADIUM	5	60.00		0.00	0	4.6500	3.8000	9.0000	2.0500
	ZINC	5	20.00		0.00	0	45.4600	55.8000	58.9000	7.0000
	84/85	ALUMINIUM	53	54.72	87	7.55	0	35.9255	20.9091	61.0000
ANTIMONY		56	92.86		0.00	0	11.4437	9.0288	21.1000	11.2806
ARSENIC		54	81.48		0.00	0	1.4139	1.2707	2.6667	1.2621
BARIUM		53	3.77		0.00	0	63.7689	62.0000	83.0000	12.4000
BERYLLIUM		54	96.30		0.00	0	0.5598	0.4896	0.8542	0.5208
CADMIUM		45	95.56		0.00	0	1.5067	1.3846	2.4375	1.2933
CALCIUM		54	0.00		0.00	0	41521.2963	41050.0000	46600.0000	6800.0000
CESIUM		48	85.42		0.00	2	90.4935	45.3125	200.0000	63.3000
CHROMIUM		54	94.44		0.00	0	2.4296	1.9412	4.6667	2.4412
COBALT		54	87.04		0.00	1	2.6396	2.0000	5.0000	2.1333
COPPER	54	59.26		0.00	0	5.0167	3.4667	8.9000	4.9333	

Table 3: Dissolved Metals  
(Ninth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CMQCC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
84/85	IRON	53	60.38	300	0.00	0	21.4396	11.5000	37.7000	20.8000
	LEAD	54	61.11		0.00	0	1.3537	0.9423	2.1500	1.3000
	LITHIUM	43	23.26		0.00	3	13.6313	8.9500	22.7000	8.1000
	MAGNESIUM	54	0.00		0.00	0	8693.7963	8485.0000	9380.0000	1090.0000
	MANGANESE	54	12.96	50	27.76	0	45.2954	15.4500	110.0000	58.4000
	MERCURY	53	96.23		0.00	0	0.1047	0.1020	0.1785	0.1020
	MOLYBDENUM	43	51.16		0.00	3	12.7200	6.4500	13.2667	6.2750
	NICKEL	54	92.59		0.00	0	4.9694	3.7500	9.0000	4.0000
	POTASSIUM	54	1.85		0.00	0	9559.0741	9525.0000	11400.0000	2550.0000
	SELENIUM	54	90.74		0.00	0	1.4806	1.0819	2.5000	1.2839
	SILICON	9	0.00		0.00	0	3910.0000	4150.0000	4320.0000	740.0000
	SILVER	54	98.15		0.00	0	1.8204	1.5817	3.3000	1.7917
	SODIUM	54	0.00		0.00	0	32759.2593	32600.0000	37200.0000	6000.0000
	STRONTIUM	42	9.52		0.00	0	243.5476	230.0000	268.0000	40.0000
	THALLIUM	53	96.23		0.00	0	2.2132	0.9000	4.2857	1.5929
	TIN	43	83.72		0.00	3	27.3813	8.0476	22.5250	7.7583
	VANADIUM	54	51.85		0.00	1	3.4698	3.5000	5.4000	2.5455
ZINC	53	15.09		0.00	0	27.6302	23.8000	44.2000	18.5000	

Table 3 Dissolved Metals  
(Tenth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CWQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
C1	ALUMINUM	4	100 00	87	0 00	0	33 7250	28 9500	72 0000	40 5500
	ANTIMONY	5	80 00		0 00	0	12 9400	11 0000	21 1000	8 5333
	ARSENIC	4	100 00		0 00	0	0 9750	0 8000	2 0000	1 0500
	BARIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	85 8000	88 6000	110 0000	12 6000
	BERYLLIUM	5	100 00		0 00	0	0 3600	0 3333	0 6667	0 0333
	CADMIUM	3	100 00		0 00	0	1 7667	1 6500	2 3000	0 9500
	CALCIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	46120 0000	47200 0000	48800 0000	3400 0000
	CESIUM	5	80 00		0 00	0	173 0000	125 0000	375 0000	160 0000
	CHROMIUM	5	100 00		0 00	0	1 7700	1 3667	2 7500	1 4000
	COBALT	5	100 00		0 00	0	1 8500	1 3333	3 6500	1 2000
	COPPER	5	60 00		0 00	0	4 4500	2 7000	9 7000	4 1500
	IRON	5	40 00	300	0 00	0	35 5300	36 0000	67 0000	24 7000
	LEAD	5	60 00		0 00	0	1 0100	0 7000	1 8000	1 1000
	LITHIUM	5	20 00		0 00	0	6 4700	6 8000	10 2000	2 2000
	MAGNESIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	9284 0000	9400 0000	10200 0000	1490 0000
	MANGANESE	5	0 00	50	80 00	0	77 0400	92 0000	114 0000	41 2000
	MERCURY	5	100 00		0 00	0	0 1000	0 1000	0 1667	0 0667
MOLYBDENUM	5	100 00		0 00	0	2 8400	2 0000	5 0000	1 9000	
NICKEL	5	100 00		0 00	0	3 8300	2 5000	7 3500	3 3500	
POTASSIUM	5	40 00		0 00	0	1522 0000	1600 0000	2100 0000	493 3333	

**Table 3 Dissolved Metals**  
(Eleventh of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CWQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
C1	SELENIUM	5	80 00		0 00	0	1 2700	1 2000	2 9667	0 7333
	SILICON	7	0 00		0 00	0	6058 5714	6270 0000	6810 0000	1450 0000
	SILVER	5	100 00		0 00	0	2 3800	2 5000	3 7500	2 1500
	SODIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	23420 0000	24000 0000	27000 0000	6000 0000
	STRONTIUM	5	0 00		0 00	0	245 6090	250 0000	270 0000	15 0000
	THALLIUM	4	100 00		0 00	0	0 6750	0 6500	0 9333	0 3633
	TIN	5	100 00		0 00	0	9 2500	6 5000	19 4500	4 3667
	VANADIUM	5	100 00		0 00	0	2 1990	1 9000	3 8000	1 9167
	ZINC	5	80 00		0 00	0	3 6200	2 5000	9 6000	2 1000
	C2	ALUMINUM	51	52 94	87	1 96	0	35 2284	17 0500	35 5000
ANTIMONY		52	64 62		0 00	0	12 4058	10 0500	22 2727	11 7945
ARSENIC		52	53 85		0 00	0	2 0817	2 0000	3 5000	1 9500
BARIUM		52	1 92		0 00	0	72 5135	72 1000	87 1000	18 2600
BERYLLIUM		52	100 00		0 00	0	0 5500	0 5100	0 8800	0 5000
CADMIUM		46	97 83		0 00	0	1 5033	1 3810	2 5000	1 2657
CALCIUM		52	0 00		0 00	0	41379 8077	40000 0000	54000 0000	15350 0000
CESIUM		44	81 82		0 00	2	77 1476	39 7368	166 6667	59 8474
CHROMIUM		52	96 15		0 00	0	2 3856	1 8831	4 3750	2 3030
COBALT		52	100 00		0 00	1	2 2784	1 7333	4 0000	2 0000
COPPER		52	55 77		0 00	0	6 5519	3 6667	12 5000	7 0667

**Table 3 Dissolved Metals**  
(Twelfth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQCC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
C2	IRON	51	60.78	300	0.00	0	21.0147	5.7333	50.0000	27.6000
	LEAD	52	69.23		0.00	0	1.1269	0.8448	2.0000	1.2690
	LITHIUM	39	23.08		0.00	2	12.2500	10.0000	13.0000	3.4000
	MAGNESIUM	52	0.00		0.00	0	14909.6154	14850.0000	16900.0000	2250.0000
	MANGANESE	52	9.62	50	51.92	0	120.0654	57.5000	193.0000	149.2500
	MERCURY	50	92.00		0.00	0	0.1198	0.1089	0.1867	0.1111
	MOLYBDENUM	39	82.05		0.00	2	7.4784	4.4000	14.4444	6.7000
	NICKEL	52	96.15		0.00	0	4.9856	3.0909	10.0000	4.7159
	POTASSIUM	52	1.92		0.00	0	6217.0192	6220.0000	7180.0000	1122.5000
	SELENIUM	51	90.20		0.00	0	1.5304	1.1111	2.7368	1.2697
	SILICON	4	0.00		0.00	0	949.0000	811.0000	1370.0000	286.0000
	SILVER	52	98.08		0.00	0	1.7769	1.5625	3.2000	1.6775
	SODIUM	52	0.00		0.00	0	51372.1154	52100.0000	59400.0000	11500.0000
	STRONTIUM	41	7.32		0.00	0	338.5976	331.0000	402.0000	56.0000
	THALLIUM	52	96.15		0.00	0	2.5894	1.1000	6.0000	2.5952
	TIN	39	82.05		0.00	2	13.7797	10.0000	23.9000	8.8889
	VANADIUM	52	78.85		0.00	1	2.2588	2.0000	4.0000	2.5000
ZINC	51	56.86		0.00	0	11.9275	3.1333	14.1000	7.2333	

**Table 3 Dissolved Metals**  
(Thirteenth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CHOC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
LANDFILL	ALUMINIUM	16	87 50	87	0 00	0	40 2062	20 9250	73 6000	46 7500
	ANTIMONY	16	87 50		0 00	1	18 9833	15 0000	30 0000	17 1333
	ARSENIC	14	84 29		0 00	0	2 2643	1 5000	4 6000	1 7667
	BARIUM	16	0 00		0 00	0	560 3750	570 0000	641 0000	84 0000
	BERYLLIUM	14	92 86		0 00	0	1 2679	0 5250	2 5000	0 9167
	CADMIUM	16	93 75		0 00	1	2 0633	1 6500	3 3333	1 7167
	CALCIUM	16	0 00		0 00	0	146125 000	141500 000	163000 000	22500 000
	CESIUM	16	93 75		0 00	5	167 1364	100 0000	357 1429	214 2857
	CHROMIUM	16	93 75		0 00	0	5 6000	2 8250	10 2500	7 3333
	COBALT	16	62 50		0 00	3	5 3808	4 7000	12 6000	4 2333
	COPPER	16	87 50		0 00	0	5 3375	3 6500	10 0000	5 2917
	IRON	16	0 00	300	100 00	0	68293 7500	69200 0000	78600 0000	13000 0000
	LEAD	16	75 00		0 00	0	2 5612	0 8417	3 6000	1 8917
	LITHIUM	16	25 00		0 00	0	45 8844	36 9500	75 0000	11 5000
	MAGNESIUM	16	0 00		0 00	0	34400 0000	32750 0000	40600 0000	7650 0000
	MANGANESE	16	0 00	50	100 00	0	1568 7500	1500 0000	1740 0000	306 0000
MERCURY	16	100 00		0 00	0	0 0989	0 0938	0 1625	0 0938	
MOLYBDENUM	16	87 50		0 00	1	17 0600	6 5000	40 0000	17 1500	
NICKEL	16	81 25		0 00	0	10 2125	7 2417	16 7000	9 6917	
POTASSIUM	16	12 50		0 00	0	5575 0000	5835 0000	6370 0000	1235 0000	

**Table 3 Dissolved Metals**  
(Fourteenth of fourteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CWQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
LANDFILL	SELENIUM	15	100.00		0.00	1	1 3571	1 1000	2 5000	0 8500
	SILICON	11	0.00		0.00	0	10000 0000	10300 0000	10900 0000	1230 0000
	SILVER	16	93.75		0.00	1	3 6833	2 5000	5 0000	2 8667
	SODIUM	16	0.00		0.00	0	71400 0000	67200 0000	83600 0000	15500 0000
	STRONTIUM	16	6.25		0.00	0	927 1875	924 0000	1130 0000	181 0000
	THALLIUM	16	100.00		0.00	0	1 8094	1 1667	2 5000	1 2917
	TIN	16	68.75		0.00	0	85 4844	25 3667	183 0000	55 5167
	VANADIUM	16	68.75		0.00	3	5 6115	3 5000	9 5500	3 9667
	ZINC	16	0.00		0.00	0	1637 4375	1590 0000	2260 0000	785 0000

Table 4 Water Quality Parameters  
(First of thirteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CHQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
BACKGROUND	BICARBONATE	55	0 00		0 00	0	89 9073	86 0000	130 0000	54 0000
	BICARBONATE AS CaCO3	73	0 00		0 00	0	89 4890	90 0000	115 0000	30 0000
	CARBONATE	58	98 28		0 00	0	2 8486	2 5000	4 4118	2 7451
	CARBONATE AS CaCO3	70	70 00		0 00	20	4 8700	4 4318	8 4091	5 6818
	CHLORIDE	127	6 30	250000	0 00	0	17 0756	12 0000	29 0000	18 4000
	CYANIDE	106	97 17	5	0 00	0	0 0061	0 0048	0 0098	0 0065
	DISSOLVED ORGANIC CARBON	9	0 00		0 00	0	5 7776	5 0000	8 8000	3 0000
	FLUORIDE	76	7 89	2000	0 00	0	0 3393	0 3200	0 4390	0 0850
	NITRATE	2	50 00	10000	0 00	0	0 1500	0 1500	0 2500	0 2000
	NITRATE/NITRITE	125	42 40	10000	0 00	0	0 3693	0 1000	0 8700	0 5079
	NITRITE	75	98 00	500	0 00	0	0 0116	0 0100	0 0179	0 0106
	OIL AND GREASE	80	73 75		0 00	0	2 9937	2 8750	4 7000	3 1593
	ORTHOPHOSPHATE	67	94 03		0 00	0	0 0211	0 0170	0 0404	0 0277
PHOSPHORUS	76	61 84		0 00	0	0 0372	0 0262	0 0600	0 0317	
SILICA	24	8 33		0 00	0	8 0171	4 7000	12 0000	7 9000	
SULFATE	127	1 57	250000	0 00	0	19 3929	17 8000	27 0000	12 0000	
SULFIDE	55	89 09	2	9 09	5	0 7800	0 5967	0 9556	0 5556	
TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS	125	0 00		0 00	0	174 166	160 000	212 0000	50 0000	
TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON	19	0 00		0 00	0	6 5737	6 0000	11 3000	5 1000	
TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS	132	37 12		0 00	0	21 1174	7 0000	26 0000	12 0455	

**Table 4 Water Quality Parameters**  
(Second of thirteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non Detect	CMQCC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
A1/A2	AMMONIA	10	10 00	60	0 00	0	0 4850	0 3850	0 5200	0 2200
	BICARBONATE AS CaCO3	14	0 00		0 00	0	183 057	194 500	253 0000	59 0000
	CARBONATE AS CaCO3	14	7 14		0 00	0	75 3714	75 4500	85 8000	41 4000
	CHLORIDE	14	0 00	250000	0 00	0	129 143	127 500	142 0000	16 0000
	CYANIDE	14	100 00	5	0 00	0	0 0061	0 0054	0 0092	0 0050
	DISSOLVED ORGANIC CARBON	6	0 00		0 00	0	16 1667	16 5000	17 0000	2 0000
	FLUORIDE	12	0 00	2000	0 00	0	2 8633	2 7500	3 6000	0 4500
	HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM	8	100 00	11	0 00	0	0 0094	0 0086	0 0150	0 0088
	NITRATE/NITRITE	14	57 14	10000	0 00	0	0 1029	0 0833	0 1600	0 0756
	NITRITE	14	92 86	500	0 00	0	0 0114	0 0107	0 0171	0 0100
	OIL AND GREASE	14	78 57		0 00	0	3 9000	3 0500	6 1000	1 2500
	ORTHOPHOSPHATE	14	64 29		0 00	0	0 0460	0 0375	0 0650	0 0640
	PHOSPHORUS	14	21 43		0 00	0	0 0825	0 0745	0 1200	0 0700
	SULFATE	14	0 00	250000	0 00	0	163 0786	153 5000	212 0000	118 0000
	SULFIDE	14	100 00	2	0 00	0	0 5000	0 5000	0 8000	0 4667
	TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS	14	0 00		0 00	0	703 8571	694 0000	782 0000	68 0000
TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON	6	0 00		0 00	0	19 1667	19 5000	21 0000	2 0000	
TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS	14	28 57		0 00	0	8 7143	7 0000	14 0000	6 0000	

Table 4 Water Quality Parameters  
(Third of thirteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CMQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
A3/A4	ALKALINITY AS CaCO3	1	100 00		0 00	0	5 0000	5 0000	5 0000	0 0000
	AMMONIA	95	15 79	60	0 00	0	2 5453	1 3000	5 5000	3 8800
	BICARBONATE	25	0 00		0 00	0	106 7600	106 0000	125 0000	30 0000
	BICARBONATE AS CaCO3	31	3 23		0 00	0	104 4774	112 0000	135 0000	40 0000
	CARBONATE AS CaCO3	35	97 14		0 00	0	5 5429	4 8875	8 4375	5 0000
	CHLORIDE	53	0 00	250000	0 00	0	49 5284	46 0000	61 0000	18 0000
	CYANIDE	13	92 31	5	0 00	0	2 8731	0 0150	10 0000	5 5607
	DISSOLVED ORGANIC CARBON	3	0 00		0 00	0	5 0000	5 0000	6 0000	2 0000
	FLUORIDE	55	43 64	2000	0 00	0	0 4077	0 4400	0 6000	0 2200
	HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM	30	100 00	11	0 00	1	0 0053	0 0054	0 0066	0 0046
	HYDROGEN SULFIDE	1	100 00		0 00	0	0 5000	0 5000	0 5000	0 0000
	NITRATE	4	0 00	10000	0 00	0	110 7000	4 9000	430 0000	214 6000
	NITRATE/NITRITE	107	0 93	10000	0 00	0	2 9416	3 2000	4 2000	2 1000
	NITRITE	55	7 27	500	0 00	0	0 1247	0 0700	0 1800	0 1000
	OIL AND GREASE	17	82 35		0 00	0	5 1588	3 0500	6 3000	2 0000
	ORTHOPHOSPHATE	44	70 45		0 00	0	0 0315	0 0172	0 0600	0 0341
PHOSPHATE	31	54 84		0 00	0	0 0355	0 0200	0 0660	0 0513	
PHOSPHORUS	16	50 00		0 00	0	0 0669	0 0417	0 1000	0 0700	

Table 4 Water Quality Parameters  
(Fourth of thirteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CWQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
A3/A4	SILICON	10	0 00		0 00	0	4 0200	4 0000	4 2000	0 0000
	SULFATE	53	0 00	250000	0 00	0	57 2660	54 0000	68 0000	20 0000
	SULFIDE	9	100 00	2	0 00	0	0 5000	0 5000	0 8000	0 4000
	TOTAL ALKALINITY	46	2 17		0 00	0	104 0326	105 0000	125 0000	35 0000
	TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS	55	0 00		0 00	0	320 5091	300 0000	350 0000	80 0000
	TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON	3	0 00		0 00	0	6 8667	7 0000	8 0000	3 0000
	TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS	383	46 48		0 00	0	8 5581	4 6094	16 0000	9 0469
B1/B2	AMMONIA	10	0 00	60	0 00	0	0 7100	0 4050	0 7800	0 3400
	BICARBONATE AS CaCO3	14	0 00		0 00	0	96 7766	89 8000	148 0000	76 5000
	CARBONATE AS CaCO3	14	21 43		0 00	0	63 1786	58 0000	106 0000	67 7000
	CHLORIDE	14	0 00	250000	0 00	0	76 4500	81 2500	88 6000	15 9000
	CYANIDE	14	100 00	5	0 00	0	0 0075	0 0089	0 0125	0 0063
	DISSOLVED ORGANIC CARBON	6	0 00		0 00	0	13 3333	14 0000	16 0000	3 0000
	FLUORIDE	14	0 00	2000	0 00	0	0 9750	1 0000	1 1000	0 1800
	HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM	8	100 00	11	0 00	0	0 0100	0 0100	0 0156	0 0089
	HYDROGEN SULFIDE	2	100 00		0 00	0	0 5000	0 5000	0 6667	0 3333
	NITRATE/NITRITE	14	85 71	10000	0 00	0	0 0771	0 0577	0 0923	0 0536
	NITRITE	14	85 71	500	0 -00	0	0 0164	0 0115	0 -0185	0 0106

Table 4 Water Quality Parameters  
(Fifth of thirteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range	
B1/82	OIL AND GREASE	14	92.85		0.00	0	3.2821	2.8750	3.3600	0.6000	
	ORTHOPHOSPHATE	14	57.14		0.00	0	0.0589	0.0417	0.1000	0.0598	
	PHOSPHATE	2	0.00		0.00	0	0.1415	0.1415	0.1900	0.0970	
	PHOSPHORUS	14	14.29		0.00	0	0.1120	0.1095	0.1700	0.0830	
	SODIUM SULFATE	2	0.00		0.00	0	23.7000	23.7000	26.7000	10.0000	
	SULFATE	14	0.00	250000	0.00	0	21.9786	21.4000	30.9000	14.1000	
	SULFIDE	14	100.00	2	0.00	0	0.5000	0.5000	0.8000	0.4667	
	TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS	14	0.00		0.00	0	335.2857	319.0000	374.0000	92.0000	
	TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON	6	0.00		0.00	0	16.8333	16.5000	22.0000	7.0000	
	TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS	14	50.00		0.00	0	6.5357	5.1875	13.0000	6.5000	
	B3	AMMONIA	3	0.00	60	0.00	0	15.3333	19.3000	23.0000	19.3000
		BICARBONATE AS CaCO3	6	0.00		0.00	0	100.6167	111.0000	142.0000	40.3000
		CARBONATE AS CaCO3	6	100.00		0.00	0	5.0000	5.0000	8.5714	4.2857
		CHLORIDE	6	0.00	250000	0.00	0	55.9500	59.2000	64.6000	6.3000
CYANIDE		6	100.00	5	0.00	0	0.0050	0.0050	0.0066	0.0043	
DISSOLVED ORGANIC CARBON		3	0.00		0.00	0	7.3333	8.0000	9.0000	4.6000	
FLUORIDE		6	0.00	2000	0.00	0	0.3467	0.3350	0.4200	0.0900	
HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM		3	100.00	11	0.00	0	0.0100	0.0100	0.0150	0.0100	
HYDROGEN SULFIDE		1	100.00		0.00	0	0.5000	0.5000	0.5000	0.0000	
NITRATE/NITRITE		5	0.00	10000	0.00	0	7.3200	8.7000	9.8000	1.9000	
NITRITE	4	0.00	500	0.00	0	0.6363	0.5450	1.4000	0.7475		

Table 4 Water Quality Parameters  
(Sixth of thirteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CWQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
83	OIL AND GREASE	6	83.33		0.00	0	5.1750	3.0750	17.2000	0.8000
	ORTHOPHOSPHATE	6	0.00		0.00	0	0.2750	0.2850	0.3500	0.1000
	PHOSPHATE	1	0.00		0.00	0	0.2800	0.2800	0.2800	0.0000
	PHOSPHORUS	6	16.67		0.00	0	0.3075	0.3100	0.5100	0.1900
	SODIUM SULFATE	1	0.00		0.00	0	67.5000	67.5000	67.5000	0.0000
	SULFATE	6	0.00	250000	0.00	0	77.1500	75.0500	98.6000	17.0000
	SULFIDE	6	100.00	2	0.00	0	0.5000	0.5000	0.8571	0.4286
	TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS	6	0.00		0.00	0	282.3333	285.0000	314.0000	44.0000
	TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON	3	0.00		0.00	0	13.0000	12.0000	19.0000	11.0000
	TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS	6	66.67		0.00	0	3.5000	3.5000	6.0000	3.0000
84/85	2,3,7,8-TCDD	6	100.00		0.00	0	0.5675	0.5375	1.0500	0.4900
	AMMONIA	85	3.53	60	0.00	0	6.8512	5.9000	11.1000	6.0000
	BICARBONATE	36	0.00		0.00	0	109.2500	106.5000	135.0000	24.5000
	BICARBONATE AS CaCO3	38	2.63		0.00	0	96.2789	97.5000	120.0000	31.6000
	CARBONATE AS CaCO3	46	100.00		0.00	0	4.7935	4.6591	6.4091	5.0000
	CHLORIDE	67	0.00	250000	0.00	0	48.0313	43.0000	62.0000	20.0000
	CYANIDE	16	68.75	5	31.25	0	9.3591	3.7500	29.4000	14.7433
	DISSOLVED ORGANIC CARBON	17	0.00		0.00	0	6.2353	6.0000	7.0000	1.0000
	FLUORIDE	68	47.06	2000	0.00	0	0.3956	0.4297	0.6000	0.2972
	HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM	51	98.04	11	0.00	0	0.0055	0.0053	0.0089	0.0052

Table 4 Water Quality Parameters  
(Seventh of thirteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CVQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
84/85	HYDROGEN SULFIDE	1	100 00		0 00	0	0 5000	0 5000	0 5000	0 0000
	NITRATE	3	0 00	10000	0 00	0	2 7867	2 6000	3 2000	0 7000
	NITRATE/NITRITE	94	3 19	10000	0 00	0	3 3593	3 2000	4 3000	1 4000
	NITRITE	64	0 00	500	0 00	0	0 4095	0 3350	0 6600	0 3600
	OIL AND GREASE	30	83 33		0 00	0	4 1817	2 7974	5 4000	2 2105
	ORTHOPHOSPHATE	45	17 78		0 00	0	0 0941	0 0800	0 1600	0 0967
	PHOSPHATE	42	42 86		0 00	0	0 1207	0 0350	0 2900	0 1642
	PHOSPHORUS	30	6 67		0 00	0	0 1773	0 1700	0 2800	0 1300
	SILICA, DISSOLVED	2	0 00		0 00	0	6 2000	6 2000	9 0000	5 6000
	SILICON	14	0 00		0 00	0	4 2857	4 0000	5 0000	1 0000
	SODIUM SULFATE	1	0 00		0 00	0	69 9000	69 9000	69 9000	0 0000
	SULFATE	66	0 00	250000	0 00	0	58 3333	58 5000	74 0000	24 0000
	SULFIDE	20	95 00	2	0 00	0	0 5300	0 5528	0 6694	0 4737
	TOTAL ALKALINITY	60	0 00		0 00	0	105 8750	102 0000	133 5000	22 6000
	TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS	70	0 00		0 00	0	348 0429	279 0000	340 0000	60 0000
TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON	17	0 00		0 00	0	8 4118	6 0000	10 0000	1 0000	
TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS	242	13 64		0 00	0	16 4649	11 2500	30 0000	15 0000	

Table 4 Water Quality Parameters  
(Eighth of thirteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CMQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
C1	ALKALINITY AS CaCO3	1	0 00		0 00	0	165 0000	165 0000	165 0000	0 0000
	AMMONIA	7	28 57	60	0 00	0	0 3186	0 2600	0 4100	0 2767
	BICARBONATE	1	0 00		0 00	0	165 0000	165 0000	165 0000	0 0000
	BICARBONATE AS CaCO3	6	0 00		0 00	0	141 0167	153 0000	194 0000	44 0000
	CARBONATE AS CaCO3	7	85 71		0 00	0	6 2143	5 7143	6 5714	5 7143
	CHLORIDE	7	0 00	250000	0 00	0	24 9000	24 6000	29 3000	6 7000
	CYANIDE	7	100 00	5	0 00	0	0 0071	0 0060	0 0100	0 0060
	DISSOLVED ORGANIC CARBON	4	0 00		0 00	0	5 5000	5 5000	7 0000	2 0000
	FLUORIDE	7	0 00	2000	0 00	0	0 4529	0 4500	0 4900	0 0700
	HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM	4	100 00	11	0 00	0	0 0088	0 0075	0 0150	0 0075
	NITRATE/NITRITE	7	100 00	10000	0 00	0	0 0500	0 0500	0 0750	0 0500
	NITRITE	7	100 00	500	0 00	0	0 0100	0 0100	0 0150	0 0100
	OIL AND GREASE	7	85 71		0 00	0	3 4714	3 0500	3 3000	0 8500
	ORTHOPHOSPHATE	7	85 71		0 00	0	0 0294	0 0286	0 0429	0 0286
	PHOSPHORUS	6	50 00		0 00	0	0 0388	0 0438	0 0540	0 0290
	SULFATE	7	0 00	250000	0 00	0	17 9286	15 8000	23 6000	10 1000
	SULFIDE	7	85 71	2	0 00	0	0 4829	0 5000	0 6667	0 3867
	TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS	7	0 00		0 00	0	240 2857	256 0000	256 0000	36 0000
	TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON	4	0 00		0 00	0	8 2500	7 5000	12 0000	4 5000
	TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS	7	14 29		0 00	0	15 5000	18 0000	18 0000	6 0000

Table 4 Water Quality Parameters  
(Ninth of thirteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CMQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
	2,3,7,8-TCDD	6	100.00		0.00	0	2.1858	0.7500	6.5000	4.2100
	AMMONIA	61	39.34	60	0.00	0	1.2052	0.474	2.8000	1.2158
	BICARBONATE	37	0.00		0.00	0	173.7297	158.0000	205.0000	38.0000
	BICARBONATE AS CaCO3	27	3.70		0.00	0	141.3293	140.0000	180.0000	46.0000
	CARBONATE AS CaCO3	40	100.00		0.00	0	4.7825	4.6053	8.2885	5.0000
	CHLORIDE	59	0.00	250000	0.00	0	49.5593	50.0000	58.0000	9.0000
	CYANIDE	10	100.00	5	0.00	0	5.1750	5.0000	8.8889	5.5558
	DISSOLVED ORGANIC CARBON	13	0.00		0.00	0	8.1538	8.0000	10.0000	2.0000
	FLUORIDE	58	3.45	2000	0.00	0	0.8517	0.8000	0.6000	0.1000
	HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM	45	97.78	11	0.00	0	0.0057	0.0052	0.0089	0.0050
	NITRATE	3	0.00	10000	0.00	0	104.4000	1.9000	310.0000	308.7000
	NITRATE/NITRITE	64	71.86	10000	0.00	0	0.2347	0.0838	0.3400	0.0713
	NITRITE	51	94.12	500	0.00	0	0.0075	0.0059	0.0100	0.0059
	OIL AND GREASE	21	61.90		0.00	0	6.2524	3.9286	12.0000	5.9571
	ORTHOPHOSPHATE	29	51.72		0.00	0	0.0354	0.0260	0.0850	0.0436
	PHOSPHATE	34	47.06		0.00	0	0.0404	0.0100	0.1100	0.0747
	PHOSPHORUS	20	5.00		0.00	0	0.1308	0.0900	0.1900	0.1100
	SILICA, DISSOLVED	3	0.00		0.00	0	6.2000	6.0000	9.0000	5.1000
	SILICON	11	54.55		0.00	0	1.9091	1.7143	4.0000	2.1429

Table 4 Water Quality Parameters  
(Twelfth of thirteen pages)

Pond	Analyte	Sample Size	Percent Non-Detect	CMQC Standard	Percent Above Standard	Number of Non-Detects Omitted	Mean	Median	85th Percentile	Inter-Quartile Range
LANDFILL	HEPTACHLOR	1	100 00		0 00	0	0 0000	0 0000	0 0000	0 0000
	HEPTACHLOR EPOXIDE	2	100 00		0 00	0	0 0000	0 0000	0 0000	0 0000
	METHOXYCHLOR	2	100 00		0 00	0	0 0003	0 0003	0 0003	0 0000
	NITRATE	1	100 00	10000	0 00	0	0 0500	0 0500	0 0500	0 0000
	NITRATE/NITRITE	16	50 00	10000	0 00	0	0 1656	0 0950	0 5100	0 1700
	NITRITE	12	50 00	500	0 00	0	0 0294	0 0280	0 0500	0 0295
	OIL AND GREASE	18	61 11		0 00	0	4 9417	2 0333	4 1333	2 9500
	ORTHOPHOSPHATE	8	87 50		0 00	0	0 0316	0 0250	0 0429	0 0286
	PHOSPHATE	5	20 00		0 00	0	0 0960	0 1000	0 1500	0 0100
	PHOSPHORUS	14	14 29		0 00	0	0 3308	0 1100	0 5900	0 2215
	SILICA, DISSOLVED	3	0 00		0 00	0	19 5887	6 3000	43 0000	35 6000
	SULFATE	16	75 00	250000	0 00	0	6 0469	2 5000	13 8000	6 7083
	SULFIDE	8	100 00	2	0 00	1	0 5000	0 5000	0 7500	0 5000
	TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS	17	0 00		0 00	0	772 7059	760 0000	940 0000	142 0000
	TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON	4	0 00		0 00	0	21 7000	21 6500	24 5000	5 4000
	TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS	16	0 00		0 00	0	400 5625	126 0000	750 0000	152 5000
TOXAPHENE	2	100 00		0 00	0	0 0005	0 0005	0 0007	0 0003	

Table 5 POND WATER IM/IRA VOA/SVOA PROPOSED CONTAMINANTS OF CONCERN  
(First of six pages)

Site	Group	Analyte	CMQC Standard	Sample Size	Percent Detect	Number of Exceedances	Mean (µg/L)
A1-A2	CLP Volatiles (1)	ACETONE		10	10	0	6.55
	CLP Semi-Volatiles (2)	BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	1.8	12	8.33	1	22.875
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	1,2,3-TRICHLOROBENZENE		11	9.09	0	0.0555
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE		12	8.33	0	0.0558
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	BENZENE, 1,2,4-TRIMETHYL		11	9.09	0	0.0564
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	0.45	12	8.33	0	0.07
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	NAPHTHALENE	0.0028	12	8.33	1	0.1483
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.8	12	16.67	0	0.0792
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	TRICHLOROETHENE	66	12	16.67	0	0.0817
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	cis-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	10	12	8.33	0	0.08
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	n-BUTYLBENZENE		11	9.09	0	0.1491
	Tri-Pesticides-EPA 619 (15)	ATRAZINE	3	12	83.33	0	1.0458

Table 5 POND WATER IM/IRA VOA/SVOA PROPOSED CONTAMINANTS OF CONCERN  
(Second of six pages)

Site	Group	Analyte	CMQCC Standard	Sample Size	Percent Detect	Number of Exceedances	Mean (µg/L)
A3 A4	CLP Volatiles (1)	1,1 DICHLOROETHENE	0.057	132	0.76	1	2.6098
	CLP Volatiles (1)	METHYLENE CHLORIDE	4.7	132	6.82	9	2.9621
	CLP Volatiles (1)	TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.8	132	1.52	2	2.6212
	CLP Semi-Volatiles (2)	BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	1.8	33	6.06	2	5.4091
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	1,1,1 TRICHLOROETHANE	200	16	6.25	0	0.0888
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	1,1 DICHLOROETHENE	0.057	16	6.25	1	0.1381
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.8	16	6.25	0	0.08
	Herbicides-EPA 615 (11)	DICAMBA		12	58.33	0	0.83
	Herbicides-EPA 615 (11)	DICHLOROPROP		12	8.33	0	0.475
	Tri Pesticides-EPA 619 (15)	ATRAZINE	3	76	59.21	5	0.7281
	Tri Pesticides-EPA 619 (15)	SIMAZINE	4	64	12.5	0	0.1563

Table 5 POND WATER IM/IRA VOA/SVOA PROPOSED CONTAMINANTS OF CONCERN

(Third of six pages)

Site	Group	Analyte	CMOCC Standard	Sample Size	Percent Detect	Number of Exceedances	Mean (µg/L)
81 82	CLP Volatiles (1)	1,2-DICHLOROETHENE		16	6 25	0	2 9063
	CLP Volatiles (1)	ACETONE		13	30 77	0	37 0365
	CLP Volatiles (1)	METHYLENE CHLORIDE	4 7	16	12 5	2	4 875
	CLP Volatiles (1)	TRICHLOROETHENE	66	16	31 25	0	4 375
	CLP Volatiles (1)	cis-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	70	1	100	0	3 3
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE		12	8 33	0	0 0567
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	18	12	16 67	0	0 3083
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	CHLOROFORM	6	12	58 33	0	0 2158
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	NAPHTHALENE	0 0028	12	8 33	1	0 12
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	TETRACHLOROETHENE	0 8	12	58 33	1	0 2133
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	TOLUENE	1000	12	8 33	0	0 1333
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	TRICHLOROETHENE	66	12	50	0	3 0775
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	VINYL CHLORIDE	2	12	16 67	0	0 1763
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	cis-1,2 DICHLOROETHENE	70	11	36 36	0	0 75
	Tri-Pesticides-EPA 619 (15)	ATRAZINE	3	12	8 33	0	0 3033

Table 5 POND WATER IM/IRA VOA/SVOA PROPOSED CONTAMINANTS OF CONCERN  
(Fourth of six pages)

Site	Group	Analyte	CVQC Standard	Sample Size	Percent Detect	Number of Exceedances	Mean (µg/L)
B3	CLP Volatiles (1)	ACETONE		6	16.67	0	8.1667
	CLP Volatiles (1)	CHLOROFORM	6	6	16.67	0	3
	CLP Volatiles (1)	METHYLENE CHLORIDE	4.7	6	16.67	1	3.6667
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	HEPTACHLOR	0.00021	6	16.67	0	0.0219
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	alpha-BHC	0.0039	6	16.67	0	0.0219
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	alpha-CHLORDANE		6	16.67	0	0.2192
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	beta-BHC	0.014	6	16.67	0	0.0219
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	gamma BHC (LINDANE)	0.019	6	16.67	0	0.0219
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	gamma-CHLORDANE		6	16.67	0	0.2192
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	75	5	60	0	0.092
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	0.3	5	40	0	0.17
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	CHLOROFORM	6	5	100	0	2.9
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.8	5	60	0	0.04
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	TRICHLOROETHENE	66	5	80	0	0.078
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502.2 (9)	cis-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	70	4	25	0	0.08
Tri-Pesticides-EPA 619 (15)	PROPAGINE		5	20	0	0.32	

Table 5 POND WATER IM/IRA VOA/SVOA PROPOSED CONTAMINANTS OF CONCERN  
(Fifth of six pages)

Site	Group	Analyte	CMQC Standard	Sample Size	Percent Detect	Number of Exceedances	Mean (µg/L)
B4 85	CLP Volatiles (1)	ACETONE		120	10	0	15 3575
	CLP Volatiles (1)	METHYLENE CHLORIDE	4.7	121	5.79	7	2 7987
	CLP Volatiles (1)	TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.8	121	1.65	2	2 5992
	CLP Semi-Volatiles (2)	BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	1.8	31	9.68	3	6 3161
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	alpha BHC	0.0039	18	5.56	0	0 0238
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	alpha-CHLORDANE		8	12.5	0	0 2238
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	beta-BHC	0.014	18	5.56	1	0 0268
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	gamma-BHC (LINDANE)	0.019	18	5.56	0	0 0238
	CLP Pesticides/PCBs (7)	gamma-CHLORDANE		8	12.5	0	0 2238
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	CHLOROFORM	6	29	62.07	0	0 7428
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.8	28	25	0	0 1339
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	TRICHLOROETHENE	66	29	27.59	0	0 3831
	Herbicides-EPA 615 (11)	DICAMBA		22	13.64	0	0 2195
	Tri-Pesticides-EPA 619 (15)	ATRAZINE	3	91	83.52	1	0 556
	Tri-Pesticides-EPA 619 (15)	SIMAZINE	4	80	15	0	0 1461
C1		NONE					
C2	CLP Volatiles (1)	METHYLENE CHLORIDE	4.7	105	6.67	7	2 8819
	CLP Volatiles (1)	TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.8	105	0.95	1	2 5857
	CLP Semi-Volatiles (2)	BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	1.8	23	17.39	4	8 3043
	Selected Compounds-EPA 502 2 (9)	1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	200	22	9.09	0	0 1468
	Tri-Pesticides-EPA 619 (15)	ATRAZINE	3	68	66.18	0	0 2109

Table 5 POND WATER IM/IRA VOA/SVOA PROPOSED CONTAMINANTS OF CONCERN  
(Sixth of six pages)

Site	Group	Analyte	CVQCC Standard	Sample Size	Percent Detect	Number of Exceedances	Mean (µg/L)
SW097*	CLP Volatiles (1)	1,1-DICHLOROETHANE		17	76.47	0	6.3824
	CLP Volatiles (1)	1,2-DICHLOROETHENE		17	35.29	0	4.3529
	CLP Volatiles (1)	2-BUTANONE		17	17.65	0	10.6471
	CLP Volatiles (1)	4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE		17	11.76	0	9.0294
	CLP Volatiles (1)	ACETONE		16	31.25	0	34.9063
	CLP Volatiles (1)	CARBON DISULFIDE		17	5.88	0	2.7059
	CLP Volatiles (1)	CHLOROETHANE		17	58.82	0	15.2353
	CLP Volatiles (1)	ETHYLBENZENE	680	17	82.35	0	12.9706
	CLP Volatiles (1)	METHYLENE CHLORIDE	4.7	17	29.41	5	15.6178
	CLP Volatiles (1)	TOLUENE	1000	17	88.24	0	44.3235
	CLP Volatiles (1)	TOTAL XYLENES		17	76.47	0	14.7647
	CLP Volatiles (1)	VINYL ACETATE		17	5.88	0	7.5882
	CLP Volatiles (1)	o XYLENE		3	66.67	0	5.1667
	CLP Semi-Volatiles (2)	2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE		3	100	0	22.3333
	CLP Semi Volatiles (2)	4-METHYLPHENOL		3	33.33	0	11
	CLP Semi-Volatiles (2)	NAPHTHALENE	0.0028	3	100	3	20.6667

\*SW097=Landfill Pond

## APPENDIX E

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table E 1 A	Potential Chemical specific Benchmarks Groundwater Quality Standards
Table E 1 B	Potential Chemical specific Benchmarks Federal Surface Water Quality Standards
Table E 1 C	Potential Chemical-specific Benchmarks Statewide and Basin (CDH/CWQCC) Surface Water Quality Standards
Table E 1 D	Potential Chemical-specific Benchmarks Stream Segment (CDH/CWQCC) Surface Water Quality Standards
Table E 1 E	Potential Chemical specific Benchmarks Soil Contaminant Criteria
Table E 2	Colorado Air Quality Control Commission Standards
Table E 3	Potential Location-specific Benchmarks
Table E 4	Potential Action specific Benchmarks
Table E 5	F039 Hazardous Waste Standards from 40 CFR 268 41 and 268 43

**TABLE E-1 A**  
**POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS**  
**GROUNDWATER QUALITY STANDARDS**

**TABLE E-1.A**  
**POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16 1992)**  
**GROUNDWATER QUALITY STANDARDS**  
**ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN  $\mu\text{g/l}$  UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED**

Parameter	Type	Method	FEDERAL STANDARDS					STATE STANDARDS								
			SDWA Maximum Contaminant Level	RCRA Subpart Limit	CDH WQCC Groundwater Quality Standards (g)											
			Table 1 (a) (b)	Table 1 (c)	Table 1 (d)	Table 1 (e)	Table 1 (f)	Table 1 (g)	Table 2 (h)	Table 3 (i)	Table 4 (j)	Table 5 (k)	Table 6 (l)			
Chloride		E325	250,000 (a)		200 (a)				200	250,000						
Cyanide (Free)		E326	200 (a)		200 (a)				200							
Fluoride		E340	4,000-2,000* (a)		1,000 (a)				1,000							
N as Nitrate		E353		100 (a)		1,000 (a)			100		2,000					
N as Nitrate Nitrite		E353		1,000 (a)		1,000 (a)			100		10,000					
N as Nitrite		E354		100 (a)		1,000 (a)			100		10,000					
Sulfate		E375.4	250,000* (a)							250,000						
Sulfate, H2S Undissociated		E376														
Coliform (Fecal)	B	SM9221 C	100 ml (a)***						100 ml							
Ammonia as Nitrogen	C	E350	10 (a)		10 (a)			0.000022					10 (a)			
Boron	E	SM901 (C8)									750					
Chlorine, Total Residual	E	SM4500														
Sulfur	E															
Dissolved Oxygen	FP	SM4500														
pH (Standard Units)	FP	E 30	5.5 (a)						6.5-8.4		6.5-8.4					
Specific Conductance	FP	E120														
Temperature (Degrees Celsius)	FP															
Alkalinity	IN	E31														
Asbestos	IN	E 30		7MF (a)		7MF (a)										
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	IN	E 30	500,000* (a)										400,000 (i)			
Total Organic Carbon (TOC)	IN	E														
Aluminum	M	(3)		50 to 200* (a)							5,000					
Antimony	M	(3)	50 (a)		50 (a)		50		50		50					
Arsenic	M	(3)														
Arsenic	M	(3)														
Barium	M	(3)	2,000 (a)			2,000 (a)	100		100							
Beryllium	M	(3)	1 (a)		1 (a)											
Cadmium	M	(3)	1 (a)		1 (a)											
Calcium	M	(3)														
Cesium	M	(3)	50 (a)		50 (a)		50		50		50					
Chromium	M	(3)														
Chromium III	M	(3)														
Chromium VI	M	E21														
Cobalt	M	(3)														
Copper	M	(3)	100 (a)		100 (a)		100		100		100					
Iron	M	(3)	300 (a)		300 (a)				300		300					
Lead	M	(3)	50 (a)		50 (a)		50		50		50					
Lithium	M	(3)														
Magnesium	M	(3)														
Manganese	M	(3)	50 (a)		50 (a)				50		50					
Mercury	M	(3)	1 (a)		1 (a)											
Molybdenum	M	(3)														
Nickel	M	(3)	100 (a)		100 (a)											
Potassium	M	(3)														
Selenium	M	(3)	1 (a)		1 (a)											
Silver	M	(3)	50 (a)		50 (a)		50		50		50					
Sodium	M	(3)														
Strontium	M	(3)														
Thallium	M	(3)	1 (a)		1 (a)											
Tin	M	(3)														
Titanium	M	(3)														
Uranium	M	SM901 (C8)														
Vanadium	M	SM901 (C8)														
Zinc	M	(3)	5,000 (a)								5,000					











**TABLE E-1 B**  
**POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS**  
**FEDERAL SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS**





**TABLE E-1 B (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16 1992)  
 FEDERAL SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS  
 ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ug/l UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Parameter	Type (7)	Method (8)	SDWA Maximum Contaminant Level			SDWA Maximum Contaminant Level Goals			CWA AWQC for Protection of Aquatic Life (9)		CWA AWQC for Protection of Human Health (c) Water and Fish Consumption Only	
			Maximum Contaminant Level	Maximum Contaminant Level Goals	Maximum Contaminant Level Goals	Acute Value	Chronic Value	Water and Fish Ingestion	Fish Consumption Only			
Cesium 134 (pCi/l)	R		(4)									
Cesium 137 (pCi/l)	R		(4)									
Gross Alpha (pCi/l)	R		15 (a)(9)									
Gross Beta (pCi/l)	R		50 (a)(4)(9)									
Plutonium (total) (pCi/l)	R		J (a)(4)									
Plutonium 238+239+240 (pCi/l)	R		(a)(4)(9)									
Radium 226+228 (pCi/l)	R		B (a)(6)									
Strontium 90+90 (pCi/l)	R		(a)(4)									
Strontium 90 (pCi/l)	R		20,000 (a)(4)(9)									
Thorium 230+232 (pCi/l)	R											
Tritium (pCi/l)	R											
Uranium 233+234 (pCi/l)	R											
Uranium 235 (pCi/l)	R											
Uranium 238 (pCi/l)	R											
Uranium (total) (pCi/l)	R											
1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	JV	(8)(1)	70 (b)	70 (b)	600 (b)	900 (b)	270 (1)	970 (1)	30	48		
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	SV	(8)						0.042	0.042	0.56		
1,2-Dichlorobenzene (Ortho)	SV	(8)(8)						2.800	2.800	3.0		
1,2-Dichlorobenzene (Para)	SV	(8)	75 (a)	75 (a)			2,020 (1)	365 (1)	2.800	3.0		
1,3-Dichlorobenzene (Meta)	SV	(8)					2,120 (1)	2,500 (1)	3.090			
1,4-Dichlorobenzene (Para)	SV	(8)					330 (1)	250 (1)	0.11 *	9.1		
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	JV	(8)					330 (1)	250 (1)	0.11 *	14.500		
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	JV	(8)					330 (1)	250 (1)	0.11 *	14.500		
2,4-Dichlorophenol	SV	(8)					4,380 (1)	2,000 (1)	0.01			
2,4-Dimethylphenol	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
2,4-Dinitrophenol	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
2-Chloronaphthalene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
2-Chlorophenol	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
2-Methylnaphthalene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
2-Methylphenol	JV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
2-Nitroaniline	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
2-Nitrophenol	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
3-Nitroaniline	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
4-Bromophenyl-phenyl ether	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
4-Chloroaniline	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
4-Methylphenol	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
4-Nitroaniline	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
4-Nitrophenol	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Acenaphthene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Anthracene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Benazone	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Benzoic Acid	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Benzo(a)anthracene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Benzo(a)pyrene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Benzyl Alcohol	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
bis(2-Chloroethoxy)methane	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
bis(2-Chloroethyl) ether	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
bis(Chloromethyl) ether	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
bis(2-Chloroisopropyl) ether	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate)	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Buzadene	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			
Buzylbenzylphthalate	SV	(8)					270 (1)	150 (1)	0.01			

**TABLE E-1 B (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16 1992)  
 FEDERAL SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS  
 ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ug/l UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Parameter	Type (7)	Method (8)	SDWA Maximum Contaminant Level 1	SDWA Maximum Contaminant Level 2	SDWA Maximum Contaminant Level Goals	CWA Aquatic Life (c) Value	CWA Chronic Value	CWA AWQC for Protection of Human Health (c) Fish and Invertebrates	CWA AWQC for Protection of Human Health (c) Fish Consumption Only
Chlorinated Ethers	SV	(b)				1,000 (1)			
Chlorinated Naphthalene	SV	(b)				200,000 (1)			
Chloroalkyl Ethers	SV	(b)							
Chlorophenol (Total)	SV	(b)							
Chrysene	SV	(b)							
Dibenzofuran	SV	(b)							
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	SV	(b)							
Dichlorobenzenes	SV	(b)							
Dichlorobenzidine (Total)	SV	(b)							
Diethylphthalate	SV	(b)							
Di(2-ethylhexyl) sebacate	SV	(b)							
Dimethylphthalate	SV	(b)							
D-n-butylphthalate	SV	(b)							
D-n-octylphthalate	SV	(b)							
Ethylene Glycol	SV	(b)							
Fluoranthene	SV	(b)							
Fluorene	SV	(b)							
Formaldehyde	SV	(b)							
Haloethers	SV	(b)							
Hexachlorobenzene	SV	(b)							
Hexachlorobutadiene	SV	(b)							
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	SV	(b)							
Hexachloroethane	SV	(b)							
Hydrazine	SV	(b)							
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	SV	(b)							
Isochlorone	SV	(b)							
Naphthalene	SV	(b)							
Nitrobenzene	SV	(b)							
Nitrophenols	SV	(b)							
Nitrosamines	SV	(b)							
N-Nitrosodibutylamine	SV	(b)							
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	SV	(b)							
N-Nitrosodipropylamine	SV	(b)							
N-Nitrosopyrrolidine	SV	(b)							
N-Nitrosophenylamine	SV	(b)							
N-Nitroso-n-propylamine	SV	(b)							
Pentachlorobenzene	SV	(b)							
Pentachlorophenol	SV	(b)							
Phenanthrene	SV	(b)							
Phthalate Esters	SV	(b)							
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons	SV	(b)							
Pyrene	SV	(b)							
Vinyl Chloride	V	(b)							
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	V	(b)							
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	V	(b)							
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	V	(b)							
1,1-Dichloroethane	V	(b)							
1,1-Dichloroethene	V	(b)							
1,2-Dichloroethane	V	(b)							
1,2-Dichloroethene (cis)	V	(b)							
1,2-Dichloroethene (trans)	V	(b)							
1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	V	(b)							
1,2-Dichloropropane	V	(b)							
1,2-Dichloropropane (cis)	V	(b)							
1,3-Dichloropropane (cis)	V	(b)							
1,3-Dichloropropane (trans)	V	(b)							
2-Butanone	V	(b)							
2-Hexanone	V	(b)							
4-Methyl-2-Pentanone	V	(b)							
Acetone	V	(b)							

**TABLE E-1 B (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16 1992)  
 FEDERAL SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS  
 ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN  $\mu\text{g/l}$  UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Parameter	Type (f)	Meft (u)	SDWA		SDWA		SDWA		CWA		CWA	
			Maximum Contaminant Level	Maximum Contaminant Level	Maximum Contaminant Level	Maximum Contaminant Level	AWQC for Protection of Aquatic Life (c)	AWQC for Protection of Human Health (c)	Chronic Value	Acute Value	Water and Fish Ingestion	For Protection of Fish Consumption Only
Acrylonitril	V	(g)	> ( )					7 550	2 600	0 056	0 65	
Benzene	V	(g)	100 (2)( )	0 ( )			3 300		0 66*		40	
Bromodichloromethane	V	(g)	100 (2)(a)									
Bromochloromethane	V	(g)	> ( )	0 (a)				35 200 (1)	30 (1)	0 4	6 04	
Carbon Disulfide	V	(g)						250 (1)				
Carbon Tetrachloride	V	(g)										
Chlorinated Benzene s	V/SV	(g)										
Chlorobenzene	V	(g)			100 (b)					488		
Chloroethane	V	(g)										
Chloroform	V	(g)	100 (2)( )					28 900 (1)	1 240 (1)	0 19	15 7	
Chloromethane	V	(g)										
Dibromochloromethane	V	(g)	100 (2)(a)									
Dichloroethane's	V	(g)										
Ethylbenzene	V	(g)			700 (b)			11 600 (1)		0 033	1 8	
Ethylene Dichloride	V	(g)			0 05 (b)			32 000 (1)		1 400	3 280	
Ethylene Oxid	V	(g)										
Halomethanes	V	(g)	100 (a)					11 000 (1)		0 19*	15 7	
Methylene Chloride	V	(g)	> (b)									
Styren	V	(g)			100 (b)							
Tetrachloroethane's	V	(g)						9 320 (1)				
Tetrachloroethene	V	(g)			5 (b)			5 280 (1)	840 (1)	0 80*	8 83	
Toluene	V	(g)			1 000 (b)			17 500 (1)		14 300	424 000	
Trichloroethane's	V	(g)						18 000 (1)				
Trichloroethene	V	(g)						45 000 (1)	21 900 (1)	2 7	80 7	
Vinyl Acetate	V	(g)	> ( )	0 (a)								
Xylenes (total)	V	(g)			10 000 (b)							



**TABLE E-1 C**  
**POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS**  
**STATEWIDE AND BASIN (CDH/CWQCC)**  
**SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS**











# TABLE E-1 C (continued)

## EXPLANATION OF TABLE

- ARMAR
  - CDH
  - dis
  - EPA
  - pCfI
  - PCB
  - SS
  - SW
  - TIC
  - Trec
  - TVS
  - ug/l
  - WQCC
- = Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements
  - = Colorado Department of Health
  - = dissolved
  - = Environmental Protection Agency
  - = picocuries per liter
  - = polychlorinated biphenyl
  - = species specific
  - = Solid Waste
  - = Tentatively Identified Compound
  - = Total Recoverable
  - = Table Value Standard (hardness dependent) see Table III in (a)
  - = micrograms per liter
  - = Water Quality Control Commission

(1) Table I = physical and biological parameters

Table II = inorganic parameters

Table III = metal parameters

Values in Tables I, II, and III for recreational uses and cold water biota are not included.

(2) N/A Endnote deleted.

(3) All are 30-day values except for nitrate, nitrite and cyanide

(4) Arsenous, sulfide, chloride, sulfate, copper, iron, manganese, antimony, beryllium, selenium, thallium, and zinc are 30-day standards, all others are 1-day standards

(5) Type abbreviations are A=anion B=bacteria C=carbon IN=inorganic FP=field parameter H=herbicide M=metal P=pesticide PP=pesticide PCB=polychlorinated biphenyl SV=semi-volatile V=volatile

(6) See Attachment 1 for analytical methods and corresponding detection limits

Abbreviations are E=EPA, SW=SW/849, a=detected as total, b=detected as TICs or with method modifications, c=not routinely monitored, d=monitored in discharge ponds, e=mixture-individual isomers detected

(7) Basic Standards for Organic Chemicals (reference a) apply as stream standards where none are listed in Table IA (reference b). See section 3.8.5(2) f) in the absence of specific numeric standards for non-naturally occurring organics the narrative standard (see section 3.1.11(1)(d)) shall be interpreted and applied in accordance with the provisions of section 3.12.7(1)(c)

(8) Where the standard is below (more stringent than) the PQL, the PQL is interpreted to be the compliance level.

(9) MDL for Radium 226 is 0.5, MDL for Radium 228 is 1.0

(10) These parameters are to be maintained at the lowest practical level. See section 3.1.11(2) in (a)

(11) Metals for aquatic life use are stated as dissolved unless otherwise specified.

(12) Metals for agricultural and domestic use are stated as total recoverable unless otherwise specified.

**TABLE E-1 D**  
**POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS**  
**STREAM SEGMENT (CDH/CWQCC)**  
**SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS**

**TABLE E-1.D**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16 1992)  
 STREAM SEGMENT (CDH/WQCC) SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS  
 ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ug/l UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

			Segment 4 & 5 Stream Classification and Water Quality Standards (b) (2)			
Parameter	Type (4)	Method (3)	Stream Segment Table (7)		Table 2 Radionuclides (8)	
			Acute Value	Chronic Value	Womam Creek	Walnut Creek
Chloride	A	E325		250,000		
Cyanide (Free)	A	E335		5		
Fluoride	A	E340				
N as Nitrate	A	E353.1		10,000		
N as Nitrate+Nitrite	A	E353.1				
N as Nitrite	A	E354.1		500		
Sulfate	A	E375.4		250,000		
Sulfide H2S Undissociated	A	E376.1		2		
Coliform (Fecal)	B	SM9221C		2,000/100ml		
Ammonia as N	C	E350	TVS	100		
Dioxin	D	(3)		0.000000013		
Boron	E	SW6010(3B)		750		
Chlorine Total Residual	E	SM4500	19	11		
Sulfur	E			2		
Dissolved Oxygen	FP	SM4500	>5,000	>5,000		
pH (Standard Units)	FP	E150.1	6.5-9	6.5-9		
Specific Conductance	FP	E120.1				
Temperature (Degrees Celsius)	FP					
inity	IN	E310.1				
pestos	IN					
Total Dissolved Solids	IN	E160.1				
Total Organic Carbon	IN	E415.1				
Aluminum	M	(3)				
Antimony	M	(3)				
Arsenic (Total Recoverable)	M	(3)	50			
Arsenic III	M					
Arsenic V	M					
Barium	M	(3)				
Beryllium	M	(3)	4			
Cadmium	M	(3)	TVS	TVS		
Calcium	M	(3)				
Cesium	M	(3)				
Chromium	M	(3)				
Chromium III (Total Recoverable)	M		50			
Chromium VI	M	E218.5	16	11		
Cobalt	M	(3)				
Copper	M	(3)	TVS	TVS		
Iron (Dissolved)	M	(3)	300	50		
Iron (Trec)	M	(3)	1 000	1 000		
Lead	M	(3)	TVS	TVS		
Lithium	M	(3)				
Magnesium	M	(3)				
Manganese (Dissolved)	M	(3)	300	50		
Manganese (Trec)	M	(3)	1 000	1 000		
Mercury	M	(3)		0.01 (Total)		
Molybdenum	M	(3)				
Nickel	M	(3)	TVS	TVS		
Potassium	M	(3)				
Selenium (Total Recoverable)	M	(3)	10			
er	M	(3)	TVS	TVS		
um	M	(3)				
rbium	M	(3)				
Thallium	M	(3)				
Tin	M	(3)				
Titanium	M	SW6010(3B)				
Tungsten	M	SW6010(3B)				
Vanadium	M	(3)				

**TABLE E-1.D (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16 1992)  
 STREAM SEGMENT (CDH/WGCC) SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS  
 ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ug/l UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Parameter	Type (4)	Method (5)	Segment 4 A. 5 Stream Classification and Water Quality Standards (6)			
			Stream Segment Table (7)		Table 2: Pesticides (8)	
			Acute Value	Chronic Value	Worms Creek	Walnut Creek
Zinc	M	(3)	TVS	TVS		
Aldicarb	P					
Aldicarb Sulfone	P					
Aldicarb Sulfoxide	P					
Aldrin	P	(3)		0.000074		
Carbofuran	P	(3C)				
Chloranal	P					
Chlordane	P	(3)		0.00046		
Chlorpyrifos	P	(3)				
DDT	P	(3)		0.000024		
DDT Metabolite (DDD)	P	(3)				
DDT Metabolite (DDE)	P	(3)				
Demeton	P	(3)				
Diazinon	P	(3)				
Dieldrin	P	(3)		0.000071		
Endosulfan I	P	(3)				
Endosulfan II	P	(3)				
Endosulfan Sulfate	P	(3)				
Endrin	P	(3)				
Endrin Aldehyde	P	(3B)				
Endrin Ketone	P	(3B)				
Guthion (Azinphos methyl)	P	(3)				
Heptachlor	P	(3)		0.00028		
Heptachlor Epoxide	P	(3)				
Hexachlorocyclohexane Alpha	P	(3)		0.0002		
Hexachlorocyclohexane Beta	P	(3)		0.0163		
Hexachlorocyclohexane (HCH or BHC)	P					
Hexachlorocyclohexane Delta	P	(3)				
Hexachlorocyclohexane, Technical (Total)	P	(3E)		0.0123		
Hexachlorocyclohexane Gamma (Lindane)	P	(3)		0.0186		
Malathion	P	(3B)				
Methoxychlor	P	(3)				
Mirex	P					
Oxamyl (Vydate)	P					
Parathion	P	(3B)				
Toxaphene	P	(3)				
Vaponate 2	P					
Aroclor 1016	PP	(3)				
Aroclor 1221	PP	(3)				
Aroclor 1232	PP	(3)				
Aroclor 1242	PP	(3)				
Aroclor 1248	PP	(3)				
Aroclor 1254	PP	(3)				
Aroclor 1260	PP	(3)				
PCBs (Total)	PP	(3)		0.000070		
2,4 5-TP Silvex	H	(3C)				
2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic Acid (2,4-D)	H	(3C)				
Acrolein	H					
Atrazine	H	(3D)		3		
Bromacil	H					
Dalapon	H	(3)				
Dimoseb	H	(3)				
Diquat	H					
Endothal	H					
Glyphosate	H					
Picloram	H					
Simazine	H	(3D)		4		
Americium (Total) (pCi/l)	R				0.05	0.05

**TABLE E-1.D (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16 1992)  
 STREAM SEGMENT (CDH/WQCC) SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS  
 ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ug/l UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Parameter	Type (4)	Method (3)	Segment 4 & 5 Stream Classification and Water Quality Standards (b) (2)			
			Stream Segment Table (7)		Table 2 Radionuclides (6)	
			Acute Value	Chronic Value	Woman Creek	Walnut Creek
Americium 241 (pCi/l)	R					
Cesium 134 (pCi/l)	R				80	80
Cesium 137 (pCi/l)	R					
Gross Alpha (pCi/l)	R				7	11
Gross Beta (pCi/l)	R				5	19
Plutonium (Total) (pCi/l)	R				0.05	0.05
Plutonium 238+239+240 (pCi/l)	R				15(a)	15(a)
Radium 226+228 (pCi/l)	R	(5)			5(a)	5(a)
Strontium 89+90 (pCi/l)	R					
Strontium 90 (pCi/l)	R				8	8
Thorium 230+232 (pCi/l)	R				60(a)	60(a)
Tritium (pCi/l)	R				500	500
Uranium 233+234 (pCi/l)	R					
Uranium 235 (pCi/l)	R					
Uranium 238 (pCi/l)	R					
Uranium (Total) (pCi/l)	R				5	10
1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	SV	(3B)				
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	SV	(3)				
1,2-Dichlorobenzene (Ortho)	SV	(3)				
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	SV	(3B)				
1,3-Dichlorobenzene (Meta)	SV	(3)				
1,4-Dichlorobenzene (Para)	SV	(3)				
5-Trichlorophenol	SV	(3)				
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	SV	(3)	1	2		
2,4-Dichlorophenol	SV	(3)				
2,4-Dimethylphenol	SV	(3)				
2,4-Dinitrophenol	SV	(3)				
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	SV	(3)				
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	SV	(3)				
2-Chloronaphthalene	SV	(3)				
2-Chlorophenol	SV	(3)				
2-Methylnaphthalene	SV	(3)				
2-Methylphenol	SV	(3)				
2-Nitroaniline	SV	(3)				
2-Nitrophenol	SV	(3)				
3-Nitroaniline	SV	(3)				
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	SV	(3)				
4-Bromophenyl-phenyl-ether	SV	(3)				
4-Chloroaniline	SV	(3)				
4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl-ether	SV	(3)				
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	SV	(3)				
4-Methylphenol	SV	(3)				
4-Nitroaniline	SV	(3)				
4-Nitrophenol	SV	(3)				
Acenaphthene	SV	(3)				
Anthracene	SV	(3)				
Benzdine	SV	(3B C)			0.00012	
Benzoic Acid	SV	(3)				
Benzo(a)anthracene	SV	(3)				
Benzo(a)pyrene	SV	(3)				
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	SV	(3)				
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	SV	(3)				
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	SV	(3)				
Benzyl Alcohol	SV	(3)				
(2-Chloroethoxy)methane	SV	(3)				
2-Chloroethyl ether	SV	(3)			0.0000037	
(Chloromethyl) ether	SV	(3)				
bis(2-Chloroisopropyl) ether	SV	(3)				
bis(2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate (Di(2-ethylhexyl)p	SV	(3)				
Butadiene	SV	(3)				
Butyl Benzylphthalate	SV	(3)				

**TABLE E-1.D (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16 1992)  
 STREAM SEGMENT (CDH/WQCC) SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS  
 ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ug/l UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Segment 4 & 5 Stream Classification and Water Quality Standards (a) (2)						
Parameter	Type (4)	Method (3)	Stream Segment Table (7)		Table 2: Fluvionatides (6)	
			Acute Value	Chronic Value	Woman Creek	Walnut Creek
Chlorinated Ethers	SV	(3)				
Chlorinated Naphthalenes	SV	(3)				
Chloroalkylethers	SV	(3)				
Chlorophenol (total)	SV	(3)				
Chrysene	SV	(3)				
Dibenzofuran	SV	(3)				
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	SV	(3)				
Dichlorobenzenes	SV	(3)				
Dichlorobenzidine (Total)	SV	(3)		0.01		
Diethylphthalate	SV	(3)				
Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate	SV	(3)				
Dimethylphthalate	SV	(3)				
Di-n-butylphthalate	SV	(3)				
Di-n-octylphthalate	SV	(3)				
Ethylene Glycol	SV	(3C)				
Fluoranthene	SV	(3)				
Fluorene	SV	(3)				
Formaldehyde	SV	(3)				
Haloethers	SV	(3)				
Hexachlorobenzene	SV	(3)		0.00072		
Hexachlorobutadiene	SV	(3)		0.45		
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	SV	(3)				
Hexachloroethane	SV	(3)		1.9		
Hydrazine	SV	(3)				
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	SV	(3)				
Isophorone	SV	(3)				
Naphthalene	SV	(3)				
Nitrobenzene	SV	(3)				
Nitrophenols	SV	(3)				
Nitrosamines	SV	(3)				
N-Nitrosodibutylamine	SV	(3B)		0.0064		
N-Nitrosodiethylamine	SV	(3B)		0.0008		
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	SV	(3B)		0.0014		
N-Nitrosopyrrolidine	SV	(3B)		0.016		
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	SV	(3B)		4.9		
N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	SV	(3B)				
Pentachlorinated Ethanes	SV	(3B)				
Pentachlorobenzene	SV	(3B)				
Pentachlorophenol	SV	(3)				
Phenanthrene	SV	(3)				
Phenol	SV	(3)				
Phthalate Esters	SV	(3)				
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons	SV	(3)				
Pyrene	SV	(3)				
Vinyl Chloride	V	(3)				
1,1,1 Trichloroethane	V	(3)				
1,1,2,2 Tetrachloroethane	V	(3)		0.17		
1,1,2 Trichloroethane	V	(3)		0.60		
1,1-Dichloroethane	V	(3)				
1,1-Dichloroethene	V	(3)				
1,2-Dichloroethane	V	(3)				
1,2-Dichloroethene (cis)	V	(3)				
1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	V	(3)				
1,2-Dichloroethene (trans)	V	(3)				
1,2-Dichloropropane	V	(3)				
1,3-Dichloropropene (cis)	V	(3)				
1,3-Dichloropropene (trans)	V	(3)				
2-Butanone	V	(3)				
2-Hexanone	V	(3)				
4-Methyl-2-pentanone	V	(3)				
Acetone	V	(3)				

**TABLE E-1.D (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16 1992)  
 STREAM SEGMENT (CDH/WQCC) SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS  
 ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN  $\mu\text{g/l}$  UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Segment 4 & 5 Stream Classification and Water Quality Standards (6) (2)						
Parameter	Type (4)	Method (3)	Stream Segment Table (7)		Table 2 Radionuclides (8)	
			Acute Value	Chronic Value	Woman Creek	Walnut Creek
Acrylonitrile	V	(3)		0.058		
Benzene	V	(3)				
Bromodichloromethane	V	(3)				
Bromoform	V	(3)				
Bromomethane	V	(3)				
Carbon Disulfide	V	(3)				
Carbon Tetrachloride	V	(3)				
Chlorinated Benzenes	V/SV	(3)				
Chlorobenzene	V	(3)				
Chloroethane	V	(3)				
Chloroform	V	(3)		0.19		
Chloromethane	V	(3)				
Dibromochloromethane	V	(3)				
Dichloroethenes	V	(3)				
Ethylbenzene	V	(3)				
Ethylene Dibromide	V	(3C)				
Ethylene Oxide	V					
Halomethanes	V	(3)		0.19		
Methylene Chloride	V	(3)				
Styrene	V	(3)				
Tetrachloroethanes	V	(3)		0.8		
1,2,2 Tetrachloroethene	V	(3)				
ene	V	(3)				
chloroethanes	V	(3)				
1,1,1 Trichloroethene	V	(3)				
Vinyl Acetate	V	(3)				
Xylenes (Total)	V	(3)				

## TABLE E-1.D (continued)

### EXPLANATION OF TABLE AND ENDNOTES

GDH = Colorado Department of Health  
EPA = Environmental Protection Agency  
pCi/l = picocuries per liter  
PCB = polychlorinated biphenyl  
RFP = Rocky Flats Plant  
SS = specific species  
THM = Total Trihalomethanes bromoform, chloroform, bromodichloromethane dibromochloromethane  
TIC = Tentatively Identified Compound  
TVS = Table Value Standard (hardness dependent) see Table III in (a)  
ug/l = micrograms per liter  
WQCC = Water Quality Control Commission

- (1) In the absence of specific, numeric standards for non-naturally occurring organics, the narrative standard is interpreted as zero with enforcement based on practical quantification levels (PQLs) as defined by GDH/WQCC or EPA
- (2) Segment 5 has a goal qualifier for all use classifications.
- (3) See Attachment 1 for analytical methods with corresponding detection limits.  
abbreviations are E=EPA, SW=SW846; a=detected as total, b=detected as TICs or with method modifications; c=not routinely monitored d=monitored in discharge ponds e=mixture-individual isomers detected
- (4) Type abbreviations are: A=anion B=bacteria; C=carbon; D=dioxin, E=element; FP=field parameter H=herbicide IN=inorganic; M=metal, P=pesticide PP=pesticide/PCB R=radionuclide SV=semi-volatile V=volatile
- (5) MDL for Radium 226 is 0.5, MDL for Radium 228 is 1.0
- (6) These parameters are to be maintained at the lowest practical level. See section 3.1.11 (f) (2) in (a)
- (7) Where the standard is below (more stringent than) the PQL, the PQL is interpreted to be the compliance level.
- (a) GDH/WQCC Colorado Water Quality Standards 3.1.0 (5 CCR 1002-6) 1/15/1974 amended 10/8/1991
- (b) GDH/WQCC Classifications and Numeric Standards for 8 Platte River Basin, Laramie River Basin, Republican River Basin, Smoky Hill River Basin 3.8.0 (5 CCR 1002-6) 4/6/1981 amended 7/16/1992 Site-specific standards may become basin-wide in 1993 with modifications.

**TABLE E-1 E**  
**POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS**  
**SOIL CONTAMINANT CRITERIA**

**TABLE E-1.E**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16, 1992)  
 SOIL CONTAMINANT CRITERIA  
 ALL VALUES ARE IN mg/Kg UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Parameter	Type (1)	Method (2)	FEDERAL BENCHMARKS (a)		STATE BENCHMARKS (b)	
			Maximum allowed Concentration		Maximum allowed Concentration	
			SOLIDS (PPM)	LIQUIDS (mg/l)	SOLIDS (PPM)	LIQUIDS (mg/l)
Chloride	A	E325				
Cyanide (Free)	A	E335	4.416 E+0	4.416 E+0		
Fluoride	A	E340				
N as Nitrate	A	E353.1				
N as Nitrate+Nitrite	A	E353.1				
N as Nitrite	A	E354.1				
Sulfate	A	E375.4				
Sulfide H2S Undissociated	A	E376.1				
Coliform (Fecal)	B	SM9221C				
Ammonia as N	C	E350				
Dioxin	D	(2)				
Boron	E	SW6010(2B)				
Chlorine Total Residual	E	SM4500				
Sulfur	E					
Dissolved Oxygen	FP	SM4500				
pH (Standard Units)	FP	E150.1				
Specific Conductance	FP	E120.1				
Temperature (Degrees Celsius)	FP					
Uranium	IN	E310.1				
Asbestos	IN					
Total Dissolved Solids	IN	E160.1				
Total Organic Carbon	IN	E415.1				
Aluminum	M	(2)				
Antimony	M	(2)	6.309 E-02	6.309 E-02		
Arsenic	M	(2)	3.155 E-01	3.155 E-01		
Arsenic III	M					
Arsenic V	M					
Barium	M	(2)	6.309 E+0	6.309 E+0		
Beryllium	M	(2)				
Cadmium	M	(2)	6.309 E-02	6.309 E-02		
Calcium	M	(2)				
Cesium	M	(2)				
Chromium	M	(2)	3.155 E-01	3.155 E-01		
Chromium III	M					
Chromium VI	M	E218.5				
Cobalt	M	(2)				
Copper	M	(2)				
Iron	M	(2)				
Lead	M	(2)				
Lithium	M	(2)				
Magnesium	M	(2)				
Manganese	M	(2)				
Mercury	M	(2)	1.262 E-02	1.262 E-02		
Molybdenum	M	(2)				
Nickel	M	(2)				
Potassium	M	(2)				
Selenium	M	(2)	6.309 E-02	6.309 E-02		
Silver	M	(2)	3.155 E-01	3.155 E-01		
Sodium	M	(2)				
Strontium	M	(2)				
Tantalum	M	(2)				
Titanium	M	SW6010(2B)				
Tungsten	M	SW6010(2B)				
Vanadium	M	(2)				
Zinc	M	(2)				

**TABLE E-1.E (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16, 1992)  
 SOIL CONTAMINANT CRITERIA  
 ALL VALUES ARE IN mg/Kg UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Parameter	Type (1)	Method (2)	FEDERAL BENCHMARKS (b)		STATE BENCHMARKS (b)	
			Maximum Allowed Concentration		Maximum Allowed Concentration	
			SOLIDS (PPM)	LIQUIDS (mg/l)	SOLIDS (PPM)	LIQUIDS (mg/l)
Aldicarb	P		1.253 E+0	6.309 E-02		
Aldicarb Sulfone	P					
Aldicarb Sulfonide	P					
Aldrin	P	(2)	1.331 E-03	1.262 E-05		
Carbofuran	P	(2C)				
Chloranil	P					
Chlordane	P	(2)	1.944 E+01	1.262 E-02		
Chlorpyrifos	P	(2)				
DDT	P	(2)	3.109 E+0	6.309 E-04		
DDT Metabolite (DDD)	P	(2)	5.982 E-02	6.309 E-04		
DDT Metabolite (DDE)	P	(2)	9.902 E-01	6.309 E-04		
Demeton	P	(2)				
Diazinon	P	(2)				
Dieldrin	P	(2)	1.292 E-03	1.262 E-05		
Endosulfan I	P	(2)				
Endosulfan II	P	(2)				
Endosulfan sulfate	P	(2)				
Endrin	P	(2)	1.004 E+0	1.262 E-03		
Endrin Aldehyde	P	(2B)				
Endrin Ketone	P	(2B)				
Guthion (Azinphos methyl)	P	(2)				
Heptachlor	P	(2)	3.345 E+0	2.524 E-03		
Heptachlor Epoxide	P	(2)	8.346 E-01	1.262 E-03		
Hexachlorocyclohexane Alpha	P	(2)				
Hexachlorocyclohexane, Beta	P	(2)				
Hexachlorocyclohexane (HCH or BHC)	P					
Hexachlorocyclohexane, Delta	P	(2)				
Hexachlorocyclohexane Technical (Total)	P	(2E)				
Hexachlorocyclohexane Gamma (Lindane)	P	(2)				
Malathion	P	(2B)				
Methoxychlor	P	(2)	2.633 E+04	6.309 E-01		
Mirex	P					
Oxamyl (Vydate)	P					
Parathion	P	(2B)				
Toxaphene	P	(2)	7.909 E+01	3.155 E-02		
Vapona 2	P					
Aroclor 1016	PP	(2)				
Aroclor 1221	PP	(2)				
Aroclor 1232	PP	(2)				
Aroclor 1242	PP	(2)				
Aroclor 1248	PP	(2)				
Aroclor 1254	PP	(2)				
Aroclor 1260	PP	(2)				
PCBs (Total)	PP	(2)	1.223 E+01	3.155 E-03		
2,4,5-TP Silvex	H	(2C)	9.905 E+0	6.309 E-02		
2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic Acid(2,4-D)	H	(2C)	1.069 E+02	6.309 E-04		
Aerolein	H		1.181 E+0	3.15 E+0		
Atrazine	H	(2D)				
Bromacil	H					
Dalapon	H	(2)				
Dinoseb	H	(2)				
Diquat	H					
Endothal	H					
Glyphosate	H					
Picloram	H					
Simazine	H	(2D)				
Americium (Total) (pCi/l)	R					

**TABLE E-1.E (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16, 1992)  
 SOIL CONTAMINANT CRITERIA  
 ALL VALUES ARE IN mg/kg UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Parameter	Type (E)	Method (Z)	FEDERAL BENCHMARKS (a)		STATE BENCHMARKS (b)	
			Maximum allowed Concentration		Maximum allowed Concentration	
			SOLIDS (PPM)	LIQUIDS (mg/l)	SOLIDS (PPM)	LIQUIDS (mg/l)
Americium 241 (pCi/l)	R					
Cesium 134 (pCi/l)	R					
Cesium 137 (pCi/l)	R					
Gross Alpha (pCi/l)	R				5.0 pCi/g	
Gross Beta (pCi/l)	R				50.0 pCi/g	
Plutonium (Total) (pCi/l)	R					
Plutonium 238+239+240 (pCi/l)	R				0.9 pCi/g	
Radium 226+228 (pCi/l)	R					
Strontium 89+90 (pCi/l)	R					
Strontium 90 (pCi/l)	R					
Thorium 230+232 (pCi/l)	R					
Tritium (pCi/l)	R					
Uranium 233+234 (pCi/l)	R					
Uranium 235 (pCi/l)	R					
Uranium 238 (pCi/l)	R					
Uranium (Total)(pCi/l)	R					
1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	SV	(2B)	5.603 E+01	6.309 E-02		
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	SV	(2)	1.217 E+04	4.4165 E+0		
1,2-Dichlorobenzene (Ortho)	SV	(2)	4.999 E+03	3.785 E+0		
N-phenylhydrazine	SV	(2B)	6.976 E-04	2.524 E-04		
1-chlorobenzene (Meta)	SV	(2)	4.790 E+04	1.893 E+0		
1-chlorobenzene (Para)	SV	(2)	2.650 E+02	4.732 E 01		
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	SV	(2)	2.101 E+04	2.524 E+01		
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	SV	(2)	3.536 E-01	1.262 E 02		
2,4-Dichlorophenol	SV	(2)	4.329 E+04	6.309 E-01		
2,4-Dimethylphenol	SV	(2)	1.248 E+01	1.262 E 01		
2,4-Dinitrophenol	SV	(2)	2.296 E+01	4.416 E-04		
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	SV	(2)				
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	SV	(2)				
2-Chloronaphthalene	SV	(2)				
2-Chlorophenol	SV	(2)	4.412 E+04	1.262 E+0		
2-Methylnaphthalene	SV	(2)				
2-Methylphenol	SV	(2)				
2-Nitroaniline	SV	(2)				
2-Nitrophenol	SV	(2)				
3,3-Dichlorobenzidine	SV	(2)	5.656 E-02	5.047 E-04		
3-Nitroaniline	SV	(2)				
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	SV	(2)				
4-Bromophenyl phenyl-ether	SV	(2)				
4-Chloroaniline	SV	(2)				
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl-ether	SV	(2)				
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	SV	(2)				
4-Methylphenol	SV	(2)				
4-Nitroaniline	SV	(2)				
4-Nitrophenol	SV	(2)				
Acenaphthene	SV	(2)				
Anthracene	SV	(2)	7.701 E+01	1.262 E-02		
Benzdine	SV	(2BC)	1.262 E-06	1.262 E-06		
Benzoic Acid	SV	(2)				
Benzo(a)anthracene	SV	(2)	9.690 E-02	6.309 E-05		
Benzo(a)pyrene	SV	(2)	3.8675 E-02	1.893 E 05		
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	SV	(2)	1.643 E-04	1.262 E-04		
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	SV	(2)				
o(k)fluoranthene	SV	(2)	7.790 E+02	2.524 E-02		
yl Alcohol	SV	(2)				
-1,2-Chloroethoxy)methane	SV	(2)				
bis(2-Chloroethyl)ether	SV	(2)	1.893 E-04	1.893 E-04		
bis(Chloromethyl)ether	SV					
bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	SV	(2)	2.234 E+03	6.309 E+0		
bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthal	SV	(2)	4.210 E+01	1.893 E-02		

**TABLE E-1.E (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16, 1992)

SOIL CONTAMINANT CRITERIA

ALL VALUES ARE IN mg/Kg UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Parameter	Type (1)	Method (2)	FEDERAL BENCHMARKS (a)		STATE BENCHMARKS (b)	
			Maximum allowed Concentration		Maximum allowed Concentration	
			SOLIDS (PPM)	LIQUIDS (mg/l)	SOLIDS (PPM)	LIQUIDS (mg/l)
Butadiene	SV					
Butylbenzylphthalate	SV	(2)	6.375 E+04	5.678 E+0		
Chlorinated Ethers	SV	(2)				
Chlorinated Naphthalenes	SV	(2)				
Chloroalkylethers	SV	(2)				
Chrysene	SV	(2)	1.516 E+01	1.262 E-03		
Dibenzofuran	SV	(2)				
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	SV	(2)	7.318 E-03	4.416 E-06		
Dichlorobenzenes	SV	(2)				
Diethylphthalate	SV	(2)	4.795 E+05	1.893 E+02		
Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate	SV					
Dimethylphthalate	SV	(2)	9.232 E+06	2.524 E+03		
Di n-butylphthalate	SV	(2)				
Di n-octylphthalate	SV	(2)	3.441 E+04	3.785 E+0		
Ethylene Glycol	SV	(2C)				
Fluoranthene	SV	(2)	2.971 E+04	1.262 E+0		
Fluorene	SV	(2)	1.048 E+01	1.262 E 02		
Formaldehyde	SV					
Haloethers	SV	(2)				
Hexachlorobenzene	SV	(2)	2.619 E-01	1.262 E-04		
Hexachlorobutadiene	SV	(2)	5.139 E+0	3.155 E-03		
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	SV	(2)	8.283 E+03	1.262 E+0		
Hexachloroethane	SV	(2)	2.956 E+0	1.893 E-02		
Hydrazine	SV		6.309 E-05	6.309 E-05		
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	SV	(2)	2.970 E+04	1.262 E-03		
Isophorone	SV	(2)	1.345 E+04	4.416 E+01		
Naphthalene	SV	(2)	5.738 E+05	6.309 E+01		
Nitrobenzene	SV	(2)	6.557 E+0	1.262 E-01		
Nitrophenols	SV	(2)				
Nitrosamines	SV	(2)				
N Nitrosodibutylamine	SV	(2B)				
N Nitrosodiethylamine	SV	(2B)				
N Nitrosodimethylamine	SV	(2B)				
N Nitrosopyrrolidine	SV	(2B)	1.262 E-04	1.262 E-04		
N Nitrosodiphenylamine	SV	(2B)	6.309 E-05	6.309 E-05		
N Nitroso-di n-dipropylamine	SV	(2B)				
Pentachlorinated Ethanes	SV	(2B)				
Pentachlorobenzene	SV	(2B)	2.284 E+03	1.893 E-04		
Pentachlorophenol	SV	(2)	2.917 E+03	1.262 E+0		
Phenanthrene	SV	(2)	1.398 E+01	1.262 E-02		
Phenol	SV	(2)	2.051 E+04	1.262 E-02		
Phthalate Esters	SV	(2)				
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons	SV	(2)				
Pyrene	SV	(2)	4.076 E+05	6.309 E+0		
Vinyl Chloride	V	(2)	1.822 E-01	1.262 E-02		
1,1,1 Trichloroethane	V	(2)	2.229 E+02	1.262 E+0		
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	V	(2)	5.832 E-03	1.262 E-03		
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	V	(2)	2.315 E-02	3.785 E-03		
1,1 Dichloroethane	V	(2)	1.140 E-02	2.254 E-03		
1,1 Dichloroethene	V	(2)	1.270 E+0	4.416 E-02		
1,2-Dichloroethane	V	(2)	3.717 E-01	3.155 E-02		
1,2-Dichloroethene (cis)	V	(2A)	2.973 E+01	4.416 E-7		
1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	V	(2)				
1,2-Dichloroethene (trans)	V	(2A)	3.641 E+01	6.309 E-01		
1,2-Dichloropropene	V	(2)	6.995 E-01	3.155 E-02		
1,3-Dichloropropene (cis)	V	(2)				
1,3-Dichloropropene (trans)	V	(2)				
2-Butanone	V	(2)				
2-Hexanone	V	(2)				
4-Methyl 2-pentanone	V	(2)				

**TABLE E-1.E (continued)**

POTENTIAL CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS (December 16, 1992)

SOIL CONTAMINANT CRITERIA

ALL VALUES ARE IN mg/Kg UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Parameter	Type (1)	Method (2)	FEDERAL BENCHMARKS (a)		STATE BENCHMARKS (b)	
			Maximum allowed Concentration		Maximum allowed Concentration	
			SOLIDS (PPM)	LIQUIDS (mg/l)	SOLIDS (PPM)	LIQUIDS (mg/l)
Acetone	V	(2)	5.170 E+02	2.524 E+01		
Acrylonitrile	V	(2B)	3.785 E-04	3.785 E-04		
Benzene	V	(2)	8.879 E-01	3.156 E-02		
Bromodichloromethane	V	(2)	7.546 E+02	4.4165 E+0		
Bromoform	V	(2)				
Bromomethane	V	(2)	3.606 E+01	3.155 E-01		
Carbon Disulfide	V	(2)	1.277 E+04	2.524 E+01		
Carbon Tetrachloride	V	(2)	1.408 E+0	3.155 E-02		
Chlorinated Benzenes	V/SV	(2)				
Chlorobenzene	V	(2)	1.526 E+02	6.309 E-01		
Chloroethane	V	(2)				
Chloroform	V	(2)	4.968 E-01	3.785 E-02		
Chloromethane	V	(2)				
Dibromochloromethane	V	(2)				
Dichloroethenes	V	(2)				
Ethylbenzene	V	(2)	4.984 E+03	4.416 E+0		
Ethylene Dibromide	V	(2C)	6.078 E-04	3.155 E-04		
Ethylene Oxide	V		6.309 E-04	6.309 E-04		
Halomethanes	V	(2)				
Methylene Chloride	V	(2)				
ene	V	(2)	2.343 E+0	3.155 E-02		
chloroethanes	V	(2)				
trichloroethene	V	(2)	3.480 E+0	3.155 E-02		
Toluene	V	(2)	1.173 E+04	1.262 E+01		
Trichloroethanes	V	(2)				
Trichloroethene	V	(2)	1.146 E+0	3.155 E-02		
Vinyl Acetate	V	(2)				
Xylenes (total)	V	(2)				

## TABLE E-1.E (continued)

### EXPLANATION OF TABLE AND ENDNOTES

CDH = Colorado Department of Health  
EPA = Environmental Protection Agency  
pCi/g = picocuries per gram  
PCB = polychlorinated biphenyl  
RCRA = Resource Conservation Recovery Act  
RFP = Rocky Flats Plant  
SDWA = Safe Drinking Water Act  
TIC = Tentatively Identified Compound  
mg/Kg = milligrams per kilogram

- (1) Type abbreviations are: A=anion; B=bacteria; C=cation; D=dioxin; E=element; FP=field parameter; H=herbicide; IN=inorganic; M=metal; P=pesticide; PP=pesticide/PCB, R=rachonamide; SV=semi-volatile; V=volatile
- (2) See Attachment 1 for analytical methods with corresponding analytes and detection limits  
abbreviations are: E=EPA; SW-SW346; A=detected as total; B=detected as TIC; C=not routinely monitored; D=monitored in discharge ponds;  
E=mixture-individual isomers detected
- (a) EPA Guidance 9347.3-00FS, A Guide to Dating of RCRA Wastes for Superfund Remedial Response: Based on Health-based 10<sup>-6</sup> risk, developed for delisting hazardous wastes and waste residuals.
- (b) Value derived from Colorado Radiation Control Rules and Regulations, 1985 as amended 1990.

**TABLE E-2**  
**COLORADO AIR QUALITY CONTROL COMMISSION**  
**STANDARDS, REGULATION 3**

**TABLE E-2**  
**COLORADO AIR QUALITY CONTROL**  
**COMMISSION STANDARDS**

(State of Colorado, Regulation 3)

**Criteria Pollutants (NAAQS)**

CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, Particulate Matter (TSP), O<sub>3</sub>, Pb

**TSP (Total Suspended Particulates) - Colorado SIP for Metropolitan Denver**

	Primary Std	Secondary Std	
Annual	75 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	60 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Annual arithmetic mean
24-Hour	260 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	150 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Not exceeded more than 1x/year

**SO<sub>2</sub> (Sulfur Dioxide) - Colorado SIP**

Incremental --->	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3
Annual Arithmetic Mean	2 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	10 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	15 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
24-Hour Maximum	5 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	50 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	100 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
3-Hour Maximum	25 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	300 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	700 µg/m <sup>3</sup>

**O<sub>3</sub> (Ozone, Oxidant) - Colorado SIP for Metropolitan Denver**

Averaging Time/Standard	1 hour	160 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
-------------------------	--------	-----------------------

**CO (Carbon Monoxide) - Colorado SIP for Metropolitan Denver**

Averaging Time/Standard	8 hour	10 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
Averaging Time/Standard	1 hour	40 µg/m <sup>3</sup>

**NO<sub>2</sub> (Nitrogen Dioxide) - Colorado SIP for Metropolitan Denver**

Averaging Time/Standard	Annual	100 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
-------------------------	--------	-----------------------

**Pb (Lead) Colorado SIP**

Averaging Time/Standard	Quarter	1.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
-------------------------	---------	-----------------------

**TABLE E-2  
COLORADO AIR QUALITY CONTROL  
COMMISSION STANDARDS**

(State of Colorado, Regulation 3)

**Colorado PSD (Prevention of Significant Deterioration) Requirements**

Significant rate of emissions per emissions unit that would equal or exceed any of the following in tons per year (tpy), emit or potential to emit.

CO 100 tpy  
NO<sub>x</sub> 40 tpy (NO + NO<sub>2</sub>)  
SO<sub>2</sub> 40 tpy

Particulate Matter 25 tpy of PM emissions (TSP)  
PM-10 Emissions. 15 tpy, particulate aerodynamic diameter  $\leq$  10  $\mu$ m

Ozone 40 tpy of VOC (precursor for O<sub>3</sub>)

Pb 0.6 tpy

Fluorides 3 tpy

H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> mist 7 tpy

H<sub>2</sub>S 10 tpy

Total reduced sulfur, including H<sub>2</sub>S 10 tpy  
Reduced sulfur compounds, including H<sub>2</sub>S 10 tpy

Total tetra- through octa-chlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans. 3.2 grams/year, 3.5x10<sup>-6</sup> tpy  
2,3,7,8 -TCDD (tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin)  
Municipal waste combustor organics

Metals, measured as particulate matter 14 Mgrams/year, 15 tpy  
Municipal waste combustor metals

Acid gases, measured as SO<sub>2</sub> and HCl 36 Mgrams/year, 40 tpy  
Municipal waste combustor acid gases

**TABLE E-2  
 COLORADO AIR QUALITY CONTROL  
 COMMISSION STANDARDS**

(State of Colorado, Regulation 3)

**Colorado PSD Requirements for Particular Pollutants**

**New Stationary Source Emissions or Net Emissions Increase from a Modification --> PSD**

Particular pollutant emissions from a new major source or major modification, which would cause air quality impacts in any area of Colorado, less than the following amounts, not subject to BACT, monitoring and analysis requirements (Amounts at 25 ° C and at one atmosphere (1013 millibars))

CO	8 hour average	575 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
NO <sub>2</sub>	Annual average	14 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
PM TSP	24-hour average	10 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
PM 10	24-hour average	10 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
SO <sub>2</sub>	24-hour average	13 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
Pb	3-month average	0.1 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
Hg	24-hour average	0.25 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
Be	24-hour average	1 ng/m <sup>3</sup> , 0.001 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
Fluorides	24-hour average	0.25 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
Vinyl chloride	24-hour average	15 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
Total reduced sulfur	1 hour average	10 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
H <sub>2</sub> S	1 hour average	0.2 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
Reduced sulfur compounds	1-hour average	10 µg/m <sup>3</sup>

**TABLE E-2**  
**COLORADO AIR QUALITY CONTROL**  
**COMMISSION STANDARDS**

(State of Colorado, Regulation 3)

**Ambient Air Increments Over Baseline Concentrations in Colorado**

Maximum allowable increases over baseline concentrations for the following:

Any Class I Area (National Parks, Wilderness and Primitive Areas)

PM - TSP	Annual geometric mean	5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
	24-hour maximum	10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
SO <sub>2</sub>	Annual arithmetic mean	2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
	24-hour maximum	5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
	3-hour maximum	25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
NO <sub>2</sub>	Annual arithmetic mean	2.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$

Any Class II Area (Nearly Everywhere Else)

PM - TSP	Annual geometric mean	19 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
	24-hour maximum	37 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
SO <sub>2</sub>	Annual arithmetic mean	20 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
	24-hour maximum	91 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
	3-hour maximum	512 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
NO <sub>2</sub>	Annual arithmetic mean	25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$

901-004 450  
(Table E2)

A.W Dybdahl, x8667

**TABLE E-3  
POTENTIAL LOCATION SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS**

<u>Location</u>	<u>Requirement</u>	<u>Citation</u>
Fault zones	RCRA regulations specify that hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal must not take place within 200 feet of a Holocene fault	40 CFR 2645 18(a)
Flood plain	Any RCRA treatment, storage or disposal facility which lies within a 100-year floodplain must be designed, constructed and operated to avoid washout	40 CFR 264 18(b)
Siting of Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites	Outlines siting criteria for hazardous waste disposal sites	Colorado Hazardous Waste Act, Sections 25 15 101, 203, 208 302
Siting of Wastewater Treatment Facilities	CDH Water Quality Control Division must approve locations of wastewater treatment facilities	Colorado Water Quality Control Act Section 25 8 202 and 25 8 702
Siting within an area where action may cause irreparable harm loss or destruction of significant articles	Planned actions must avoid threatening significant scientific, prehistorical, historical, or archeological data	36 CFR Part 65, National Historic Preservation Act
Siting on or near historic property owned or controlled by Federal agency	Action to preserve historic properties, planning of action to minimize harm to National Historic Landmarks, included in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places	36 CFR Part 800 National Historic Preservation Act
Siting on critical habitat of endangered or threatened species	Action to conserve endangered or threatened species	50 CFR Parts 200, 402, 33 CFR Parts 320-330
Wetlands	Actions must minimize the destruction loss, or degradation of wetlands as defined by Executive Order 11990, Section 7	40 CFR Part 6, Appendix A
	Actions must not discharge dredged or fill material into wetlands without permit	40 CFR Parts 230, 231
Area affecting stream or river	Action must protect fish or wildlife	40 CFR 6 302

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS\***

<b>Actions<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Requirements</b>	<b>Prerequisites for Applicability<sup>c,d</sup></b>	<b>Citation</b>
<b>Air Stripping</b>	(CAA requirements to be provided.)		
<b>Closure with No Post-closure Care (e.g., Clean Closure)</b>	General performance standard requires elimination of need for further maintenance and control, elimination of post-closure escape of hazardous waste, hazardous constituents, leachate, contaminated run-off, or hazardous waste decomposition products	Applicable to land-based unit containing hazardous waste <sup>d</sup> Applicable to RCRA hazardous waste (listed or characteristic) placed at site after the effective date of the requirements, or placed into another unit. Not applicable to material treated, stored, or disposed only before the effective date of the requirements, or if treated in-situ, or consolidated within area of contamination. Designed for cleanup that will not require long-term management Designed for cleanup to health based standards	40 CFR 264.111
	Disposal or decontamination of equipment, structures, and soils	May apply to surface impoundments and container or tank liners and hazardous waste residues, and to contaminated soil, including soil from dredging or soil disturbed in the course of drilling or excavation, and returned to land	40 CFR 264.111 40 CFR 264.178 40 CFR 264.197 40 CFR 264.288(o)(1) and 40 CFR 264.258
	Removal or decontamination of all waste residues, contaminated containment system components (e.g., liners, dikes) contaminated subsoils, and structures and equipment contaminated with waste and leachate, and management of them as hazardous waste		
	Meet health-based levels at unit		40 CFR 264.259

\*Currently on RCRA, CHA, and SDWA requirements are included. Additional action-specific requirements will be added as additional statutes are analyzed.

<sup>b</sup>Action alternatives from ROD keyword index, FY1986 Record of Decision Annual Report, January 1987, Hazardous Site Control Division, EPA.

Requirements have been proposed but not promulgated for air stripping, hybrid closure, gas collection and miscellaneous treatment. When these regulations are promulgated, they will be included in the matrix.

<sup>c</sup>Some action specific requirements listed may be relevant and appropriate event if RCRA definitions of storage, disposal, or hazardous waste are not met, or if the waste at the site is similar to but not identifiable as a RCRA hazardous waste.

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS\***

<b>Actions<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Requirements</b>	<b>Prerequisites for Applicability<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>Citation</b>
<b>Closure with Waste In-place</b>	Eliminate free liquids by removal or solidification.	Applicable to land disposal of hazardous waste. Applicable to RCRA hazardous waste (listed or characteristic) placed at site after the effective date of the requirements, or placed into another unit. Not applicable to material treated, stored, or disposed only before the effective date of the requirements, or if treated in-situ or consolidated within area of contamination.	40 CFR 264.228(a)(2) 40 CFR 264.228(a)(2) 40 CFR 264.258(b)
	Stabilization of remaining waste and waste residues to support cover		
	Installation of final cover to provide long-term minimization of infiltration		40 CFR 264.310
	30-year post-closure care and ground-water monitoring. <sup>c</sup>		40 CFR 264.310
<b>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act Program</b>	Establishes basic requirements for implementation of the Superfund at DOE facilities.		DOE 5480 14
<b>Container Storage</b>	Containers of RCRA hazardous waste must be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintained in good condition,</li> <li>• Compatible with hazardous waste to be stored, and</li> <li>• Closed during storage (except to add or remove waste)</li> </ul> Inspect container storage areas weekly for deterioration.	Storage of RCRA hazardous waste (listed or characteristic) not meeting small quantity generator criteria held for a temporary period greater than 90 days before treatment, disposal, or storage elsewhere (40 CFR 264.10), in a container (i.e., any portable device in which a material is stored, transported, disposed of, or handled) A generator who accumulates or stores hazardous waste on-site for 90 days or less in compliance with 40 CFR 262.34(a)(1-4) is not subject to full RCRA storage requirements. Small quantity generators are not subject to the 90-day limit (40 CFR 262.34 (c),(d), and (e))	40 CFR 264 171 40 CFR 264 172

\*Regional administrator may revise length of post-closure care period (40 CFR 264.117)

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS\***

<b>Actions<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Requirements</b>	<b>Prerequisites for Applicability<sup>c,d</sup></b>	<b>Citation</b>
<b>Container Storage (Continued)</b>	Place containers on a sloped, crack-free base, and protect from contact with accumulated liquid. Provide containment system with a capacity of 10% of the volume of containers of free liquids. Remove spilled or leaked waste in a timely manner to prevent overflow of the containment system		40 CFR 264.175
	Keep containers or ignitable or reactive waste at least 50 feet from the facility's property line		40 CFR 264.176
	Keep incompatible materials separate Separate incompatible materials stored near each other by a dike or other barrier		40 CFR 264.177
	At closure, remove all hazardous waste and residues from the containment system, and decontaminate or remove all containers, liners		40 CFR 264.178
	Storage of banned wastes must be in accordance with 40 CFR 268. When such storage occurs beyond one year the owner/operator bears the burden of proving that such storage is solely for the purpose of accumulating sufficient quantities to allow for proper recovery, treatment, and disposal		40 CFR 268.50
<b>Construction of a New Surface Impoundment (see Closure with Waste In-place and Closure with No Post-closure Care)</b>	<u>Minimum Technology Requirements</u> Use two liners, a top liner that prevents waste migration into the liner and a bottom liner that prevents waste migration through the liner (throughout the post-closure period)	RCRA hazardous waste (listed or characteristic) currently being placed in a new surface impoundment, or use of replacement or lateral extension of existing landfills or surface impoundments.	40 CFR 264.220
	Design liners to prevent failure due to pressure gradients, contact with the waste, climatic conditions, and the stress of installation and daily operations		40 CFR 264.221
	Provide a leachate collection system between the two liners		40 CFR 264.221
	Use a leak detection system that will detect leaks at the earliest possible time		40 CFR 264.222

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS\***

<b>Actions<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Requirements</b>	<b>Prerequisites for Applicability<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>Citation</b>
Construction of a New Surface Impoundment (see Closure with Waste In-place and Closure with No Post-closure Care) (Continued)	<b>Groundwater Monitoring:</b> Establish a detection monitoring program (264.98) Establish a compliance monitoring program (264.99) and corrective action monitoring program (264.100) when required by 40 CFR 264.91. All monitoring programs must meet RCRA general groundwater monitoring requirements (264.97)	Creation of a new landfill unit to treat, store, or dispose of RCRA hazardous wastes as part of a remedial action.	40 CFR 264.91-264.100
Dike Stabilization	Design and operate facility to prevent overtopping due to overfilling; wind and wave action, rainfall, run-on, malfunctions of level controllers, alarms, and other equipment; and human error	Existing surface impoundment containing hazardous waste, or creation of a new surface impoundment.	40 CFR 264.221
	Construct dikes with sufficient strength to prevent massive failure		40 CFR 264.221
	Inspect liners and cover systems during and after construction.		40 CFR 264.226
	Inspect weekly for proper operation and integrity of the containment devices.		40 CFR 264.226
	Remove surface impoundment from operation if the dike leaks or there is a sudden drop in liquid level.		40 CFR 264.227
	At closure, remove or decontaminate all waste residues and contaminated materials. Otherwise, free liquids must be removed, the remaining wastes stabilized, and the facility closed in the same manner as a landfill.		40 CFR 264.228
	Manage ignitable or reactive wastes so that it is protected from materials or conditions that may cause it to ignite or react.		40 CFR 264.227

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS<sup>a</sup>**

Actions <sup>b</sup>	Requirements	Prerequisites for Applicability <sup>c,d</sup>	Citation
Discharge of Treatment System Effluent	<p><b><u>Best Available Technology</u></b> Use of best available technology economically achievable is required to control toxic and non-conventional pollutants. Use of best conventional pollutant control technology is required to control conventional pollutants. Technology-based limitations may be determined on a case-by-case basis.</p>	Point source discharge to waters of the United States. <sup>4a</sup>	40 CFR 122.44(a)
	<p><b><u>Water Quality Standards</u></b> Applicable Federally-approved State water quality standards must be complied with. These standards may be in addition to or more stringent than other Federal standards under the CWA.<sup>b</sup></p>		40 CFR 122.44 and State regulations approved under 40 CFR 131
	<p>Discharge limitations must be established at more stringent levels than technology based standards for toxic pollutants.</p>		40 CFR 122.44(e)
	<p><b><u>Best Management Practices</u></b> Develop and implement a Best Management Practices program to prevent the release of toxic constituents to surface waters.</p>		40 CFR 125.100
	<p>The Best Management Practices program must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish specific procedures for the control of toxic and hazardous pollutant spills.</li> </ul>	Discharge to waters of the U.S.	40 CFR 125.104

<sup>a</sup>Waters of the U.S. is defined broadly in 40 CFR 122.2 and includes essentially any water body and wetland.

<sup>b</sup>Section 121 of SARA exempts on-site CERCLA activities from obtaining permits. However, the substantive requirements of a law or regulation must be met. In particular on-site discharges to surface waters are exempt from procedural NPDES permit requirements. Off site discharges would be required to apply for and obtain an NPDES permit.

<sup>c</sup>Federal Water Quality Criteria (FWQC) may be relevant and appropriate depending on the designated or potential use of the water, the media affected, the purposes of the criteria, and current information. (CERCLA Section 121(d)(2)(B)(1)) FWQC. The protection of aquatic life will be relevant and appropriate when environmental factors (e.g., protection of aquatic organisms) are being considered. (50 FR 30784 (July 29, 1995))<sup>3</sup>

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS\***

Actions <sup>b</sup>	Requirements	Prerequisites for Applicability <sup>d</sup>	Citation
Discharge of Treatment System Effluent (Continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a prediction of direction, rate of flow, and total quantity of toxic pollutants where experience indicates a reasonable potential for equipment failure</li> <li>• Assure proper management of solid and hazardous waste in accordance with regulations promulgated under RCRA.</li> </ul>		
	<p><u>Monitoring Requirements.</u> Discharge must be monitored to assure compliance. Discharge will monitor:</p>		40 CFR 122.41(i)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mass of each pollutant</li> <li>• The volume of effluent</li> <li>• Frequency of discharge and other measurements as appropriate</li> </ul>		
	<p>Approved test methods for waste constituent to be monitored must be followed. Detailed requirements for analytical procedures and quality controls are provided.</p>		40 CFR 136 1-136 4
	<p>Sample preservation procedures, container materials, and maximum allowable holding times are prescribed.</p>		
	<p>Comply with additional substantive conditions such as.</p>		40 CFR 122.41(i)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duty to mitigate any adverse effects of any discharge, and</li> <li>• Proper operation and maintenance of treatment system</li> </ul>		
Discharge of Dredge and Fill Material to Waters of the United States and Ocean Waters	<p>The four conditions that must be satisfied before dredge and fill is an allowable alternative are:</p>	<p>Capping, dike stabilization, construction of beams and levees, and disposal of contaminated soil, waste material or dredged material are examples of activities that may involve a discharge of dredged or fill material.</p>	40 CFR 230 33 CFR 320-330
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There must be no practical alternative.</li> <li>• Discharge of dredged or fill material must not cause a violation of State water quality standards, violate any applicable toxic effluent standards, jeopardize an endangered species, or injure a marine sanctuary</li> </ul>		

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS<sup>a</sup>**

<b>Actions<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Requirements</b>	<b>Prerequisites for Applicability<sup>c,d</sup></b>	<b>Citation</b>
<b>Discharge of Dredge and Fill Material to Waters of the United States and Ocean Waters (Continued)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No discharge shall be permitted that will cause or contribute to significant degradation of the water</li> <li>• Appropriate steps to minimize adverse effects must be taken</li> </ul> <p>Determine long- and short-term effects on physical, chemical, and biological components of the aquatic ecosystem</p>		
<b>Dredging</b>	Removal of all contaminated soil	RCRA hazardous waste placed at site after the effective date of the requirements, or placed into an other unit.	See Closure in this Exhibit
	Dredging must comply with Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and U.S Army Corps of Engineers regulations	Dredging in navigable waters of the United States	33 U S C 403 33 CFR 320-330
<b>Emergency Plan Preparedness and Response for Operations</b>	Provide coordination direction of planning, preparedness, and response to operational emergencies in which there is a potential for personal injury, destruction of property, theft or release of toxic, radioactive, or other hazardous material which present a potential threat to health, safety, or the environment		DOE 5500.2
<b>Environmental Compliance Issue Coordination</b>	Establishes DOE requirements for coordination of significant environmental compliance issues		DOE 5400.2A
<b>Environmental Protection Safety and Health Protection Information Reporting Requirements</b>	Establishes requirements and procedures for reporting information having environmental protection, safety, or health significance for DOE operations		DOE 5484 1
<b>Excavation</b>	Movement of excavated materials to new location and placement in or on land will trigger land disposal restrictions for the excavated waste or closure requirements for the unit in which the waste is being placed.	Materials containing RCRA hazardous wastes subject to land disposal restrictions are placed in another unit	40 CFR 268 (Subpart D)
	Area from which materials are excavated may require cleanup to levels established by closure requirements	RCRA hazardous waste placed at site after the effective date of the requirements.	See Closure in this Exhibit

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS\***

<b>Actions<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Requirements</b>	<b>Prerequisites for Applicability<sup>c,d</sup></b>	<b>Citation</b>
General Environmental Protection Program	Establishes environmental protection program requirements, authorities, and responsibilities for DOE operations for ensuring compliance with federal and state environment protection laws and regulations, federal executive orders, and internal department policies.		DOE 5400.1
Land Treatment	Prior to land treatment, the waste must be treated to BDAT levels or meet a no migration standard.	RCRA hazardous waste being treated or placed into another unit.	See Closure in this Exhibit.
	Ensure that hazardous constituents are degraded, transformed, or immobilized within the treatment zone		40 CFR 264.271
	Maximum depth of treatment zone must be no more than 1.5 meters (5 feet) from the initial soil surface and more than 1 meter (3 feet) above the seasonal high water table		40 CFR 264.271
	Demonstrate that hazardous constituents for each waste can be completely degraded, transformed, or immobilized in the treatment zone		40 CFR 264.271
	Minimize runoff of hazardous constituents.		40 CFR 264.273
	Maintain runoff/runoff control and management system		40 CFR 264.273
	Special application conditions if food-chain crops are grown in or on treatment zone		40 CFR 264.276
	Unsaturated zone monitoring.		
	Special requirements for ignitable or reactive waste.		
	Special requirements for incompatible wastes.		40 CFR 264.282
Special testing and location requirements for certain hazardous materials.		40 CFR 264.283	
		RCRA waste numbers F020, F021, F022, F023, F026, F027 (dioxin-containing wastes)	

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS\***

<b>Actions<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Requirements</b>	<b>Prerequisites for Applicability<sup>cd</sup></b>	<b>Citation</b>
National Ambient Air Quality	National ambient air quality standards have been set to attain and maintain primary and secondary standards to protect public health and the environment. Requirements include a major source permit, prevention of significant deterioration permit, non-attainable area permit, and visibility permit.	Remedial actions at Operable Unit 2 that may result in new sources of air emissions include incineration, excavation, and air stripping of contaminated ground water.	CAA Section 109 and 40 CFR 50
National Environmental Policy Act - All New Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determination of level of documentation required</li> <li>• Screen, review and assess potential environmental impacts</li> <li>• Early submittal of an environmental checklist to NEPA compliance committee</li> </ul>		
Operation and Maintenance	30-year post-closure care to ensure that site is maintained and monitored.	Land disposal closure	40 CFR 264.310
Slurry Wall	Excavation of soil for construction of slurry wall may trigger land disposal restrictions.	Materials containing RCRA hazardous waste subject to land disposal restrictions are placed in another unit (See Treatment section for LDR schedule. Also see Consolidation, Excavation sections in this Exhibit.)	
Surface Water Control	Prevent runoff and control and collect runoff from a 24-hour 25-year storm (waste piles, land treatment facilities, landfills).	RCRA hazardous waste treated, stored, or disposed after the effective date of the requirements.	40 CFR 264.251(c),(d) 40 CFR 264.273(c),(d) 40 CFR 264.301(c),(d)
	Prevent over-topping of surface impoundment.		40 CFR 264.221(c)
Tank Storage (On-site)	Tanks must have sufficient structural strength to ensure that they do not collapse, rupture, or fail.	Storage of RCRA hazardous waste (listed or characteristic) not meeting small quantity generator criteria held for a temporary period greater than 90 days before treatment, disposal, or storage elsewhere (40 CFR 264.10), in a tank (i.e., any portable device in which a material is stored, transported, disposed of, or handled). A generator who accumulates or stores hazardous waste on-site for 90 days or less in compliance with 40 CFR 262.34(a) (1-4) is not subject to full RCRA.	40 CFR 264.190
	Waste must not be incompatible with the tank material unless the tank is protected by a liner or by other means.		40 CFR 264.191
	Tanks must be provided with secondary containment and controls to prevent overfilling, and sufficient freeboard maintained in open tanks to prevent overtopping by wave action or precipitation.		40 CFR 264.193-194

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS\***

Actions <sup>b</sup>	Requirements	Prerequisites for Applicability <sup>a,d</sup>	Citation
<b>Tank Storage (On-site)</b> (Continued)	(1-4) is not subject to full RCRA storage requirements. Small quantity generators are not subject to the 90-day limit (40 CFR 262.34(c), (d), and (e))		
	Inspect the following: overfilling control, control equipment, monitoring data, waste level (for uncovered tanks), tank condition, above-ground portions of tanks (to assess their structural integrity), and the area surrounding the tank (to identify signs of leakage)		40 CFR 264.195
	Repair any corrosion, crack, or leak.		40 CFR 264.196
	At closure, remove all hazard waste and hazardous waste residues from tanks, discharge control equipment, and discharge confinement structures.		40 CFR 264.197
	Store ignitable and reactive waste so as to prevent the waste from igniting or reacting. Ignitable or reactive wastes in covered tanks must comply with buffer zone requirements in "Flammable and Combustible Liquids Code," Tables 2-1 through 2-6 (National Fire Protection Association, 1976 or 1981)		40 CFR 264.198
<b>Treatment</b> (In a unit)	<u>Storage Prohibitions.</u> Storage of banned wastes must be in accordance with 40 CFR 268. When such storage occurs beyond one year, the owner/operator bears the burden of proving that such storage is solely for the purpose of accumulating sufficient quantities to allow for proper recovery, treatment and disposal.		40 CFR 268.50
	Design and operating standards for unit in which hazardous waste is treated. (See citations at right for design and operating requirements for specific unit.)	Treatment of hazardous waste in a unit.	40 CFR 264.190-192 (Tanks) 40 CFR 264.221 (Surface Impoundments) 40 CFR 264.251 (Waste Piles) 40 CFR 264.273 (Land Treatment Unit) 40 CFR 264.343-345 (Incinerators)

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS<sup>a</sup>**

Actions <sup>b</sup>	Requirements	Prerequisites for Applicability <sup>c,d</sup>	Citation
Treatment (in a unit) (Continued)			40 CFR 264.601 (Miscellaneous Treatment Units) 40 CFR 265.573 (Thermal Treatment Units)
Treatment (when Waste will be Land Disposal)	Treatment of waste subject to ban on land disposal must attain levels achievable by best demonstrated available treatment technologies (DBAT) for each hazardous constituent in each listed waste, if residual is to be land disposed. If residual is to be further treated, initial treatment and any subsequent treatment that produces residual to be treated need not be DBAT, if it does not exceed value in constituent concentration in waste extract Table for each applicable water (See 51 FR 40642, November 6, 1986)	Disposal of contaminated soil and debris resulting from CERCLA response actions or RCRA corrective actions is <u>not</u> subject to land disposal prohibitions and/or treatment standards for solvents, dioxins, or California list wastes unit November 8, 1990 (and for certain first third wastes until August 8, 1990)	40 CFR 268 10 40 CFR 268 11 40 CFR 268 12 40 CFR 268 41 40 CFR 268 (Subpart D)
		All wastes listed as hazardous in 40 CFR 261 as of November 8, 1984, except for spent solvent wastes and dioxin-containing wastes, have been ranked with respect to volume and intrinsic hazards, are scheduled for land disposal prohibition and/or treatment standard determinations as follows	51 FR 40641 52 FR 25760
		Solvents and dioxins Nov 8, 1986 California list wastes Jul 8, 1987 One-third of all ranked and hazardous wastes Aug 8, 1988	
		Underground injection of solvents and dioxins and California list wastes Aug 8, 1988	
		CERCLA response action and RCRA corrective action soil and debris Nov 8, 1988	
		Two-thirds of all ranked and listed hazardous wastes Jul 8, 1989	
		All remaining ranked and listed hazardous wastes identified by characteristic under RCRA section 3001 May 8, 1990	

**TABLE E-4  
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC BENCHMARKS\***

Actions <sup>b</sup>	Requirements	Prerequisites for Applicability <sup>a,d</sup>		Citation
Treatment (when Waste will be Land Disposal) (Continued)		Any hazardous waste or identified waste RCRA section 3001 after November 8, 1984	Within 6 months of the date of identification or listing	
Treatment (when Waste will be Land Disposal) (Continued)	BDAT standards for spent solvent wastes and dioxin-containing wastes are based on one of four technologies or combinations. for waste waters, (1) stem stripping, (2) biological treatment, or (3) carbon absorption [alone or in a combination with (1) or (2)], and for all other wastes, (4) incineration. Any technology may be used however, if it will achieve the concentration levels specified.			40 CFR 268.30 RCRA Sections 3004 (d)(3), (e)(3) 42 U.S.C. 6924(d)(3), (e)(3)
Worker Safety	Occupational Safety and Health program for DOE contractor employees at government-owned contractor-operated facilities.			DOE 5483 1A
	Health and Safety Plan must be submitted.			29 CFR 1910.120

**TABLES E-5A AND E-5B  
F039 HAZARDOUS WASTE STANDARDS  
FROM 40 CFR 268.41 AND 268.43**

268.41 TABLE CCWE — CONSTITUENT CONCENTRATIONS IN WASTE EXTRACT — Continued

Waste code	Commercial chemical name	See also	Regulated hazardous constituent	CAS No for regulated hazardous constituent	Wastewaters		Nonwastewaters						
					Concentration (mg/l)	Notes	Concentration (mg/l)	Notes					
F011	NA	Table CCW in 268.43	Cadmium	7440-43-8	NA		0.068						
				Chromium (Total)	7440-47-32	NA		5.2					
				Lead	7439-92-1	NA		0.51					
				Nickel	7440-02-0	NA		0.32					
				Silver	7440-22-4	NA		0.072					
F012	NA	Table CCW in 268.43	Cadmium	7440-43-8	NA		0.068						
				Chromium (Total)	7440-47-32	NA		5.2					
				Lead	7439-92-1	NA		0.51					
				Nickel	7440-02-0	NA		0.32					
				Silver	7440-22-4	NA		0.072					
F019	NA	Table CCW in 268.43	Chromium (Total)	7440-47-32	NA		5.2						
				F020 F023 and F026 F028 dioxin containing wastes	HiCDD All Hexachloro dibenzo-p-dioxins	<1 ppb		<1 ppb					
					HiCDF All Hexachloro-dibenzofurans	<1 ppb		<1 ppb					
					PeCDD All Pentachloro dibenzo p-dioxins	<1 ppb		<1 ppb					
					TCDF All Tetrachloro dibenzo p-dioxins	<1 ppb		<1 ppb					
F024	NA	Table CCW in 268.43	2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	85-95-4	<1 ppb		<1 ppb						
				2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	88-06-2	<0.05 ppm		<0.05 ppm					
				2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	58-90-2	<0.05 ppm		<0.05 ppm					
				Pentachlorophenol	87-86-5	<0.01 ppm		<0.01 ppm					
				F039	NA	Table CCW in 268.43	Chromium (Total)	7440-47-32	NA		0.073		
								Lead	7439-92-1	NA		[Reserved]	
								Nickel	7440-02-0	NA		0.088	
								Antimony	7440-36-0	NA		0.23	
								Arsenic	7440-38-2	NA		5.0	
								Barium	7440-39-3	NA		52	
								Cadmium	7440-43-8	NA		0.066	
								Chromium (Total)	7440-47-32	NA		5.2	
								Lead	7439-92-1	NA		0.51	
								Mercury	7439-97-6	NA		0.025	
				K001	NA	Table CCW in 268.43	Nickel	7440-02-0	NA		0.32		
Selenium	7782-48-2	NA						5.7					
Silver	7440-22-4	NA						0.072					
Lead	7439-92-1	NA						0.51					



268.43 TABLE CCW -- CONSTITUENT CONCENTRATIONS IN WASTES -- Continued

Waste code	Commercial chemical name	See also	Regulated hazardous constituent	CAS number for regulated hazardous constituent	Wastewaters		Nonwastewaters	
					Concentration (mg/l)	Notes	Concentration (mg/kg)	Notes
	4 Bromophenyl phenyl ether			101 55 3	0.055	(*)	15	(*)
	n Butyl alcohol			71 36-3	5.6	(*)	2.6	(*)
	Butyl benzyl phthalate			85 88 7	0.017	(*)	7.6	(*)
	2 sec Butyl 4 6 diisopropyl			88 85 7	0.046	(*)	2.5	(*)
	Carbon tetrachloride			56-23 5	0.057	(*)	5.6	(*)
	Carbon disulfide			75-15-0	0.014	(*)	NA	(*)
	Chlordane			67 74 8	0.0033	(*)	0.13	(*)
	p-Chloroaniline			106 47 8	0.46	(*)	1.6	(*)
	Chlorobenzene			106 90-7	0.057	(*)	5.7	(*)
	Chlorobenzilate			610 15 6	0.10	(*)	NA	(*)
	2 Chloro-1,3 butadiene			126 99 8	0.057	(*)	NA	(*)
	Chlorodibromomethane			124 48 1	0.057	(*)	15	(*)
	Chloroethane			75-00-3	0.27	(*)	8.0	(*)
	bis(2 Chloroethoxy) methane			111 81 1	0.038	(*)	7.2	(*)
	bis(2 Chloroethyl) ether			111 44 4	0.033	(*)	7.2	(*)
	Chloroform			67 66 3	0.046	(*)	5.6	(*)
	bis(2 Chloroisopropyl) ether			39636 32 8	0.055	(*)	7.2	(*)
	p Chloro m-cresol			59 50-7	0.018	(*)	14	(*)
	Chloromethane (Methyl chloride)			74 87-3	0.19	(*)	33	(*)
	2 Chloronaphthalene			91 8 7	0.055	(*)	5.6	(*)
	2 Chlorophenol			85 57 8	0.044	(*)	5.7	(*)
	3 Chloropropylene			107 05 1	0.036	(*)	2.8	(*)
	Chrysene			218-01 9	0.059	(*)	8.2	(*)
	o-Cresol			95-46 7	0.11	(*)	5.6	(*)
	Cresol (m- and p-isomers)				0.77	(*)	3.2	(*)
	Cyclohexanone			108 94 1	0.36	(*)	NA	(*)
	1,2 Dibromo-3 chloropropane			96-12 8	0.11	(*)	15	(*)
	1,2 Dibromoethane (Ethylene dibromide)			106-93 4	0.028	(*)	15	(*)
	Dibromomethane			74 85 3	0.11	(*)	15	(*)
	2,4 Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2, 4 D)			84 75 7	0.72	(*)	10	(*)
	o,p DDD			53 19-0	0.023	(*)	0.087	(*)
	p,p DDD			72 64 6	0.023	(*)	0.087	(*)

o p DDE	3124 82 6	0.031	(1)	0.087	(1)
p p DDE	72 55 9	0.031	(1)	0.087	(1)
o p DDT	789 02 6	0.0039	(1)	0.087	(1)
p p DDT	50-26 3	0.0039	(1)	0.087	(1)
Dibenz(a,h) anthracene	53 70 3	0.055	(1)	NA	(1)
Dibenz(a,e) pyrene	182 65 4	0.081	(1)	NA	(1)
m Dichlorobenzene	541 73 1	0.038	(1)	6.2	(1)
o Dichlorobenzene	95 50-1	0.068	(1)	6.2	(1)
p Dichlorobenzene	106 46 7	0.090	(1)	6.2	(1)
Dichlorodifluoromethane	75 71 6	0.23	(1)	7.2	(1)
1,1 Dichloroethane	75 34 3	0.059	(1)	7.2	(1)
1,2 Dichloroethane	107 06 2	0.21	(1)	7.2	(1)
1,1 Dichloroethylene	75 35-4	0.025	(1)	33	(1)
trans-1,2		0.054	(1)	33	(1)
Dichloroethylene			(1)		(1)
2,4 Dichlorophenol	120-83 2	0.044	(1)	14	(1)
2,6 Dichlorophenol	87 65 0	0.044	(1)	14	(1)
1,2 Dichloropropane	78 87 5	0.65	(1)	18	(1)
cis,1,3	10061-01 3	0.036	(1)	18	(1)
Dichloropropane			(1)		(1)
trans-1,3	10061 02 6	0.036	(1)	18	(1)
Dichloropropane			(1)		(1)
Dieldrin	60-57 1	0.617	(1)	0.13	(1)
Diethyl phthalate	84 66 2	0.20	(1)	28	(1)
2,4 Dimethyl phenol	105-67 9	0.026	(1)	14	(1)
Dimethyl phthalate	131 11 3	0.047	(1)	28	(1)
Di-n-butyl phthalate	84 74 2	0.057	(1)	28	(1)
1,4 Dinitrobenzene	100 25-4	0.32	(1)	2.3	(1)
4,6 Dinitro-cresol	534 52 1	0.26	(1)	160	(1)
2,4 Dinitrophenol	51 26 5	0.12	(1)	160	(1)
2,4 Dinitrotoluene	121 14 2	0.32	(1)	140	(1)
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	606 20-2	0.55	(1)	28	(1)
Di-n-octyl phthalate	117 84 0	0.017	(1)	28	(1)
Di-n-propylcarbamate	621 64 7	0.40	(1)	14	(1)
Diphenylamine	122 39-4	0.62	(1)	NA	(1)
1,2-Diphenyl hydrazine	122 66 7	0.67	(1)	NA	(1)
Diphenyl nitrosamine	621 64 7	0.40	(1)	NA	(1)
1,4 Dioxane	123 81 1	0.12	(1)	NA	(1)
Dioxolon	298-04 4	0.017	(1)	176	(1)
Endosulfan I	339 98 6	0.023	(1)	6.2	(1)
Endosulfan II	33213 6 5	0.029	(1)	0.068	(1)
Endosulfan sulfate	1031 07 8	0.029	(1)	0.13	(1)
Erdin	72 20 8	0.028	(1)	0.13	(1)
Erdin aldehyde	7421 83 4	0.025	(1)	0.13	(1)
Ethyl acetate	141 76-6	0.34	(1)	33	(1)
Ethyl cyanide	107 12 0	0.24	(1)	360	(1)
Ethyl benzene	100-41 4	0.057	(1)	6.0	(1)
Ethyl ether	60 28 7	0.12	(1)	160	(1)

268.43 TABLE CCW — CONSTITUENT CONCENTRATIONS IN WASTES—Continued

Waste code	Commercial chemical name	See also	Registered hazardous constituent	CAS number for regulated hazardous constituent	Wastewaters		Nonwastewaters	
					Concentration (mg/l)	Notes	Concentration (mg/kg)	Notes
			bis(2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate	117 81 7	0.28	(*)	28	(*)
			Ethyl methacrylate	97 83 2	0.14	(*)	180	(*)
			Ethylene oxide	75 21 8	0.12	(*)	NA	(*)
			Famphur	52 85-7	0.017	(*)	15	(*)
			Fluorene	206 44 0	0.068	(*)	0.2	(*)
			Fluorochloromethane	66 73 7	0.059	(*)	4.0	(*)
			Heptachlor	75 69 4	0.020	(*)	33	(*)
			Heptachlor epoxide	76 44 8	0.0012	(*)	0.066	(*)
			He chlorobenzene	1024 57 3	0.018	(*)	0.066	(*)
			Hexachlorodiene	118 74 1	0.055	(*)	37	(*)
			Hexachlorocyclopenta diene	87 68 3	0.055	(*)	28	(*)
			Hexachlorodibenzo-turent	77 47 4	0.057	(*)	3.6	(*)
			Hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin		0.000063	(*)	0.001	(*)
			Hexachloroethane	87 72 1	0.055	(*)	0.001	(*)
			Hexachlorocyclopene	1888 71 7	0.035	(*)	28	(*)
			Indeno(1,2,3-c-d)pyrene	183 38 5	0.0055	(*)	0.2	(*)
			Iodomethane	74 88 4	0.19	(*)	65	(*)
			Isobutanol	78 83 1	5.6	(*)	170	(*)
			Isoodin	465 73-6	0.021	(*)	0.068	(*)
			Isosafrole	120 58 1	0.081	(*)	2.6	(*)
			Ketone	143 50-8	0.0011	(*)	0.13	(*)
			Methacrylonitrile	128 98 7	0.24	(*)	84	(*)
			Methanol	67 56 1	5.6	(*)	NA	(*)
			Methacrylene	81 80 5	0.041	(*)	1.3	(*)
			Methoxychlor	72 43 5	0.25	(*)	0.18	(*)
			3-Methylbutanethene	56 49 5	0.0055	(*)	15	(*)
			4,4-Methylene bis(2-chloroaniline)	101 14 4	0.50	(*)	35	(*)
			Methylene chloride	75-09-2	0.689	(*)	33	(*)
			Methyl ethyl ketone	78 93 3	0.28	(*)	36	(*)
			Methyl isobutyl ketone	108 10 1	0.14	(*)	33	(*)
			Methyl methacrylate	80 62 8	0.14	(*)	160	(*)
			Methyl methanesulfonate	66 27 3	0.018	(*)	NA	(*)
			Methyl parathion	288-00-0	0.014	(*)	4.8	(*)
			Naphthalene	91 20-3	0.059	(*)	31	(*)

2 Naphthylamine	91 59 8	0.52	(1)	NA
p Nitroaniline	100-01 6	0.028	(1)	26
Nitrobenzene	99 95-3	0.068	(1)	14
5 Nitro-o-toluidine	99 55 8	0.32	(1)	28
4 Nitrophenol	100 02 7	0.12	(1)	28
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	65-18 5	0.40	(1)	28
N Nitrosodimethylamine	62 75-9	0.40	(1)	NA
N Nitroso-d-n-butylamine	924 16 3	0.40	(1)	17
N Nitrosomethyl-ethylamine	10585 95 6	0.40	(1)	23
N Nitrosomorpholine	59-89 2	0.40	(1)	23
N Nitrosopyridine	100-76 4	0.013	(1)	35
N Nitrosopyrrolidine	930-65 2	0.013	(1)	35
Parathion	56 36 2	0.014	(1)	46
Pentachlorobenzene	608 93 5	0.055	(1)	37
Pentachlorobenzene		0.000063	(1)	0.001
Perena		0.000063	(1)	0.001
Pentachlorobenzene p-dioxin	82-66 6	0.055	(1)	46
Pentachloronitrobenzene	87 98-5	0.089	(1)	74
Pentachlorophenol	62 44 2	0.081	(1)	16
Phenacetin	85 01 6	0.059	(1)	31
Phenanthrene	108 95 2	0.039	(1)	82
Phorals	298-02 2	0.021	(1)	46
Phthalic anhydride	85 44 6	0.089	(1)	NA
Promamide	23850 58 3	0.093	(1)	16
Pyrene	129 00-0	0.087	(1)	16
Pyridine	110 86 1	0.014	(1)	35
Sairole	84 59 7	0.081	(1)	22
Slvex (2 4 6 Tr)	93 72 1	0.72	(1)	79
2 4 5 T	93 76 6	0.72	(1)	79
1 2 4 5	95 84 3	0.055	(1)	18
Tetrachlorobenzene		0.000063	(1)	0.001
Tetrachlorobenzene		0.000063	(1)	0.001
Arens		0.057	(1)	42
Tetrachlorobenzene p-dioxin	630 20 6	0.057	(1)	42
1 1 1 2	79 34 6	0.057	(1)	42
Tetrachloroethane	127 16 4	0.056	(1)	56
Tetrachloroethane	58 90 2	0.030	(1)	37
2 2 4 6	108 88 3	0.080	(1)	28
Tetrachlorophenol				
Toluene				

268.43 TABLE CCW — CONSTITUENT CONCENTRATIONS IN WASTES—Continued

Waste code	Common chemical name	See also	Regulated hazardous constituent	CAS number for regulated hazardous constituent	Wastewaters		Nonwastewaters	
					Concentration (mg/l)	Notes	Concentration (mg/kg)	Notes
K001	NA	Table CCWE in 268.41	Toxophene	8001 35 1	0.0093	(1)	13	(1)
			1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	120 82 1	0.055	(1)	19	(1)
			1,1,1-Trichloroethane	71 55 6	0.054	(1)	66	(1)
			1,1,2-Trichloroethane	79 00 5	0.054	(1)	66	(1)
			Trichloroethylene	79 01 6	0.054	(1)	66	(1)
			2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	85 95 4	0.16	(1)	37	(1)
			2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	86 06 2	0.036	(1)	37	(1)
			1,2,3-Trichloropropane	96 18 4	0.65	(1)	28	(1)
			1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2,2-tetrafluoroethane	76 13 1	0.037	(1)	28	(1)
			Tris(2,3-dibromopropyl)phosphate	128 72 7	0.11	(1)	NA	
			Vinyl chloride	75 01 4	0.27	(1)	33	(1)
			Xylenes (Total)	57 12 5	0.32	(1)	28	(1)
			Fluoride	16984 48 6	12	(1)	16	(1)
			Sulfide	8496 25 8	35	(1)	NA	
			Antimony	7440 36-0	14	(1)	NA	
			Arsenic	7440 38 2	1.9	(1)	NA	
			Berilium	7440 39 3	1.4	(1)	NA	
			Beryllium	7440 41 7	1.2	(1)	NA	
			Calcium	7440 43 6	0.82	(1)	NA	
			Chromium (Total)	7440 47 32	0.20	(1)	NA	
			Copper	7440 50-8	0.37	(1)	NA	
			Lead	7439 82 1	1.3	(1)	NA	
			Mercury	7439 97 6	0.28	(1)	NA	
			Nickel	7440-02 0	0.15	(1)	NA	
			Selenium	7782 48 2	0.95	(1)	NA	
			Silver	7440 22 4	0.82	(1)	NA	
Thallium	7440 28 0	0.29	(1)	NA				
Vanadium	7440 62 2	1.4	(1)	NA				
Zinc	7440 68 6	0.042	(1)	NA				
Naphthalene	91 20 3	1.0	(1)	NA				
Perchlorophenol	87 86 5	0.031	(1)	15	(1)			
Phenanthrene	85 01 8	0.16	(1)	7.4	(1)			
Pyrene	129 00 0	0.031	(1)	15	(1)			
Toluene	108 00 0	0.028	(1)	15	(1)			
Xylenes (Total)	108 86 3	0.028	(1)	28	(1)			
Lead	7439 82 1	0.032	(1)	33	(1)			
Chromium (Total)	7440 47 32	0.037	(1)	NA				
Lead	7439 92 1	0.9	(1)	NA				
		3.4	(1)	NA				
K002	NA	Table CCWE in 268.41	Chromium (Total)	7440 47 32	0.037	(1)	NA	
			Lead	7439 92 1	0.9	(1)	NA	

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTION OF RETAINED OPTIONS**

**APPENDIX F**  
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
Spill Control Options	1
Stormwater Collection and Storage Options	8
Treatment Options	14
Alternative Water Transfer Options	24
Monitoring Options	34

APPENDIX F
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS

Spill Control Options

Option 4 4 3 Construct Centralized Tank Farm for Spill Control/Capture

A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design

Storage - The volume of tankage required for this option could vary between wide limits For instance, to provide the existing "live" capacity in the spill control ponds (A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2 and C-2) would require 69 5 acre-feet of storage

For the A- and B-series ponds, 20 5 acre-feet is required This volume is equivalent to the basin runoff generated by a 1- to 2-year storm which would require 6 7 million gallons of tankage and a major construction effort The peak runoff rate associated with a 1- to 2-year, 6-hour storm is approximately 80 cfs in each drainage, but, it is not practical to pump at 80 cfs because of the size of pump required Since this pumping rate cannot practically be achieved, runoff contaminated by spills will still need to be diverted to the existing spill ponds for temporary storage

The C-2 pond accepts both spills and normal stormwater runoff To equal its live capacity of 49 acre-feet in tanks would be impractical The peak runoff rate to C-2 is also beyond the practical scope for diverting stormwater (i e , 40 cfs for a 5-year event)

This option could be altered enough to be beneficial and feasible by using a lower pumping rate and smaller storage tanks (250,000 gallons) The dimensions of a 250,000-gallon tank are 42 feet in diameter and 24 feet high A single tank would serve each of the A-, B- and C-series drainages as a primary response measure The existing spill control ponds would be maintained for initial capture and reserve capacity Water in the tanks would be sampled, treated if necessary and then either discharged or disposed

Piping - Approximately 4500 feet of 8-inch diameter PVC pipe would be required to carry flows from Ponds A 1, B-1 and C-2 to the centralized tanks

Pumps - Three pump stations rated at 1600 gallons per minute (gpm) each would be utilized to pump water from A-1, B-1 and C-2 to the centralized tanks These high-volume pumps would be effective in isolating a nominal amount of contaminated runoff

B Conceptual Cost Estimate

Table with 2 columns: Description and Cost. Rows include Tankage @ \$1/gallon (\$750,000), Piping @ \$30/foot (135,000), Pumps @ \$70,000/cfs or \$250,000/pump station (750,000), and a total of \$1,635,000.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

This option would provide additional spill control/capture facilities since the existing spill containment pond network would need to remain in place as a back-up system. The use of tanks would allow a spill to be isolated from the environment to a greater extent than is possible with the ponds

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

A centralized tank can be implemented over a period of time since the existing spill control ponds will remain as a back-up system. Additional tanks could be added later. Earthwork will be required to prepare a site for the tanks

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

A centralized tank farm would require more piping than the placement of separate tanks on each drainage, but less site preparation for tank construction

**C 4 Versatility**

This option would add versatility to Rocky Flats Plant's (RFP's) pond management system since it would allow a spill to be contained and isolated while allowing the existing ponds to be available to capture a second spill or contaminated storm runoff event

**C 5 Operable Unit (OU) Interactions**

This option would be independent of all known OU actions

**C 6 Waste Generation**

Sediments would be deposited in the existing ponds and would require maintenance over time. Significant sediment accumulations would not be expected in the tanks

**APPENDIX F  
 DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
 (Continued)**

**Option 4 4 4 Construct Tanks for Spill Control/Capture on Each Drainage**

**A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

Storage - The volume of tankage required for this option could vary. To equal the existing "live" capacity in the basin spill ponds (A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2 and C-2) would require 69.5 acre-feet of storage. For the A- and B-series ponds, this volume is equivalent to the runoff generated by a 1- to 2-year storm and would require 6.7 million gallons of tankage and a major construction effort. The peak runoff rate associated with a 1- to 2-year, 6-hour storm is approximately 80 cfs in each drainage, but, it is not practical to pump 80 cfs because of the size of pumps required. Since this pumping rate cannot practically be achieved, runoff contaminated by spills would still need to be diverted to the existing spill ponds for temporary storage.

Similar conditions exist on the C drainage where 49 acre-feet of the live storage is currently available. The peak inflow rate for a 5-year storm is 40 cfs. Pumping at the peak flow rate and providing equivalent storage would not be practically feasible.

This option could be altered enough to be beneficial and feasible by using a lesser pumping rate and smaller storage tank capacity in each of the basins (250,000 gallons). The dimensions of each tank in each of the three drainage basins would be 42 feet in diameter and 24 feet high.

Piping - Approximately 500 feet of 8-inch diameter PVC pipe will be required to carry flows from a pump station just upstream of each of the ponds (A-1, B-1 and C-2) to the tanks.

Pumps - Three pumps, one for each tank, would be required. These pumps would be rated at 1600 gpm so that they could be able to isolate a nominal amount of contaminated runoff.

**B Conceptual Cost Estimate**

Tankage @ \$1/gallon	\$ 750,000
500 feet Piping @ \$30/foot	15,000
Pumps @ \$70,000/cfs or \$250,000/pump station	<u>750,000</u>
	<b>\$1,515,000</b>

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

This option would provide additional spill control/capture facilities since the existing spill containment pond network will need to remain in place as a back-up system. The use of a tank allows a spill to be isolated from the environment to a greater extent than is possible with the ponds. This option provides larger storage capacity compared to Option 4.4.3.

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

Tanks could be installed over a period of time, since the existing spill containment ponds would remain as a back-up system. Additional tanks could be added later. A considerable amount of earthwork would be required to prepare a site for tanks of this size.

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

Tanks placed in each basin would require less piping than a centralized tank farm, but a centralized tank location would require less site preparation for construction. This option can be compared directly to Option 4.4.3 (construct centralized tank farm for spill control/capture) for cost-effectiveness. This option results in a greater expense since a higher percentage of cost would be devoted to tanks rather than pumps and piping.

**C 4 Versatility**

This option is versatile since it would allow a spill to be contained and isolated and keep the existing ponds available to capture a second spill or contaminated storm runoff event. This option provides more versatility than a centralized tank farm because it places a separate spill containment tank in each basin and provides a greater total volume of tanks.

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option would be independent of all known OU actions.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C 6 Waste Generation**

Sediments would tend to accumulate in the existing ponds and would require maintenance over time. Significant sediment accumulations would not be expected in the tanks.

**Option 4 4 8 Utilize Existing Ponds A-1, A-2, B-1 and B-2 for Spill Control/Capture**

**A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

Storage - Utilize existing ponds for storage and maximize "live" storage to the extent possible. The current maximum drawdown is to the 30 percent capacity level for all spill containment ponds. An analysis should be conducted to determine if this maximum drawdown can be increased for any or all of the spill containment ponds in order to provide more "live" storage.

**B Conceptual Cost Estimate**

Negligible costs would be required to implement this option.

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

This option would provide two storage facilities in series on each of the A and B drainages. The C drainage would have a single storage pond. This would allow for system redundancy which increases the opportunity for isolation of a spill. This option could provide additional spill control/capture volume by utilizing more "live" storage than currently exists and would not depend on pumps or pipes to capture contaminated runoff.

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

This option requires minimal expenditure and could be implemented immediately. Funding should be provided to address dam maintenance and dam safety concerns which were raised in the Army Corps of Engineers (COE) report released in 1993 (COE, 1993).

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

C 3    Cost-effectiveness

This option could be implemented for minimal cost and would provide effective spill control storage. Providing storage in ponds is more economical than storage in tanks.

C 4    Versatility

The use of four spill control/capture ponds is a versatile option because it allows for runoff contaminated by spills to be isolated from the remainder of the pond system.

C 5    OU Interactions

This option would be independent of all known OU actions.

C 6    Waste Generation

Sediments would accumulate in the ponds and would require maintenance over time.

Option 4.4.9 Consolidate Existing Spill Control Ponds to One Per Drainage

A    Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design

Storage - Consolidation of ponds would most likely involve enlargement of the largest spill pond on each drainage, namely Ponds A-2 and B-2. Providing a comparable storage volume to that provided by the existing ponds would require an increase in Pond A-2's volume by 3 acre-feet (a 20 percent enlargement), resulting in a depth increase of 1 foot, and an increase to Pond B-2's volume by 1.1 acre-feet (a 20 percent enlargement), resulting in a 1-foot increase in depth.

B    Conceptual Cost Estimate

A-2 enlargement @ \$50,000/acre-foot	\$150,000
B-2 enlargement @ \$50,000/acre-foot	<u>60,000</u>
	\$210,000

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

This option could provide a simplified operating procedure for spill control/capture and would reduce the number of sampling locations. However, this option would limit system redundancy by leaving no volume in reserve for spills and less ability to isolate spills as compared to two ponds per drainage.

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

Should modification of the dams be required for safety, these activities could disturb or cover existing sediment which may be contaminated (COE 1993). The dam might have to be bypassed during construction.

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

The cost of consolidating storage facilities would not be offset by any increase in spill volume.

**C 4 Versatility**

This option would be less versatile operationally for isolating spilled material than Option 4.4.8 (Utilize Existing Ponds A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2 and C-2 for Spill Control/Capture). It would also be less versatile for longer-term clean-up operations which may require the use of one pond for spill control while the other is remediated.

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option would be independent of all known OU actions.

**C 6 Waste Generation**

Future sediment deposition would go to only one spill containment pond location per basin rather than two per basin. The amount of sediment deposited would not increase or decrease from existing conditions.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**Stormwater Collection and Storage Options**

**Option 4 5 1 Maintain and Continue Using Existing On-line Stormwater Ponds**

**A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

**Monitoring** - This option would implement recommendations from the Corps of Engineers report (COE 1993) concerning increased monitoring of the phreatic water surface in the terminal ponds dam embankments through the installation of piezometers and continued analysis of structural integrity to assure dam safety

**Surface Water System Improvements** - This option would provide modifications to the following bypass pipes or channels as follows

- **A-series Ponds** - Increase the capacity of the A-series bypass pipe which normally carries flow past the spill containment ponds (A-1 and A-2) to Pond A-3 This is a 42-inch corrugated metal pipe (CMP) with a capacity of 90 cfs When the capacity is exceeded, which begins to occur during a six-hour storm event with a return period of two years, excess flows begin to fill A-1 and sometimes A-2 This can reduce or eliminate the available live volume for spill control/capture and may increase the volume of water requiring treatment

Improvements would include modifications to the existing gate structure and a concrete-lined channel Details of this option are contained in the Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan (EG&G, 1992)

- **B-series Ponds** - Increase the capacity of the B-series bypass pipe which normally carries flow around Ponds B-1, B-2 and B-3 to B-4 and B-5 This bypass pipe is a 48-inch CMP with a capacity of 160 cfs When the capacity is exceeded, which begins to occur for a six-hour storm event with a return period of five to ten years, excess flows will enter B-1, B-2 and B-3 This can reduce or eliminate available live volume for spill control/capture and for isolation of STP effluent storage

These improvements would include a new concrete-lined channel as detailed in the Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan (EG&G, 1992)

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

- C-series Ponds - The Woman Creek Bypass Canal (WCBC) is designed to carry flow from Woman Creek around Pond C-2. Pond C-2 captures flow from the south side of the plant site via the South Interceptor ditch. WCBC features a concrete stream diversion structure immediately upstream of Pond C-2 which diverts Woman Creek flows through seven 60-inch culverts to the bypass canal. As originally constructed, the capacity of the WCBC was in excess of the 100-year, 6-hour peak flow of 730 cfs. A recent EG&G report, "Woman Creek Bypass Canal Report 1991" (SWD-008-92), dated June 18, 1992 by Doug Murray (EG&G), describes large reductions in the flow capacity due to vegetation growth and related vegetative debris. The report also states that current flow capacity is estimated at 260 cfs, or slightly less than the 25-year return period flow. When this capacity is exceeded, flows begin to enter C-2, potentially reducing the ability of C-2 to contain stormwater runoff of spills from the south side of the plant site and mixing stormwater with potentially contaminated water requiring testing and possibly treatment.

A component of this option would be to take immediate measures to restore the capacity of the WCBC. There are also deficiencies due to vegetative growth in the West Interceptor Canal and the West Walnut Creek Bypass Canal (both are west of the plant site) and the South Interceptor Ditch leading to Pond C-2. These problems should also be remedied as part of this option. The components of this improvement are detailed in the Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan (EG&G, 1992).

**B Conceptual Cost Estimate**

Dam Safety Monitoring	\$ 100,000
Surface Water System Improvements	
A-series ponds	1,000,000
B-series ponds	900,000
C-series ponds (restore capacity of	500,000
South Interceptor Ditch and Woman	
Creek Bypass Channel)	
Clean out 2 channels west of plant site	<u>500,000</u>
	<b>\$3,000,000</b>

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

The measures included in this option would increase the ability of the stormwater ponds to receive the stormwater, thereby allowing the spill ponds to be available for their intended purpose. The improved bypass capacity would reduce the potential for stormwater flows to overwhelm the spill control ponds and carry contaminants downstream.

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

Existing systems could remain operational during the construction phase and would not impede current pond management. Projects could be implemented in phases.

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

This option would provide immediate, recognizable benefits for a relatively low cost.

**C 4 Versatility**

This option would provide versatility by addressing problems associated with stormwater management, as well as spill control/capture. This option would increase the ability to isolate and monitor STP effluent as needed.

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option would be independent of all known OU actions.

**C 6 Waste Generation**

Sediments would accumulate in the ponds and bypass canals and would require periodic maintenance. Erosion would be controlled during construction activities.

APPENDIX F  
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
(Continued)

Option 4 5 4 Consolidate Existing Stormwater Ponds to One Per Drainage

A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design

Storage - Consolidation of ponds would most likely involve enlargement of the largest of the existing ponds, namely A-4 and B-5. Pond C-2 would not be modified since it is currently the only stormwater pond on the C drainage receiving core area runoff. To provide a comparable volume of storage provided by the existing ponds would require an increase in Pond A-4's volume by 35 acre-feet (a 35 percent enlargement), resulting in a depth increase of 7.5 feet, and an increase of 1 acre-foot to Pond B-5's volume (a 2 percent enlargement), resulting in a 0.2-foot increase in depth.

B Conceptual Cost Estimate

A-4 enlargement @ \$50,000/acre-foot	\$1,750,000
B-5 enlargement @ \$50,000/acre-foot	<u>50,000</u>
	\$1,800,000

C Comparative Analysis Criteria

C 1 Risk Reduction

Consolidating stormwater ponds can provide a simplified operating procedure. The safety of the existing stormwater dam can also be addressed by this option. However, hazards associated with a dam failure would be increased since all basin storage would be located in one pond. This option would reduce the number of sampling points.

Consolidating the ponds could result in contamination to larger volumes of water, possibly resulting in increased treatment requirements. This option would reduce system redundancy and lessen reserve storage potential in the event of contamination.

For this option, future sediment deposition would accumulate in only one stormwater location per basin. This option would mean the loss of the capability to isolate STP effluent in Pond B-3.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

The proposed modification of the terminal dam could disturb existing sediment which may be contaminated. Flows would have to bypass the terminal pond during construction.

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

The costs would not be offset by any increase in storage volume.

**C 4 Versatility**

This option would be less versatile for isolating incoming flows for monitoring and/or treatment than Option 4 5 1 (maintain and continue using existing on-line stormwater ponds).

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option would be independent of all known OU actions.

**C 6 Waste Generation**

Future sediment deposition would accumulate in only one pond location per basin. This project would require moving large quantities of earth, and may create waste which may not be disposed on-site.

**Option 4 5 12 Construct Storage Tanks for STP Effluent Only**

**A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

**Storage** - The volume of storage required for this option is a function of the incoming effluent flow rate and the required holding time. Assuming these tanks would be used on a routine basis (rather than for "upsets" or spill collection) and that any tank must be batch-sampled rather than continuously-sampled, the tanks would be sized by computing the product of inflow and holding time. A reasonable turnaround time for Segment 5 analytes which include organics, metals and radionuclides is 21 days. Using a design flow of 0.15 million gallons per day (MGD) and a contingency factor of 25 percent, a storage volume of 4 million gallons would be required. Four one-million-gallon tanks (each sized at 80 feet diameter and 28 feet tall) would occupy at least 1 acre of land.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

Pumps - A pump station rated at 250 gpm would be required to keep pace with the rate of STP effluent discharge and to deliver the discharge to the tanks

**B      Conceptual Cost Estimate**

Tanks @ \$1/gallon	\$4,000,000
Pump station @ \$50,000 each	<u>50,000</u>
	<b>\$4,050,000</b>

**C      Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1      Risk Reduction**

Reducing or eliminating STP effluent discharges from the B-series pond system would reduce nutrient loadings which routinely cause algae blooms in the ponds. Discharges from the tanks could be sent directly to Segment 4 following sampling.

Potential STP effluent upsets would be independently contained and would not impact routine stormwater management operations.

**C 2      Funding and Schedule Constraints**

This option's use of four tanks would allow it to be implemented over a period of time. Each tank could come on-line at different times.

**C 3      Cost-effectiveness**

There would be a high cost to this option without substantial justification. High operations and maintenance costs would be incurred for repairing, cleaning, disinfecting, inspecting and operating these tanks.

**C 4      Versatility**

These tanks would need to be dedicated to STP effluent and would not be available for stormwater-related spill control (in order to avoid commingling of clean effluents with contaminated stormwater) and thus the option would have limited versatility.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option would be independent of all known OU actions

**C 6 Waste Generation**

Soil disturbance would occur during site preparation for tank construction. Maintenance activities would include periodic disposal of accumulated sediment in the tanks.

**Treatment Options**

**Option 4.6.1 Construct Mobile Treatment Units for Multi-pond Use**

**A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

Mobile treatment units would be utilized as needed to address stormwater (or spills in spill containment ponds) which does not meet water quality standards for discharge or transfer.

**Pumps** - Two to three portable/submersible pumps of varying sizes (15/50/100 gpm) would be required for pond pumping.

**Piping** - Approximately 200 to 300 feet of flexible piping would be needed to transfer water to mobile unit from the pond(s) and to the discharge point from the mobile unit.

**Treatment Units** - Single or multiple mobile units would be necessary for processes including pretreatment and multi-stage treatment depending on constituents and volumes to be treated. A rented mobile treatment unit used at RFP may not be able to be cost-effectively decontaminated and used elsewhere. The purchase cost is therefore a consideration of this option.

**Power Source** - 220 volt wiring or a generator would be required.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**B      Conceptual Cost Estimate**

Rental of a 15-gpm multi-stage (e.g., ion exchange/GAC/precipitation) system with operator	\$750 to 1000/day
Purchase of a mobile 15-gpm multi-stage exchange/GAC/precipitation) system with operator	150,000
Pumps and piping	<u>20,000</u>

Total Costs are dependent on the duration of treatment operations

**C      Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1      Risk Reduction**

Minor risk reduction is expected from this option because it is unlikely that treatment could reduce contaminants of concern (COCs) to significantly lower levels than the capabilities of the current technology and facilities. However, mobile treatment unit(s) offer the most strategic method for addressing COCs at problem areas when detected. This option may also reduce risk associated with slug discharges resulting from spills.

**C 2      Funding and Schedule Constraints**

Renting a few portable treatment systems would minimize capital construction costs. Construction/Assembly of the system could involve a long lead time because of the uniqueness of the system and the small number of contractors with this type of design/construction expertise.

**C 3      Cost-effectiveness**

Mobile treatment units could allow treatment of multiple sources with one unit, thereby resulting in higher cost effectiveness over using individual systems for each source. Mobile treatment systems could also be contracted from suppliers of such services which would be economical. Cost-effectiveness would nonetheless be low, however, due to the low COC levels. Cost-effectiveness would be further reduced if a variety of portable systems are required to ensure treatment for an acceptable range of COCs. Another reduction in cost-effectiveness would occur if numerous systems are required to treat a single source if portable systems are purchased for stand-by use, or if extensive influent storage is required.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

It is possible that if a mobile treatment unit is used to treat a highly-contaminated volume of water, the unit could not be decontaminated to an acceptable level for use by the contractor elsewhere and would need to be purchased

C 4    Versatility

This option would be extremely versatile because multiple sources could be addressed with a single system. Multiple stage systems would be most versatile because they would be applicable to a wide range of COCs. Treatment could also be contracted on an as-needed basis.

C 5    OU Interactions

This option is independent of all known OU actions.

C 6    Waste Generation

Depending on the treatment type implemented, filter cake or spent medias may be classified as low-level wastes. Waste volumes would be minor because of low constituent levels.

Option 4.6.2 Construct Individual Treatment Facilities at Each Pond

A      Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design

Storage - 1000 to 2000 gallons of influent storage (equalization) would be required at each treatment facility.

Piping - To transfer water to the treatment system from influent storage and to the discharge point from treatment system, approximately 1000 total feet of piping would be required.

Pump Stations - Pumps and controls would be required at each pond with approximately 100 gpm capacity each. A 100-gpm pumping rate would be consistent with the expected treatment rate.

Treatment Systems - Multi-stage treatment facilities would be housed in a completely enclosed structure. Facilities could be shared by 2 to 3 ponds, depending on locations, to reduce costs.

**APPENDIX F  
 DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
 (Continued)**

Power Source - 220-volt wiring or a generator would be required

**B      Conceptual Cost Estimate**

4-5 Storage facilities @ \$20,000 each	\$100,000
Piping @ \$30/foot	30,000
Pumps @ \$70,000/cfs or \$20,000 each	100,000
4-5 Treatment facilities @ \$5M-\$10M each	<u>35,000,000</u>
	<b>\$35,230,000</b>
 Annual operation and maintenance costs	 \$250,000

**C      Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1    Risk Reduction**

Only minor risk reduction is expected because it is unlikely that treatment could reduce COCs to significantly lower levels than the capabilities of the current technology and facilities. This option may reduce risk associated with slug discharges resulting from spills. Individual treatment systems will allow for optimum design capacity and technology.

**C 2    Funding and Schedule Constraints**

Individual treatment systems would be relatively expensive with total costs for all required facilities ranging from \$5-50 million and would stretch the 5-year time frame due to construction requirements.

**C 3    Cost-effectiveness**

Placement of individual systems near sources would be cost-effective with respect to piping and pumping costs. Cost-effectiveness would be low, however, because the already low COC levels are not likely to be greatly reduced. Cost-effectiveness would be further reduced if extensive influent storage is required. Individual permanent systems would also be relatively expensive when compared to a mobile treatment unit.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C 4 Versatility**

Versatility would be less than for mobile rented (or purchased) treatment units because those units could be requested for a specific treatment need following sampling

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option is independent of all known OU actions

**C 6 Waste Generation**

Depending on the treatment type implemented, filter cake or spent medias could be classified as low-level wastes Waste volumes would be relatively minor because of low constituent levels

**Option 4 6 7 Use Existing OU Treatment Facilities**

**A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

**Treatment Systems** - This option would utilize treatment systems currently available at the RFP including OU 1, OU 2 and OU 4 treatment facilities

In addition to OU treatment facilities, the 374 Evaporator was also evaluated for available capacity and potential use The following table shows the characteristics of the existing OU treatment facilities and the 374 Evaporator

Facility	Available Capacity	Technology	Influent Storage
OU 1 Treatment Facility	30 gpm, 16 hrs /day	ion exchange, UV oxidation	15,000 gal
OU 2 Treatment Facility	45 gpm, 24 hrs /day, 330 days/yr	neutralization, precip /co-precip , sedimentation, microfiltration, GAC	10,000 gal
OU 4 Treatment Facility	51,000 gal/day, 150 - 365 days/yr	straining, evaporation (VC and flash evap)	1,380,000 gal
374 Evaporator	None	decontamination, evaporation	850,000 gal

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

Piping - 20,000 feet of piping would be required to transfer pond water to treatment systems for maximum versatility

Pump Stations - Pumps and controls are required at each pond with approximately 100-gpm capacity each

Tank Trucks - Tanker truck(s) to haul source water to treatment systems could be a viable alternative to pipe systems

**B Conceptual Cost Estimate**

Piping @ \$30/foot	\$300,000
Pump stations @ \$70,000/cfs	160,000
Treatment systems	0
Tank trucks @ \$100,000/truck	<u>200,000</u>
	<b>\$360,000-460,000</b>

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

This option would likely result in minor risk reduction because it is unlikely that treatment could reduce COCs to significantly lower levels. This option could reduce risk of slug discharges resulting from spills. Existing treatment facilities would reduce risks associated with COCs for which there is on-site treatment technology with available capacity.

Coordination of treatment of new influent sources with the influent source that existing facilities were originally designed to treat would not necessarily reduce overall site risks.

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

Funding would not be a major issue for this option because only operational and maintenance (O&M) costs would increase. O&M cost data for existing facilities is not available for evaluation, but it is likely that incremental O&M costs would be minimal.

APPENDIX F  
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
(Continued)

C 3 Cost-effectiveness

Use of existing systems makes the treatment component of this option cost-effective. The piping needed to convey water from the ponds to the treatment facilities and additional influent storage are the most costly components of this option. Trucking water to be treated could be a more cost-effective approach.

C 4 Versatility

This option is versatile because it expands capabilities of existing systems to include treatment of additional sources.

C 5 OU Interactions

This option may impact OU planning efforts by utilizing the remaining capacity at existing facilities. This option would require changes to the ROD.

C 6 Waste Generation

Waste volumes such as filter cakes and spent media would be increased with increased treatment rates. Wastes generated from new sources would be additive to current wastes and, therefore, classified similarly to low-level wastes.

Option 4 6 8 Expand Existing OU Treatment Facilities

A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design

This option contains the same basic components which were required for Option 4 6 7, including expansion of existing treatment facilities.

Treatment Systems - OU facilities with potential for expansion include OU 1 (expand by 30 gpm), OU 2 (expand by 20 gpm) and OU 4. Additionally, the 374 Evaporator (expand by 10 to 15 gpm) which is located out of the OUs was evaluated for expansion.

B Conceptual Cost Estimate

Discussions with RFP treatment personnel indicate that it would require significant capital costs to expand most existing treatment facilities. Costs to expand buildings housing treatment equipment may be particularly costly. Expansion costs are wide-ranging depending on technologies expanded or added to existing OUs. Such costs are

APPENDIX F  
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
(Continued)

estimated in the range of \$100,000 to add additional ion exchange or GAC units to \$20 million to add new technologies in expanded buildings

Expansion of the 374 Evaporator facility from 32 gpm to 45 gpm would cost approximately \$22 million

All expansion costs would be additive to costs summarized in Option 467 which would be required to distribute pond water to existing OU treatment facilities

C Comparative Analysis Criteria

C 1 Risk Reduction

Minor risk reduction is expected because it is unlikely that treatment could reduce COCs to significantly lower levels. This option could reduce risk associated with slug discharges resulting from spills. Existing treatment facilities would reduce risks associated with COCs for which there is on-site treatment technology that could be expanded.

Coordination of treatment of new influent sources with the influent sources that existing facilities were originally designed to treat might not reduce overall site risks.

C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints

Expansion of the A-4 tent facility to include new treatment technologies (i.e., radionuclide removal) would provide a versatile and strategically located facility.

C 3 Cost-effectiveness

Expansion of existing facilities, where possible, would be most cost-effective than constructing new facilities. Costs to transfer wastes to existing facilities would not be prohibitive.

C 4 Versatility

This option would be versatile because it expands capabilities of existing systems to include treatment of additional sources and allows centralized treatment for multiple source streams.

**APPENDIX F  
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
(Continued)**

**C 5    OU Interactions**

This option would require changes to the ROD

**C 6    Waste Generation**

Waste volumes such as filter cakes and spent media would be increased with increased treatment. Wastes generated from new sources would be additive to current wastes and, therefore, classified as low-level waste

**Option 4 6 9    Consolidate Treatment Facilities at Pond A-4 for Use by Entire Pond System**

**A      Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

**Treatment Systems** - This option would use the existing A-4 system including filter bags and GACs. The A-4 system currently contains a fully available capacity of approximately 17 MGD for organics treatment. This capacity could potentially be expanded.

At a minimum, radionuclides and metals treatment should be added to A-4's treatment capabilities.

**Piping** - Approximately 10,500 feet of piping would be required to collect pond water at Pond A-4 facilities.

**Pump Stations** - Pumps and controls at each pond with approximately 100 gpm capacity would be required.

**Influent Storage** - A relatively large influent storage tank with an approximate 1 MGD capacity would be necessary to fully utilize the A-4 treatment facility.

**B      Conceptual Cost Estimate**

Storage facility	\$ 250,000
Piping @ \$30/foot	315,000
Pump stations @ \$70,000/cfs	160,000
Treatment facility expansion	<u>2,000,000</u>
	<b>\$2,725,000</b>
 Operation and maintenance costs	 \$ 250,000

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

Risks associated with slug discharges resulting from spills could be reduced. A comprehensive and strategically located treatment facility with expanded treatment capacity could provide effective risk reduction.

**C 2 Funding and Scheduling Constraints**

A single, large treatment system could be prohibitively expensive, however, because the existing A-4 organics treatment system could be expanded for multi-stage treatment it would reduce capital costs.

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

A single, large system at Pond A-4 would reduce piping and pumping costs. Use of A-4 facilities would offer a convenient, centrally located treatment system at which there would be no conflicting treatment objectives other than treating pond water. Also, there is significant capacity (1.7 MGD) currently available at A-4.

**C 4 Versatility**

A single system designed to treat multiple sources would be inherently versatile. Simultaneous treatment of multiple sources could be difficult.

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option would be independent of all known OU actions.

**C 6 Waste Generation**

Wastes generated from new sources would be similar to wastes previously generated by the system. Upgrades to the existing system to expand treatment capabilities would generate different types of wastes (e.g., metals sludge, radionuclides, etc.).

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**Alternative Water Transfer Options**

**Option 4 7 1 1 Recycle STP Effluent for On-site Industrial Use**

**A      Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

**Pumping** - Two pumping stations would be required for this option. One pumping station of approximately 200 gpm would be required to transfer STP effluent from surface storage to the recycle system surge tank. A second pump station of approximately 100 gpm would pump water out of the surge tank, through backflow preventers, and into the industrial water system against an existing head of approximately 50 feet.

**Piping** - Approximately 4000 feet of 8-inch diameter piping would be required to transfer water to the surge tank. This pipeline could be surface layed, or buried, depending on the design life of the system and type of pipe material selected.

**Storage** - Storage facilities would be required for this option for STP effluent prior to recycling efforts. Additional water storage required for this option would include a surge tank estimated at a 100,000-gallon capacity, located adjacent to and connected to the plant's industrial water supply header.

**Treatment** - STP effluent meeting Segment 5 criteria and other benchmarks identified in Table 3-1 would require no treatment other than suspended solids removal prior to its use as non-potable industrial water. This would be accomplished by a 4-stage, multi-media filter located just after the first pump station, and sized at 200 gpm.

**Controls** - Automatic/Manual controls would be required to prevent overfilling of the surge tank. Manual operation of the system would be required to protect pumping equipment and monitor effluent storage levels and filter performance.

**B      Conceptual Cost Estimate**

Construction	\$1,500,000
Operations and maintenance/year	<u>200,000</u>
	<b>\$1,700,000</b>

APPENDIX F  
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
(Continued)

C Comparative Analysis Criteria

C 1 Risk Reduction

Health-based reductions in risk would be nominal. STP effluents under this option would already meet Segment 5 water quality criteria, and no additional treatment (other than sediment filtration) would be employed. Minor risk reduction would be possible through reduced downstream discharges. A minimal reduction could occur in pond storage levels, thereby reducing dam failure risks.

C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints

This option would have minor cost and schedule constraints due to its relatively low cost, use of standard construction techniques and use of accepted technology.

C 3 Cost-effectiveness

This option would be a cost-effective approach to reducing downstream discharges and dam safety concerns and would also provide cost savings through decreased raw water purchases. However, the demand for recycled water for industrial use would likely decrease as industrial operations are phased out.

C 4 Versatility

Due to the availability of other recycle sources (from the 374 Evaporators) and the limited usage of raw water, this option cannot accomplish the total recycle of STP effluent. The maximum available raw water demand at RFP would be approximately 17 MG/yr, whereas the STP effluent volume would be approximately 55 MG/yr. STP effluent not being recycled would be discharged off-site according to current practices.

C 5 OU Interactions

This option would be independent of all known OU actions.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C 6    Waste Generation**

This option would generate a small volume of waste in the form of used filter media and backflush waters from the multi-media filter. Estimated volumes would be approximately 5 cubic yards of low-hazard granular filter material (sand, grit, etc.) and 800-1000 gallons of non-toxic backwash water annually.

**Option 4 7 1 2    Recycle Pond Water to RFP Industrial Water Supply**

**A      Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

The components and basis of design for this option are identical to those for recycling STP discharges (Option 4 7 1 1). Any surface water for which recycling is proposed, would require a pump station and filter at the water source location, piping, surge tank and controls.

**B      Conceptual Cost Estimate**

A-3, A-4 or B-5 recycling	
Recycling facilities	\$2,800,000
Operations and maintenance	<u>200,000</u>
	\$3,000,000
C-2 recycling	
Recycling facilities	\$1,100,000
Operations and maintenance	<u>200,000</u>
	\$1,300,000

**C      Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1    Risk Reduction**

This option has the same risk reduction potential as Option 4 7 1 1, with the following addition:

Average annual stormwater runoff collected and discharged at RFP is approximately 120 million gallons (MG). Runoff is divided between drainages as follows: A-series - 55 MG, B-series - 45 MG, C-series - 20 MG. With an estimated industrial usage of 17 mg per year, no drainage could routinely achieve zero discharge, although during drier years, zero discharge of Pond C-2 would be achievable.

APPENDIX F  
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
(Continued)

Option 4 7 1 4 Directly Spray Evaporate Pond Water (Aerosol Spray Method) On-site

A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design

Storage - This option assumes that storage facilities would be the existing surface water impoundments

Piping - Piping to supply water to the spray heads would use 6-inch diameter aluminum or high-density polyethylene pipe. A 6-inch centrifugal pump would supply approximately 1200 linear feet of pipe with spray heads at 30- to 40-foot intervals

Pumps - Either diesel-powered or electric-powered pumps capable of delivering 200-gpm flow rates and 30-35 psi pressure would be required for an aerosol spray system

Spray Heads - Spray heads would be high-volume, riser-type atomizing spray, in order to maximize the volume of water evaporated

System Layout - The system would spray water over the pond from which it came. Piping with spray heads could be located adjacent to the pond, or designed to float in the pond. Edge-located piping would be easier to install, maintain and operate

Controls - Spray systems would be manually operated (start and stop) to ensure they are not operated in weather conditions which are not suitable for evaporation

B Conceptual Cost Estimate

Construction cost is estimated at \$300,000 to \$400,000 per pond. Utilizing 4 ponds will result in a total cost of \$1,200,000 to \$1,600,000

O&M costs are estimated at \$30,000 to \$40,000 annually using plant site staff

C Comparative Analysis Criteria

C 1 Risk Reduction

Health-based reductions in risk would not be expected for water meeting Segment 5 standards. Spray evaporation operations would reduce or eliminate transfers between non-discharging ponds. Reduced pond storage levels would also improve dam safety

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

This option would have no cost or schedule constraints due to its low cost, low level of technology and ease of installation

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

This option would not be a cost-effective method of reducing downstream discharges from stormwater ponds, and would only be cost-effective for small-volume ponds (i.e., spill control ponds) for which lowered pond levels may prevent the need to discharge or transfer from these ponds

**C 4 Versatility**

Spray evaporation systems could be installed and operated at any pond meeting the required water quality criteria. Each spray head would be capable of evaporating 100 to 150 gallons per day (gpd) on an average basis. Limitations due to climatic conditions would result in seasonal operations (approximately April-October) and a need to store water prior to evaporation. A typical system comprising 40 heads and operated 180 days per year could evaporate approximately 900,000 gallons annually.

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option interacts with planning and management aspects of OUs 5, 6 and 7, but does not preclude any actions to be taken during characterization or remediation of those OUs.

**C 6 Waste Generation**

No wastes would be generated by this option.

**Option 4.7.1.5 Mechanically Evaporate Pond Water (Evaporative Coolers) On-site**

**A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

**Pumping** - Either diesel or electric-powered pumps would be required to pump water from storage to a new evaporator.

APPENDIX F  
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
(Continued)

Evaporator Design - Mechanical evaporators would require heat inputs to promote evaporation. An evaporator capable of evaporating 10 MG/year (a typical size) would require a dependable source of energy in the form of waste heat, electrical energy, or other sources of power. System components would typically include pumping and feed controls, heat exchangers, heating elements, controls, recirculation piping, pre-filtration equipment and corrosion protection features.

B Conceptual Cost Estimate

A 10 MG/year evaporator is conceptually estimated at \$20-25 million, based on previously prepared estimates and industry guidelines.

O&M costs are estimated at \$400-500 thousand per year using plant site staff.

C Comparative Analysis Criteria

C 1 Risk Reduction

The risk reduction potential for mechanical evaporation would be minimal. Evaporated water would meet Segment 5 water quality criteria and other benchmarks identified in Table 3-1 prior to evaporation.

C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints

The high level of funding required for this option, the large scale of construction effort involved, and the expected permitting requirements for this option all impose significant schedule constraints on this option. An estimated completion schedule is 3 to 5 years.

C 3 Cost-effectiveness

Mechanical evaporation of water meeting Table 3-1 benchmarks would not be cost-effective and would not represent a reasonable reduction in risk for the money spent.

APPENDIX F  
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
(Continued)

C 4 Versatility

Mechanical evaporators are large facilities that would require a high level of operational control to ensure they are functioning properly, cannot be relocated, and cannot be expanded beyond design capacity. Their versatility in addressing changing water management needs would be low. These evaporators could not be used for contaminated water.

C 5 OU Interactions

This option would be independent of all known OU actions.

C 6 Waste Generation

Waste generated from operations (in the form of concentrates or sludges) or cleaning could be regulated and difficult to dispose or store.

Option 4.7.1.8 Transfer Interior Ponds to Pond A-3 to Maintain Spill Control Capacity

A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design

This option transfers water meeting imposed water quality control criteria from interior spill control ponds to Pond A-3 for eventual discharge.

Pumping - A portable pump station of approximately 500 gpm would be required to transfer water from Pond A-2 to Pond A-3. Due to lack of electrical power availability, this pump would operate on gasoline or diesel fuel.

Piping - Transfer piping consisting of approximately 300 additional feet of 6-inch diameter high density polyethylene (HDPE) pipe would be required to create a discharge point to Pond A-3.

B Conceptual Cost Estimate

Pump station	\$40,000
Valving	1,000
Piping	<u>1,000</u>
	\$42,000

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

Transferring water that meets benchmarks identified in Table 3-1 would present no significant risk to human health and the environment

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

Due to its low cost, there would be no cost or schedule constraints for this option

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

This option is a cost-effective method of maximizing available spill control capacity, thereby providing maximum protection to downstream waters

**C 4 Versatility**

The pipeline used for this option could also be used to transfer water which requires treatment

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option has no OU interactions

**C 6 Waste Generation**

No wastes would be generated by this option

**APPENDIX F  
 DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
 (Continued)**

**Option 4729 Discharge Stormwater Ponds to Segment 4**

**A Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

This option focuses on reduction of sampling efforts by discharging directly from ponds which meet Segment 4 standards and other benchmarks identified in Table 3-2 to downstream receiving waters

**Piping** - Surface-laid piping necessary to discharge Ponds A-4, B-5 and C-2 to Segment 4 currently exists. Additional surface piping would be installed from Pond A-3 to a connection with the A-4 discharge piping north of Pond A-4

**Pumps** - Pumps currently exist at Pond A-4, B-5 and C-2 for use in transfer or discharge operations. An additional pump would be installed at Pond A-3

**B Conceptual Cost Estimate**

Piping (A-3) at \$30/foot (1000')	\$30,000
Pump at A-3	<u>25,000</u>
	<b>\$55,000</b>

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

Ponds A-4 and C-2 are currently discharged to Segment 4 in accordance with Segment 4 standards. Under current operational management, Ponds B-5 and A-3 would be monitored for a limited suite of indicator parameters (consistent with Segment 5 Standards) prior to transfer to Pond A-4 and discharge. Monitoring of these ponds for Segment 4 Standards and other Table 3-2 benchmarks, as required for discharges, is a more stringent requirement than currently exists. More stringent monitoring requirements are presumably more protective and thus represent a reduction in risk compared to current conditions.

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

This option has no cost or schedule constraints due to its low cost, high use of existing facilities and ease of installation.

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

APPENDIX F  
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
(Continued)

This option is a cost-effective method of managing stormwater discharges. Redundant sampling of Ponds A-3 and B-5 prior to transfer to Pond A-4 (which is in turn sampled prior to discharge) is eliminated in favor of a single, more stringent sampling event at Ponds A-3 and B-5. Operational costs would also be reduced by not handling A-3 and B-5 water a second time in Pond A-4.

C 4 Versatility

This option would provide greater versatility and flexibility than the current operational system. By discharging Ponds B-5 and A-3 directly to Segment 4, Pond A-4 would receive only a limited amount of routine inflow, making it available for non-routine storage of high flows resulting from spring runoff or large storm events. This pond would also be available to accept transfers of water from Ponds A-3, B-5 and C-2 that do not meet discharge standards, and would provide a central storage location that is adjacent to the existing A-4 treatment facilities.

C 5 OU Interactions

This option would maintain current capabilities to capture, store and monitor discharges and runoff from upstream OUs prior to off-site discharge. This option also would improve the operational flexibility of the ponds for dealing with future OU 5 and OU 6 remediation efforts and is consistent with expected final actions for water control and water management during cleanup operations.

C 6 Waste Generation

No wastes would be generated by this option.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**Option 4 7 2 10 Pipe Water from Pond C-2 to Walnut Creek in On-Site Pipeline**

**A      Option Components and Basis of Conceptual Design**

This option utilizes the existing transfer piping between C-2 and the Walnut Creek drainages to eliminate discharges to the Standley Lake basin

**Pumping** - A permanent pump station of approximately 500 gpm would be required to transfer water from Pond C-2 directly to the Walnut Creek drainage below Pond A-4 or B-5. Due to lack of electrical power availability, this pump station would operate on gasoline or diesel fuel

**Piping** - Transfer piping consisting of 8-inch diameter high density polyethylene (HDPE) pipe which currently exists between Pond C-2 and Ponds B-5 and A-4. A tee, two gate valves and approximately 300 additional feet of pipe would be required to create a discharge point below Pond A-4 or B-5

**B      Conceptual Cost Estimate**

Pump station	\$80,000
Valving	10,000
Piping	<u>1,000</u>
	\$91,000

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

Transferring water that meets benchmarks identified in Table 3-1 would present no significant risk to human health and the environment and would eliminate a perceived risk from residents in the Standley Lake basin

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

There would be no cost or schedule constraints for this option

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

This option is a cost-effective method of reducing Pond C-2 discharges to Woman Creek and Standley Lake. This option cannot assure that Pond C-2 would not overtop during a flood event since runoff volume from an extreme event could exceed the storage capacity of C-2

**C 4 Versatility**

The pipeline used for this option could also be used to transfer water to Pond B-5, Pond A-4 or directly to the Broomfield Diversion Ditch

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option would transfer water from the jurisdiction of OU 5 (Woman Creek) to the jurisdiction of OU 6 (Walnut Creek), but could be discontinued at any time and would not impact actions or planning efforts for these OUs under the Interagency Agreement (IAG)

**C 6 Waste Generation**

No wastes would be generated by this option

APPENDIX F  
DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS  
(Continued)

Monitoring Options

Option 4 8 3 Monitor Influent Streams

A Basis of Conceptual Monitoring Plan

Influent stream water would be sampled and analyzed for the water quality parameters that are currently monitored at RFP during a pre-discharge sampling event with Colorado Department of Health (CDH). These parameters include gross alpha, gross beta, ammonia, nitrate/nitrite, sulfate, sulfide, TDS, TSS, bicarbonate/carbonate, chloride, fluoride, semi-volatile organics, volatile organics, cyanide, HSL metals, triazine herbicides, organochlorine herbicides, and organophosphorus pesticides

Influent streams would also be monitored in real-time for flow and indicator parameters (pH, temperature, conductivity) using instrumented flumes, weirs and water quality probes

Samples would be taken monthly on each of the three RFP drainages

B Conceptual Cost Estimate

Laboratory Analytical Costs	\$2500
Field (Sampling) Costs	<u>300</u>
	\$2800 per sample
36 samples per year	\$100,800

C Comparative Analysis Criteria

C 1 Risk Reduction

No risk reduction associated with potential chemical exposure would be achieved by this option. Influent stream monitoring does not provide earlier detection capabilities than monitoring pond water directly due to the fact real-time analytical methods are unavailable for chemical constituents of concern at the low detection limits required. Monitoring of indicator parameters could provide early indication of potential water quality problems

C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints

There would be no funding or schedule constraints associated with this option

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

C 3 Cost-effectiveness

Flow monitoring would promote efficient and cost effective pond water management by maximizing the planning time for pond water transfer or discharge operations. Monitoring of indicator parameters would be a cost-effective method for early identification of potential water quality problems.

C 4 Versatility

This option would provide versatility by monitoring a large number of water quality parameters and would allow time for remedial action prior to transfer or release.

C 5 OU Interactions

This option would be independent of all known OU actions.

C 6 Waste Generation

No waste would be generated by this option.

Option 4 8 4 Monitor Ponds

A Basis of Conceptual Monitoring Plan

Pond water would be sampled and analyzed at regular intervals (monthly, quarterly, or annually) for COCs and Segment 5 analytes to demonstrate compliance with the ambient water quality requirements of Table 3-1. Pond volumes, dam piezometers, and indicator parameters (pH, temperature, conductivity) would be monitored in real time to assist operational management and stay apprized of changing conditions.

Sampling efforts for this option include radionuclide-specific analysis for plutonium, americium and uranium which results in higher analytical costs.

Ponds A-1, A-2, B-1 and B-2 would be sampled quarterly. Ponds A-3, A-4 and B-5 and the Landfill Pond will be sampled monthly.

B Conceptual Cost Estimate

Laboratory Analytical Costs	\$4000
Field (Sampling) Costs	<u>300</u>
	\$4300 per sample
64 samples per year	\$275,200

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

This option would ensure that contaminants in ponds that are not transferred or discharged would be detected and remedial actions could be implemented as needed. Pond volume and dam piezometer monitoring would ensure dam safety considerations are accounted for and uncontrolled discharges would not occur. This option would be protective of human health and environment and would promote compliance with the numeric water quality criteria adopted for this Interim Measures/Interim Remedial Action (IM/IRA) Decision Document.

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

There would be no funding or schedule constraints associated with this option.

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

Cost effectiveness is a function of the frequency of routine water quality monitoring compared to the frequency with which operational monitoring is conducted. Monthly or quarterly monitoring at ponds which are also monitored at a similar frequency for operational reasons is redundant and not cost effective. Quarterly or annual monitoring of non-discharging ponds would be cost effective in determining compliance with ambient water quality criteria. Frequent volume and piezometer monitoring would be very cost-effective compared to the potential impacts from a dam failure.

**C 4 Versatility**

This option would provide versatility by monitoring different ponds at different frequencies depending on the frequency in which a particular pond undergoes monitoring for operational purposes.

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option would be independent of all known OU actions.

**C 6 Waste Generation**

No wastes would be generated by this option.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

Option 4 8 5 Monitor Transfers

A      Basis of Conceptual Monitoring Plan

Ambient pond water quality would be sampled and analyzed prior to transfer operations for the parameters that are currently monitored at RFP during a pre-discharge sampling event with CDH. These parameters would include gross alpha, gross beta, ammonia, nitrate/nitrite, sulfate, sulfide, TDS, TSS, bicarbonate/ carbonate, chloride, fluoride, semi-volatile organics, volatile organics, cyanide, HSL metals, triazine herbicides, organochlorine herbicides, and organophosphorus pesticides. Analytical results would be compared against Segment 5 criteria and other benchmarks identified in Table 3-1. During transfers, flows and indicator parameters (pH, temperature, conductivity) would be monitored in real time to assist operational management and provide early warning of changing water quality conditions.

B      Conceptual Cost Estimate

Laboratory Analytical Costs	\$2500	
Field (Sampling) Costs	<u>300</u>	
	\$2800 per sample	
 12 samples per year		 \$33,600

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

**C Comparative Analysis Criteria**

**C 1 Risk Reduction**

This option would ensure that contaminants that are both regulated and of particular concern would be detected in time to take remedial action prior to transfer to other ponds. This option would be protective of human health and the environment and would promote compliance with the numeric water quality criteria adopted for this IM/IRA Decision Document.

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

There would be no funding or schedule constraints associated with this option.

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

This option would be a cost-effective method of determining compliance with benchmarks compared to monitoring for all Segment 5 parameters, many of which have never been detected in RFP waters.

**C 4 Versatility**

This option would provide versatility by monitoring a large suite of parameters prior to transfers and only indicator parameters (which would allow early detection of water quality problems) during transfers.

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option would be independent of known OU actions.

**C 6 Waste Generation**

No wastes would be generated by this option.

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

Option 4 8 6 Monitor Discharges

A      Basis of Conceptual Monitoring Plan

Ambient pond water quality would be sampled and analyzed prior to discharge operations for the parameters that are currently monitored at RFP during a pre-discharge sampling event with CDH. These parameters would include gross alpha, gross beta, ammonia, nitrate/nitrite, sulfate, sulfide, TDS, TSS, bicarbonate/ carbonate, chloride, fluoride, semi-volatile organics, volatile organics, cyanide, HSL metals, triazine herbicides, organochlorine herbicides, and organophosphorus pesticides. Analytical results would be compared against Segment 4 criteria and other benchmarks identified in Table 3-2. During discharges, flows and indicator parameters (pH, temperature, conductivity) would be monitored in real time to assist operational management and provide early warning of changing water quality conditions. Whole Effluent Toxicity Tests (WET) would also be conducted on discharged water as a check on overall water quality (toxicity), and to comply with current Federal Facilities Compliance Agreement (FFCA) requirements.

B      Conceptual Cost Estimate

Laboratory Analytical Costs	\$2500
Field (Sampling) Costs	<u>300</u>
	\$2800 per sample

18 samples per year	\$50,400
---------------------	----------

Laboratory Analytical Costs	
for <i>Ceriodaphnia sp</i>	\$275
fathead minnows	500
field (Sampling) costs	<u>300</u>
	\$1075 per sample

18 samples per year	\$19,350
---------------------	----------

C      Comparative Analysis Criteria

C 1      Risk Reduction

**APPENDIX F**  
**DESCRIPTIONS OF RETAINED OPTIONS**  
(Continued)

This monitoring option would ensure that contaminants are detected in time to take remedial action prior to downstream discharge, and would achieve regulatory compliance. Biomonitoring would provide an assessment of overall water quality, but would be insufficient to determine compliance with chemical-specific numerical standards and overall risk to downstream water.

**C 2 Funding and Schedule Constraints**

There would be no funding or schedule constraints associated with this option.

**C 3 Cost-effectiveness**

This option would be a cost-effective method of determining compliance with Segment 4 criteria compared to monitoring for all Segment 4 parameters, many of which have never been detected in RFP waters. Biomonitoring provides information on the overall toxicity and water quality at a minimal cost.

**C 4 Versatility**

This option would provide versatility by monitoring a large suite of parameters prior to discharge and only indicator parameters (which would allow early detection of water quality problems) during discharge.

**C 5 OU Interactions**

This option would be independent of known OU actions.

**C 6 Waste Generation**

No wastes would be generated by this option.

**APPENDIX G  
EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL EXPOSURE  
FROM PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES**

**APPENDIX G  
EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL EXPOSURE  
FROM PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES**

Evaluation of Risks to Personnel due to Inhalation

August 3, 1992 EG&G Memorandum from R S Roberts to S A Pettis Risks due to  
Spray Evaporation of B-2 Pond

September 29, 1993 WWE Calculation Sheets on Estimated Air Emissions

October 8, 1993 EG&G Memorandum From R M Garren to G V Porter Pond Water  
IM/IRA Air Emissions Evaluation

Evaluation of Risks to Personnel due to Water Ingestion

**AUGUST 3, 1992 EG&G MEMORANDUM  
FROM R.S ROBERTS TO S A PETTIS:  
RISKS DUE TO SPRAY EVAPORATION OF B-2 POND**

## INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

DATE August 3, 1992

TO S A Pettis, Surface Water, Bldg 80, X8615

FROM   
R S Roberts, Remediation Programs, Bldg 80, X8508

SUBJECT RISKS DUE TO THE SPRAY EVAPORATION OF B-2 POND - RSR-016-92

A risk analysis was performed to evaluate the potential human health risk due to the spray evaporation of the B 2 pond. The results of this evaluation show that the carcinogenic risk due to this activity is  $2.7 \times 10^{-10}$  and the Hazard Index is  $4.5 \times 10^{-7}$ . These values are well below the acceptable carcinogenic range of  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  to  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  and the acceptable Hazard Index of 1.0.

In order to calculate the above risks, it was assumed that an individual will live at the Rocky Flats Plant fence line for the next thirty years and that spray evaporation will continue for that period of time. This individual will be exposed to volatile organic compounds (VOC) that are volatilized from the spray head when water is sprayed over the B 2 pond. The VOCs volatilized during spray evaporation are transported from the spray head to the hypothetical individual at the fence line. This exposure scenario was reviewed and approved by the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Colorado Department of Health (CDH). All assumptions used in this analysis are outlined in Attachment I.

Attachment II shows the analytical results used in this risk analysis. Methylene Chloride, Acetone, 1,2 Dichloroethene and Trichloroethene were evaluated in this risk assessment. J and B qualified data were assumed to be present at the reported value.

If you have any questions or need support in presenting this information, please contact me.

dmf

Attachments  
As Stated (2)

cc  
G M Anderson  
M B Arndt  
R C Flory  
D S Murray  
D M Smith

**SPRAY EVAPORATION RISK ASSUMPTIONS**

**A) Spray Evaporation Specifications**

Average Flowrate = 1000 gallons\minute  
Daily Exposure Duration = 10 hours\day  
Annual Exposure Duration = 125 days\year  
Duration of Spray Evaporation Activities = 30 years

**B) Dispersion of Volatiles**

$$CHI\!Q = (1\!/\!PI)(U)(SIGMA\!-\!Y)(SIGMA\!-\!Z)$$

PI = 3.1416  
U = 4.7 meters\second  
SIGMA-Y = 110 meters  
SIGMA-Z = 43 meters  
Distance to Individual = 1.6 kilometers  
Stability Class = D

Assumptions were taken from the Plan For Prevention Of Contaminant Dispersion, dated February, 1992

Assume 100% volatilization from water

**C) Inhalation of Volatilized Constituents**

$$\text{Intake} = \frac{(ER)(CHI\!Q)(IR)(DEF)(AEF)(ED)}{(BW)(AT)}$$

ER = Emission Rate = Chemical Specific Value  
CHI\!Q = Dispersion Value  
IR = Inhalation Rate = 0.83 m<sup>3</sup>\hour  
DEF = Daily Exposure Frequency = 10 hours\day  
AEF = Annual Exposure Frequency = 125 days\year  
ED = Exposure Duration = 30 years  
BW = Body Weight = 70 kg  
AT = Averaging Time = 70 Years (Carcinogens)  
AT = Averaging Time = 30 Years (Non-Carcinogens)

$$\text{Carcinogenic Risk} = (\text{Intake})(\text{Slope Factor})$$

$$\text{Hazard Index} = \text{Intake}\!/\!\text{Reference Dose}$$

Slope Factors and Reference Doses used in this analysis were taken from the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) and the Health Effects Assessment Summary Tables (HEAST). The primary source was IRIS. Slope Factors and Reference Doses are current as of 7/30/92.

1A  
VOLATILE ORGANICS ANALYSIS DATA SHEET

EPA SAMPLE NO

Pond B-2 6/23/92  
NP50631 WC

Lab Name ITAS-ST LOUIS

Contract 262 01

Lab Code ITAS

Case No --

SAS No

SUB No ---

Matrix (soil/water) Water

Lab Sample ID 2109-601

Sample wt/vol 5 (g/ml) #1

Lab File ID >E4065

Level (low/med) LUW

Date Received ~~06/20/92~~ 06/23/92

% Moisture not dec -

Date Analyzed 06/23/92

Column (pack/cap) LAP

Dilution Factor 1

CAS NO	COMPOUND	CONCENTRATION UNITS		Q
		(ug/L)	or ug/Kg	
74-87-3	Chloromethane	10	IU	
74-83-9	Bromomethane	10	IU	
75-01-4	Vinyl Chloride	10	IU	
75-00-3	Chloroethane	10	IU	
75-09-2	Methylene Chloride	11	IB	
67-64-1	Acetone	18	I	
75-15-0	Carbon Disulfide	5	IU	
75-35-4	1,1-Dichloroethane	5	IU	
75-34-3	1,1-Dichloroethane	5	IU	
540-59-0	1,2-Dichloroethane (total)	4	I J	
67-66-3	Chloroform	5	IU	
107-06-2	1,2-Dichloroethane	5	IU	
76-93-3	2-Butanone	10	IU	
71-55-6	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	5	IU	
56-23-5	Carbon Tetrachloride	5	IU	
108-05-4	Vinyl Acetate	10	IU	
75-27-4	Bromodichloromethane	5	IU	
78-87-5	1,2-Dichloropropane	5	IU	
10061-01-5	cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	5	IU	
79-01-6	Trichloroethane	4	I J	
124-48-1	Dibromochloromethane	5	IU	
79-00-5	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	5	IU	
71-43-2	Benzene	5	IU	
10061-02-6	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	5	IU	
75-25-2	Bromoform	5	IU	
108-10-1	4-Methyl-2-Pentanone	10	IU	
591-78-6	2-Hexanone	10	IU	
127-18-4	Tetrachloroethane	5	IU	
79-34-5	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	5	IU	
108-88-3	Toluene	5	IU	
108-90-7	Chlorobenzene	5	IU	
100-41-4	Ethylbenzene	5	IU	
100-42-5	Styrene	5	IU	
1330-20-7	Xylene (total)	5	IU	

DRAFT

0 - file in correct level

Potential Air Emissions for IM/IRA Combined (Preferred) Option

1) Spray Evaporation

7 systems - 2 at landfill, 2 at A-2, each at A-1, B-1, and B-2

Each system will evaporate  $\sim 900,000$  gallons over 180 days (5000 gal/day)

A) Water Quality of Evaporated Water - Use sample mean from Table 1.1, 1.3, or 1.8 (attached) for ambient concentration

B) Diesel Pumps - 1 Diesel Pump per system  
Usage - 8 hr/day  $\times$  180 days = 1440 hrs  
Fuel Consumption  $\sim 1.1$  gal/hr

2) A-4 Discharge

A) Diesel Pump  
Usage - 24 hr/day  $\sim$  13 days/month = 3744 hr/year  
Fuel Consumption  $\sim 3.3$  gal/hr

B) Diesel Generator for A-4 Tent (50 kw)  
Usage - 10 hr/day for 80 days/year = 800 hr/year  
Fuel Consumption  $\sim 1.2$  gal/hr

3) B-5 Transfer

A) Diesel Pump  
Usage - 24 hr/day  $\sim$  9 days/month = 2592 hr/year  
Fuel Consumption  $\sim 3.3$  gal/hr

B) Diesel Light Plant (15 kw)  
Usage 10 hr/day  $\sim$  9 days/month = 1080 hr/year  
Fuel Usage  $\sim$  ~~1.2~~ <sub>0.35</sub> gal/hr

4) C-2 Recycle System

A) ~~Propane Powered Pump~~ Propane Powered Pump 96 HP  
~~Usage~~ Propane Usage = 11.4 lb/hr  
Usage 25 days/month for 6 months 10 hr/day = 1500 hr/yr

5) A-4 Tent Propane System

Usage 10 hr/day  $\times$  180 days (est) = 1800 hr/year  
Fuel Consumption  $\sim$  ~~1.2~~ ~~7.2~~ 7.2 lb/hr

\* C) Disposal operation option - 11 hr/detected

WRIGHT WATER ENGINEERS, INC  
2490 West 26th Ave - Suite 100-A  
Denver, Colorado 80211  
Tel. (303) 480-1700  
Subject \_\_\_\_\_

Date 9-29-93 Sheet \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_  
Proj No 901 004 450  
Proj Name IM/IRA  
Des. By Mende Ckd. By \_\_\_\_\_

## Calculation Sheet for Air Emissions Estimate

Spraying Evaporation Systems (Per Doug Murray - EG&G)

Operational April - September ~ 180 days

Evaporation estimate is 900,000 gal per system @ A-2 & LF

Pumps (Diesel) are run 8 hr / day (daylight hours only)

Fuel Usage estimate is 40 gal / wk (1 gal / hr)

B-5 Transfer and A-4 Discharge

Pump Fuel Usage is 10 gal / 3 hrs @ ~ 800 gpm (Doug Lee - Riedel)

Light Plant Fuel Usage  $15 \text{ kW} / 144,000 \text{ Btu/gal} \times 2428 \text{ kW-hr} = .35 \text{ gal/hr}$

**OCTOBER 8, 1993 EG&G MEMORANDUM  
FROM R.M GARREN TO G V PORTER  
POND WATER IM/IRA AIR EMISSIONS EVALUATION**



## INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

DATE            October 8, 1993

TO              G V Porter, Surface Water Division, Bldg T893A, X5661

FROM           R M Garren, Air Quality Division, Bldg 080, X8512 *RMJ*

SUBJECT        POND WATER IM/IRA AIR EMISSIONS EVALUATION - RMG-013-93

This correspondence accompanies the attached set of calculations used to evaluate potential air emissions from a list of proposed options provided by the Surface Water Division (SWD) for the Pond Water Management Interim Measures/Interim Remedial Action (IM/IRA). The proposed options were evaluated to determine if an Air Pollutant Emission Notice (APEN) or permit application would be required for spray evaporation activities and the operation of propane and diesel fired equipment. The options were outlined in a correspondence from Wright Water Engineers, Inc dated September 29, 1993. The following is a summary of the evaluation.

- Evaluation of spray evaporation activities described in option 1 of the letter indicate that emissions are well below reportable levels and the impact on air quality is negligible.
- The diesel-fired pump mentioned in part B of option 1 will not require an APEN or permit application based on the actual hours of operation. In order to demonstrate compliance to the Colorado Department of Health (CDH), an operating log documenting hours of operation and fuel consumption (if possible) must be maintained.
- The diesel-fired pump mentioned in options 2 and 3 will require an APEN. A permit application will not be required based on the actual hours of operation. The Air Quality Division will require proper notification of implementation plans in order to prepare and submit the appropriate paperwork to the CDH.
- The diesel-fired generator mentioned in part B of option 2 will not require an APEN or permit application based on the actual hours of operation. In order to demonstrate compliance to the CDH, an operating log documenting hours of operation and fuel consumption (if possible) must be maintained.
- The diesel-fired light plant mentioned in part B of option 3 will not require an APEN or permit application. An operating log for this unit is not necessary.
- The propane-fired pump mentioned in option 4 will not require an APEN or permit application based on the actual hours of operation. In order to demonstrate compliance to the CDH, an operating log documenting hours of operation and fuel consumption (if possible) must be maintained.

**G V Porter**  
**October 8, 1993**  
**RMG-013-93**  
**Page 2**

- **The Pond A-4 tent propane system mentioned in option 5 will not require an APEN or permit application. An operating log for this unit is not necessary.**

**Any deviation in the hours of operation or the equipment listed in these options that will affect air emissions will require a re-evaluation by the Air Quality Division. Please notify the Air Quality Division immediately if an option is selected that requires an APEN. If you have any questions concerning this correspondence, please contact me at X8512 or digital page 4281.**

**RMG**

**Attachment**  
**As Stated**

**cc**  
**R C. Ninninger**  
**C. A. Patnoe**

**OCTOBER 7, 1993 WWE CALCULATION SHEETS  
ON PROPOSED OPTIONS**







## **G 1 Summary**

A CERCLA risk analysis was performed to evaluate the resulting differences in risk from pond water management alternatives described in the Interim Measures/ Interim Remedial Action (IM/IRA) Decision Document. A steady state model of the pond water flow and the risk results from the Baseline Risk Assessment were used together to predict changes in risk resulting from different water management actions. "Worst case" large volume spills were postulated to occur in each drainage area and the risks calculated for different spill control alternatives. Water storage, collection, and transfer options for non-spill conditions were also evaluated.

## **G 2 Introduction**

A CERCLA human health risk comparison was performed where applicable for the retained options discussed in Chapter 5 and described in Appendix F of this document. The purpose of this risk evaluation was to provide quantitative assessment on risks relative to each proposed alternative as a tool for the IM/IRA Decision process on proposed actions. A compartmental flow model of the Rocky Flats surface water ponds was developed in order to predict the contaminant concentrations in the individual ponds and the resulting human health risks for a variety of pond management alternatives. Current baseline risk levels calculated in the Baseline Risk Assessment (Appendix D, summarized in Section 2.5), were used together with the flow model to predict the resulting risk reductions of proposed alternatives for spill capture and water storage/ transfer.

## **G 3 Model Description**

A flow model was developed for the surface water ponds on North Walnut Creek, South Walnut Creek, and Woman Creek. The ponds included in the model are Ponds A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, C-1, C-2, and the Landfill Pond. The model base case represents steady state flow averaged over the calendar year 1992 and is given in Figure G-1, Pond Flow Model. The flow data used in model are given in the following tables:

- Table G-1 S Walnut Creek Flows
- Table G-2 N Walnut Creek Flows
- Table G-3 Regulated Discharges and Woman Creek Flows
- Table G-4 Average Pond Capacities

The sources of data used for water release rates, pond capacities, and transfer between ponds include the 1992 Rocky Flats Environmental Report, EG&G Surface Water Operating Logs and Summaries, and the EG&G Surface Water flow monitoring network. The values for annual precipitation and evaporation used in the model were the average values for the Rocky Flats Plant site of 16 inches and 40 inches respectively.

#### **G 4 Model Use and Method of Comparison**

The model described above was developed to predict the results of introducing perturbations in the system, changes in water flow (re-routing water, spray evaporation, or elimination of ponds) and the addition of a contaminant (spills) were evaluated. Other IM/IRA option categories such as treatment and monitoring options were not evaluated since the model could not be as easily applied to these cases.

For simplicity in modeling spills, the assumption is made that the entire amount of chemical considered is dumped into the receiving pond and then the spill action alternative occurs. Since spills are not steady state events, then only those flows appropriate to the spill event are carried from the base model to the spill model. Restated, credit is taken for pond operator actions to implement the spill control measures according to the spill control alternative being evaluated. The risks associated with spills are then compared for each alternative quantitatively.

The Baseline Risk Assessment for the pond water was limited to the future residential land use scenario and the ingestion of surface water only. Even though this is a highly unlikely scenario, it served as the upper-bound of risk for any scenarios on-site as well as any current or future scenarios for receptors using the water off the Rocky Flats plant site. However, when comparing alternatives which differ in the amount of water which is released off plant site, then one must select which receptor, future on-site, or current off-site is to be the basis of comparison. For this analysis, the future on-site receptor drinking water from the ponds is the scenario for comparison since the baseline risks were calculated in this way.

In addition, the retained options are also evaluated and compared for the potential to spread contamination off the Rocky Flats plant site.

#### **G 5 Spills**

The following three sections model spills of carbon tetrachloride, trichloroethylene (TCE), and nitric acid. In the case of each spill, the contaminant has two or three possible fates based on the spill capture alternative.

- Captured by the existing ponds (Ponds A-1 and A-2 in the cases of the carbon tetrachloride spill, pond C-2 in the TCE spill, and Ponds B-1 and B-2 in the nitric acid spill) This is the no action alternative)
- Captured by a tank
- Captured by a single pond equivalent to the existing ponds (The TCE spill analysis does not model an equivalent pond )

The analysis assumes that 100% of the contaminant enters the applicable interceptor pond, that there is no loss of contaminant en route. Additionally, the only pathway analyzed is ingestion of contaminated water.

Table G-1 below summarizes the different values of risk and hazard quotients (HQs) to a hypothetical on-site resident individual who ingests the contaminated pond water. The values for risk and HQs were obtained from Sections G 5 1, G 5 2 and G 5 3.

The baseline risk is derived from the risk assessment contained in Chapter 2. This risk assessment assumes that concentrations are as summarized in Tables D-2 1 through D-2 8 in Appendix D of this report.

Table G-1  
Comparison of Risks and HQs from Different  
Contaminant Spills and Different Pond Configurations

	Existing Ponds	Single Spill Control Pond	Tanks
Carbon Tetrachloride	1.7E-5	1.7E-5	4.9E-6
TCE	HQ=0.071	Not Analyzed	HQ=0.071
Nitric Acid	2.13E-5	HQ=0.54	HQ=0.54

It is noted that the risk/hazard is identical for the existing two-pond configuration and the equivalent pond. Therefore, the construction of a single spill control pond cannot be justified from the basis of risk alone. Also, the tank option does not reduce the hazard from a spill, compared to the pond configuration, for spills of TCE or nitric acid, and has only marginally

reduced risk compared to the pond configuration for a spill of carbon tetrachloride. Because of this, it may be difficult the extra expense of capturing tanks.

#### **G 5 1 Building 707 Carbon Tetrachloride Tank Spill Into North Walnut Creek**

This section of the appendix models a release of carbon tetrachloride from a 5040 gallon tank at Building 707. The entire tank contents are assumed to flow into North Walnut Creek without any carbon tetrachloride dissipating into the atmosphere, which is a simplifying if very conservative assumption because water ingestion is the only pathway analyzed. Three separate scenarios are used in this model, all of which are identical except for the receiving pond configuration. In all scenarios, the pathway modeled is ingestion, in other words, it is assumed that an individual living on plant site drinks 2 liters per day of contaminated water.

In the first scenario (analyzed in Section 5 1 1, No Action Alternative), the carbon tetrachloride flows into the presently used configuration of Ponds A-1 and A-2. There the contaminant mixes with the ponds. Since the ingestion period is extremely long (30 years in this model), it is assumed that both ponds reach equilibrium, and the carbon tetrachloride concentrations will be the same in all ponds.

In the second scenario (analyzed in Section 5 1 2, Replace Existing Ponds A-1 and A-2 With One Spill Control Pond), the carbon tetrachloride flows into a single spill control pond, with the same volume as present-day Ponds A-1 and A-2. There the contaminant mixes with the pond to form a homogeneous solution.

In the third scenario (analyzed in Section 5 1 3, Use of Tanks to Capture Spill), tanks are used to contain the spill. It is assumed that the tanks are 100 percent effective, and none of the carbon tetrachloride escapes containment.

#### **G 5 1 1 Capture Using Existing Ponds**

The ultimate carbon tetrachloride concentration is equal to the total amount of carbon tetrachloride released, divided by the total volume of the ponds. The resulting concentration of carbon tetrachloride is

$$\text{Conc} = (5040 \text{ gal} \times 1.595^1 \times 3.785 \text{ liters/gal} \times 1 \text{ gram/1000 liters}) / [(0.33 \times 10^6 \text{ gal} + 2.04 \times 10^6 \text{ gal}) \times 3.785 \text{ liters/gal}] = 3.39 \times 10^{-6} \text{ g/L} = 3.39 \text{ ug/L}$$

The cancer risk associated with daily ingestion of water contaminated with 3.39 ug/L of carbon tetrachloride is calculated using the following formula taken from EPA's Risk Assessment Guide for Superfund<sup>2</sup>, modified for ingestion only. The oral slope factor for carbon tetrachloride is taken from the IRIS database<sup>3</sup>. The cancer risk is

$$\text{Risk} = [\text{Conc} \times \text{EF} \times \text{ED} \times \text{IR}_w \times \text{SF}_o] / [\text{BW} \times \text{AT} \times 365 \text{ day/yr} \times (1000 \text{ ug/mg})]$$

where

$$\text{Conc} = \text{contaminant concentration} = 3.39 \text{ ug/l}$$

$$\text{EF} = \text{exposure frequency} = 350 \text{ day/yr}$$

$$\text{ED} = \text{exposure duration} = 30 \text{ yr}$$

$$\text{IR}_w = \text{water drinking rate} = 2 \text{ l/day}$$

$$\text{SF}_o = \text{oral slope factor} = 0.13 \text{ kg-day/mg}$$

$$\text{BW} = \text{receptor body weight} = 30 \text{ kg}$$

$$\text{AT} = \text{averaging time} = 70 \text{ yr}$$

Inserting these values into the equation

$$\text{Risk} = [(3.39 \text{ ug/L}) \times (350 \text{ day/yr}) \times (30 \text{ yr}) \times (2 \text{ L/day}) \times (0.13 \text{ kg-day/mg})] / [(70 \text{ kg}) \times (70 \text{ yr}) \times (365 \text{ day/yr}) \times (1000 \text{ ug/mg})] = 1.21 \times 10^{-5} \text{ excess risk of contracting cancer}$$

When added to the baseline risk of  $4.9 \times 10^{-6}$ , this comes to  $1.7 \times 10^{-5}$  total risk

---

<sup>1</sup>The specific gravity of carbon tetrachloride at 20 C, taken from Page 3-25 of Perry's *Chemical Engineers' Handbook*, Fifth Edition

<sup>2</sup>Environmental Protection Agency, *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume I Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A)*, Interim Final, EPA/540/1-89/002, December 1989

<sup>3</sup>IRIS Database Update, dated June 30, 1993

### Assumptions

1 It is assumed that all of the carbon tetrachloride goes to the ponds. Actually, much of the contaminant will volatilize.

2 It is assumed that the ponds' concentration of carbon tetrachloride remains undiluted for 30 years of ingestion. The actual concentration will be diluted quickly from volatilization, inflow of precipitation water, etc.

3 It is assumed that an individual will use water from the ponds for his drinking water source. In fact, it is highly doubtful that a resident at Rocky Flats would wish to drink the pond water, as opposed to using municipally supplied water.

4 All pathways are ignored except for water ingestion.

### G 5 1 2 Replace Existing Ponds A-1 and A-2 With One Spill Control Pond

The ultimate carbon tetrachloride concentration is equal to the total amount of carbon tetrachloride released, divided by the total volume of the single pond. This pond's volume is equivalent to the volume of existing ponds A-1 and A-2. The resulting concentration of carbon tetrachloride is identical to that calculated in Section 5 1 1, and is equal to 3.39 ug/l.

The cancer risk associated with daily ingestion of water contaminated with 3.39 ug/l of carbon tetrachloride is identical to that calculated in Section 5 1 1, and equals  $1.21 \times 10^{-5}$  risk of contracting cancer. When added to the background risk of  $5.1 \times 10^{-6}$ , this comes to  $1.7 \times 10^{-5}$  total risk.

### Assumptions

1 It is assumed that all of the carbon tetrachloride goes to the ponds. Actually, much of the contaminant will volatilize.

2 It is assumed that the ponds' concentration of carbon tetrachloride remains undiluted for 30 years of ingestion. The actual concentration will be diluted quickly from volatilization, inflow of precipitation water, etc.

3 It is assumed that an individual will use water from the ponds for his drinking water source. In fact, it is highly doubtful that a resident at Rocky Flats would wish to drink the pond water, as opposed to using municipally supplied water.

4 All pathways are ignored except for water ingestion.

#### G 5 1 3 Use of Tanks to Capture Spill

It is assumed that all of the spill is contained in the tanks, and that none of it is subsequently released. Under this assumption, there is no pathway to a receptor, and there is no risk. So the total risk is equal to baseline, and equals  $4.9 \times 10^{-6}$ .

#### Assumptions

- 1 All pathways are ignored except for water ingestion.
- 2 It is assumed that all of the carbon tetrachloride is captured by the tanks, and that the tanks never release any contaminated water.

#### G 5 1 4 Comparison of Risk

Table G-2 below compares the different risks after a carbon tetrachloride spill under each of the different scenarios.

Table G-2  
Risks After a  $\text{CCl}_4$  Spill

	Existing Ponds	Single Spill Control Pond	Tanks
Risk	$1.7 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.9 \times 10^{-6}$

#### G 5 2 Trichloroethylene Spill into the South Interceptor Ditch

This section of the appendix models a release of 110 gallons of trichloroethylene (TCE). The entire tank contents are assumed to flow into the South Interceptor Ditch without any

TCE dissipating into the atmosphere, a simplifying assumption. Two separate scenarios are used in this model, which are identical except for the receiving pond configuration. In both scenarios, the pathway modeled is ingestion, in other words, it is assumed that an individual living on plant site drinks 2 liters per day of contaminated water.

In the first scenario (analyzed in Section 5.2.1, No Action Alternative), the TCE flows into the presently used configuration of Pond C-2. There the contaminant mixes with the pond and its concentration is assumed to become uniform.

In the second scenario (analyzed in Section 5.2.2, Use of Tanks to Capture Spill), a tank is used to contain the spill. It is assumed that the tank is 100 percent effective, and none of the TCE escapes containment.

#### G 5.2.1 Capture by Existing Pond

The ultimate TCE concentration is equal to the total amount of TCE released, divided by the total volume of the pond. The resulting concentration of TCE is

$$\text{Conc} = (110 \text{ gal} \times 1.466^4 \times 3.785 \text{ liters/gal} \times 1 \text{ gram/1000 liters}) / [4.96 \times 10^6 \text{ gal} \times 3.785 \text{ liters/gal}] = 3.25 \times 10^{-8} \text{ g/L} = 0.033 \text{ ug/L}$$

The non-cancer risk associated with daily ingestion of water contaminated with 0.033 ug/l of TCE is calculated as a hazard quotient using the following formula taken from EPA's Risk Assessment Guide for Superfund<sup>5</sup>. The reference doses for TCE are taken from EPA's memo, Risk-Based Concentration Table, Third Quarter 1993<sup>6</sup>. The hazard quotient is

$$\text{HQ} = [\text{Conc} \times \text{EF} \times \text{ED} \times (\text{IR}_w / \text{RfD}_w)] / [\text{BW} \times \text{AT} \times 365 \text{ day/yr} \times (1000 \text{ ug/mg})]$$

---

<sup>4</sup>The specific gravity of TCE at 20 C, taken from Page 3-43 of Perry's *Chemical Engineers' Handbook*, Fifth Edition.

<sup>5</sup>Environmental Protection Agency, *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume I Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A)*, Interim Final, EPA/550/1-89/002, December 1989.

<sup>6</sup>Memo from Roy L. Smith, entitled "Risk-Based Concentration Table, Third Quarter 1993, dated July 9, 1993.

where

Conc = contaminant concentration = 0.033 ug/L

EF = exposure frequency = 350 day/yr

ED = exposure duration = 30 yr

IR<sub>w</sub> = water drinking rate = 2 l/day

RfD<sub>o</sub> = oral reference dose = 6E-3 kg-day/mg

BW = receptor body weight = 70 kg

AT = averaging time = 70 yr

Inserting these values into the equation

$HQ = [(0.033 \text{ ug/l}) \times (350 \text{ day/yr}) \times (30 \text{ yr}) \times (2 \text{ l/day}) / (6E-3 \text{ kg-day/mg})] / [(70 \text{ kg}) \times (70 \text{ yr}) \times (365 \text{ day/yr}) \times (1000 \text{ ug/mg})] = 6.56E-5$  When added to the baseline Hazard Index of 0.071, the total hazard is 0.071

#### G 5 2 2 Use of Tanks to Capture Spill

It is assumed that all of the spill is contained in the tanks, and that none of it is subsequently released. Under this assumption, there is no pathway to a receptor, and there is no excess hazard. So the hazard is equal to baseline, which is 0.071.

#### Assumptions

- 1 All pathways are ignored except for water ingestion
- 2 It is assumed that all of the TCE is captured by the tanks, and that the tanks never release any contaminated water

#### G 5 2 3 Comparison of Hazard

Table 5.3 below compares the different Hazard Indices after a TCE spill under both scenarios. The difference in Hazard Index is not significant.

**Table G-3**  
**Hazard Indices After a Spill of Trichloroethylene**

	Existing Ponds	Tanks
Hazard Index	0.071	0.071

**G 5 3 Building 910 Nitric Acid Spill Into South Walnut Creek**

This section of the appendix models a release of nitric acid from a 2000 gallon tank outside Building 910. The entire tank contents are assumed to degrade to nitrate, and flow into South Walnut Creek without any nitrate dissipating into the atmosphere or ground, a simplifying if very conservative assumption. Three separate scenarios are used in this model, all of which are identical except for the receiving pond configuration. In all scenarios, the pathway modeled is ingestion, in other words, it is assumed that an individual living on plant-site drinks 2 liters per day of contaminated water.

In the first scenario (analyzed in Section 5 3 1, No Action Alternative), the nitrate flows into the presently used configuration of Ponds B-1 and B-2. There the contaminant mixes with the ponds. Since the ingestion period is extremely long (30 years in this model), it is assumed that all ponds reach equilibrium, and the nitrate concentrations will be the same in all ponds.

In the second scenario (analyzed in Section 5 3 2, Replace Existing Ponds B-1 and B-2 With One Spill Control Pond), the nitrate flows into a single spill control pond, with the same volume as present-day ponds B-1 and B-2. There the contaminant mixes with the pond.

In the third scenario (analyzed in Section 5 3 3, Use of Tanks to Capture Spill), tanks are used to contain the spill. It is assumed that the tanks are 100% effective, and none of the nitrate escapes containment.

**G 5 3 1 Capture by Existing Ponds**

The ultimate nitrate concentration is equal to the total amount of nitrate released, divided by the total volume of the ponds. The resulting concentration of nitrate is

$$\text{Conc} = (2000 \text{ gal} \times 1.502^7 \times 3.785 \text{ liters/gal} \times 1 \text{ gram/1000 liters}) / [(0.35 \times 10^6 \text{ gal} + 1.01 \times 10^6 \text{ gal}) \times 3.785 \text{ liters/gal}] = 2.21 \times 10^{-6} \text{ g/L} = 2.21 \text{ ug/L}$$

The non-cancer hazard quotient associated with daily ingestion of water contaminated with 2.21 ug/L of nitrate is calculated as a hazard quotient using the following formula taken from EPA's Risk Assessment Guide for Superfund<sup>8</sup>. The reference doses for nitrate are taken from the IRIS database<sup>9</sup>. The hazard quotient is

$$\text{HQ} = [\text{Conc} \times \text{EF} \times \text{ED} \times (\text{IR}_w / \text{RfD}_o)] / [\text{BW} \times \text{AT} \times 365 \text{ day/yr} \times (1000 \text{ ug/mg})]$$

where

Conc = contaminant concentration = 2.21 ug/L

EF = exposure frequency = 350 day/yr

ED = exposure duration = 30 yr

IR<sub>w</sub> = water drinking rate = 2 l/day

RfD<sub>o</sub> = oral reference dose = 1.60 kg-day/mg

BW = receptor body weight = 70 kg

AT = averaging time = 70 yr

Inserting these values into the equation

$$\text{HQ} = [(2.21 \text{ ug/L}) \times (350 \text{ day/yr}) \times (30 \text{ yr}) \times (2 \text{ l/day}) / (1.60 \text{ kg-day/mg})] / [(70 \text{ kg}) \times (70 \text{ yr}) \times (365 \text{ day/yr}) \times (1000 \text{ ug/mg})] = 1.6 \times 10^{-5}$$

When added to the baseline hazard index of 0.54, the resulting Hazard Index is 0.54.

---

<sup>7</sup>The specific gravity of nitric acid at ambient (15 to 20 C), taken from Page 3-17 of Perry's *Chemical Engineers' Handbook*, Fifth Edition

<sup>8</sup>Environmental Protection Agency, Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume I Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A), Interim Final, EPA/550/1-89/002, December 1989

<sup>9</sup>IRIS Database Update, dated June 30, 1993

### **Assumptions**

- 1 It is assumed that all of the nitrate goes to the ponds. Actually, much of the contaminant will seep into the ground, etc**
- 2 It is assumed that the ponds' concentration of nitrate remains undiluted for 30 years of ingestion. The actual concentration will be diluted quickly from inflow of precipitation water, etc**
- 3 It is assumed that an individual will use water from the ponds for his drinking water source. In fact, it is highly doubtful that a resident at Rocky Flats would wish to drink the pond water, as opposed to using municipally supplied water**
- 4 All pathways are ignored except for water ingestion**

### **G 5 3 2 Replace Existing Ponds B-1 and B-2 With One Spill Control Pond**

**The ultimate nitrate concentration is equal to the total amount of nitrate released, divided by the total volume of the single pond. The pond's volume is equivalent to the volume of existing Ponds B-1 and B-2. The resulting concentration of nitrate is identical to that calculated in Section 5 3 1, and is equal to 2.21 ug/L.**

**The hazard associated with daily ingestion of water contaminated with 2.21 ug/L of TCE is identical to that calculated in Section 5 3 1, and the Hazard Quotient equals  $1.64 \times 10^{-5}$ . When added to the baseline hazard of 0.54, the resulting Hazard Index is 0.54.**

### **Conservative Assumptions**

- 1 It is assumed that all of the nitrate goes to the pond. Actually, much of the contaminant will seep into the ground, etc**
- 2 It is assumed that the pond's concentration of nitrate remains undiluted for 30 years of ingestion. The actual concentration will be diluted quickly from inflow of precipitation water, etc**
- 3 It is assumed that an individual will use water from the pond for his drinking water source. It is highly doubtful that a resident at Rocky Flats would wish to drink the pond water, as opposed to using municipally supplied water**

**Nonconservative Assumption**

- 1 All pathways are ignored except for water ingestion

**G 5 3 3 Use of Tanks to Capture Spill**

It is assumed that all of the spill is contained in the tanks, and that none of it is subsequently released Under this assumption, there is no pathway to a receptor, and there is no hazard So the Hazard Index equals baseline, which is 0 54

**Assumptions**

- 1 All pathways are ignored except for water ingestion
- 2 It is assumed that all of the nitrate is captured by the tanks, and that the tanks never release any contaminated water

**G 5 3 4 Comparison of Hazard**

Table 5 4 below compares the different risks posed by the nitrate spill under each of the different scenarios Differences in Hazard Indices are unnoticeable

Table G-4  
Hazard Resulting From a Nitrate Spill

	Existing Ponds	Single Spill Control Pond	Tanks
Hazard Index	0 54	0 54	0 54

**G 7 Water Storage /Transfer Options**

Water storage and transfer involves the routine collection and storage of the Rocky Flats sewage treatment plant (STP) effluent and stormwater runoff from the plant site Water is then transferred to a location where it can be isolated for proper monitoring before being released off-site Water storage and transfer alternatives analyzed include recycling all or part of the STP and stormwater on-site, changing pond water release points, and spray

evaporating more of the pond water on-site in lieu of releasing it off-site. The alternatives in this category were presented in Section 5 of the IM/IRA Report as proposed additional management tools rather than mutually exclusive alternatives. Hence each alternative will be evaluated for potential risk reduction relative to the no action or baseline risk given in Appendix D of this report.

#### G 7.1 Existing Pond Water Management Plan

The risks resulting from existing pond water management for routine collection, storage and transfer operations (described in Section 2.2) were assumed to be the risks calculated in the baseline risk assessment from the chemical concentration data measured in each pond. These total cancer and non-cancer risks are given in Appendix D in Tables D-1.1 to D-1.8.

#### G 7.2 Recycle / Tank STP Water

From Figure G-1 and Table G-1, the current flow from the STP into S. Walnut Creek occurs at Pond B-3 at the average flow rate of 141 kgal/day (thousand gallons per day).

It can also be seen that this is currently the major source of water to Pond B-3. The Pond B-3 water then flows to Pond B-4 and then B-5 where it is held until being transferred to Pond A-4 for release.

The contaminants of concern (COCs) for Pond B-3 (Site 4) in the baseline risk assessment included two radionuclides with a combined lifetime excess cancer risk (LECR) of  $5.4 \times 10^{-7}$ . See Table D-2.4 in Appendix D. The metal, inorganic, and organic COCs combined to produce a hazard index of 0.0004. Since these risk levels are low compared to EPA standards, reducing or eliminating the STP effluent flow into the pond system by recycling the water to use on plant site or collecting the effluent in a tank will not appreciably reduce the human health risk for a future on-site receptor. However, it could reduce the release of water and spread of contamination off-site.

### **G 7 3 Direct Spray Evaporate Ponds**

Currently spray evaporation is used to limit the amount of water transferred and released from Pond A-2 and the Landfill Pond. One proposed action is to use spray evaporation in smaller Ponds A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2 to keep these ponds at lower levels between precipitation events. The net effect of spray evaporation on contaminant levels in the pond being sprayed is normally an increase. However, if the volume sprayed is limited to the precipitation inflow, then spraying does not concentrate contaminants in the pond and so does not affect risk at the pond. Spray evaporating Ponds B-1 and B-2 under normal conditions (no spill) would reduce or eliminate the need to transfer water from Pond B-2 to A-2 and reduce the potential to spread low level contamination. In a previous analysis, the additional risk posed to off-site receptors from spray evaporation via the direct inhalation pathway was evaluated for Pond B-2 for several volatile organics and was shown to be below the EPA acceptable risk range for carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic risk. A copy of this analysis, "Risks Due To Spray Evaporation of B-2 Pond" -RSR-016-92 is attached.

### **M 7 4 Redirect Water from Woman Creek to Walnut Creek Downstream of Pond A-4**

One water transfer alternative is to divert water in Woman Creek to Walnut Creek downstream of A-4 through an on-site pipeline. Since this action would not reroute water flowing into any of the ponds on plant-site or introduce contaminants, then the contaminant concentrations in the ponds and hence the risk would not be expected to change.

**Table G-1. South Walnut Creek Flows**

		Monthly Pond Flow Data													
		S Walnut Creek Flows													
		Waste Water Treatment Plant Effluent (Mgal)	Central Ave Ditch from Plant site SW022 (Mgal)	B1 Bypass Pipeline to B4 GSD10 (Mgal)	Central Ave Ditch to B5 SW010 (Mgal)	B1 Transfer to B2 (Mgal)	B2 Transfer to A2 (Mgal)	B3 Natural Flow to B4 (Mgal)	B4 Natural Flow to B5 (Mgal)	B5 Natural Flow to A4 (Mgal)	GS009 (Mgal)				
<b>1991</b>															
January		6.41													
February		4.96													
March		6.03													
April		6.00													
May		6.14													
June		5.07		0.78											
July		4.03		3.42											
August		3.41		5.82											
September		3.00		1.79											
October		3.41	0.25	1.25							7.20				
November		3.30	8.53	1.86											
December		3.41	3.10	1.01							11.40				
<b>1991 Total Flow</b>															
<b>Yearly Ave Flow Rate (kgal/day)</b>		<b>151</b>													
<b>1992</b>															
January		3.9	0.03	1.22		0.00	0.00			n.d.	3.60				
February		3.5	0.00	1.14		0.00	0.00			n.d.	5.90				
March		5.0	5.41	12.60		0.00	0.00			n.d.	5.76				
April		3.9	0.14	3.32		0.00	0.00			n.d.	5.89				
May		4.0	1.51	n.d.		0.00	0.00			13.33	0.00				
June		4.5	0.34	7.87		0.00	0.00			16.14	10.02				
July		4.3	0.00	15.01		0.00	0.00			14.90	8.60				
August		4.7	0.94	n.d.		0.00	0.00			21.49	0.00				
September		3.9	0.00	16.76		0.00	0.00			11.69	9.35				
October		4.0	0.53	n.d.		0.02	0.33			n.d.	0.00				
November		4.5	3.29	1.15		0.00	0.00			n.d.	5.63				
December		5.3	0.89	0.81		0.00	0.00			n.d.	9.74				
<b>1992 Total Flow</b>		<b>51.5</b>													
<b>Yearly Ave Flow Rate (kgal/day)</b>		<b>141</b>													
		<b>36</b>		<b>219</b>		<b>0.05</b>		<b>0.90</b>		<b>141</b>		<b>507</b>		<b>177</b>	

**Table G-2 North Walnut Creek Flows**

Monthly Pond Flow Data												
N Walnut Creek Flows												
	North Walnut Creek SW093 (Mgal)	A1 Bypass Pipeline to A3 GS013 (Mgal)	A1 Bypass Pipeline to A1 (Mgal)	A1 Outlet leak to A2 (Mgal)	A2 Spray Evap (Mgal)	Landfill Pond Effluent to A3 (Mgal)	Landfill Pond A1 (Mgal)	Landfill Spray Evap (Mgal)	A3 Discharge to A4 (GS012) (Mgal)			
1991												
January												
February												
March												
April												
May		50.70										
June		34.30										
July		23.60										
August		30.90										
September		14.80										
October	2.80	n d										
November	6.78	54.00										
December	7.81	24.70										11.30
<b>1991 Total Flow</b>												
<b>Yearly Ave Flow Rate (kgal/day)</b>												
1992												
January	6.81	21.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
February	5.81	15.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.50
March	26.09	125.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.59
April	9.08	45.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.09
May	8.85	39.30	0.41	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
June	6.23	58.30	0.81	0.51	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.45
July	4.02	68.00	0.00	0.00	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
August	8.14	9.94	0.00	0.00	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.79
September	2.67	12.10	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00	5.16
October	5.14	n d	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.00
November	7.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.04
December	9.24	39.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>1992 Total Flow</b>	<b>99.07</b>		<b>1.22</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>25.62</b>
<b>Yearly Ave Flow Rate (kgal/day)</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>1305</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>70.0</b>

**Table G-3 . Regulated Discharges and Woman Creek Flows**

		Monthly Pond Flow Data									
		Regulated Discharges					Woman Creek Flows				
		Pond A4 (GS011) (Mgal)	Pond C1 (GS007) (Mgal)	Pond C2 To BDD (Mgal)	Walnut Creek at Indiana GS003 (Mgal)	Woman Creek at Indiana GS001 (Mgal)	Mower Ditch at Indiana GS002 (Mgal)	N Woman S Creek GS006 (Mgal)	Woman Creek to C2 GS006 (Mgal)	South Interceptor Ditch Input to C2 SW027 (Mgal)	Antelope Springs GS016 (Mgal)
<b>1991</b>											
January		1 05	8 95	0 00							
February		11 52	9 77	0 00							
March		13 19	2 94	0 00							
April		7 16	4 46	0 00							
May		14 93	8 32	0 00							
June		46 34	7 10	10 77			7 17	20 50			
July		3 92	1 53	0 00		0 00	9 60	61 09			
August		7 16	3 37	0 00		0 00	0 30	5 38			
September		12 52	0 67	0 00		0 00	1 98	5 05			
October		7 95	2 45	0 00		0 00	0 20	6 15			
November		0 00	8 86	0 00		0 00	0 04	n d	0 02		
December		27 08	5 90	0 00		0 00	31 11	26 46	3 24		
<b>1991 Total Flow</b>		<b>152 80</b>	<b>64 31</b>	<b>10 77</b>		<b>1 57</b>	<b>15 17</b>	<b>20 61</b>	<b>0 75</b>		
<b>Yearly Ave Flow</b>		<b>419</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>30</b>			<b>268</b>	<b>679</b>			
<b>1992</b>											
January		1 08	7 33	0 00	8 13	35 61	5 88	23 48	1 03		
February		5 31	5 76	0 00	4 34	32 80	3 64	17 19	0 26		
March		44 31	15 83	8 48	77 77	49 99	20 17	47 77	25 57		
April		17 49	12 91	7 60	20 72	40 49	8 00	14 06	0 37		
May		11 80	3 55	0 00	11 23	11 84	20 31	9 75	0 25		
June		5 15	1 85	0 00	6 42	14 60	24 78	10 21	0 58		
July		16 28	0 05	0 00	16 71	0 00	8 02	6 31	0 01		
August		0 00	1 22	0 00	0 86	0 00	0 19	8 13	3 49		
September		27 83	low flow	0 00	25 51	0 01	0 34	9 51	0 00		
October		8 91	1 60	0 00	7 77	n d	n d	n d	0 00		
November		0 00	3 33	0 00	0 00	0 02	3 05	26 39	0 50		
December		24 12	5 69	0 00	22 54	n d	3 61	25 92	0 39		
<b>1992 Total Flow</b>		<b>162 27</b>	<b>59 10</b>	<b>16 08</b>	<b>202 00</b>				<b>32 46</b>		
<b>Yearly Ave Flow</b>		<b>443</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>89</b>		



**APPENDIX H  
STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR  
POND WATER MANAGEMENT**

APPENDIX H  
STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR  
POND WATER MANAGEMENT

1-C90-EPR-SW 03

*Containment of Spills Within the Rocky Flats Drainages*

This procedure describes actions that should be taken to contain a spill which has entered a drainage and is threatening to enter the surface water detention ponds in the Buffer Zone. These actions will help to minimize damage to the environment and to plant operations.

Driver(s)

- a) Agreement in Principle (AIP)
  - b) DOE Order 5400 1, General Environmental Protection Program
- 

1-C91-EPR-SW 01

*Requirement for Control and Disposition of Incidental Waters*

This procedure contains the actions required for the control and disposition of incidental waters. The purpose of this procedure is to assure environmental protection by controlling, containing, sampling, analyzing, and/or discharging incidental waters originating from Rocky Flats sources.

Driver(s)

- a) Best Management Practices (BMPs)
  - b) Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA)
  - c) Clean Water Act (CWA)
- 

1-C92-EPR-SW 02

*Control of Rocky Flats Flood Waters*

This procedure is intended to provide instructions for controlling and containing excessive runoff and to minimize flooding. This instruction falls within the context of Rocky Flats water management plans.

Driver(s)

- a) Colorado State regulations on dam safety
  - b) DOE Order 5400 1, General Environmental Protection Program
-

**APPENDIX H**  
**STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR**  
**POND WATER MANAGEMENT**  
(Continued)

5-21000-OPS-SW 01

*Surface Water Data Collection Activities*

This Standard Operation Procedure (SOP) describes procedures that will be used at the Rocky Flats Plant (RFP) in performance of field activities at surface water collection sites. This SOP describes initial site evaluation procedures and outlines an order of data collection activities to be performed at each site by a two or three member field crew. Details are provided in this document so that all sampling personnel following these procedures will deliver samples to the laboratory and will perform discharge and field parameter measurements in a consistent manner.

Driver(s)

- a) DOE Order 5400 1, General Environmental Protection Program
  - b) EPM/SWD NPDES-FFCA Operations Sampling Plan
- 

5-21000-OPS-SW 02

*Field Measurements of Surface Water Field Parameters*

This SOP describes procedures that will be used at RFP to obtain measurements of surface water parameters in the field. These parameters are temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, alkalinity, specific conductance, total residual chlorine, free chlorine, turbidity, hardness and nitrates. This SOP describes field measurement procedures, personnel responsibilities and qualifications, and quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC).

Driver(s)

- a) NPDES-FFCA Operations Sampling Plan
  - b) DOE Order 5400 1, General Environmental Protection Program
-

APPENDIX H  
STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR  
POND WATER MANAGEMENT  
(Continued)

5-21000-OPS-SW 03

*Surface Water Sampling*

This SOP describes procedures, documentation and equipment that will be used to collect water quality samples from surface water data collection sites at RFP. More than one sampling method is required because flow conditions vary from site to site. In consideration of these varied conditions, this SOP describes methods that are to be used on the site-specific flow conditions.

Driver(s)

- a) NPDES-AFCA
  - b) DOE Order 5400 1, General Environmental Protection Program
- 

5-21000-OPS-SW 04

*Discharge Measurement*

This SOP describes procedures that will be used at RFP to measure surface water discharge in streams and ditches or from seeps and pipes. Discharge is defined as the volume rate of flow of water, including any substances suspended or dissolved in the water. This document outlines a set of standard methods for various flow conditions at RFP.

This SOP describes equipment and procedures that will be used for field data collection and documentation in order to attain acceptable standards of accuracy, precision, comparability, representativeness and completeness.

Driver(s)

- a) NPDES-AFCA
  - b) DOE Order 5400 1, General Environmental Protection Program
-

APPENDIX H  
STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR  
POND WATER MANAGEMENT  
(Continued)

5-21000-OPS-SW 08

*Pond Sampling*

This SOP describes procedures that will be used to collect surface water samples and measure field parameters from ponds at RFP. Specifically, this SOP describes methods to be used for pond sampling and for measurement of field parameters in water from ponds that will be used for field data collection and documentation to attain acceptable standards of accuracy, comparability, representativeness and completeness.

Driver(s)

- a) DOE Order 5400 1, General Environmental Protection Program
- 

5-21000-OPS-SW 16

*Sampling of Incidental Waters*

This SOP describes procedures that will be used at RFP for the collection of water samples from incidental sources. These would include water collected as a result of (1) construction activities that require excavation below the groundwater table and subsequent dewatering, (2) collection and dewatering of precipitation and stormwater runoff in excavations, pits, trenches, ditches or depressions that do not intercept the electrical vaults, or manholes that require pumping as described in the "Procedures for the Control and Disposition of Incidental Waters" (EG&G, May, 1990).

This SOP describes personnel responsibilities and qualifications, sample collection and preservation procedures, and QA/QC and documentation requirements that will be used for field data collection to attain acceptable standards of accuracy, precision, comparability, representativeness and completeness.

Driver(s)

- a) Best Management Practices (BMPs)
  - b) Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA)
  - c) Clean Water Act (CWA)
-

APPENDIX H  
STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR  
POND WATER MANAGEMENT  
(Continued)

5-21000-OPS-SW 19

*Control Procedure for Water Discharges from Surface Water Control Ponds A 3, A 4, B 3, B 5, C 1 and C 2*

This procedure describes sampling, analytical, reporting and approval activities required prior to initiating discharges, and describes operational and monitoring activities during actual discharges

Driver(s)

- a) Agreement in Principle (AIP)
  - b) DOE Order 5400 1, General Environmental Protection Program
- 

5 21000-OPS-SW 20

*Control Procedure for Water Spraying from the Landfill Pond and Pond A 2 and for Internal Pond Water Transfers*

This procedure describes pre-operational activities including sampling, analytical and approval requirements, and describes operational controls governing actual operations

Driver(s)

- a) Agreement in Principle (AIP)
  - b) DOE Order 5400 1, General Environmental Protection Program
- 

5-21000-OPS-SW 27

*Dam Inspection and Monitoring Procedure*

The purpose of the dam inspection procedure is to identify existing or potential dam safety concerns and to provide a shorter frequency between formalized dam inspections currently performed by other groups or agencies. Dam safety monitoring is performed for previously identified dam safety concerns

Driver(s)

- a) Colorado State regulations on dam safety
  - b) DOE Order 5400 1, General Environmental Protection Program
-

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

**APPENDIX H**  
**STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR**  
**POND WATER MANAGEMENT**  
(Continued)

1-15200-EPIP-12 14

*Water Detention Pond Dam Failure*

This procedure describes emergency response actions to be taken in the event of actual or potential unplanned releases of detention pond dam water from RFP. It also defines seven action levels (0 through 6) for categorizing conditions at the dams up to and including dam failure

Driver(s)

- a) Colorado Radiological Emergency Response Plan, Rocky Flats Plant
  - b) DOE Order 5500 1B, Emergency Management System
  - c) DOE Order 5500 3A, Planning and Preparedness for Operational Emergencies
-