From: Mitchell, Tanya
To: Sy, William
Subject: RE: rolling knolls
Date: Monday, September 14, 2015 9:37:32 AM

Hi Bill,
NJDEP and CDM had the following comments on the QAPP. Please let me know if you have any concerns with their findings.
Thanks,
Tanya
NJDEP
ADDENDUM 1 TO THE QAPP FOR THE DATA GAP SAPS

1. QAPP Worksheet #17 - Description of the sampling area (second bullet item): It is noted that Arcadis has designated several of the perimeter samples as sediment samples even though they are located in zones that are not portrayed on the figures as being inundated. We request that the type of boring advancement and sample collection technique employed (soil vs sediment) for the perimeter samples be determined at the time of sample collection. This is consistent with Section 2.1.1 of the updated Addendum 1 to the Data Gaps SAP (5th paragraph). Please update the narrative in all documents and the relevant tables/worksheets to reflect this.

If there is a specific reason for treating these sample locations different from others in the same areas, please provide the reasoning.

2. QAPP Worksheet #17 – Sample locations – Soil Samples a.: It is not apparent that the narrative in this section in regard to the number of samples to be collected matches what is included on Worksheet #18. Please update the narrative in all documents and the relevant tables/worksheets to accurately reflect the Data Gap sampling proposals, including any changes that are necessary to accommodate NJDEP and EPA comments on this submittal.
3. QAPP Worksheet #17 – Sample locations – Sediment samples b.: It is not apparent that the narrative in this section in regard to the number of samples to be collected matches what is included on Worksheet #18. Please update the narrative and the relevant tables / worksheets to accurately reflect the proposals, including any changes that are necessary to accommodate NJDEP and EPA comments on this submittal.
4. QAPP Worksheet #18 - Matrix: It is noted that Arcadis has designated several of the perimeter samples on this worksheet as sediment samples even though they are located in areas that are not portrayed on the figures as being inundated. We request that the type of boring advancement and sample collection technique employed (soil vs sediment) for the perimeter samples be determined at the time of sample collection. This is consistent with Section 2.1.1 of the updated Addendum 1 to the Data Gaps SAP (5th paragraph). Please update Worksheet #18 to reflect this.

If there is a specific reason for treating these sample locations different from others in the same areas, please provide the reasoning.

5. QAPP Worksheet #18: For Interior Landfill Samples SS-177 through SS-183, it noted that the depth for these samples is TBD. While this is acceptable, it is requested that perhaps a footnote be added to briefly explain how the depths will be determined (i.e. the first foot beneath the waste material at each boring location and a second one foot sample collected directly above the underlying clay layer).
6. QAPP Worksheet #18: The depth proposed for samples SD-45 through SD-69 is not consistent with either EPA's August 17, 2015 correspondence, or with the Arcadis's August 26, 2015, responses to EPA. Worksheet #18 does not include the samples required to be collected at the 1- 2 foot interval below grade which were discussed in the referenced correspondences. Please update the worksheet to reflect the correct boring depth and sampled intervals.

It is also requested that the "type" of sample collection technique listed in the worksheet for SD-45 through SD-69 (Grab Sample) be clarified. The collection techniques mentioned in the August 2015 Addendum 1 to the Data Gaps SAP for these samples include the use of either a dedicated Lexan coring device or stainless steel Macrocore sampler. It is suggested that the "Type" column for these

sample locations in the worksheet be updated to be consistent with the sampling technique proposal included in the Data Gaps SAP which references specific coring devices.

CDM

1. QAPP Worksheet #14/16 Project Tasks and Schedule: This does not address the pore water sample that was aborted at the MW-13 location. The schedule appears to be comprehensive with this exception. Please clarify the Group's plan to collect an aqueous sample at this location.
2. QAPP Worksheet 20 Field QC Summary: No QA/QC is proposed for PCB congeners, except a field blank. Although only two samples, both from one location are proposed, it has been several months since this parameter has been analyzed and full QA/QC is recommended.

From: Sy, William

Sent: Friday, September 11, 2015 1:54 PM

To: Mitchell, Tanya

Subject: rolling knolls

Tanya,

I have only a couple of comments to the revised Data Gap addendum

1. Section 2.2.2 of the SAP – It indicated that the 0 to 0.5 foot interval will be homogenized and transferred into sample containers for TCL/TAL analysis without the VOC fraction. It seems that the 0.5 to 1 foot interval where the VOC sample will be collected from should also be included as part of the soil to be homogenized to capture the 0 to 1 foot interval characterization. Please clarify.
2. Some of the sample identifier numbers in both figures 3a and 3b included with electronic copies of the SAP and QAPP did not convert correctly into the pdf files, these numbers were showing as an empty squares. Please verify.

Don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions. Thanks-Bill

William Sy
USEPA Region 2, DESA/HWSB/HWSS
Ph. 732-321-6648
Fax 732-321-6622