South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control

Site:
Break: 3.4
Other:

2600 Bull Street
Columbia, S.C. 29201

Commissioner
Michael D. Jarrett

Board
Moses H. Clarkson, Jr., Chairman
Oren L. Brady, Jr., Vice-Chairman
Euta M. Colvin, M.D., Secretary
Harry M. Hallman, Jr.
Henry S. Jordan, M.D.
Toney Graham, Jr. M.D.

June 30, 1988

Mr. Jon Bornholm
US EPA, Region IV
345 Courtland Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30365

RE: Medley Farm Site (RI/FS Work Plan)
Cherokee County

Dear Mr. Bornholm:

The above referenced document has been reviewed by the Department. You will find enclosed, in memorandum form, the major hydrogeological concerns. No other major concern were noted at this time. Please pay special attention to the comments that have been duplicated due to a failure to have then incorporated in the last review period.

If you have any questions, please call.

Sincerely,

J. Kirk Lindsey/For

Wilson C. Miles, Jr.
Site Engineering Section
Bureau of Solid and Hazardous
Waste Management

WCMjr:elf

Enclosure

ERRB
RECEIVED
JUL 11 1988
EPA — REGION IV
ATLANTA, GA.

10909728

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control

Site:
Break: 3.4
Other:

2600 Bull Street
Columbia, S.C. 29201

Commissioner
Michael D. Jarrett

Board
Moses H. Clarkson, Jr., Chairman
Oren L. Brady, Jr., Vice-Chairman
Euta M. Colvin, M.D., Secretary
Harry M. Hallman, Jr.
Henry S. Jordan, M.D.
Toney Graham, Jr. M.D.

MEMORANDUM

TO: W. Coleman Miles
Site Engineering Section
Bureau of Solid and Hazardous Waste Management

FROM: Judy Canova, Hydrologist JC
Superfund and Solid Waste Section
Division of Hydrogeology
Bureau of Solid and Hazardous Waste Management

DATE: July 6, 1988

RE: Medley Farms Site, Cherokee County
RI/FS Work Plan, Second Draft
Hydrogeologic Review
SCD 980 558 142

The proposed remedial investigation methods for the referenced facility have been reviewed from a historical and hydrogeologic perspective. Following are comments which should be addressed in a revised plan prior to initiating the investigation:

I. Monitor Well Installation and Construction

A. A proposal for monitor well installation in accordance with South Carolina Well Standards and Regulations R.61-71 must be submitted to the Division of Hydrogeology at the Bureau of Solid and Hazardous Waste Management for approval prior to installation of monitoring wells.

B. In the first draft, an allotment for a possible two additional wells was made if, after completion of Phase I, it was deemed necessary. This was not mentioned in the second draft, but it should be included in the final work plan.

II. Site Characterization

A. Geology

1. Split spoon samples from all monitor wells and borings should be described. Continuous cores should be taken from the first two saprolite wells, and they should also be described. Cross-sections and maps of the site should be provided based on the results.

2. From a hydrogeologic perspective, natural moisture content/atterburg limits are not needed for soil borings or well cuttings because these values are not generally used for hydrogeologic interpretations. Instead, the number of sieve analyses should be increased.

B. Hydrogeology

1. A record of the depth at which each soil boring encounters ground water should be kept.

2. In Section 2.1.2, it is stated that "Information will be developed in the RI to evaluate whether Jones Creek, the Big Blue Branch, or Thicketty Creek act as a permanent ground water flow divides for both the surficial and bedrock aquifers in this area." However, there is no proposal within the plan of how this will be done or what information will be collected to determine if the creeks are flow divides. More details are needed, or the statement should be removed.

C. Ground-water Sampling and Analysis

1. MW-3 should be sampled for all TCL's in addition to MW-2 and MW-4.

2. It is recognized that the site is located in an area with high recharge potential. Therefore, several downgradient private wells should be sampled and analyzed for indicator parameters.

III. <u>Base Map Requirements</u>

A. All sources of information used in this report should be cited on the page where used, whether in the text or on a map.

B. All creeks discussed should be clearly labelled on a topographic map.

C. Figure 2.2 is incorrectly labelled "Proposed Test Pit Locations." Test pit locations are not shown in this figure.

D. In Section 3.6.3, it is mentioned that proposed MW-3 and MW-4 are located along probable fracture traces. A clearly labelled map with well locations and fracture trace locations is needed which cites the information source used for fracture trace location.