Message

From: Ohl, Matthew [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5BDE479F1AB54A9EBC9541A7D452C3B7-MOHL]
Sent: 7/28/2020 1:58:52 PM
To: Julie Konzuk [JKonzuk@Geosyntec.com]
CC: Peter Racher [pracher@psrb.com]; Norman Bernstein [nwbernstein@nwbllc.com]; Gary Wealthall [GWealthall@Geosyntec.com]; Andy Gremos [agremos@ramboll.com]; Douglas Petroff [dpetroff@idem.in.gov]; Nichter, Mark W CIV USARMY CELRL (USA) [Mark.W.Nichter@usace.army.mil]; Krueger, Thomas [krueger.thomas@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Third Site: Sampling Request Response

Good morning Julie:

Thank you for your response. I have a few initial questions.

1. If the sumps contain significant levels of contamination or DNAPL, would the current sampling program help you determine the extent to which it may act as a source of groundwater contamination?
2. Isn't the treatment contractor obliged to remove such contamination if it exists?
3. If so, could delaying the sampling hinder their ability to complete the required treatment?

Thank you,

Matt

Matthew J. Ohl
Remedial Project Manager
United States Environmental Protection Agency
77 West Jackson Boulevard, SR-6J
Chicago, IL 60604-3590

phone: 312.886.4442
fax: 312.692.2447
e-mail: ohl.matthew@epa.gov

From: Julie Konzuk <JKonzuk@Geosyntec.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 9:56 PM
To: Ohl, Matthew <ohl.matthew@epa.gov>
Cc: Peter Racher <pracher@psrb.com>; Norman Bernstein <nwbernstein@nwbllc.com>; Gary Wealthall <GWealthall@Geosyntec.com>; Andy Gremos <agremos@ramboll.com>
Subject: RE: Third Site: Sampling Request

Matt,

In Gary Wealthall's absence, I am responding to the email from MM regarding proposed sampling in the P-1 and P-2 sumps. We have discussed internally and have concerns that collection of these data, as proposed by MM, are not consistent with the over-arching objective of the investigation. As discussed in the Supplemental Sampling Plan, the objectives of the investigation currently underway are to delineate the remaining DNAPL containment area contamination distribution, both laterally and vertically, to assess whether contaminant mass detected in wells P-1 and P-2 is coming from residual untreated mass within the ERH target treatment area or from the underlying till. The presence of contamination (if any) that may have collected in the sump is simply a reflection of contamination that would have migrated downwards from some unknown elevation within the ERH target treatment zone and, as such, is not informative as to the vertical location of residual contamination. Any contamination that may be confined within

the sumps of these wells is also unlikely to have influenced the concentrations detected in the shallower interval of P-1 (~25 ft depth sample) or in surrounding MM extraction wells where concentrations at both shallow and deep depths exceeded the ERH performance standard (e.g., X-D2, X-D3, X-D4, and X-C3). We are collecting depth-discrete soil cores and deep groundwater samples at two locations in close proximity to P-1, which should provide more representative evidence regarding the remaining contaminated zones and the depths at which the contamination remains down to a depth of 46'. As such, there is little value added of doing the additional sampling proposed by MM as part of this program.

Therefore, Geosyntec believes that we should continue with the currently planned sampling program as is. Once we receive the data and have a chance to interpret the lateral and vertical extent of remaining impacts, if the results of the soil and groundwater profiling at the two locations surrounding P-1 are inconsistent with the groundwater samples collected from P-1, then we can revisit this and develop any needed follow on sampling depending on the analysis of the data collected.

Please let us know if you have any concerns with the proposed approach or would like to discuss this further.

Regards,

Julie

Julie Konzuk, Ph.D., P.Eng. (ON)
Senior Principal
Geosyntec Consultants International, Inc.
1243 Islington Avenue
Suite 1201
Toronto, ON M8X 1Y9
Phone: 416.637.8746 Mobile: 416.271.2373

GEOSYNTEC | SIREM | SAVRON

Follow Us – LinkedIn | Twitter | Facebook | YouTube

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Ohl, Matthew** <ohl.matthew@epa.gov>
Date: Mon, Jul 27, 2020 at 8:49 AM
Subject: Third Site: Sampling Request
To: David A. Rountree <drountree@mcmillan-mcgee.com>, Peter M. Racher Esq. <pracher@psrb.com>, Bernstein, Norman <nwbernstein@nwbllc.com>, Andrew A Gremos <agremos@ramboll.com>
Cc: Brent Winder <brent.winder@mcmillan-mcgee.com>, Knox, Corey S CIV (USA) <Corey.S.Knox@usace.army.mil>, Mark Nichter <Mark.W.Nichter@usace.army.mil>, Krueger, Thomas <krueger.thomas@epa.gov>

Good morning:

We don't have a concern with sampling the well sumps.

Thank you,

Matt

Matthew J. Ohl
Remedial Project Manager
United States Environmental Protection Agency
77 West Jackson Boulevard, SR-6J
Chicago, IL 60604-3590

phone: 312.886.4442
fax: 312.692.2447
e-mail: ohl.matthew@epa.gov

From: David A. Rountree <drountree@mcmillan-mcgee.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 7:38 AM
To: Ohl, Matthew <ohl.matthew@epa.gov>; Peter M. Racher Esq. <pracher@psrb.com>; Bernstein, Norman <nwbernstein@nwbllc.com>; Andrew A Gremos <agremos@ramboll.com>
Cc: Brent Winder <brent.winder@mcmillan-mcgee.com>
Subject: [SPAM-Sender] Sampling Request

Gents,

Mc2 recommends that, in addition to the groundwater sampling performed previously and ongoing at Third Site, that a sample be collected from the sump of monitoring wells P-1 and P-2. The sump is a 1-foot section of the well at the very bottom, from 40 feet BGS to 41 feet BGS, that is not screened and is capped on the bottom (see attached well construction diagram). We believe that it would be useful to see what concentrations and/or separate contaminant phases exist at this dead-end segment at the very bottom of the well. Note that high concentrations and/or separate phases of chlorinated solvents will have a higher density than uncontaminated water, and would definitely settle in the bottom of the well if a separate phase, and may settle there if dissolved in high concentrations. This information would be useful to compare between P-1 (contaminated) and P-2 (remediated), as well as for observing if there is any difference between conditions within P-1 and the adjacent soil and groundwater.

Mc2 proposes to sample with a peristaltic pump and Teflon(tm) tubing from the very bottom of the well sump. No purging would be conducted, as the purpose of the sampling would be to observe conditions within the well as opposed to the surrounding aquifer.

Please review and advise. We would like to obtain these data during this field event.

Cheers,

--

David A. Rountree

McMillan-McGee Corp

Direct: +1 (403) 569-5116

Mobile: +1 (403) 921-0848

Fax: +1 (403) 272-7201

4895 35B Street Southeast

Calgary, Alberta T2B 3M9

Canada

"The best way out is always through." - Robert Frost

This email and attachments may contain confidential information intended solely for the addressee(s) as indicated above. If you are not the intended recipient of this document, please notify sender immediately and destroy all copies.

Disclosure, reproduction, distribution or any other use is prohibited and unlawful. Thank you.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

--

Norman W. Bernstein
N.W. Bernstein & Associates, LLC
800 Westchester Ave., Suite N319
Rye Brook, N.Y. 10573
(914) 358-3500

In accordance with Internal Revenue Service Circular 230, any discussion of a federal tax issue in this communication or in any attachment is not intended to be used, and it cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding federal tax penalties.

This message may contain confidential information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege or otherwise. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking action in reliance on the contents of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete the original message. Thank you.