3R - 170

AGWMR

2009



El Paso Tennessee Pipeline Company

San Juan Basin Pit Program Groundwater Sites Project

Final 2009 Annual Report Federal Sites (Volume 1)

April 2010





1801 California Street, Suite 2900 Denver, Colorado 80202

2009 ANNUAL GROUNDWATER REPORT FEDERAL SITES VOLUME I

EL PASO TENNESSEE PIPELINE COMPANY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

METER or LINE ID	NMOCD CASE NO.	SITE NAME	TOWNSHIP	RANGE	SECTION	UNIT
87640	3RP-155-0	Canada Mesa #2	24N	06W	24	I
89961	3RP-170-0	Fields A#7A	32N	1 I W	34	E
73220	3RP-068-0	Fogelson 4-1 Com. #14	29N	11W	4	Р
89894	3RP-186-0	Hammond #41A	27N	_ 08W	25	. 0
97213	3RP-190-0	Hamner #9	29N	09W	20	А
94715	3RP-196-0	James F. Bell #1E	30N	13W .	10	Р
89232	3RP-202-0	Johnston Fed #6A	31N	• 09W	35	F
LD072	3RP-204-0	K27 LD072	25N	06W	4	E
LD174	3RP-212-0	LAT L 40	28N	04W	-13	Н
LD151	3RP-213-0	Lat 0-21 Line Drip	30N	09W	12	0
94810	3RP-223-0	Miles Fed 1A	26N	07W	· 5	F
89620	3RP-235-0	• Sandoval GC A #1A	30N	09W	35	C

* The Hamner #9 site was submitted for closure in January 2009 and is pending approval from NMOCD. There were no monitoring activities for this site in 2009.







RECEIVED OCD

2010 APR 19 A 10: 39

April 16, 2010

Mr. Glenn von Gonten New Mexico Oil Conservation Division (NMOCD) 1220 South St., Francis Drive Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

RE: El Paso Tennessee Pipeline Company Pit Groundwater Remediation Sites 2009 Annual Reports

Dear Mr. Von Gonten:

MWH Americas, Inc., on behalf of El Paso Tennessee Pipeline Company (EPTPC), is submitting the enclosed 2009 Annual Reports for each of EPTPC's 21 remaining San Juan River Basin pit groundwater remediation sites. The reports present the 2009 sampling and product recovery data and include recommendations for 2010 activities at these sites.

The 2009 Annual Reports are divided into three volumes based on location type. The volumes are as follows:

Volume Location Type

- 1 Federal Land
- 2 Non-Federal Land (Excl. Navajo Nation)
- 3 Navajo Nation

If you have any questions concerning the enclosed reports, please call either Doug Stavinoha of EPTPC (713-420-5150), Ian Yanagisawa of EPTPC (713-420-7361), or me (303-291-2276).

Sincerely,

Jed Smith Project Manager

encl.

cc: Bill Freeman – NNEPA, Shiprock, NM (Volume 3 Only) Bill Liese – BLM, Farmington, NM (Volume 1 Only) Brandon Powell – NMOCD, Aztec, NM (Volumes 1, 2, and 3) Doug Stavinoha – EPTPC (Volumes 1, 2, and 3)

> 1801 California Street Suite 2900 Denver, Colorado 80202

TEL 303 291 2222 FAX 303 291 2221 www.mwhglobal.com

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AMSL	above mean sea level
В	benzene
btoc	below top of casing
E	ethylbenzene
EPTPC	El Paso Tennessee Pipeline Company
ft	foot/feet
GWEL	groundwater elevation
ID	identification
MW	monitor well
NMWQCC	New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission
T	toluene
TOC	top of casing
NA	not applicable
NMOCD	New Mexico Oil Conservation Division
NS	not sampled
ORC	oxygen-releasing compound
μg/L	micrograms per liter
Х	total xylenes



3R170

EPTPC GROUNDWATER SITES 2009 ANNUAL GROUNDWATER REPORT

Fields A#7A Meter Code: 89961

SITE DETAILS

Legal Description:	Town:	32n	Range:	11w	Sec:	34	Unit:	E
NMOCD Haz Ranking:	40	Land Type:	Federal	Operator:	BP / Amoco Company	Prod	uction	
PREVIOUS ACTIVI	<u>TIES</u>							
Site Assessment:	8/94	Excavat	ion:	9/94 (70cy)	Soil Boring	:	7/95	
Monitor Well:	7/95	Geoprobe:		NA	Additional MWs:		12/95	
Downgradient MWs:	12/95	Replace	MW:	NA	Quarterly Initiated:		NA	
ORC Nutrient Injection:	NA	Re-Exca	vation:	NA	PSH Remov Initiated:	val	8/97	
Annual Initiated:	4/97	Quarter	ly Resumed:	NA	PSH Removin 2009?	val	No	

SUMMARY OF 2009 ACTIVITIES

- **MW-1:** Annual groundwater sampling (April) and semiannual water level monitoring (April and November) were performed during 2009.
- **MW-2:** Semiannual water level monitoring (April and November) was performed during 2009. This well was dry in 2009.
- **MW-3:** Annual groundwater sampling (April) and semiannual water level monitoring (April and November) were performed during 2009.
- **MW-4:** Annual groundwater sampling (April) and semiannual water level monitoring (April and November) were performed during 2009.

Site-Wide Activities: No other activities were performed at this Site during 2009.

SITE MAP

A Site map (April) is attached as Figure 1.

SUMMARY TABLES AND GRAPHS

• Historic analytical and water level data are summarized in Table 1 and presented graphically in Figures 2 through 5. Where applicable, static water level elevations were corrected for measurable thicknesses of free-product (specific gravity of 0.8).

EPTPC GROUNDWATER SITES 2009 ANNUAL GROUNDWATER REPORT

Fields A#7A Meter Code: 89961

- Historic free-product recovery data are summarized in Table 2 and presented graphically in Figures 2 and 4.
- The 2009 laboratory report is presented in Attachment 1 (included on CD).
- The 2009 field documentation is presented in Attachment 2 (included on CD).

GEOLOGIC LOGS AND WELL COMPLETION DIAGRAMS

No subsurface activities were performed at this Site during 2009.

DISPOSITION OF GENERATED WASTES

All purge water was taken to the El Paso Natural Gas Rio Vista Compressor Station.

ISOCONCENTRATION MAPS

No isoconcentration maps were prepared for this Site; however, the attached Site map presents the analytical and water level data collected during the annual sampling event.

RESULTS

- The groundwater flow direction at this Site is to the southwest, based on historic water level measurements.
- BTEX concentrations in MW-1 have declined substantially since 1997, when freeproduct recovery was initiated. The April 2009 benzene concentration was 25.5 µg/L. All other BTEX constituents were below standards.
- MW-2, which was dry in 2009, was last sampled in 2008 and was clean at the time, consistent with the historical sample results for this well.
- BTEX concentrations in MW-3 have declined substantially since 1997, when freeproduct recovery was initiated at MW-1. However, the benzene concentration was 182 µg/L in April 2009, which is still above the NMWQCC benzene standard. All other BTEX constituents were below standards in 2009.
- BTEX concentrations in MW-4 have also attenuated from their historic highs in January 1997. The annual sample from MW-4 showed elevated benzene (695 μg/L) and total xylenes (745 μg/L) constituent concentrations, both decreased from their 2008 levels.

RECOMMENDATIONS

• MW-1 will be gauged semiannually and sampled annually (April) until BTEX concentrations approach the NMWQCC standards.

EPTPC GROUNDWATER SITES 2009 ANNUAL GROUNDWATER REPORT

Fields A#7A Meter Code: 89961

- EPTPC will attempt semiannual groundwater level measurements and annual groundwater sampling in April at MW-2, MW-3, and MW-4.
- Once concentrations approach the NMWQCC standards, the wells will be sampled quarterly until BTEX concentrations are below standards for four consecutive quarters, at which time this Site will be submitted for closure.





FIGURE 3 SUMMARY OF GROUNDWATER BTEX CONCENTRATIONS AND FLUID LEVELS FIELDS A#7A (METER #89961) MW02







- Groundwater Depth

0

Product Depth

1



FIGURE 5 SUMMARY OF GROUNDWATER BTEX CONCENTRATIONS, FLUID LEVELS, AND PRODUCT RECOVERY FIELDS A#7A (METER #89961) MW04



*In some cases, older recovery event data are not available. However, the cumulative totals still include all historic recovery.



FIGURE 2 SUMMARY OF GROUNDWATER BTEX CONCENTRATIONS, FLUID LEVELS, AND PRODUCT RECOVERY FIELDS A#7A (METER #89961) MW01

*In some cases, older recovery event data are not available. However, the cumulative totals still include all historic recovery.

- Total Recovery

Product Recovered —

Monitor Well	Sample Date	Benzene (ug/L)	Toluene (ug/L)	Ethylbenzene (ug/L)	Total Xylenes (ug/L)	Depth to Water (ft	Corrected GW Elevation
NMWQCC	GW Std.:	10	750	750	620	BTOC)	(ft AMSL)
MW01	8/9/1995	1950	1946	115	1361	22.50	6064.08
MW01	1/3/1996	3150 🛬 👡	5280	361	-3460	23.28	
MW01	4/18/1996	1300	2140	119	1240	24.20	6062.38
MW01	7/29/1996	503	804	28	363	25.07	6061.55
MW01	10/21/1996	843	1300	26	422	25.45	6061.19
MW01	1/30/1997	1300	2200	76.8	966	26.83	6059.96
MW01	4/21/1997	951	1920	73	894	26.47	6060.13
MW01	1/26/2004	121	54	15.8	216	31.02	6055.56
MW01	4/21/2004	116	58.1	29.3	83.3	30.67	6055.91
MW01	4/18/2005	108	29.0	14.2	274	30.19	6056.39
MW01	10/22/2005	180	69.2	6.3	154	30.74	6055.84
MW01	4/25/2006	83.7	23.8	2.1J	82.5	31.41	6055.17
MW01	10/24/2006	254	108	4.0	169	31.39	6055.19
MW01	4/24/2007	106	37.2	3.3	112	31.66	6054.92
MW01	4/21/2008	246	38.3	1.6J	81.3	30.31	6056.27
MW01	4/7/2009	25.5	11.0	0.60J	21:5	31.24	6055.34
MW02	1/3/1996	28.8	<2.5	297	1169	24.27	6060.57
MW02	4/18/1996	<1.0	<1.0	2.64	<3.0	25.53	6059.31
MW02	7/29/1996	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<6.0	26.48	6058.36
MW02	10/21/1996	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<3.0	26.96	6057.88
MW02	1/30/1997	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<6.0	27.73	6057.11
MW02	4/21/1997	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<3.0	27.77	6057.07
MW02	4/13/2001	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	30.33	6054.51
MW02	4/18/2005	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0 -	<2.0	30.98	6053.86
MW02	4/21/2008	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<6.0	30.66	6054.18
MW03	1/3/1996	176	. 16.4	225	1550,	24.88	6059.78
MW03	4/18/1996	129	<2.0	212	463	25.75	6058.91
MW03	7/29/1996	212	<2.0	167	393	26.64	6058.02
MW03	10/21/1996	165	<1.0	157	467	27.16	6057.50
MW03	1/30/1997	144	<1.0	198	851	27.92	6056.74
MW03	4/21/1997	2070	4340	332	4730	28.00	6056.66
MW03	* 4/13/2001	120	5.2	<5.0	80	30.48	6054.18
MW03	4/18/2005	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<2.0	30.77	6053.89
MW03	4/25/2006	46.4	5.0	<5.0	<10	31.61	6053.05

SUMMARY OF BTEX COMPOUNDS IN GROUNDWATER SAMPLES FIELDS A#7A (METER #89961)

Page 1

Monitor Well	Sample Date	Benzene (ug/L)	Toluene (ug/L)	Ethylbenzene (ug/L)	Total Xylenes (ug/L)	Depth to Water (ft	Corrected GW Elevation
NMWQCC	GW Std.:	10	750	750	620	BIUC)	(IT AMSL)
MW03	4/24/2007	179	<5.0	12.3	37.9	31.90	6052.76
MW03	4/21/2008	140	2.5	2.7	16.9	30.40	6054.26
MW03	4/7/2009	182	<50	<50	<100	31.40	6053.26
MW04	1/3/1996	2470	1880	206	2350	25.69	6059.51
MW04	4/18/1996	4760	2460	235	1880	26.42	6058.78
MW04	7/29/1996	1830	2380	106	967	28.65	6058.01
MW04	10/21/1996		4520	149	1680	28.84	6057.47
MW04	1/30/1997	4320	7420	280	3250	28.85	6056.69
MW04	4/21/1997	2410	5170	219	2530	28.68	6056.60
MW04	4/21/2008	1580	679	6.8J	3900	31.22	6053.98
MW04	4/7/2009	695	. 206	<50	745	31.40	6053.80

SUMMARY OF BTEX COMPOUNDS IN GROUNDWATER SAMPLES FIELDS A#7A (METER #89961)

Notes:

Results shown in bold typeface exceed their respective New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission standards.

"J" = result is qualified as estimated. See laboratory report and/or supplemental data validation report for further detail. "<" = analyte was not detected at the indicated reporting limit. Static groundwater elevations have been corrected for product thickness where applicable. Specific gravity of 0.8 used.

SUMMARY OF FREE-PRODUCT REMOVAL FIELDS A#7A (METER #89961)

Monitor Well	Removal Date	Depth to Product (ft BTOC)	Depth to Water (ft BTOC)	Product Thickness (feet)	Volume Removed (gallons)	Cumulative Removal (gallons)	Corrected GW Elevation (ft AMSL)
MW01	7/29/1996	25.02	25.07	0.05		2.85	6061.55
MW01	10/21/1996	25.38	25.45	0.07		2.85	6061.19
MW01	1/30/1997	26.57	26.83	0.26		2.85	6059.96
MW01	4/21/1997	26.44	26.47	0.03		2.85	6060.13
MW01	1/30/2001	28.74	30.08	1.34	1.25	4.10	6057.57
MW01	2/8/2001	28.65	29.85	1.20	1.00	5.10	6057.69
MW01	2/16/2001	29.08	30.20	1.12	1.00	6.10	6057.28
MW01	2/17/2001	29.08	29.66	0.58	1.00	7.10	6057.38
MW01	2/26/2001	29.39	29.54	0.15	1.00	8.10	6057.16
	3/5/2001	29.25	. 29.28	0.03	0.50	8.60	6057.32
MW01	4/11/2001		29.33	0.00	0.10	8.70	6057.25
MW01	6/5/2001	29.34	29:46	0.12	1.00	9:70	6057.22
MW01	6/15/2001	29.57	29.65	0.08		9.70	6056.99
MW01	7/6/2001	·	30:00;	.0.00	0.50	10.20	6056.58
MW01	7/13/2001		29.96	0.00	0.05	10.25	6056.62
MW01	10/10/2001	30.32	30.33	0.01	0.02	10.27	6056.26
MW01	12/4/2001		30.51	0.00	0.02	10.29	6056.07
MW01	12/13/2001	29.42	29.43	0.01		10.29	6057.16
MW01	12/21/2001	30.39	30.40	0.01		· 10.29	6056.19
MW01	1/7/2002	30.58	30.59	0.01		10.29	6056.00
MW01	1/23/2002	30.40	30.41	0.01	0.01	10.30	6056.18
MW01	1/31/2002	30.94	30.95	s. 0.01		10.30	6055.64
MW01	2/7/2002	31.11	31.12	0.01		10.30	6055.47
MW01	2/14/2002	31,17	31.18	0.01		10.30	6055.41
MW01	2/20/2002	31.14	31.15	0.01		10.30	6055.44
• MW01	3/21/2002	30.78	30.80	0.02	~~ *	10.30	. 6055.80
MW01	3/28/2002		30.92	0.00	0.01	10.31	6055.66
MW01	10/1/2002		• 31.77	0.00	0.02	10.33	6054.81
MW01	4/27/2003	31.06	31.07	0.01	0.02	10.35	6055.52
MW04	5/8/1996	25.83	26.42	0.59		0.00	6059.25
MW04	7/29/1996	26.82	28.65	1.83		0.00	6058.01
MW04	10/21/1996	27.45	28.84	1.39		0.00	6057.47
MW04	1/30/1997	28.43	28.85	0.42		0.00	6056.69
MW04	4/21/1997	28.58	28.68-	0.10		0.00	6056.60

.

Depth to Volume Depth to Product Cumulative Corrected Product (ft Monitor Removal Water (ft Thickness Removed **GW Elevation** Removal Well Date BTOC) BTOC) (feet) (gallons) (gallons) (ft AMSL) 31.01 6/5/2001 **MW04** 31.25 0.24 0.10 0.10 6054.14 6/15/2001 **MW04** 31.12 31.56 0.44 0.15 0.25 6053.99 **MW04** 7/6/2001 31.20 NA NA 0.10 0.35 NA 31.44 7/13/2001 NA 0.10 0.45 NA **MW04** NA 130 31.51 **MW04** 7/20/2001 NA . 0.45 NA NA 8/1/2001 31.54 NA 0.45 **MW04** NA NA --**MW04** 12/13/2001 31.65 NA NA 0.45 NA 12/21/2001 31.61 NA NA 0.45 NA **MW04** --**MW04** 1/7/2002 31.61 NA NA 0.45 NA ÷÷. 1/23/2002 NA NA 0.45 NA **MW04** 31.62 ---31.61 MW04 1/31/2002 NA 0.45 1 NA NA **MW04** 2/7/2002 31.60 NA NA 0.45 NA ---31.62 **MW04** 2/14/2002 NA NA 0.45 NA ---**MW04** 2/20/2002 31.62 NA 0.45 NA NA ---

SUMMARY OF FREE-PRODUCT REMOVAL FIELDS A#7A (METER #89961)

Notes:

"--" indicates either that product was not measurably detected or that product was not recovered.

"NA" indicates that the respective data point is not available.

Groundwater elevations may not be static due to removal of equipment. Corrections for product thickness utilize SG of 0.8.

Lodestar Services, Incorporated PO Box 4465, Durango, CO 81302 Office (970) 946-1093

WELL DEVELOPMENT AND SAMPLING LOG

Project Name: Client: Project Manager:	San Juan B MWH Ashley Age	asin r	Samp	Location: Date: Iler's Name:	Fields A #7 4/7/2009 Troy Urbai	7A n	Well No: Time:	MW-4 11:07
Measuring Point: Well Diameter:	TOC 4" Wa	Depth Tot ater Colum	to Water: tal Depth: in Height:	31.4 31.58 0.18	ft ft ft	Depth Product	to Product: : Thickness:	ft ft
Sampling Method: Criteria:	□ Submersib ☑ Bottom Va ☑ 3 to 5 Casi	le Pump [lve Bailer ing Volumes o	Centrifug Double C of Water Re	al Pump 🗌 Pe Theck Valve Baile moval 🗹 Stabili	ristaltic Pump er zation of Indi	0 Other	ers 🗹 Other	bail dry
Callftrus frasfin		<u>C.</u>		Water Volun	ne in Well	τ		• - I
	vater	Gall	ons 7 x 3	Oun	ices		volume	to be removed
0.10 / .00		0.11						
Time (military)	pH (su)	SC (ms)	Temp (°C)	ORP (millivolts)	D.O. (mg/L)	Turbidity (NTU)	Vol Evac. gal	Comments/Flow Rate
11:11	7.46	5.42	62.8				0.03	black, sheen
			C1 2 E 2					
rilldi.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Sec. 2.27	01.3-	The second s		i allandon in her i senterio Allandon no i senterio	0.11	Diack, sileen, ui y
COMMENTS:	only enoug sample is u	sh water to Inpreserve	o fill two v d.	oas. HCL pre	eservative r	reacted with	n groundwa	iter - rinsed voa clean and
Instrumentation:	🗹 pH Meter	DO Mor	nitor 🗹 C	onductivity Met	er 🗹 Tem	perature Mete	r 🗌 Other	r
Water Disposal:	Rio Vista							
Sample ID:	MW-4		. Sa	imple Time: .	11:17	_		
Analysis Requested:	🖸 BTEX		Alkalini	ty 🗋 TDS	Cations	Anions	Nitrate	Nitrite 🗌 Metals
Trip Blank:	070420	09TB01				Duplica	ate Sample:	

Lodestar Services, Incorporated

PO Box 4465, Durango, CO 81302 Office (970) 946-1093

WATER LEVEL DATA

Project Name: San Juan Basin Groundwater Project Manager: Ashley Ager Client: MWH

Site Name: Fields A #7A

Well	Time	Depth to Product (ft)	Depth to Water (ft)	Product Thickness (ft)	Volume Removed	Comments
MW-1	9:13 AM	-	31.24	-	-	sampled for BTEX
MW-2		-	-	-	-	dry at 31.93
MW-3		-	31.40	-	-	sampled for BTEX
MW-4		-	31.40	-	-	sampled for BTEX

Comments

Current Operator: BP

Take site photos, review site map. No changes to current map.

Signature: Ashley L. Ager

Date: 04/07/2009

04/07/2009 Date:

Lodestar Services, Incorporated

PO Box 4465, Durango, CO 81302 Office (970) 946-1093

WATER LEVEL DATA

Project Name: San Juan Basin Groundwater Project Manager: Ashley Ager Client: MWH

Site Name: Fields A #7A

Well	Time	Depth to Product (ft)	Depth to Water (ft)	Product Thickness (ft)	Volume Removed	Comments
MW-1	8:39 AM	-	31.77	-	-	
MW-2		-	-	-	-	dry at 31.96
MW-3		-	31.97	_	-	
MW-4		-	31.58		-	

Comments

Signature: Ashley L. Ager

Date: 11/05/2009

11/04/2009

Date:



04/20/09

Technical Report for

Montgomery Watson

San Juan Basin Pit Groundwater Remediation 2008-2009



Accutest Job Number: T26735

Sampling Date: 04/07/09

Report to:

MWH Americas 1801 California St. Suite 2900 Denver, CO 80202 jed.smith@mwhglobal.com; daniel.a.wade@mwhglobal.com; craig.moore@mwhglobal.com; ala@lodestarservices.com ATTN: Jed Smith

Total number of pages in report: 20



E



Test results contained within this data package meet the requirements of the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference and/or state specific certification programs as applicable.

Paul K Canevard

Paul Canevaro Laboratory Director

Client Service contact: William Reeves 713-271-4700

Certifications: TX (T104704220-06-TX) AR (88-0756) FL (E87628) KS (E-10366) LA (85695/04004) OK (9103) UT(7132714700) This report shall not be reproduced, except in its entirety, without the written approval of Accutest Laborator

This report shall not be reproduced, except in its entirety, without the written approval of Accutest Laboratories. Test results relate only to samples analyzed.

Gulf Coast • 10165 Harwin Drive • Suite 150 • Houston, TX 77036 • tel: 713-271-4700 • fax: 713-271-4770 • http://www.accutest.com



Table of Contents

-1-

Section 1: Sample Summary	3
Section 2: Case Narrative/Conformance Summary	4
Section 3: Sample Results	5
3.1: T26735-1: FIELDS A7 MW-1	6
3.2: T26735-2: FIELDS A7 MW-3	7
3.3: T26735-3: FIELDS A7 MW-4	8
3.4: T26735-4: 070409TB01	9
Section 4: Misc. Forms	10
4.1: Chain of Custody	11
4.2: LRC Form	14
Section 5: GC Volatiles - QC Data Summaries	18
5.1: Method Blank Summary	19
5.2: Blank Spike/Blank Spike Duplicate Summary	20

•

.



.

r S

્ઝ 4

GI

Sample Summary

Montgomery Watson

.

Job No: T26735

San Juan Basin Pit Groundwater Remediation 2008-2009

Sample	Collected		·	Matr	ix	Client
Number	Date	Time By	Received	Code	Туре	Sample ID .
T26735-1	04/07/09	10:20 TU	04/08/09	AQ	Ground Water	FIELDS A7 MW,1
T26735-2	04/07/09	10:50 TU	04/08/09	AQ	Ground Water	FIELDS A7 MW-3
T26735-3	04/07/09	11:17 TU	04/08/09	AQ	Ground Water	FIELDS A7 MW-4
T26735-4	04/07/09	07:00 TU	04/08/09	AQ	Trip Blank Water	070409TB01





SAMPLE DELIVERY GROUP CASE NARRATIVE

Client:	Montgomery Watson	Job No	T26735
Site:	San Juan Basin Pit Groundwater Remediation 2008-2009	Report Date	4/20/2009 3:29:23 PM

3 Sample(s), 1 Trip Blank(s) and 0 Field Blank(s) were collected on 04/07/2009 and were received at Accutest on 04/08/2009 properly preserved, at 2 Deg. C and intact. These Samples received an Accutest job number of T26735. A listing of the Laboratory Sample ID, Client Sample ID and dates of collection are presented in the Results Summary Section of this report.

Except as noted below, all method specified calibrations and quality control performance criteria were met for this job. For more information, please refer to QC summary pages.

Volatiles by GC By Method SW846 8021B

Matrix	AQ	Batch ID:	GKK1470

* All samples were analyzed within the recommended method holding time.

All method blanks for this batch meet method specific criteria.

Accutest Laboratories Gulf Coast (ALGC) certifies that this report meets the project requirements for analytical data produced for the samples as received at ALGC and as stated on the COC. ALGC certifies that the data meets the Data QualityObjectives for precision, accuracy and completeness as specified in the ALGC Quality Manual except as noted above. This report is to be used in its entirety. ALGC is not responsible for any assumptions of data quality if partial data packages are used







Section 3

Sample Results

.

Report of Analysis

. . . .

5 of 20 CACCUTEST: T26735 Laboratories

			Repo	rt of Ana	alysis			Page 1 of 1
Client Sam Lab Sampl Matrix: Method: Project:	ple ID: FIELD e ID: T26735 AQ - G SW846 San Jua	S A7 MW-1 5-1 Fround Water 8021B an Basin Pit (Groundwater	Date S Date F Percer 2008-20	Sampled: Received: nt Solids: 109	04/07/09 : 04/08/09 : n/a		
Run #1 Run #2	File ID KK030477.D	DF 1	Analyzed 04/09/09	By FI	Prep D n/a	ate	Prep Batch n/a	Analytical Batch GKK1470
Run #1 Run #2	Purge Volume 5.0 ml							
Purgeable	Aromatics							
CAS No.	Compound		Result	RL	MDL	Units	Q	
71-43-2 108-88-3 100-41-4 1330-20-7 95-47-6	Benzene Toluene Ethylbenzene Xylenes (total) o-Xylene m,p-Xylene		25.5 11.0 0.60 21.5 4.6 16.9	 1.0 1.0 2.0 1.0 1.0 	0.21 0.23 0.35 0.55 0.55 0.66	ug/l ug/l ug/l ug/l ug/l ug/l	J	
CAS No.	Surrogate Rec	coveries	Run# 1	Run# 2	Lim	its		

CHO NO.	Surrogate Recoveries	Kull# 1	Kull# Z	Linns
460-00-4	4-Bromofluorobenzene	92%		58-125%
98-08-8	aaa-Trifluorotoluene	81%		73-139%

ND = Not detected MDL - Method Detection Limit

RL = Reporting Limit

J = Indicates an estimated value

ł

B = Indicates analyte found in associated method blank N = Indicates presumptive evidence of a compound





ω

E = Indicates value exceeds calibration range

		Repor	t of An	alysis			Page 1 of 1
Client Sam Lab Samp Matrix: Method: Project:	aple ID: FIELDS A7 MW-3 le ID: T26735-2 AQ - Ground Wate SW846 8021B San Juan Basin Pit	3 er Groundwater F	Remediation	Date S Date I Percer 2008-20	Sampled: Received nt Solids 009	04/07/09 : 04/08/09 : n/a	
Run #1 Run #2	File IDDFKK030478.D50	Analyzed 04/09/09	By FI	Prep D n/a	ate	Prep Batch n/a	Analytical Batch GKK1470
Run #1 Run #2	Purge Volume 5.0 ml						
Purgeable	Aromatics						
CAS No.	Compound	Result	RL	MDL	Units	Q	
71-43-2 108-88-3 100-41-4 1330-20-7 95-47-6	Benzene Toluene Ethylbenzene Xylenes (total) o-Xylene m,p-Xylene	182 ND ND ND ND ND ND	50 50 50 100 50 50 50	10 11 17 28 28 33	ug/l ug/l ug/l ug/l ug/l ug/l		
CAS No.	Surrogate Recoveries	Run# 1	Run# 2	Lim	its		
460-00-4 98-08-8	4-Bromofluorobenzene aaa-Trifluorotoluene	79% 73%		58-1 73-1	25% 39%		

ND = Not detectedMDL - Method Detection Limit RL = Reporting Limit

- E = Indicates value exceeds calibration range
- J = Indicates an estimated value

B = Indicates analyte found in associated method blank

N = Indicates presumptive evidence of a compound



3. 2

			Page 1 of					
Client Sam Lab Samp Matrix: Method: Project:	nple ID: FIEL le ID: T2673 AQ - SW84 San Ju	DS A7 MW 15-3 Ground Wa 16 8021B Jan Basin P	7-4 ater lit Groundwater	Remediati	Date S Date I Percer on 2008-20	Sampled: Received nt Solids)09	04/07/09 : 04/08/09 : n/a	
Run #1 Run #2	File ID KK030479.D	DF 50	Analyzed 04/09/09	By FI	Prep D n/a	ate	Prep Batch n/a	Analytical Batch GKK1470
Run #1 Run #2	Purge Volum 5.0 ml	3						
Purgeable	Aromatics							
CAS No.	Compound		Result	RL	MDL	Units	Q	
71-43-2 108-88-3 100-41-4	Benzene Toluene Ethylbenzene		695 206 ND	50 50 50	10 11 17	ug/l ug/l ug/l		

100

50

Run# 2

50

28

28

33

745

229

516

Run#1

94%

77%

MDL - Method Detection Limit ND = Not detected

- RL = Reporting Limit
- E = Indicates value exceeds calibration range

Xylenes (total)

Surrogate Recoveries

4-Bromofluorobenzene

aaa-Trifluorotoluene

o-Xylene

m,p-Xylene

1330-20-7

95-47-6

CAS No.

460-00-4

98-08-8

J = Indicates an estimated value

ug/l

ug/l

ug/l

Limits

58-125%

73-139%

- B = Indicates analyte found in associated method blank
- N = Indicates presumptive evidence of a compound





ယ ယ

		Report of Analysis										
Client Sar Lab Samp Matrix: Method: Project:	mple ID: 07040 ble ID: T2673 AQ - ' SW84 San Ju	9TB01 5-4 Frip Blank 6 8021B an Basin F	Water ² it Groundwater	Remedia	Date Sampled Date Received Percent Solids tion 2008-2009	04/07/09 : 04/08/09 : n/a						
Run #1 Run #2	File ID KK030476.D	DF 1	Analyzed 04/09/09	By FI	Prep Date n/a	Prep Batch n/a	Analytical Batch GKK1470					
Run #1 Run #2	Purge Volume 5.0 ml	;										

Purgeable Aromatics

.

CAS No.	Compound	Result	RL	MDL	Units	Q
71-43-2	Benzene	ND	1.0	0.21	ug/l	
108-88-3	Toluene	ND	1.0	0.23	ug/l	
100-41-4	Ethylbenzene	ND	i 1.0	0.35	ug/l	
1330-20-7	Xylenes (total)	ND	2.0	0.55	ug/l	
95-47-6	o-Xylene	ND	1.0	0.55	ug/l	
	m,p-Xylene	ND	1.0	0.66	ug/l	
CAS No.	Surrogate Recoveries	Run# 1	Run# 2	Limi	ts	
460-00-4	4-Bromofluorobenzene	89%		58-12	25%	
98-08-8	aaa-Trifluorotoluene	74%		73-13	89 %	

ND = Not detected MDL - Method Detection Limit RL = Reporting Limit E = Indicates value exceeds calibration range

.

J = Indicates an estimated value

:

N = Indicates presumptive evidence of a compound



B = Indicates analyte found in associated method blank



Section 4

Misc. Forms	

Custody Documents and Other Forms

Includes the following where applicable:

Chain of Custody LRC Form



ACCUTEST. Laboratories 10165 Harwin, Suite 150 - Houston,	, TX 7	7036 -	CH	AI	N (00 fa	IC	F (713-	CU -271	JS -43	5 T (770	01	DY	Tracking	88	51	260	S Acc	tie Order (udeut Job	Control B	1-5	Page of
													4		1 2.3%		itais 1	2019	a ser al		。/ 〉 〉
Client / Reporting Information	10 A 40 A 40	Project N	ne /No	roject In	formatio	on]		2444 (4.0	u. end	in a line of	1.2.69	8, 11,4 4,12,4	62.036	1, / -	Rev	questec	Analys	**	<u>argeogra</u>	Matrix Codes
WH		EPTPC	San Juan	Basin	Pit GV	VRe	media	tion :	200	8-200)9										GW - Ground Water
roject Contact E-Mail		Bill to	0011000				Invoice	Attn.				1									WW - Wastewalar
ed Smith jed.smith@mwhgiobal.c	om	Ei Pasc	Согр			Nor	ma R	amos	s												60 - Soli
		Address																			SL - Studge
801 California Street, Suite 2900	Zio	1001 Lo	oulsiana S	treet, F	Rm S19	04B				- 7	'ln	-		1	· •						
enver CO	80202	Housto	r			TX				77	002										SOL - Other Solid
hane No. Fax No.		Phone No	n.						Fa	ax No.		1									
03-291-2276												1									
amplers's Name Urbai		Client Pu	chase Order	1 10	2-1]	80	· · · ·	00	7	12									
troy on bun	1	Collectio	<u>27-17</u>	<u>, r</u> n			mber		- M	ved by	ottles	ĕ									
Accutest / Field ID / Point of Collection		0000000		1	# of	0	8 8	ğ	ŝ	ŝ i	5 2	ΪĤ	1								LAB USE ONLY
	Di	n to	Time	Matrix	bottles	1 ±	2 1	Ť	Ť.	1	<u> </u>	in i		\rightarrow							
Fields A7 MW-1	0407	09	1020	60	3	X						X					_				
2 Fields A7 MW-3	040	704	1050	GW	3						X	X									
3 Fields A7 MW.4	1040	104	11:7	600	2	П					X	X									
Y DIDY OG TRIK		1 <u>.</u>	A-100	[AD	2		+				1-	1			-			-		-	
	CAO	/0 1	0 700		<u> </u>	ŕ	-+-			-			┝╌╢	-	-+-				++		+
						\vdash				+	_				_		_		+	_	
	<u> </u>				ļ	\square					_										
						\Box															
						\mathbf{T}	+	11	H		-							+			
				<u> </u>		\vdash		+	-+	-		-	\vdash						+		
Stimpfiel Timerund Time / Business days)	AT 1. 2 1. 104	e	8-26-315	Data	Delbarah			Exc			1_	111.0	1.294	CARA COL	578						State State States
X 10 Day STANDARO Approved By:/ D		ALC: NO	Com	nercial "/		<u>, </u>	TRRP	-13		herora.		02502	. 12. *	1.994	5.96		Comme		. (150-10	Construction of the second
7 Day			X Com	nerciai "i	3-	Н	EOD F	ormat			_		ρ	ley	50	Co	рy	re	su/H	s 4	c
4 Day RUSH			Redu	ced Tier	1		Other,				-		1	1	~	1	0	i	<i>.</i>		
3 Day EMERGENCY			Full D	ata Pack	290								٩	14	ω	105	101	40	Ser	Vice	i con
2 Day EMERGENCY			1												-						
1 Day EMERGENCY	<u> </u>		Comm	ercial "A	" = Resul	ts Onl	ly .														
Roal time analytical data available via Lablink			Comm	ercial "B	- = Resul	ts & S	tandar	d QC													
SAMPLE CUSTODY	MUST BE D	DOUMENT	EO BELOW E	ACH TIN	E SAMP	LES C	HANGE	POS	5E85	ION, IP	CLUD	NG CO	RIER D	LIVER	Y		. 1957	in an	. They war		an an the station of the states
Rainquiched by Sanpler:	Data Tito:	100	Received By	:				Relin	-	H By	(Date Tim	"G	~	Reca	heres ?	. /	17.	λ
1 jugo [373	7/1	07	1					2	F	CU	٢7	د.	1,8	٩_	/3	,	2.	Æ	02/	Up/	·
Assude the date of	Catel Timet		Received By	:				Relin	-quish	ed By:			1	Date Tim			Rece	Hved By:			$\langle \rangle$
Relinguished by:	Date Time:		S Received By	:				4 Cust	ody S	na) F			Preserve	d where	applica	ble	4		On Ice	Goo	er Temp.
	1		L											n					\sim	- 7	- °C

.

T26735: Chain of Custody Page 1 of 3



4.1 4

Accutest Job Number: Tub TSC Client: MWH Date/Tim # of Coolers Received: Thermometer #: # 3 Temperature A Cooler Temps: #1: 2.2 #3: #4: #5: #6: Method of Delivery: FEDEX UPS Accutest Courier Greyhound Delivery Airbill Numbers: COOLER INFORMATION Sample containers received broken Wet ice received in cooler VOC vials have headspace Sample labels missing or illegible Do n COC does not match label(s) D/T on COC does not match label(s) Chain of Custody not received Sample/Bottles revol but no analysis on COC Sample/Bottles roved but no analysis on COC Sample/Bottles roved but no analysis on COC Sample D/T unclear or missing Bottles missing for requested analysis Num GOC not properly executed Insufficient volume for analysis Num Summary of Discrepancies: Sample received improperly preserved Num	Adjustment Factor: #7:#8: Other Trip Blank on COC but not received Trip Blank not intact Received Water Trip Blank Received Soil TB
Cooler Temps: #1: 2.2 #2: #3: #4: #5: #6: Method of Delivery: FEDEX UPS Accutest Courier Greyhound Delivery Airbill Numbers: COOLER INFORMATION SAMPLE INFORMATION Cooler Greyhound Delivery Cooler Temps: #1: Cooler Temps: #1: Cooler Sample containers received broken Delivery Airbill Numbers: Cooler Information Sample containers received broken Delivery Cooler Temperature enteria not met VOC vials have headspace Sample labels missing or filegible Delivery Chain of Custody not received Sample/Bottles rovd but no analysis on COC Sample/Bottles rovd but no analysis on COC Sample labels missing for requested analysis Num Cool not properly executed Bottles missing for requested analysis Num Summary of Discrepancies: Summary of Discrepancies: Num	#7:#8: Other TRIP BLANK INFORMATION Trip Blank on COC but not received Trip Blank received but not on COC Trip Blank not intact Received Water Trip Blank Received Soil TB
Cooler relines. #0. #0. #0. #0. Method of Delivery: FEDEX UPS Accutest Courier Greyhound Delivery Airbill Numbers:	Other TRIP BLANK INFORMATION Trip Blank on COC but not received Trip Blank received but not on COC Trip Blank not intact Received Water Trip Blank Received Soil TB
COOLER INFORMATION SAMPLE INFORMATION Custody seal missing or not intact Sample containers received broken uses Temperature criteria not met VOC vials have headspace Wet ice received in cooler Sample labels missing or lilegible CHAIN OF CUSTODY D/T on COC does not match label(s) Chain of Custody not received Sample listed on COC, but not received Sample D/T unclear or missing Bottles missing for requested analysis COC not properly executed Insufficient volume for analysis Summary of Discrepancies: Num	TRIP BLANK INFORMATION Trip Blank on COC but not received Trip Blank received but not on COC Trip Blank not intact Received Water Trip Blank Received Soil TB
DSX MW-4 on COC Sers None privated - Bott in as Non-privated	aber of Encores? aber of 5035 kils? aber of lab-filtered metals? le hes Heck - Loggel
TECHNICIAN SIGNATURE/DATE: INFORMATION AND SAMPLE LABELING VERIFIED BY: Chapt Representative Notified:	
By Accutest Representative: Via Client Instructions:	a: Phone Email

T26735: Chain of Custody Page 2 of 3

		•	SAMPLE RI	ECEIPT	LOG					
JOB #:		126735	• .	DATE/TIME	RECEIVED:		4-B	-9 900		
CLIENT:	·	hwt			INITIALS		Эc			
COOLER#	SAMPLE ID	FIELD ID	DATE	MATRIX	VOL	BOTTLE #	LOCATION	PRESERV	Р	н
· ()	Fields AZ MW-1	4-7-9-1020	W	4ml	1.3	IR	1 (2) 3 4	<2	> 12
1	2	1 mu-3	1050	1	Ň	11	1	0 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
	3	MW-4	[117			1-2		$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<2	>12
	Y.	TOY BLAK				1-2.	•	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
								1 2 3 4 5 6 7 B	<2	>12
		,						1 2 3. 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
								1 2 3 4 5 6 7 6	<u></u> 2	>12
					,			1 2 3 4 5 8 7 8	<2	>12
						Ţ		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
								1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12 '
				12	9			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
				El -				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
			$\int f$					1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	190/					1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
		·						1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	· <2	. > 12
			<u> </u>					1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
				, i				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 B	<2	>12
								1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
								1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
, 								1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12
								<u>1 2 3 4</u> <u>5 6 7 8</u>		>12
/	<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>		l	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<2	>12

the second se

T26735: Chain of Custody Page 3 of 3

:



4.1

Appendix A Laboratory Data Package Cover Page

Thi

us data	a package c	onsists of:
Ļ	This si	ignature page, the laboratory review checklist, and the following reportable data:
Ģ	R1	Field chain-of-custody documentation;
ņ	R2	Sample identification cross-reference;
Ģ	R3	Test reports (analytical data sheets) for each environmental sample that includes:
		a) Items consistent with NELAC 5.13 or ISO/IEC 17025 Section 5.10
		b) dilution factors,
		c) preparation methods,
		d) cleanup methods, and
		e) if required for the project, tentatively identified compounds (TICs).
Ģ	R4	Surrogate recovery data including:
		a) Calculated recovery (%R), and
		b) The laboratory's surrogate QC limits.
Ģ	R5	Test reports/summary forms for blank samples;
Ģ	R6	Test reports/summary forms for laboratory control samples (LCSs) including:
		a) LCS spiking amounts,
		b) Calculated %R for each analyte, and
		c) The laboratory's LCS QC limits.
Ċ	R7	Test reports for project matrix spike/matrix spike duplicates (MS/MSDs) including:
		a) Samples associated with the MS/MSD clearly identified,
		b) MS/MSD spiking amounts,
		c) Concentration of each MS/MSD analyte measured in the parent and spiked samples,
		d) Calculated %Rs and relative percent differences (RPDs), and
_		e) The laboratory's MS/MSD QC limits
Ļ	R8	Laboratory analytical duplicate (if applicable) recovery and precision:
		a) the amount of analyte measured in the duplicate,
		b) the calculated RPD, and
_		c) the laboratory's QC limits for analytical duplicates.
Ļ	R9	List of method quantitation limits (MQLs) for each analyte for each method and matrix;
Ļ	RIO The	Uther problems or anomalies.
	The E	exception Report for every "No" or "Not Reviewed (NR)" item in laboratory review checklist

Release Statement: I am responsible for the release of this laboratory data package. This data package has been reviewed by the laboratory and is complete and technically compliant with the requirements of the methods used, except where noted by the laboratory in the attached exception reports. By me signature below, I affirm to the best of my knowledge, all problems/anomalies, observed by the laboratory as having the potential to affect the quality of the data, have been identified by the laboratory in the Laboratory Review Checklist, and no information or data have been knowingly withheld that would affect the quality of the data.

Check, if applicable: [] This laboratory is an in-house laboratory controlled by the person responding to rule. The official signing the cover page of the rule-required report (for example, the APAR) in which these data are used is responsible for releasing this data package and is by signature affirming the above release statement is true.

Paul K Canevaro Name (Printed)

Faul KCanevor Signature

Laboratory Director Official Title (printed) 4/20/2009 Date



Laboratory Name: Accutest Laboratories Gulf Coast LRC Date: 4/20/2009 Project Name: San Juan Basin Pit Groundwater Remediation 2008-2009 Laboratory Job Number: T26735 Reviewer Name: Paul K. Canevaro Prep Batch Number(s): GKK1470 #1 A ² Description Yes No NA NR ⁴ Chain-of-custody (C-O-C) Yes No NA NR ⁴ Yes No NA NR ⁴ R2 OI Samples meet the laboratory's standard conditions of sample acceptability upon receipt? X X R2 OI Sample and quality control (QC) identification Y X X Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the corresponding QC data? X X X R3 OI Test reports X X X Were all amples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X X X X Were all anyle identifications checked by a peer or supervisor? X X X X Were all analyte identifications checked by a peer or supervisor? X X X X Were all analyte identifications checked by a peer or supervisor? X X X X X Were all nubse resulls < MQL, were all only a peer or supervisor	Appendix A (cont'd): Laboratory Review Checklist: Reportable Data								
Project Name: San Juan Basin Pit Groundwater Remediation 2008-2009 Laboratory Job Number: T26735 Reviewer Name: Paul K. Canevaro Prep Batch Number(s): GKK1470 #1 A ² Description Yes No NA NR ⁴ #1 A ² Description Yes No NA NR ⁴ R1 OI Did samples meet the laboratory's standard conditions of sample acceptability upon receipt? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report? X Image: Standard Conditions described in an exception report?									
Reviewer Name: Paul K. Canevaro Prep Batch Number(s): GKK1470 # ¹ A ² Description Yes No NA NR ⁴ R1 OI Did samples meet the laboratory's standard conditions of sample acceptability upon receipt? X Image: Chain-of-custody (C-O-C) R2 OI Sample and quality control (QC) identification 7 1 Image: Chain-of-custody (C-O-C) R3 OI Sample and quality control (QC) identification 7 1 Image: Chain-of-custody (C-O-C) R3 OI Test reports X Image: Chain-of-custody (C-O-C) R4 Other than those ross-referenced to the laboratory ID numbers? X Image: Chain-of-Custody (C-O-C) R4 Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards?									
#1 A ² Description Yes No NA NR ⁴ R1 OI Did samples meet the laboratory's standard conditions of sample acceptability upon receipt? X X R2 OI Sample and quality control (QC) identification X X R3 OI Test reports X X X R4 OI Test reports X X X Were all analyte identification X X X X R4 OI Test reports X X X X Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X X X X Were all nabore results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards?									
R1 OI Did samples meet the laboratory's standard conditions of sample acceptability upon receipt? X R2 OI Sample and quality control (QC) identification X X R2 OI Sample and quality control (QC) identification X X R3 OI Test reports X X Were all aboratory ID numbers cross-referenced to the corresponding QC data? X X R3 OI Test reports X X Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X X X Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards?	ER# ⁵								
R1 OI Did samples meet the laboratory's standard conditions of sample acceptability upon receipt? X Were all departures from standard conditions described in an exception report? X X R2 OI Sample and quality control (QC) identification X X Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the laboratory ID numbers? X X X R3 OI Test reports X X X Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X X X X Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards?									
Were all departures from standard conditions described in an exception report? X R2 OI Sample and quality control (QC) identification Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the laboratory ID numbers? X R3 OI Test reports Were all amples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards?	- AND ADD ADD ADD ADD ADD ADD ADD ADD ADD								
R2 OI Sample and quality control (QC) identification Image: Control (QC) identification Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the laboratory ID numbers? X Image: Control (QC) identification R3 OI Test reports X Image: Control (QC) identification Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X Image: Control (QC) identification is control (QC) identification standards? Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X Image: Control (QC) identification standards? Were calculations checked by a peer or supervisor? X Image: Control (QC) identification standards? Were all nalyte identifications checked by a peer or supervisor? X Image: Control (QC) identification standards? Were all results for soil and sediment samples reported on a dry weight basis? X Image: Control (QC) identification? Were % moisture (or solids) reported for all soil and sediment samples? X Image: Control (QC) identification? Were surrogate recovery data Image: Control (QC) identification? X Image: Control (QC) identification? Were surrogate added prior to extraction? X Image: Control (QC) identification? X Image: Control (QC) identification? R4 O Surrogate recover									
Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the laboratory ID numbers? X Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the corresponding QC data? X R3 OI Test reports Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards?	A								
Are all laboratory ID numbers cross-referenced to the corresponding QC data? X R3 OI Test reports X Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X X Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards?	<u></u>								
R3 OI Test reports X Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X X Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards?									
Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? X Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards?									
Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards?	·								
Were calculations checked by a peer or supervisor? X Were all analyte identifications checked by a peer or supervisor? X Were sample quantitation limits reported for all analytes not detected? X Were all results for soil and sediment samples reported on a dry weight basis? X Were % moisture (or solids) reported for all soil and sediment samples? X If required for the project, TICs reported? X R4 O Surrogate recovery data Were surrogates added prior to extraction? X Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? X Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if applicable, cleanup procedures? X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
Were all analyte identifications checked by a peer or supervisor? X Were sample quantitation limits reported for all analytes not detected? X Were all results for soil and sediment samples reported on a dry weight basis? X Were % moisture (or solids) reported for all soil and sediment samples? X If required for the project, TICs reported? X R4 O Surrogate recovery data Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? X Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if applicable, cleanup procedures? X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
Were sample quantitation limits reported for all analytes not detected? X Were all results for soil and sediment samples reported on a dry weight basis? X Were % moisture (or solids) reported for all soil and sediment samples? X If required for the project, TICs reported? X R4 O Surrogate recovery data Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? X Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? X Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
Were all results for soil and sediment samples reported on a dry weight basis? X Were % moisture (or solids) reported for all soil and sediment samples? X If required for the project, TICs reported? X R4 O Surrogate recovery data Were surrogates added prior to extraction? X Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? X R5 OI Test reports/summary forms for blank samples Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if applicable, cleanup procedures? X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
Were % moisture (or solids) reported for all soil and sediment samples? X If required for the project, TICs reported? X R4 O Surrogate recovery data Were surrogates added prior to extraction? X Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? X R5 OI Test reports/summary forms for blank samples Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if applicable, cleanup procedures? X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
If required for the project, TICs reported? X R4 O Surrogate recovery data Were surrogates added prior to extraction? X Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? X R5 OI Test reports/summary forms for blank samples Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? X Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if applicable, cleanup procedures? X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
R4 O Surrogate recovery data X Were surrogates added prior to extraction? X X Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? X X R5 OI Test reports/summary forms for blank samples X X Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? X X X Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X X X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if X X X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
Were surrogates added prior to extraction? X Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? X R5 Ol Test reports/summary forms for blank samples Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? X Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if X Were blank concentrations < MQL?	1								
Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? X R5 OI Test reports/summary forms for blank samples Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? X Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
R5 OI Test reports/summary forms for blank samples Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? X Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if X applicable, cleanup procedures? X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? X Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if X applicable, cleanup procedures? X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? X Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if X applicable, cleanup procedures? X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if X applicable, cleanup procedures? X Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
Were blank concentrations < MQL?									
LED LED LE A DOTATOT CONTROL COMPLEX LE N.Y.									
Were all COCs included in the LCS?	1.8.19								
Was each LCS taken through the entire analytical procedure including pren and cleanup steps?									
Were LCSs analyzed at the required frequency?									
Were LCSs analyzed at the required frequency:									
Doos the detectobility date deaument the laboratory's conchility to detect the COCs at the MDL used.									
to calculate the SQLs?									
Was the LCSD RPD within QC limits?									
R7 OI Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) data									
Were the project/method specified analytes included in the MS and MSD? X									
Were MS/MSD analyzed at the appropriate frequency?									
Were MS (and MSD, if applicable) %Rs within the laboratory QC limits?									
Were MS/MSD RPDs within laboratory QC limits?									
R8 OI Analytical duplicate data	<u>````````````````````````````````</u>								
Were appropriate analytical duplicates analyzed for each matrix?	····								
Were analytical duplicates analyzed at the appropriate frequency?									
Were RPDs or relative standard deviations within the laboratory QC limits?	<u>-</u>								
Image: Notice of the sector of the	<u>,, '4</u>								
Are the MQLs for each method analyte included in the laboratory data package?									
Do the inights correspond to the concentration of the lowest non-zero calibration standard? X									
Are unadjusted MQLs included in the laboratory data package? X IP10 OL Other methanism for evention									
Are all house mathematics and the second time of the transmission of the second									
Are all known problems/anomalies/special conditions noted in this LRC and ER?									
were an necessary corrective actions performed for the reported data?									

Items identified by the letter "R" must be included in the laboratory data package submitted in the TRRP-required report(s). Items identified by the letter "S" should be retained and made available upon request for the appropriate retention period.
 = organic analyses; I = inorganic analyses (and general chemistry, when applicable);
 NA = Not applicable;



Appendix A (cont'd): Laboratory Review Checklist: Reportable Data										
Laboratory	Name	e: Accutest Laboratories Gulf Coast	LRC Date: 4/20/2009							
Project Nar										
Reviewer N										
# ¹	A ²	Description	Yes	No	NA ³	NR⁴	ER# ⁵			
S1	01	Initial calibration (ICAL)								
		Were response factors and/or relative response factors for ea	x			<u></u>				
		Were percent RSDs or correlation coefficient criteria met?		X	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	İ	Was the number of standards recommended in the method u	X	Í	·		í			
		Were all points generated between the lowest and highest sta	generated between the lowest and highest standard used to calculate the curve?							
		Are ICAL data available for all instruments used?	Il instruments used?							
		Has the initial calibration curve been verified using an appro	opriate second source standard?	X				<u>į </u>		
S2	01	Initial and continuing calibration verification (ICCV and	d CCV) and continuing calibration							
	1	Was the CCV analyzed at the method-required frequency?		X	ĺ					
ĺ	İ	Were percent differences for each analyte within the method	I-required QC limits?	X	Î					
İ	Ì	Was the ICAL curve verified for each analyte?		X	Ì	<u> </u>				
İ		Was the absolute value of the analyte concentration in the in	organic CCB < MDL?	X	Ì	·				
S3	0	Mass spectral tuning:								
		Was the appropriate compound for the method used for tuning	ng?			X				
	l l	Were jon abundance data within the method-required OC lir	nits?	1		x		<u>† </u>		
S4	0	Internal standards (IS):		_	1	<u> </u>				
		Were IS area counts and retention times within the method-		487 <u>1 CONNER</u>	X	an galaganan in the				
S5	01	Raw data (NELAC section 1 appendix A glossary, and se	ection 5.12 or ISO/IEC 17025 section							
1		Were the raw data (for example, chromatograms, spectral da	X							
		Were data associated with manual integrations flagged on the	nanual integrations flagged on the raw data?					1		
S6	0.	Dual column confirmation								
	i	Did dual column confirmation results meet the method-requ	ired QC?	X				1		
S7	0	Tentatively identified compounds (TICs):								
	1	If TICs were requested, were the mass spectra and TIC data	subject to appropriate checks?			X		PERMIT		
S8	1	Interference Check Sample (ICS) results:				1				
		Were percent recoveries within method QC limits?				X				
S9	1	Serial dilutions, post digestion spikes, and method of star	ndard additions			÷.				
		Were percent differences, recoveries, and the linearity within	n the QC limits specified in the method?			X				
S10	OI	Method detection limit (MDL) studies		67	1					
		Was a MDL study performed for each reported analyte?		X						
011		Is the MDI_either_adjusted_or_supported_by_the_analysis_of_I	0		 					
511	Ol Proficiency test reports:									
		Was the laboratory's performance acceptable on the applicat	ole proficiency tests or evaluation studies?							
S12	01	Standards documentation	,,, ,,							
		Are all standards used in the analyses NIST-traceable or obtained from other appropriate sources?								
S13	OI	Compound/analyte identification procedures	Compound/analyte identification procedures							
	ļ	Are the procedures for compound/analyte identification doc	X							
S14	01	Demonstration of analyst competency (DOC)		a second		di fe				
		Was DOC conducted consistent with NELAC Chapter 5C o	r ISO/IEC 4?	X						
		Is documentation of the analyst's competency up-to-date and	d on file?	X	1	KA PROVIDENT				
815	01	Verification/validation documentation for methods (NEL	AC Chap 5 or ISO/IEC 17025 Section 5)							
	ļ	Are all the methods used to generate the data documented, v	verified, and validated, where applicable?	<u> </u> X						
S16	01	Laboratory standard operating procedures (SOPs):	-				<u> </u>			
		Are laboratory SOPs current and on file for each method per	rformed?	X						
I	J			1	1		1	1		

Items identified by the letter "R" should be included in the laboratory data package submitted to the TCEQ in the TRRP-required report(s). Items identified by the letter "S" should be retained and made available upon request for the appropriate retention period. O =organic analyses; 1 = inorganic analyses (and general chemistry, when applicable). NA = Not applicable. 1

2

3



4.2

_aborat	ory Name: Accutest Laboratories Gulf Coast	LRC Date: 4/20/2009
roject	: San Juan Basin Pit Groundwater Remediation 2008-2009	Laboratory Job Number: T26735
Review	er Name: Paul K. Canevaro	Prep Batch Number(s): GKK1470
ER # ¹	DESCRIPTION	
	For reporting purposes, the MQL is defined in the report method blank. The SQL/MDL is defined in the report as	as the RL. The unadjusted MQL/RL is reported in the s the MDL.
	All anomalies are discussed in the case narrative	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

·* -

ER# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked on the LRC)



RG-366/TRRP-13 December 2002

A4

÷





Section 5

GC Volatiles

QC Data Summaries

Includes the following where applicable:

- Method Blank Summaries
- Blank Spike Summaries
- Matrix Spike and Duplicate Summaries





Method Blank Summary

Job Number:	T26735										
Account:	MWHCODE Montgomery Watson										
Project:	San Juan Basin Pit Groundwater Remediation 2008-2009										
Sample	File ID	DF	Analyzed	By	By Prep Date Prep Batch Analytical Ba						
GKK1470-MB	KK030474	.D1	04/09/09	FI	FI n/a n/a GKK1470						
The QC report	ed here applies	s to the fo	llowing samples	s:	• •	Method: SW84					

. . . .

T26735-1, T26735-2, T26735-3, T26735-4

Compound	Result	RL	MDL	Units Q
Benzene	ŇD	1.0	0.21	ug/l
Ethylbenzene	ND	1.0	0.35	ug/l
Toluene	ND .	1.0	0.23	ug/l
Xylenes (total)	ŇĎ	2.0	0.55	ug/l
o-Xylene	ND	1.0	0.55	ug/l
m,p-Xylene	ND	1.0	0.66	ug/l
Surrogate Recoveries		Limi	ts	
4-Bromofluorobenzene	92%	58-12	25%	
aaa-Trifluorotoluene	74%	73-13	39 %	
	Compound Benzene Ethylbenzene Toluene Xylenes (total) o-Xylene m,p-Xylene Surrogate Recoveries 4-Bromofluorobenzene aaa-Trifluorotoluene	CompoundResultBenzene Ethylbenzene Toluene Xylenes (total) o-Xylene m,p-XyleneND ND NDSurrogate Recoveries92% 3aa-Trifluorobenzene 34%	CompoundResultRLBenzeneND1.0EthylbenzeneND1.0TolueneND1.0Xylenes (total)ND2.0o-XyleneND1.0m,p-XyleneND1.0Surrogate RecoveriesLimit4-Bromofluorobenzene92%58-12aaa-Trifluorotoluene74%73-13	Compound Result RL MDL Benzene ND 1.0 0.21 Ethylbenzene ND 1.0 0.35 Toluene ND 1.0 0.23 Xylenes (total) ND 2.0 0.55 o-Xylene ND 1.0 0.55 m,p-Xylene ND 1.0 0.66 Surrogate Recoveries Limits 4-Bromofluorobenzene 92% 58-125% aaa-Trifluorotoluene 74% 73-139%

the second second second second



Page 1 of 1

<u>კ</u>

Blank Spike/Blank Spike Duplicate Summary

Job Number:	126735
Account:	MWHCODE Montgomery Watson
Project:	San Juan Basin Pit Groundwater Remediation 2008-2009

Sample File ID DF Analyzed By Prep Date Prep Batch Analytical Batc	Sample	File ID	DF	Analyzed	By	Prep Date	Prep Batch	Analytical Batch
GKK1470-BS KK030471.D1 04/09/09 FI n/a n/a GKK1470	GKK1470-BS	KK030471.	D1	04/09/09	FI	n/a	n/a	GKK1470
GKK1470-BSD KK030472.D1 04/09/09 FI n/a n/a GKK1470	GKK1470-BSD	KK030472.	D1	04/09/09	FI	n/a	n/a	GKK1470

The QC reported here applies to the following samples:

Method: SW846 8021B

T26735-1, T26735-2, T26735-3, T26735-4

CAS No.	Compound	Spike ug/l	BSP ug/l	BSP %	BSD ug/l	BSD %	RPD	Limits Rec/RPD
71-43-2	Benzene	20	19.5	.98	18.9	95	· 3 ^{****}	86-121/30
100-41-4	Ethylbenzene	20	18.9	95	18.4	92	3	81-116/30
108-88-3	Toluene	20	19.3	.,97	18.7	94	3	87-117/30
1330-20-7	Xylenes (total)	60	56.2	94	54.7	91	13 Å	85-115/30
95-47-6	o-Xylene	20	18.6	93	18.2	91	2	87-116/30
	m,p-Xylene	40	37.6	94	36.6	92	3	84-116/30
CAS No.	Surrogate Recoveries	BSP	BS	SD	Limits			
460-00-4	4-Bromofluorobenzene	98 %	97	%	58-125	%		
98-08-8	aaa-Trifluorotoluene	78 %	76	%	73-139	%		



Page 1 of 1

5.2

Lodestar Services, Incorporated PO Box 4465, Durango, CO 81302 Office (970) 946-1093

WELL DEVELOPMENT AND SAMPLING LOG

Project Name: Client: Project Manager:	San Juan B MWH Ashley Age	asin er	Samp	Location: Date: ler's Name:	Fields A #7 4/7/2009 Troy Urbai	7A n	Well No: Time:	MW-3 10:37
Measuring Point: Well Diameter:	TOC 4" Wa	Depth To ater Colum	to Water: tal Depth: nn Height:	31.8 31.96 0.16	ft ft ft	Depth Product	to Product: Thickness:	ft ft
Sampling Method: Criteria:	□ Submersib ☑ Bottom Va ☑ 3 to 5 Cas	ile Pump Ive Bailer ing Volumes (Centrifug Double C of Water Rer	al Pump 🔲 Pe heck Valve Bail noval 🗹 Stabil	eristaltic Pump ler ization of India) 🗌 Other cator Paramete	ers 🗹 Other	bail dry
			N N	Water Volur	ne in Well			
Gal/ft x ft of w	/ater	Gal	lons	Our	nces		Volume	to be removed
0.16 x .65		0.10	4 x 3	1			0	.312 gal
Time (military)	pH (su)	SC (ms)	Temp (°C)	ORP (millivolts)	D.O. (mg/L)	Turbidity (NTU)	Vol Evac. _gal	Comments/Flow Rate
10:45	7.29	4.85	61.2				0.185	black, sheen
Final:	7.85	4.92	60.6				0.2	black, sheen, dry
COMMENTS:	barely eno sample is u	ugh water Inpreserve	to fill voa ed.	s. HCL prese	ervative rea	icted with g	roundwate	r - rinsed voa clean and
Instrumentation:	☑ pH Meter	DO Mor	nitor 🗹 C	onductivity Me	ter 🗹 Tem	perature Mete	r 🗌 Othe	r
Sample ID:	MW-3		- Sa	mple Time:	10:50	-		
Analysis Requested:	BTEX Other		🗌 Alkalini	ty 🗌 TDS	Cations [🗋 Anions 🗌	Nitrate 🗌	Nitrite 🗍 Metals
Trip Blank:	070420	09TB01	-			Duplica	ate Sample:	

Lodestar Services, Incorporated PO Box 4465, Durango, CO 81302 Office (970) 946-1093

• •

WELL DEVELOPMENT AND SAMPLING LOG

Project Name: Client: Project Manager:	San Juan B MWH Ashley Age	asin r	Samp	Location: Date: oler's Name:	Fields A #7 4/7/2009 Troy Urbai	'A 1	Well No: Time:	MW-1 9:28
Measuring Point: Well Diameter:	TOC 4" Wa	Depth To ater Colum	to Water: tal Depth: in Height:	31.24 39.92 8.68	ft ft ft	Depth Product	to Product: Thickness:	ft ft
Sampling Method: Criteria:	□ Submersib ☑ Bottom Va ☑ 3 to 5 Casi	le Pump Ive Bailer ing Volumes	Centrifug Double C of Water Re	ial Pump 🗌 Pe Theck Valve Baile moval 🗹 Stabili	ristaltic Pump er zation of India	Other	ers 🗹 Other	bail dry
				Water Volun	ne in Well			
Gal/ft x ft of v	vater	Gal	ons	Oun	ces		Volume	to be removed
8.68 x .65	, ,	5.64	1 x 3				10	6.93 gal
Time (military)	pH (su)	SC (ms)	Temp (°C)	ORP (millivolts)	D.O. (mg/L)	Turbidity (NTU)	Vol Evac.	Comments/Flow Rate
9:42	6.94	6.54	59.2		<u></u>		1	clear
	7.00	6.51	59.2				2	clear
	7.04	6.63	59.2					clear
	7.13	6.74	59.4				5	clear
	7.35	7.04	59.4	1			10	clear
	7.44	6.86	59.2				15	clear
	7.46	6.88	59.4				16	light gray, silty
	7.45	6.88	59.4				17	light gray, silty
Final:	7.42	6.9	59.3	n an an an an an an an an an an an an an		Halle and the second se	17.5	light gray, silty
COMMENTS:								<u></u>
Instrumentation:	D pH Meter	DO Mor	nitor 🗹 C	onductivity Mete	er 🗹 Tem	perature Mete	r 🗌 Other	
Water Disposal:	Rio Vista	<u>.</u>						
Sample ID:	MW-1		. Sa	mple Time:	10:20			
Analysis Requested:	BTEX Other	U VOCs	🗌 Alkalini	ty 🗌 TDS	Cations [Nitrate 🛛 I	Nitrite 🗌 Metals
Trip Blank:	070420	09TB01				Duplica	ate Sample:	

. •