

River Corridor Closure Contract

Groundwater, Leachate, and Lysimeter Monitoring and Sampling at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Calendar Year 2013

August 2014

For Public Release

Washington Closure Hanford

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
Office of Assistant Manager for River Corridor



TRADEMARK DISCLAIMER _____

Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof or its contractors or subcontractors.

This report has been reproduced from the best available copy.

Printed in the United States of America

08/27/2014 ²⁸

STANDARD APPROVAL PAGE

Title: Groundwater, Leachate, and Lysimeter Monitoring and Sampling at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Calendar Year 2013

Author Names: R. L. Weiss
B. L. Lawrence

Approval: W. A. Borlaug, Waste Operations Project Engineer

W.A. Borlaug
Signature

8/25/2014
Date

B. L. Lawrence, Waste Operations Environmental Project Lead

Blawrence
Signature

8/25/2014
Date

The approval signatures on this page indicate that this document has been authorized for information release to the public through appropriate channels. No other forms or signatures are required to document this information release.

**River Corridor
Closure Contract** 

**Groundwater, Leachate, and
Lysimeter Monitoring and Sampling
at the Environmental Restoration
Disposal Facility, Calendar Year 2013**

August 2014

Authors:

R. L. Weiss

B. L. Lawrence

For Public Release

Washington Closure Hanford

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
Office of Assistant Manager for River Corridor



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document reports the findings of the groundwater, leachate, and lysimeter monitoring and sampling at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) for calendar year (CY) 2013. The ERDF is a Hanford Site low-level mixed waste disposal facility that was brought into service on July 1, 1996. Baseline sampling and analytical data obtained from monitoring wells and the ERDF leachate collection system were used to determine contaminants of concern (COCs) and background conditions for long-term monitoring as described in the *Groundwater Protection Plan for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility*¹ and to meet the requirements of the ERDF Record of Decision (ROD)².

The purpose of this annual monitoring report is to evaluate the conditions of and identify trends for groundwater beneath ERDF and report leachate results in fulfillment of the requirements specified in the ERDF ROD² and the ERDF Amended ROD³. The overall objective of the groundwater monitoring program is to determine whether ERDF has impacted the groundwater. This objective is complicated by the fact that ERDF is situated downgradient of the numerous groundwater contamination plumes originating from the 200 West Area.

Each of the ERDF cells is constructed with a double-liner system for the purpose of collecting liquids, or leachate, that may travel through the waste materials stored at the disposal site. These liquids are typically generated from natural precipitation and the application of dust control water that percolates downward through the disposed waste materials and collects on the surface of the lining material. The primary liners and the secondary liners each are designed to deliver leachate to sump areas. Sumps for the primary liners are independent from the sumps associated with the secondary liners. The primary and secondary sumps at each of the cells are routinely evacuated, and the leachate is stored in holding tanks prior to transfer to the Effluent Treatment Facility.

¹ BHI-00079, 1996, *Groundwater Protection Plan for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility*, Rev. 0, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.

² EPA, 1995, *Record of Decision for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Hanford Site, 200 Area, Benton County, Washington*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Seattle, Washington.

³ EPA, 1999, *Amended Record of Decision, Decision Summary and Responsiveness Summary for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Hanford Site – 200 Area, Benton County, Washington*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Seattle, Washington.

The leachate in the storage tanks is sampled semiannually to (1) provide data to maintain leachate delisting status, (2) provide confirmation that Effluent Treatment Facility acceptance criteria are continuing to be met, and (3) assess whether additional COCs should be added to the routine ERDF groundwater monitoring program.

The ERDF groundwater monitoring program is part of the larger Hanford Site groundwater monitoring program, in which groundwater sampling is conducted across the entire Hanford Site. Groundwater samples are collected semiannually from four monitoring wells in the vicinity of ERDF. The monitoring well network consists of one upgradient well (699-36-70A) and three downgradient wells (699-37-66, 699-35-66A, and 699-36-66B). Groundwater monitoring wells in the ERDF well network have exhibited a gradual rate of decline in water levels since monitoring was initiated in September 1995. Water-level measurements collected during CY 2013 from wells 699-35-66A and 699-36-70A show a rate of decline that may be starting to stabilize.

Based on the CY 2013 analytical results, the statistical analysis of monitoring data, an evaluation of the groundwater, leachate, and lysimeters monitoring data, and a review of the water-level measurement data, the following information is offered:

Nitrate, carbon tetrachloride, gross beta, technetium-99, iodine-129, and uranium present in samples collected from the ERDF monitoring wells are due to the migration of contaminants from non-ERDF sources in the 200 West Area upgradient in the prevailing groundwater flow towards ERDF. The two new groundwater wells (699-37-66 and 699-36-66B) appear to have been placed within the existing groundwater contamination plume that has been slowly moving in the downgradient direction underneath ERDF. These wells were placed further downgradient than the original wells. This may extend the time period needed to allow contaminant peaks from historical releases in the 200 West Area to pass the downgradient wells due to the increased travel time of the groundwater between monitoring locations. The contaminant peak appears to have passed the upgradient well around CY 2005, establishing a slight downward trend in contamination levels there.

Groundwater activities from gross beta have varied from a long-term upward trend in the downgradient wells to all wells showing decline. All wells were below the upper tolerance levels for CY 2013. Groundwater activity from uranium has remained stable with a downward trend.

Levels of technetium-99 in all wells decreased in CY 2013. Only the fall analysis for well 699-35-66A exceeded the upper tolerance level. This is a good indication that the groundwater contaminant plume from the 200 West Area is moving in an easterly direction. Groundwater activity from uranium, technetium-99, gross alpha, and gross beta will continue to be monitored in future sampling to evaluate the data for adverse impacts from ERDF leachate to the groundwater at this location.

Arsenic concentrations remain well below Hanford Site background reference values. Historical analysis has shown periodic spikes in the groundwater data, while September 2009 samples show concentrations in the wells back within the general trend line. No Hanford Site-derived sources for arsenic have been identified for potential impact in the groundwater under ERDF. Pre-Hanford use of arsenic in agriculture may be the source of this contamination.

Chromium levels in the downgradient well 699-35-66A have historically been elevated and remain above the upper tolerance interval. Well 699-36-70A chromium levels increased significantly in the fall 2013 sampling, remaining just below the upper tolerance level. All other wells are stable at a level below the upper tolerance interval. The source of the elevated levels does not appear to be ERDF related and appears to be related to the groundwater contaminant plume from the 200 West Area or from corrosion of well components. Chromium levels and other corrosion products will continue to be monitored in future sampling.

Total organic halide concentrations significantly spiked in downgradient wells during CY 2006 monitoring and were detected again in the newly installed downgradient wells in CY 2008 sampling. The two new groundwater wells (699-37-66 and 699-36-66B) appear to have been placed within the existing groundwater contamination plume that has been slowly moving in the downgradient direction from ERDF. Analysis has shown periodic spikes in the groundwater data in the past. No correlations can be seen between total organic halide results and the volatile organic analyses performed at the same time (volatile organic analyses will report unexpected detections of chlorinated organics, the most likely contributor to total organic halide results). Total organic halide analysis is only an indicator analysis. Recent samples have been downward indicating with three of the four wells below the upper tolerance levels for the fall CY 2013 samples. Any future indication of consistent contamination will be evaluated to establish the source and composition of the compounds.

Trends in the leachate indicate decreasing gross alpha, gross beta, and uranium activity in samples collected over the past 3 years. Groundwater monitoring data for these constituents were examined to determine potential impacts to groundwater from ERDF operations.

Based on this CY 2013 data evaluation, there has been no correlation between leachate COC levels and groundwater COC levels that would indicate the leachate is impacting the groundwater under ERDF. Therefore, no additional analytes are recommended for the groundwater monitoring program or the routine leachate sampling. The current monitoring frequency appears to be appropriate for future monitoring needs.

The source of the liquid within the lysimeters is from the vadose zone located beneath the ERDF cell liner and is made up of compaction moisture from the admix layer located immediately above the lysimeter, construction water, consolidation water, and/or condensation water. The absence of technetium-99 within the lysimeter liquid is a very good indicator that the leachate collection system located above the lysimeters is not leaking liquid into the lysimeters. This is based on technetium-99's high solubility and ease of mobility through soils when soluble; there are no detectable levels of technetium-99 within the lysimeter liquid. Additional supporting evidence is the high sulfate concentration in the lysimeter liquid in comparison to the leachate, indicating there is no effective dilution of the lysimeter liquid.

No upward trends can be noted for any of the analytes for which delisting values have been established. The concentrations of contaminants in the ERDF leachate have not changed significantly in recent years, and there are no indications for potential to exceed delisting levels for any constituent.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1	PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES.....	1-1
2.0	BACKGROUND.....	2-1
2.1	GENERAL DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.2	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION DISPOSAL FACILITY.....	2-1
2.2.1	Leachate System.....	2-1
2.2.2	Lysimeter System.....	2-4
3.0	GROUNDWATER AND LEACHATE MONITORING.....	3-1
3.1	GROUNDWATER SAMPLING.....	3-1
3.1.1	General Approach to Evaluating Results	3-3
3.1.2	Statistical Approach to Evaluating Results.....	3-3
3.1.3	Determination of Tolerance Intervals	3-4
3.2	SUMMARY OF GROUNDWATER ANALYSES	3-4
3.3	GROUNDWATER LEVELS.....	3-8
3.4	SUMMARY OF GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL LEVEL MEASUREMENTS.....	3-11
3.5	LEACHATE SAMPLING.....	3-11
3.6	SUMMARY OF LEACHATE ANALYSIS.....	3-11
4.0	LYSIMETER MONITORING AND SAMPLING	4-1
4.1	PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES.....	4-1
4.2	LYSIMETER MONITORING AND SAMPLING	4-1
4.2.1	Camera Inspection and Dewatering.....	4-1
4.3	LYSIMETER SAMPLING	4-1
4.3.1	General Approach to Evaluating Results	4-3
4.4	SUMMARY OF LYSIMETER ANALYTICAL RESULTS.....	4-4
4.5	SUMMARY OF LYSIMETER ANALYSIS	4-4
4.6	EVALUATION OF CY 2013 LYSIMETER RESULTS	4-5

5.0	REFERENCES.....	5-1
-----	-----------------	-----

APPENDICES

A	GROUNDWATER SAMPLING RESULTS, 1996-2013	A-i
B	GROUNDWATER SAMPLING TRENDS, 1996-2013	B-i
C	LEACHATE SAMPLING RESULTS SUMMARY, 2010-2013	C-i
D	LEACHATE SAMPLING TRENDS, 1998-2013.....	D-i
E	ERDF LYSIMETER SAMPLING, CY 2013	E-i

FIGURES

2-1.	Location of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility	2-2
2-2.	The ERDF Monitoring Well Location Map.....	2-3
3-1.	Water-Level Contour Map.....	3-9
3-2.	Hydrograph from the ERDF Groundwater Monitoring Wells.....	3-10

TABLES

3-1.	List of Groundwater Analytes by Analytical Method.	3-1
3-2.	Summary of Tolerance Interval Comparisons and Trends	3-5
4-1.	Lysimeter Dewatering Activity.....	4-2
4-2.	List of Routine Lysimeter Analytes by Analytical Method.	4-3

ACRONYMS

CERCLA	<i>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980</i>
COC	contaminant of concern
CY	calendar year
ERDF	Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility
ERDF GPP	<i>Groundwater Protection Plan for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility</i>
ETF	Effluent Treatment Facility
RCRA	<i>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976</i>
ROD	Record of Decision
SAP	sampling and analysis plan

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) is a Hanford Site low-level mixed waste disposal facility that was brought into service on July 1, 1996. Baseline sampling and analytical data obtained from monitoring wells and the ERDF leachate collection system were used to determine contaminants of concern (COCs) and background conditions for long-term monitoring as described in the *Groundwater Protection Plan for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility* (ERDF GPP) (BHI-00079) and to meet the requirements of the ERDF Record of Decision (ROD) (EPA 1995). Based on about 10 years of ERDF monitoring activities and statistical evaluations of the data, the ERDF GPP (WCH-198) was revised and a new *Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility Leachate Sampling and Analysis Plan* (SAP) (WCH-173) was approved. Any new requirements or changes in evaluation that were recommended by the new ERDF GPP and SAP are included in this report and will be in future reports. Ongoing groundwater and leachate monitoring are performed to meet the requirements of the ERDF ROD, and details of the monitoring program are described in the revised ERDF GPP (WCH-198) and the ERDF Amended ROD (EPA 1999).

1.1 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this annual monitoring report is to evaluate the conditions of and identify trends for groundwater beneath ERDF, and to report leachate results in fulfillment of the requirements specified in the ERDF ROD (EPA 1995) and the ERDF Amended ROD (EPA 1999). The objectives of this report are as follows:

- Review routine groundwater sampling data to statistically evaluate if there have been changes in COC concentrations over time that may be attributed to ERDF operations
- Assess conditions that may indicate the presence of encroaching groundwater contaminant plumes originating from upgradient sources in the 200 West Area
- Assess data from routine ERDF leachate sampling to determine if additional constituents should be added to the ERDF groundwater monitoring COCs list and to confirm that leachate concentrations do not exceed delisting levels specified in the ERDF Amended ROD (EPA 1999)
- Evaluate the groundwater levels in the ERDF monitoring wells to determine if the existing wells need to be modified or replaced
- Biennially evaluate waste streams disposed at ERDF as part of the delisted criteria for the leachate
- Describe and evaluate the conditions and identify trends of the ERDF lysimeter system as related to the vadose zone monitoring and changes in the volume of liquid in the lysimeters
- Describe and evaluate the sample data, identify changes or trends in the data, and incorporate a summary of the results.

Appendix A shows analytical results for groundwater samples that were collected from the ERDF monitoring well network from calendar year (CY) 1996 through CY 2013. Appendix B graphically shows trends in the monitoring data resulting from routine groundwater sampling in the ERDF well network. The most recent 3 years of leachate analytical results for samples collected from CY 2011 through CY 2013 are presented in Appendix C. Leachate data collected from CY 1996 through CY 2012 are contained in previous ERDF groundwater and leachate monitoring reports (BHI-01382, BHI-01641, BHI-01684, BHI-01738, BHI-01777, WCH-88, WCH-189, WCH-295, WCH-315, WCH-399, WCH-455, WCH-536). Lysimeter data collected from CY 1996 through CY 2012 are contained in previous ERDF lysimeter monitoring reports (WCH-42, WCH-335, WCH-400, WCH-454, WCH-536, WCH-564).

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The ERDF site is located between the 200 East and 200 West Areas of the Hanford Site (Figure 2-1). This location was selected for ERDF over other possible locations because of the depth to groundwater in this area, its location above pre-existing groundwater plumes, the relatively flat topography in this area, and the compatibility of this location with stakeholder recommendations.

The ERDF landfill is authorized under the *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980* (CERCLA). The landfill was designed to meet the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* (RCRA) minimum technology requirements; however, ERDF is not permitted as a RCRA facility. Wastes disposed at ERDF contain elevated levels of radionuclides and hazardous constituents originating from the 100, 200, and 300 Area waste sites.


2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION DISPOSAL FACILITY

The approved design of the ERDF is a series of side-by-side cells that measures 21.3 m (70 ft) in depth, with a wall slope of 3:1 and with final dimensions of 433 m (1,420 ft) long by 219 m (720 ft) wide at the top of the cells. There are currently 10 waste cells associated with the ERDF site. Initially, cells 1 and 2 were constructed, and the placement of waste in these cells has since been completed. An interim cover has been constructed over these cells consisting of a plastic membrane and 0.305 m (1 ft) of soil. Cells 3 and 4 were constructed in 2000, and the placement of waste in these cells has been completed. Construction of cells 5 and 6 was completed during 2004 and cells 7 and 8 started receiving waste during the first half of CY 2009. Construction of super cells (double the width) 9 and 10 was completed in early 2011. Figure 2-2 shows ERDF as it is currently constructed. Throughout CY 2013, approximately 980,312 metric tons (1,080,609 US tons) of remediation wastes were disposed at the facility.

2.2.1 Leachate System

Each of the ERDF cells was constructed with a double-liner system for the purpose of collecting liquids, or leachate, that may travel through the waste materials stored at the disposal site. These liquids are typically generated from natural precipitation and the application of dust control water that percolates downward through the disposed waste materials and collects on the surface of the lining material. The primary (upper) and secondary (lower) liners each are designed to deliver leachate to sump areas. Sumps for the upper liners are independent from the sumps associated with the lower liners. The upper and lower sumps at each of the cells are routinely evacuated, and the leachate is stored in holding tanks prior to transfer to the Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF).

Figure 2-1. Location of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility.






Figure 2-2. The ERDF Monitoring Well Location Map.

2.2.2 Lysimeter System

Gravity collection lysimeters (basin lysimeters) were constructed in response to the *Study of Vadose Zone Monitoring at the Hanford Site, Task 1, Use in New Cells at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility* (DOE/RL-2003-31). This study was performed by Fluor Hanford for the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL). The purpose of the study was to report on the status of vadose zone monitoring and to recommend measures that could be taken at the Hanford Site to further develop the technology of vadose zone monitoring. Lysimeters were installed beginning with the construction of cells 5 and 6 and continued with all subsequent cell construction.

The lysimeter design selected from the study for installation under the ERDF cells was a basin lysimeter. These are constructed by excavating a sloping recession within the cell sub-grade beneath the composite liner system and installing an approximate 380.9-m² (4,100-ft²) liner into the area. A 15-cm (6-in.)-diameter perforated pipe section is laid atop the lysimeter liner and connected to a high-density polyethylene piping that is installed to the upper edge of the cell area.

This type of lysimeter is not configured to detect small increases in liquid accumulation. A thick-walled, 15-cm (6-in.)-diameter pipe is laid flat on the bottom of a collection area of approximately 50.7 m² (546 ft²) and increasing to 380.9 m² (4,100 ft²) at the top of the lysimeter. The lysimeter has an approximate capacity to contain 181,699 L (48,000 gal) within the available pore space of the gravel.

The vadose zone monitoring activities described herein are expected to continue until after the final landfill cap is installed and the annual quantity of leachate collected in the secondary leachate collection and removal system is shown to be insignificant (i.e., less than the amount needed to activate the removal pumps).

3.0 GROUNDWATER AND LEACHATE MONITORING

The groundwater and leachate monitoring program is described in the ERDF GPP (WCH-198). This section provides an overview of these monitoring requirements.

3.1 GROUNDWATER SAMPLING

Groundwater samples are collected semiannually from four monitoring wells in the vicinity of ERDF. This monitoring well network is scheduled for routine sampling during the first and third quarters of each year. The monitoring well network consists of one upgradient well (699-36-70A) and three downgradient wells (699-37-66, 699-35-66A, and 699-36-66B). During CY 2013 groundwater sampling was completed at all of the ERDF monitoring wells in March and September. Well locations are shown in Figure 2-2.

The COCs for routine monitoring were determined based on the results of preoperational baseline sampling, conducted in March 1996, and known contaminant plumes beneath ERDF. Additional COCs may be added to the groundwater monitoring program if analytical results from leachate sampling indicate it is warranted. To date, no additional COCs have been identified for addition to the groundwater lists based on leachate analysis results. Table 3-1 lists the analytes for the groundwater monitoring program.

Table 3-1. List of Groundwater Analytes by Analytical Method. (2 Pages)

Analyte	Method ^a	Practical Quantitation Limit	Accuracy ^b (%)	Precision ^b (%)
Arsenic	6010	10 µg/L	±25	±25
Barium	6010	20 µg/L	±25	±25
Chromium	6010	70 µg/L	±25	±25
Lead	6010	40 µg/L	±25	±25
Selenium	6010	750 µg/L	±25	±25
Tin	6010	30 µg/L	±25	±25
Vanadium	6010	80 µg/L	±25	±25
Zinc	6010	20 µg/L	±25	±25
Carbon tetrachloride	8260	5 µg/L	±25	±25
Alkalinity	310.1 ^c	10,000 µg/L	±20	±25
Chloride	300.0 ^d	10,000 µg/L	±20	±25
Fluoride	300.0 ^d	100 µg/L	±20	±25
Nitrogen (in nitrite/nitrate)	353.1	0.05 µg/L	±20	±25
Sulfate	300.0 ^d	2,000 µg/L	±20	±25
Total dissolved solids	160.1 ^c	10,000 µg/L	±20	NA
Total organic halides	9020	5 µg/L	±20	NA

Table 3-1. List of Groundwater Analytes by Analytical Method. (2 Pages)

Analyte	Method ^a	Practical Quantitation Limit	Accuracy ^b (%)	Precision ^b (%)
Carbon-14	^e	200 pCi/L	±20	±25
Iodine-129	^e	5 pCi/L	±20	±25
Technetium-99	^e	10 pCi/L	±20	±25
Radium	903.1 ^f	1 pCi/L	±20	±25
Total uranium	^e	0.1 µg/L	±20	±25
Gross alpha	900.0 ^f	3 pCi/L	±20	±25
Gross beta	900.0 ^f	4 pCi/L	±20	±25
pH	^g	NA	NA	NA
Specific conductance	120.1 ^{c, g}	25 µS/cm	±20	NA
Turbidity	180.1 ^{c, g}	0.05 NTU	±0.05 NTU	NA

^a Method number indicated is from *Test Method for Evaluating Solid Wastes: Physical Chemical Methods* (SW-846) (EPA 1986), unless otherwise specified. The laboratory uses the most recent published version of these methods.

^b Accuracy is expressed as percent recovery; precision is expressed as a percent relative difference.

^c Method specified is from *Methods for Chemical Analysis of Water and Wastes* (Kopp and McKee 1983).

^d Method specified is from *Determination of Inorganic Anions in Aqueous and Solids Samples by Ion Chromatography* (Lindahl 1984), and is a modification of EPA Method 300.0 (EPA 1993).

^e Industry standard method, laboratory-specific, based on acceptance by Washington Closure Hanford.

^f Method specified is from *Prescribed Procedures for Measurement of Radioactivity in Drinking Water* (EPA 1989).

^g Parameter will be measured in the field.

NA = not available, or not applicable

NTU = nephelometric turbidity units

Routine groundwater sampling has been conducted since ERDF operations commenced. Sampling at the ERDF groundwater wells was not completed during March 2000 due to a Hanford Site moratorium on groundwater sampling. Well 699-37-68 was not sampled during September 2000 because of problems with a dedicated monitoring well pump (BHI-01738). Groundwater wells 699-37-68 and 699-36-67 were decommissioned in 2007 due to construction of ERDF waste cells 7 and 8. Groundwater monitoring wells 699-37-66 and 699-36-66B were installed as replacement downgradient wells.

3.1.1 General Approach to Evaluating Results

Groundwater samples collected from the ERDF monitoring well network were analyzed in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW-846 (EPA 1986), industry standard, or laboratory-specific test methods (Table 3-1). Laboratory results for these samples were entered into the Hanford Environmental Information System, a Hanford Site database that contains environmental analytical data. Groundwater monitoring data contained in the Hanford Environmental Information System were evaluated to identify the analytical results needed for inclusion in this report. The following data selection and evaluation criteria were applied:

- Quality assurance/quality control data were evaluated for the purpose of identifying potential collection or analytical problems. However, unless a problem with the data was identified during this review, the results or discussions regarding the quality assurance/quality control data were not included in this report.
- All data qualifiers were recorded.
- If the relative percent difference between values reported for main and duplicate samples was greater than 20%, the samples were flagged in the data spreadsheet and the data evaluated to determine their applicability.
- Data acceptance based on a less than 20% relative difference criterion was relaxed for analytical results reported at or near the method detection limit (e.g., typically within five times the detection limit). This allows for an expected increased analytical error when values are close to the detection limit.
- Only analytical results for metals from filtered groundwater samples were used for metals evaluation.

3.1.2 Statistical Approach to Evaluating Results

The statistical analysis of ERDF groundwater monitoring data is based on the ERDF GPP (WCH-198) and *Hanford Site Groundwater Monitoring: Setting, Sources, and Methods* (PNNL-13080). The ERDF GPP requires that background water quality be established from four consecutive groundwater sampling events using one of two methods. The groundwater quality background conditions can be determined using either facility-wide data or historical data from each well in the monitoring network. The first approach (facility-wide) results in a single background value for the site for each constituent to which subsequent groundwater quality data are compared; this is referred to as an interwell comparison (PNNL-13080).

The second approach (historical) results in background water quality data for each well to which the subsequent groundwater quality data are compared; this approach is referred to as an intrawell comparison (PNNL-13080).

The interwell approach has been selected and used for the ERDF groundwater monitoring program. This method will allow for the consideration of impacts from non-ERDF sources.

For each analyte of interest identified in the ERDF GPP, data from four pre-operational sampling events at each of the four ERDF monitoring wells were grouped together into data sets. The average concentration, activity, or other appropriate measure for each analyte was

determined, and the tolerance interval for each analyte was calculated. Data from the subsequent semiannual monitoring events are compared to background levels and tolerance intervals. Those constituents observed to have levels outside of the tolerance interval are evaluated to determine whether the deviation may be related to an ERDF or non-ERDF source(s).

Where analytical results report a nondetect, the detection limit value is used in this assessment. If a current measurement exceeds a tolerance interval based on the reported detection limit, it is not considered to be a confirmed exceedance and is discussed qualitatively.

3.1.3 Determination of Tolerance Intervals

The tolerance interval represents a concentration range that contains a specified proportion of the population with a specified probability (PNNL-13080). Both the upper and lower bounds of the interval (two-sided) were calculated. The parametric tolerance interval was determined using the following equation:

$$TI = X_b + k * S_b \text{ (two-sided)}$$

where:

- k = normal tolerance factor, which depends on the number of background samples (n), coverage (P%), and the confidence level (Y)
- X_b = mean of background concentrations
- S_b = sample standard deviation
- TI = tolerance interval.

Coverage of 95% and a confidence level of 95% were used to determine the parametric tolerance interval. Application of this equation assumes that a normal (or lognormal) distribution is a reasonable approximation of the background concentrations.

3.2 SUMMARY OF GROUNDWATER ANALYSES

The groundwater results were used to measure analytical and statistical variability. The statistical basis for comparison of the groundwater analysis results is presented in Section 3.1.2 of this report. Analytical results reported for groundwater samples, collected from the ERDF monitoring well network are presented in Appendix A. The analyte trend plots summarizing groundwater monitoring results are included in Appendix B and have been revised to reflect the new tolerance limits for CY 2007 data onward (WCH-198). The tolerance limits show an overlap in the graphical presentations in Appendix B to better show changes. The original tolerance intervals apply to pre-2007 sampling; the new tolerance limits apply only to CY 2007 and later sampling.

Groundwater monitoring results and apparent trends based on CY 2013 data are summarized in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2. Summary of Tolerance Interval Comparisons and Trends. (2 Pages)

Analyte	Upper Tolerance Interval ^a	Well(s) Exceeding Upper Tolerance Interval in CY 2013 ^b				Comments
		70A	66A	66B	66	
Arsenic	4.2 µg/L	No	No	No	No	Arsenic concentrations in all wells 66 and 66B had nondetectable levels that did not exceed the tolerance level for the CY 2013 samples. All arsenic detections are very close to analytical detection limits (i.e., higher analytical uncertainty). It should also be noted that the reported arsenic detects for CY 2013 remained below the Hanford Site background levels listed in the ERDF GPP (WCH-198) for arsenic (11.8 µg/L).
Barium	122.3 µg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited concentrations below the tolerance interval and stable with regards to previous years for the established wells. Well 66 showed the highest recordable levels of all the wells, but remains below the tolerance level.
Chromium	13.4 µg/L	No	Yes	No	No	Chromium levels in 66A are elevated relative to the tolerance limit, but have not changed significantly from previous years. The other wells were all below the upper tolerance level.
Lead	5 µg/L	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Lead concentrations for CY 2013 sampling were detected above the upper tolerance level.
Selenium	5.6 µg/L	No	Yes	No	Yes	Two wells exhibited concentrations below the tolerance interval, two reported results just above the tolerance level in the fall sampling. Selenium levels have been reported routinely near the tolerance levels in recent years.
Tin	10 µg/L	No	No	No	No	Tin levels in CY 2013 sampling were not detected but with reported detection limits above the tolerance limits.
Uranium	3.4 µg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited stable uranium concentrations below the tolerance interval.
Vanadium	40 µg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited vanadium concentrations below the tolerance interval.
Zinc	26.5 µg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited stable zinc concentrations below the tolerance interval.
Alkalinity	152.9 mg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited alkalinity concentrations below the tolerance interval and stable with regards to previous years.
Chloride	26 mg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited chloride concentrations below the tolerance interval and stable with regards to previous years.
Fluoride	0.45 mg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited stable fluoride concentrations below the tolerance interval.
Sulfate	37.8 mg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited sulfate concentrations below the tolerance interval and stable with regards to previous years.
Gross alpha	2.98 pCi/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited gross alpha concentrations below the tolerance interval and stable with regards to previous years. No apparent trending in the data was seen.

Table 3-2. Summary of Tolerance Interval Comparisons and Trends. (2 Pages)

Analyte	Upper Tolerance Interval ^a	Well(s) Exceeding Upper Tolerance Interval in CY 2013 ^b				Comments
		70A	66A	66B	66	
Gross beta	31.5 pCi/L	No	No	No	No	Gross beta activity was below tolerance limits in all the wells and the concentrations are the lowest as compared to the previous years. Wells 66, 66B, and 70A have shown general downward trends over the last 3 years, while well 66A had been on an upward trend over the last 3 years.
Carbon-14	58.1 pCi/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited stable carbon-14 concentrations below the tolerance interval.
Iodine-129	21.1 pCi/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited iodine-129 concentrations below the tolerance level and stable.
Technetium-99	93.8 pCi/L	No	Yes	No	No	All wells were lower in CY 2013 with only one determination for well 66A above the tolerance limit. There is an indication of downward trending for all wells.
Radium	0.695 pCi/L	No	No	No	No	Radium was not detected in any of the wells during the CY 2013 monitoring events; all detection limits were below the tolerance interval and all of the wells appear to be stable relative to previous years.
Carbon tetrachloride	11 µg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited carbon tetrachloride concentrations below the tolerance interval with no significant trends identified.
Nitrogen in nitrite and nitrate	51.1 mg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited concentrations below the tolerance interval and appear stable with regards to previous years with an indication of downward trending.
Total organic halides	5 µg/L	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	All wells exceeded the tolerance limit for the March 2013 sampling, levels decreased in September with only well 70A still above the tolerance limit.
Total dissolved solids	570 mg/L	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited concentrations below the tolerance interval and appear stable with regards to previous years. The new downgradient well 66 displayed elevated levels, but remained below the tolerance limit, and a determination on trending could not be reached due to lack of historical data.
Turbidity	49.8 NTU	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited concentrations below the tolerance interval and appear stable with regards to previous years.
pH	8.01 units/ 7.48 units ^c	No	No	No	No	The wells exhibited pH concentrations below the upper tolerance interval.
Specific conductance	774 µS/m	No	No	No	No	All wells exhibited concentrations below the tolerance interval and appear stable with regards to previous years.

^a New upper tolerance levels have been set for 2007 onward in the revised ERDF GPP (WCH-198).

^b Well identification:

70A = upgradient monitoring well 699-36-70A

66 = downgradient monitoring well 699-37-66

66A = downgradient monitoring well 699-35-66A

66B = downgradient monitoring well 699-36-66B.

^c pH tolerance interval includes upper and lower limits.

CY = calendar year

ERDF GPP = *Groundwater Protection Plan for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility*

NTU = nephelometric turbidity units

Numerous contaminant plumes that originated from past activities in the 200 West Area are near or beneath the ERDF site. Chemical processing activities of uranium and plutonium in the 200 West Area are known to have introduced contaminants in the groundwater upgradient from ERDF. Plumes originating from 200 West Area sources detected in ERDF monitoring wells include nitrogen (nitrate plus nitrite), carbon tetrachloride, gross alpha, gross beta, technetium-99, iodine-129, and uranium. Detailed descriptions of the sources for these constituents are contained in the ERDF GPP (WCH-198). Due to the elevated readings of COCs, the newly established monitoring wells appear to indicate the contaminate plumes are migrating eastward.

The apparent trends in groundwater concentrations of these constituents are as follows:

- **Chromium.** Chromium levels in the downgradient well 699-35-66A have historically been elevated and remain above the upper tolerance interval. Well 699-36-70A chromium levels increased significantly in the fall 2013 sampling remaining just below the upper tolerance level. All other wells are stable at a level below the upper tolerance interval. The source of the elevated levels do not appear to be ERDF related and appear to be related to the groundwater contaminant plume from the 200 West Area or from corrosion of well components. Chromium levels and other corrosion products will continue to be monitored in future sampling.
- **Lead.** The data from the CY 2013 analysis potentially indicate an upward trend in lead levels in all wells. However, periodic spikes have been noted in the past followed by a return to nondetection levels. Lead levels will be specifically monitored in future sampling.
- **Nitrogen.** Concentrations for nitrogen (nitrate plus nitrite) have remained stable and continue to show a long-term downward trend for well 699-36-70A. Wells 699-37-66, 699-36-66B, and 699-35-66A exhibit elevated but stable readings.
- **Total organic halides.** Total organic halide concentrations significantly spiked in downgradient wells during CY 2006 monitoring and were detected again in the newly installed downgradient wells in CY 2008 sampling. The two new groundwater wells (699-37-66 and 699-36-66B) appear to have been placed within the existing groundwater contamination plume that has been slowly moving in the downgradient direction from ERDF. Analysis has shown periodic spikes in the groundwater data in the past. No correlations can be seen between total organic halide results and the volatile organic analyses performed at the same time (volatile organic analyses will report unexpected detections of chlorinated organics, the most likely contributor to total organic halide results). Total organic halide analysis is only an indicator analysis. Recent samples have been downward indicating with three of the four well below the upper tolerance levels for the fall CY 2013 samples. Any future indication of consistent contamination will be evaluated to establish the source and composition of the compounds.
- **Carbon tetrachloride.** Carbon tetrachloride concentrations have remained fairly consistent at levels below the upper tolerance interval within the ERDF monitoring wells.
- **Gross alpha activity.** Gross alpha activity concentrations have been slightly variable, but generally within the calculated tolerance intervals, since monitoring at the ERDF well network was initiated.

- **Gross beta activity.** Groundwater activity from gross beta has varied from a long-term upward trend in the downgradient wells with all wells showing decline. All wells were below the upper tolerance levels for CY 2013.
- **Technetium-99.** Technetium-99 activity concentrations in the ERDF monitoring wells have remained stable and generally been within tolerance intervals over the course of ERDF monitoring activities. Historical sampling results suggest activity in well 699-36-70A with a downward trend, and well 699-35-66A historically showed an upward trend. Levels of technetium-99 in all wells decreased in CY 2013. Only the fall analysis for well 699-35-66a exceeded the upper tolerance level. This is a good indication that the groundwater contaminant plume from the 200 West Area is moving in an easterly direction.
- **Iodine-129.** Iodine-129 activity has remained stable in all monitoring wells over the course of ERDF monitoring activities; no wells have exceeded the upper tolerance interval.
- **Uranium.** Uranium activity in groundwater has generally been stable in the ERDF monitoring wells with a slight long-term downward trend.

3.3 GROUNDWATER LEVELS

Water-level measurements were collected from each of the four monitoring wells during the semiannual groundwater sampling events to determine groundwater accessibility during future monitoring events. Water level measurements were taken during each routine groundwater monitoring event immediately prior to purging the well for sample collection.

NOTE: During the September 2005 monitoring event, the exact water level in monitoring well 699-36-67 could not be determined because the electronic tape measure (e-tape) did not appear to reach the top of the water in the well. The e-tape apparently did not sound indicating that water had been reached and appeared to be dry when removed from the well. Based on the length of the e-tape used, the water level in this well was more than 3.5 m (11.5 ft) lower than anticipated. Sampling at this well took place as planned, and the well produced a sufficient amount of water for sample collection. This measurement was treated as an anomaly and not used to evaluate water levels and future accessibility. Prior to the decommissioning of well 699-36-67 in 2007, subsequent samples have returned to expected levels.

Based on a water-level contour map (Figure 3-1), groundwater in the vicinity of ERDF generally moves from the west across the site to the east-northeast at approximately 91 m (298.5 ft) below the surface. The hydraulic gradient is about 0.001 m/m on the west end of ERDF and averages 0.003 m/m across the entire width of ERDF with the east end being considerably greater. The average hydraulic gradient for the operable unit (200 West) that included ERDF is 0.002 m/m. The groundwater table in and near the 200 West Area has been steadily declining since discharges to the 200 West Area pond and trench systems were discontinued during the mid-1980s.

The current hydrograph for the ERDF monitoring wells presented in Figure 3-2 indicates an annual decline of less than 0.4 m/yr (1.31 ft/yr), which is consistent with the regional hydrologic changes reported for the area (BHI-01311, PNNL-15070-SUM).

Figure 3-1. Water-Level Contour Map.





Figure 3-2. Hydrograph from the ERDF Groundwater Monitoring Wells.



3.4 SUMMARY OF GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL LEVEL MEASUREMENTS

Groundwater monitoring wells in the ERDF well network have exhibited a gradual rate of decline in water levels since monitoring was initiated in September 1995. Overall trends will continue to be monitored with future sampling.

Based on the measured water levels in the four ERDF monitoring wells, it was determined that the height of the water column in the ERDF upgradient monitoring well 699-36-70A is 3.5 m (11 ft). The downgradient monitoring wells had water column levels of 3.0 m (10 ft) at well 699-35-66A, 9.2 m (30 ft) at well 699-37-66, and 9.2 m (30 ft) at well 699-36-66B. At the current average rate of decline, the monitoring wells would be available for use as they are currently constructed for approximately 15 to 22 years.

3.5 LEACHATE SAMPLING

The leachate is sampled semi-annually to provide data for leachate delisting analyses and to assess whether additional COCs should be added to the routine ERDF groundwater monitoring program. Although separate leachate sampling may also be performed to verify that waste acceptance criteria for the ETF continue to be met, ETF is currently relying on the semi-annual sampling results to monitor acceptance. The evaluation and reporting of any ETF-specific sampling data are outside the scope of this report.

Initial leachate sampling was performed quarterly through the end of CY 2000 for an extensive list of analytes as defined by the ERDF Amended ROD (EPA 1999). This "long list" of analytes is shown in Appendix C. At the end of the initial baseline sampling, the analyte list was revised (short list) and leachate sampling was reduced to a semiannual basis. The short list of analytes is identified in Appendix C. Once every 2 years (biennial), sampling of the long list of analytes is performed on the leachate as identified in the ERDF Amended ROD (EPA 1999).

The leachate sampling program is described in the *Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility Leachate Sampling and Analysis Plan* (WCH-173). The representative samples are collected to support routine and confirmatory sampling programs. The representative samples are collected from varying levels within the leachate storage unit.

The ERDF project continued routine sampling and analysis of landfill leachate during CY 2013. (NOTE: The second leachate sampling was delayed due to operational issues until February 2014. This data is included in the official CY 2013 timeframe reported here.) Composite leachate samples for the short list of analytes were collected during CY 2013-2014. Data for the current year and from the two prior years of leachate sampling (i.e., CYs 2010 to 2014) are used to identify trends that may indicate if additional laboratory analysis for groundwater samples is warranted.

3.6 SUMMARY OF LEACHATE ANALYSIS

Data associated with leachate sampling conducted from CY 2011 through CY 2013 are presented in Appendix C. Only analytical results that were reported as significant detects (>1 ppb), or as nondetected values, but which are on the routine short list and long list or groundwater monitoring COCs lists, are included in this report. Leachate sampling trends are presented in Appendix D.

The composite leachate samples contained detectable concentrations of common metals, anions, and mobile radionuclides. Many of the metals results showed concentration spikes during the CY 2011 sampling events relative to the previous years, subsequent results have remained consistent with sample data previous to the spike and none of the results approached delisting levels. The nitrate results for March 2011 showed a similar spike but remained below previous maximum values. The other anions showed no significant fluctuations over the year. The suspended solid results also spiked in March 2011 and have returned to low levels, recently nondetected. There were no exceedances of a delisting level during the year.

Evaluation of the reported constituents for the expanded analyte list found no impact to the delisting criteria.

The following is an update of those constituents of primary interest for which there were detectable concentrations and their activities in evaluation of the CY 2013 sampling results:

- **Chromium.** Chromium concentrations began declining during CY 2007 and stabilized immediately after the March 2011 spike, but have increased in recent years. The chromium concentration averaged 29 µg/L in December 2006, but the CY 2013 average was approximately 52 µg/L.
- **Nickel.** Nickel, which is on the long list of analytes and monitored once every 2 years, could not be evaluated for CY 2013.
- **Potassium.** Potassium concentrations have declined from a maximum of about 26,000 µg/L to ~20,250 µg/L through CY 2013.
- **Specific conductance.** Specific conductance remained steady during CY 2013.
- **Nitrate.** Nitrate concentrations rebounded from the historic low seen in the September 2012 samples but remain well below previous maximums, averaging ~267 mg/L.
- **Total dissolved solids.** Total dissolved solids had been increasing through 2006, with CY 2013 averaging ~1,897,000 µg/L.
- **Gross alpha.** Gross alpha activity concentrations historically increased through December 2008, reaching a maximum concentration of 3,380 pCi/L, but have declined in recent sampling. Recent levels have been stable at approximately 500 pCi/L.
- **Gross beta.** Gross beta activity concentrations historically increased through December 2008, reaching a maximum concentration of 1,500 pCi/L, but have declined in recent sampling. Recent levels have been stable at approximately 400 pCi/L.
- **Uranium.** Uranium concentrations historically increased through December 2008 and reached a new maximum concentration of 3,060 µg/L in March 2010, but have declined rapidly. The uranium concentrations have rebounded from the low seen in the September 2012 samples but remain well below previous maximums averaging 1,370 µg/L in the latest samples.
- **Technetium-99.** Technetium-99 concentrations have decreased since March 2010 and have been stable at approximately 300 pCi/L.

- **Tritium.** Tritium concentrations remained above 100,000 pCi/L from the beginning of analysis in December 2008 through CY 2010 and then declined to approximately half of the maximum values. An increase was seen in the CY 2013 samples from 73,000 pCi/L to 96,900 pCi/L.

4.0 LYSIMETER MONITORING AND SAMPLING

4.1 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this section is to evaluate the conditions and identify trends to develop Hanford Site-specific data on the performance of the lysimeter systems related to the vadose zone monitoring and potential future use of the lysimeter systems. The objectives of this section are as follows:

- Assess data from routine ERDF lysimeter sampling to determine if COC concentrations over time may be attributed to ERDF operations
- Describe and evaluate the sample data, identify changes or trends in the data, and incorporate a summary of the results
- Evaluate the data to determine if the routine analyte list of indicator parameters is adequate
- Document and describe the changes in the volume of liquid in the lysimeter.

4.2 LYSIMETER MONITORING AND SAMPLING

The lysimeter monitoring program is described in the *Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility Lysimeter Monitoring and Sampling Plan* (WCH-291). This section provides an overview of these monitoring and sample results.

4.2.1 Camera Inspection and Dewatering

The lysimeters were visually structurally sound without any obstructions within the visual portion of the pipe. The lysimeters had some silt sediment within the water layer that clouded out the camera when disturbed. Prior to the visual disturbance associated with the silt, the liquid associated with the lysimeters appeared transparent with minimal suspended particles. The liquid surfaces had no apparent sheen and only had a very minor amount of unidentifiable floating particles.

The lysimeter dewatering activity with each cell is presented in Table 4-1.

4.3 LYSIMETER SAMPLING

Analytical results are evaluated to document vadose zone conditions, characterized to ensure proper management of liquids, and monitored for any trends in the data.

The vadose zone monitoring activities are expected to continue until after the final landfill cap is installed and the annual quantity of leachate collected in the secondary leachate collection and removal system is shown to be insignificant (i.e., less than the amount needed to activate the removal pumps).

Table 4-1. Lysimeter Dewatering Activity.

Year	Cell 5 Lysimeter (gal)	Cell 6 Lysimeter (gal)	Cell 7 Lysimeter (gal)	Cell 8 Lysimeter (gal)	Cell 9 Lysimeter (gal)	Cell 10 Lysimeter (gal)
CY 2005	NA	2,302				
CY 2006	3,541	273				
CY 2007	NA	NA				
CY 2008	2,770	NA				
CY 2009	1,851	3,000	800	650		
CY 2010	400	360	400	Insufficient volume to pump ^a		
CY 2011	Insufficient volume to pump ^a	Insufficient volume to pump ^a	Insufficient volume to pump ^a	Insufficient volume to pump ^a	1,600	6,000
CY 2012	1,700	1,500	4,800	2,300	4,400	2,800
CY 2013	750	550	1,200	1,250	2,400	1,850
Total	11,012	7,985	7,200	4,200	8,400	10,650

^a Malfunction of the dewatering pump system may have falsely indicated insufficient pumpable volumes in the lysimeter. An upgraded dewatering pump was utilized in CY 2102.

NA = not available or not applicable

Lysimeters in cells 5 and 6 were initially sampled in August 2005 in accordance with *Gravity Collection Lysimeter Monitoring Plan ERDF Cells 5 and 6* (BHI-01777). Initial lysimeter samples for cells 5 and 6 were analyzed for chloride, gross alpha, technetium-99, and gross beta. In CY 2009, the *Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility Lysimeter Monitoring and Sampling Plan* (WCH 2009b) was developed. It was determined that the COCs for the initial sampling of the lysimeters should be consistent with the COCs for the routine leachate sampling at ERDF as described in the *Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility Leachate Sampling and Analysis Plan* (WCH-173). The routine leachate list is identified in Appendix C. Cell 7 and 8 lysimeters were initially sampled in CY 2009. Cells 9 and 10 lysimeters were initially sampled in CY 2011.

The purpose of the initial characterization was to establish a baseline and determine if the routine analyte list of indicator parameters was adequate. No changes to the routine lysimeter analysis lists were identified from the initial characterization results.

All subsequent sampling of lysimeter liquids after the initial sampling were analyzed for the routine lysimeter list defined in the *Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility Lysimeter Monitoring and Sampling Plan* (WCH 2009b).

4.3.1 General Approach to Evaluating Results

Table 4-2 shows the list of routine lysimeter analytes by analytical method. Lysimeter samples were analyzed in accordance with the requirements of the EPA SW-846 (EPA 1986), industry standard, or laboratory-specific test methods as presented in Table 4-2. The following data selection and evaluation criteria were applied when reviewing the data:

- Quality assurance/quality control data were evaluated for the purpose of identifying potential collection or analytical problems. However, unless a problem with the data was identified during this review, the results of or a discussion regarding the quality assurance/quality control data were not included in this report.
- All data qualifiers were recorded.
- If the relative percent difference between values reported for main and duplicate samples was greater than 20%, the samples were flagged in the data spreadsheet and the data evaluated to determine their applicability.
- Data acceptance based on a less than 20% relative percent difference criterion was relaxed for analytical results reported at or near the method detection limit (e.g., typically within five times the detection limit). This allows for an expected increased analytical error when values are close to the detection limit.

Table 4-2. List of Routine Lysimeter Analytes by Analytical Method. (2 Pages)

Analyte	Method ^a	Practical Quantitation Limit	Accuracy ^b (%)	Precision ^b (%)
Calcium	6010	1,000 µg/L	80-120	±20
Magnesium	6010	750 µg/L	80-120	±20
Potassium	6010	4,000 µg/L	80-120	±20
Sodium	6010	500 µg/L	80-120	±20
Chloride	300.0 ^c	200 µg/L	80-120	±20
Nitrate	300.0 ^c	250 µg/L	80-120	±20
Sulfate	300.0 ^c	500 µg/L	80-120±20	±20±25
Total dissolved solids	2540C ^d	10,000 µg/L	80-120	±20
Total suspended solids	2540D ^d	8,000 µg/L	80-120	±20
Total organic carbon	5310B ^d	1,000 µg/L	80-120	±20
Technetium-99	^e	15 pCi/L	80-120	±20
Total uranium	^e	1 µg/L	80-120	±20
Gross alpha	900.0 ^f	3 pCi/L	80-120	±20
Gross beta	900.0 ^f	5 pCi/L	80-120	±20
pH	^g	0.5 pH unit	NA	NA

Table 4-2. List of Routine Lysimeter Analytes by Analytical Method. (2 Pages)

Analyte	Method ^a	Practical Quantitation Limit	Accuracy ^b (%)	Precision ^b (%)
Specific conductance	^f	1 µS/cm	NA	NA

^a Method number indicated is from *Test Method for Evaluating Solid Wastes: Physical Chemical Methods* (SW-846) (EPA 1986), unless otherwise specified. The laboratory uses the most recent published version of these methods.

^b Accuracy is expressed as percent recovery; precision is expressed as a percent relative difference.

^c Method specified is from *Determination of Inorganic Anions in Aqueous and Solids Samples by Ion Chromatography* (Lindahl 1984), and is a modification of EPA Method 300.0 (*Method 300.0 Determination of Inorganic Anions by Ion Chromatography* [EPA 1993]).

^d *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*.

^e Industry standard method, laboratory-specific, based on acceptance by Washington Closure Hanford.

^f Method specified is from *Prescribed Procedures for Measurement of Radioactivity in Drinking Water* (EPA 1989).

^g Parameter will be measured in the field.

EPA= U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

NA = not available or not applicable.

4.4 SUMMARY OF LYSIMETER ANALYTICAL RESULTS

Data associated with the cell lysimeters sampling conducted during CY 2013 are presented in Appendix E.

A summary of the analytical results from the CY 2013 sampling events are discussed below.

4.5 SUMMARY OF LYSIMETER ANALYSIS

Lysimeter samples contained detectable concentrations of common metals, anions, and radionuclides. No analytical anomalies were noted for the analysis. The following is a brief description of those constituents for which concentrations/activities contained inconsistencies when compared with the other lysimeters. These inconsistencies are typically large differences in concentrations cell-to-cell.

- **Sulfate.** Soluble salts, such as sulfate, were the primary constituents present within the lysimeter liquid and can be directly correlated to the levels of the primary constituents found within the admix material used to construct the cells. Concentrations have remained relatively constant in recent years with indications of slow upward trends in most cells.
- **Total dissolved solids.** Total dissolved solids appear to be remaining stable in all of the cell lysimeters.
- **Total suspended solids.** Total suspended solids concentrations indicate a significant decrease in all of the cell lysimeters with the exception of cells 9 and 10, which have historically been low from initial sampling.
- **Uranium.** Uranium levels within cell 5 through 8 lysimeters had low detectable levels; cells 9 and 10 had very low levels present.

- **Gross alpha.** Gross alpha activity concentrations in the cell 5 lysimeter appear elevated when compared to the other cell lysimeters.
- **Gross beta.** Gross beta activity appears to be within a consistent range within the lysimeters.
- **pH.** The cells appear to have stable pH levels.

4.6 EVALUATION OF CY 2013 LYSIMETER RESULTS

There has been no indication of contamination of the lysimeters by leachate generated during ERDF operations. The absence of technetium-99 within the lysimeter liquid is a very good indicator that the leachate collection system located above the lysimeters is not leaking liquid into the lysimeters. This is based on technetium-99's high solubility and ease of mobility through soils when soluble; there are no detectable levels of technetium-99 within the lysimeter liquid. Additional supporting evidence is the high sulfate concentration in the lysimeter liquid in comparison to the leachate, indicating there is no effective dilution of the lysimeter liquid.

No consistent changes or trends have been noted in the analytical data from each cell over time.

The routine lysimeter analyte list appears to continue to be adequate at this time.

Based on the data, response to dewatering activities cannot be analyzed adequately at this time. Further inspections and dewatering of lysimeters is planned as a routine activity during CY 2014.

5.0 REFERENCES

- BHI-00079, 1996, *Groundwater Protection Plan for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility*, Rev. 0, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- BHI-01311, 1999, *Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model for the Carbon Tetrachloride and Uranium/Technetium Plumes in the 200 West Area: 1994 Through 1999 Update*, Rev. 0, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- BHI-01382, 2000, *Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Calendar Year 1996 Through 1999*, Rev. 0, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Richland, Washington.
- BHI-01641, 2002, *Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Calendar Year 2001*, Rev. 0, Bechtel Hanford Inc., Richland, Washington.
- BHI-01684, 2003, *Groundwater and Leachate Monitoring and Sampling at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Calendar Year 2002*, Rev. 0, Bechtel Hanford Inc., Richland, Washington.
- BHI-01738, 2004, *Groundwater and Leachate Monitoring and Sampling at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Calendar Year 2003*, Rev. 0, Bechtel Hanford Inc., Richland, Washington.
- BHI-01777, 2005, *Groundwater and Leachate Monitoring and Sampling at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Calendar Year 2004*, Rev. 0, Bechtel Hanford Inc., Richland, Washington.
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980*, 42 U.S.C. 9601, et seq.
- DOE/RL-2003-31, 2003, *Study of Vadose Zone Monitoring at the Hanford Site, Task 1, Use in New Cells at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility*, Rev. 0, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.
- EPA, 1986, *Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Wastes: Physical Chemical Methods*, SW-846, (supplemented 1990), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- EPA, 1989, *Prescribed Procedures for Measurement of Radioactivity in Drinking Water*, EPA/600/4-80-032, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- EPA, 1993, *Method 300.0 Determination of Inorganic Anions by Ion Chromatography*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- EPA, 1995, *Record of Decision for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Hanford Site, 200 Area, Benton County, Washington*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Seattle, Washington.

- EPA, 1999, *Amended Record of Decision, Decision Summary and Responsiveness Summary for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Hanford Site – 200 Area, Benton County, Washington*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Seattle, Washington.
- Kopp, J. F. and G. D. McKee, 1983, *Methods for Chemical Analysis of Water and Wastes*, EPA-600/4-79-020, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Monitoring and Support Laboratory, Washington, D.C.
- Lindahl, P. C., 1984, *Determination of Inorganic Anions in Aqueous and Solid Samples of Ion Chromatography*, EPA/600/4-84/017, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois.
- PNNL-13080, 2000, *Hanford Site Groundwater Monitoring: Setting, Sources and Methods*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- PNNL-15070-SUM, 2005, *Summary of Hanford Site Groundwater Monitoring for Fiscal Year 2004*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976*, 42 U.S.C. 6901, et seq.
- WCH-42, 2006, *Annual Report for Gravity Collection Lysimeter Monitoring Plan - ERDF Cells 5 and 6, CY 2006*, Rev. 1, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.
- WCH-88, 2006, *Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Calendar Year 2005*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.
- WCH-189, 2007, *Groundwater and Leachate Monitoring and Sampling at ERDF, CY 2006*, Rev. 1, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland Washington.
- WCH-173, 2008, *Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility Leachate Sampling Plan*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.
- WCH-198, 2008, *Groundwater Protection Plan for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.
- WCH-291, 2009, *Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility Lysimeter Monitoring and Sampling Plan*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.
- WCH-295, 2008, *Groundwater and Leachate Monitoring and Sampling at ERDF, CY 2007*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland Washington.
- WCH-315, 2009, *Groundwater and Leachate Monitoring and Sampling at ERDF, CY 2008*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.
- WCH-335, 2009, *Annual Report for Gravity Collection Lysimeter Monitoring Plan - ERDF Cells 5 and 6, CY 2008*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.
- WCH-399, *Groundwater and Leachate Monitoring and Sampling at ERDF, CY 2009*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.

WCH-400, 2010, *Annual Report for Gravity Collection Lysimeter Monitoring in ERDF Cells 5, 6, 7, and 8, CY 2009*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.

WCH-454, 2011, *Annual Report for Gravity Collection Lysimeter Monitoring in ERDF Cells 5, 6, 7, and 8, CY 2010*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.

WCH-455, 2011, *Groundwater and Leachate Monitoring and Sampling at ERDF, CY 2010*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.

WCH-536, 2012, *Groundwater and Leachate Monitoring and Sampling at ERDF, CY 2011*, Rev.0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.

WCH-564, 2013, *Groundwater and Leachate Monitoring and Sampling at ERDF, CY 2012*, Rev. 0, Washington Closure Hanford, Richland, Washington.

APPENDIX A
GROUNDWATER SAMPLING RESULTS, 1996-2013

Table A-1. Arsenic. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	3 B		1.1 B		3 B		1.7 B	1.7 B					4.4	
Sep-96	2.6 B	3.8 B	0.98 B		2.1 B		0.67 B						4.4	
Mar-97	2.8 B	2.7 B	2 B		2.5 B		1.4 B						4.4	
Sep-97	3.5 B	2.8 B	1.9 B		3.3 B		1.6 U						4.4	
Mar-98	2.1 B		1.6 B	1.1 B	2.6 B		0.6 U						4.4	
Aug-98	2.8 B		1 U		1.2 B		1.4 B	1 U					4.4	
Mar-99	3.3 U		3.3 U	3.3 U	3.3 U		3.3 U						4.4	
Sep-99	3.3 U	3.3 U	3.3 U		3.3 U		3.3 U						4.4	
Mar-00													4.4	
Sep-00	2.6		2.4 U		3.2	3.8							4.4	
Mar-01	3		2.3 U		5.2		4.5	3.2					4.4	
Sep-01	5.6		22.8	10 U	52.1 U		52.1 U						4.4	
Mar-02	4.4	3 U	4.6		4.3		3 U						4.4	
Sep-02	4.4		4.5 U	3.3	3.8		3.3 U						4.4	
Mar-03	3.5 U		4.4		3.5 U		3.5 U						4.4	
Sep-03	4.2 U	4.2 U	4.2 U		4.2 U		4.2 U						4.4	
Mar-04	3.4 U		3.40 U		3.4 U		3.4 U	3.4 U					4.4	
Sep-04	3.6 U		3.7	3.6 U	3.6 U		3.6 U						4.4	
Mar-05	34 U	34 U	34 U		34 U		34 U						4.4	
Sep-05	4.7 U		23.6 U		23.6 U		27.5	23.6 U					4.4	
Mar-06													4.4	
Sep-06	5.3		3.7 U	3.7 U	4.7		3.7 U						4.4	4.2
Mar-07	4.6		4.1		4.3	5	4.1 U						4.4	4.2
Sep-07	5.6		4.1 U	4.1 U	4.1 U		4.1 U							4.2
Mar-08	5 U				5 U	5			5 U		5 U			4.2
Jun-08									5 U		5 U			4.2
Sep-08	3.8				5.5				3.5		2.9	3.6		4.2

Table A-1. Arsenic. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Dec-08									10 U		10 U	10 U		4.2
Mar-09	10 U				10 U				10 U		10 U	10 U		4.2
Sep-09	4.54 B	3.1 B			3.2 B				2.14 B		2.23 B			4.2
Apr-10	2.6 B				2.8 B				10 U	10 U	10 U			4.2
Nov-10	2.71 B				2.97 B				10 U	2.4 B	2 B			4.2
Mar-11	3.15B				2.85B	3.58B			3.54B		3.45B			4.2
Sep-11	10U				4.03B	3.96B			10U		10U			4.2
Mar-12	2.87 B				3.63B				4U	4U	2.43B			4.2
Sept-12	3.32 B				2.91B	3.28B			2.09B		2.38B			4.2
Mar-13	2.7 B				2.5B	2U			2U		2.2B			4.2
Sept-13	2U				2.4B				2U	2U	2U			4.2

B = Estimated results
 C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
 D = Reported from dilution
 J = Estimated results
 U = Result is nondetected

Table A-2. Barium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	46 B		81.9 B		92.1 B		92 B	90.6 B					123.3	
Sep-96	42.9 B	0.0402 B	66.7 B		80.8 B		77.9 B						123.3	
Mar-97	46.3 B	47 B	87.6 B		93.4 B		102 B						123.3	
Jun-97					83.6								123.3	
Sep-97	42.2 B	40.9 B	64.6 B		80 B	76.6	69.6 B						123.3	
Mar-98	43.7		66.8	66.6	78.4	82.4	79						123.3	
Aug-98	39.8 B		58.2 B		74.1 B		71.1 B	69 B					123.3	
Mar-99	40.5		59	58.4	76.1	72.8	73.2						123.3	
Sep-99	40.3 B	40.2 B	54.1 B		75.6 B		69.8 B						123.3	
Jan-00					77.8 B								123.3	
Mar-00													123.3	
Sep-00	38.9		51.5		73.8	74.3							123.3	
Dec-00					77.3 B								123.3	
Mar-01	38		50		71.4		68.1	69.9					123.3	
Sep-01	40.5		200 U	200 U	71.2		64.9						123.3	
Dec-01					74.6 B								123.3	
Mar-02	38.3	38.5	56.2		66.9		68.7						123.3	
Sep-02	39.8		58.1	0.31	69.4		67.9						123.3	
Mar-03	37.8		49.6		70		64.3						123.3	
Sep-03	39.8	41.4	58.3		71.5		65						123.3	
Mar-04	38.9		56.1		56.5		66.6	66.5					123.3	
Sep-04	39.9 C		56.3 C	57.2 C	60.9 C		68.7 C						123.3	
Mar-05	39.3	39.5	56.4		60.4		61.6						123.3	
Sep-05	37.1 C		48.4		54.5		65.4	63.8					123.3	
Mar-06	35.4	38.1	55.2		58.1		64.5						123.3	
Sep-06	39.2 C		53	52.1	55.9 C		60.5						123.3	122.3
Mar-07	40		57.7		61.3	46.1	67.7						123.3	122.3
Sep-07	39 C		55.4	54.9	53.8 C		66.4							122.3
Mar-08	39 C				49.4 C	50.6 C			80 C		64.8 C			122.3
Jun-08									77.4		59.8			122.3
Sep-08	39.7 C				51 C				77.9 C		59.8 C	59.9 C		122.3
Dec-08									76.8		59.5	59.2		122.3
Mar-09	37				46				75.1		55.8	56.4		122.3
Sep-09	37.6	37.8			43.6				71.6		55.2			122.3

Table A-2. Barium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-10	41				45.8				77.8	76.9	57.2			122.3
Nov-10	39.2				44				72.2	75.4	58			122.3
Mar-11	38.4				43.1	44.6			74.6		57			122.3
Sep-11	38.9				43.5	44			72.1		58.6			122.3
Mar-12	38				44.3				76.1	74.3	57.2			122.3
Sep-12	38.8				44.6	45			75.7		58			122.3
Mar-13	40.8B				45.2B	44.9B			77.2		60.4			122.3
Sep-13	40.6B				46.6B				78.4	75.7	60			122.3

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was \leq 5x the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-3. Chromium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	13.4		4.4 U		5.9 B		7.7 B	5.1 B					16.5	
Sep-96	12.1	0.0205	4.4 U		4.4 U		4.4 U						16.5	
Mar-97	12.2	12	2.7 U		3.9 B		4.5 B						16.5	
Jun-97					7.9 B								16.5	
Sep-97	13.4	13.3	3.3 B		3.5 U	3.6 B	3.5 U						16.5	
Mar-98	16.6		3.3 B	3.6 B	6.8 B	5.4 B	4.1 B						16.5	
Aug-98	13.5		4.2 U		4.2 U		4.2 U	4.2 U					16.5	
Mar-99	13.9		2.3	2.2	6.1 B	2.2	3.1						16.5	
Sep-99	14.8	14.8	2.5 B		4.4 B		3.1 B						16.5	
Jan-00					4.4 B								16.5	
Mar-00													16.5	
Sep-00	16.3		1.6		4.6	4.9							16.5	
Dec-00					5.7 U								16.5	
Mar-01	14.8		2.4		4.1		4.5	3.8					16.5	
Sep-01	21.1		10 U	10 U	7.4		5.4						16.5	
Dec-01					1.5 B								16.5	
Mar-02	16.3	16.2	5.2		6		11.3						16.5	
Sep-02	16.2		5.6	1.2	5.5		8.7						16.5	
Mar-03	16.3		2.5		3.8		9.9						16.5	
Sep-03	16.2 C	17.2C	3.6		4.9		12 C						16.5	
Mar-04	16.6		4.1		4		4.4	3.8					16.5	
Sep-04	15.6		5.5	5.3	3.8		11.6						16.5	
Mar-05	15.9	17.1	9.7 U		9.7 U		9.7 U						16.5	
Sep-05	14.4		3.6 UC		3.6 UC		3.6 UC	5.4 UC					16.5	
Mar-06	14.6	15.8	6.4 U		6.4 U		6.4 U						16.5	
Sep-06	16.3		2.5	2.6	4.8		3.4						16.5	13.4
Mar-07	17.5		3.1		4.9	3.4	4.3						16.5	13.4
Sep-07	17		2.7	3.3	3.4		5							13.4
Mar-08	17.2				4.2	4.7			2.8		4.1			13.4
Jun-08									2.2		3.2			13.4
Sep-08	17.1				4.5				2.5		3.4	3.6		13.4
Dec-08									2.93		3.98	3.93		13.4
Mar-09	16				5.21				1.99 B		3.2	3.27		13.4
Sep-09	16.4	16			3.78				2.74		3.32			13.4

Table A-3. Chromium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-10	16.9				4.5				2.46	3.12	3.69			13.4
Nov-10	16.5				3.67				2.48	2.51	3.46			13.4
Mar-11	16.1				3.56	3.79			2.47		3.08			13.4
Sep-11	16.2				3.73	3.63			2.32		3.37			13.4
Mar-12	16.1				3.31				2.51	2.28	3.38			13.4
Sep-12	17.2				4.25	3.99			2.51		3.51			13.4
Mar-13	20.2				4.6B	4.9B			3.1U		3.9B			13.4
Sep-13	20.3				13				3.9B	5.5B	5.3B			13.4

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was \leq 5x the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-4. Lead Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	1 UJ		1 UJ		1 UJ		1 UJ	1 UJ					70.4	
Sep-96	42.1 U	0.002 U	42.1 U		42.1 U		42.1 U						70.4	
Mar-97	26 U	26 U	26 U		34.8 B		26 U						70.4	
Sep-97	1.1 U	1.1 U	1.1 U		1.1 U		47.1 U						70.4	
Mar-98	1.1 U		1.1 U	1.1 U	1.1 U		2.4 B						70.4	
Aug-98	30.2 U		30.2 U		30.2 U		30.2 U	30.2 U					70.4	
Mar-99	1.8 U		1.8 U	1.8 U	1.8 U		2.5						70.4	
Sep-99	2.1 U	4	49.2		6.7		2.4 B						70.4	
Mar-00													70.4	
Sep-00	2.1 U		2.1 U		2.1 U	2.1 U							70.4	
Mar-01	2.6 U		2.6 U		2.6 U		2.6 U	2.6 U					70.4	
Sep-01	3.7		6.8	3 U	22.7 U		22.7 U						70.4	
Mar-02	2.2 U	2.8	2.2 U		2.2 U		4.2						70.4	
Sep-02	2.4 U		2.4 U	2.4 U	2.4 U		2.4 U						70.4	
Mar-03	2.6 U		2.3 U		2.6 U		2.6 U						70.4	
Sep-03	1.9 U	1.9U	1.9 U		1.9 U		1.9 U						70.4	
Mar-04	2 U		2 U		2 U		2 U	2					70.4	
Sep-04	1.9 U		1.9 U	1.9 U	1.9 U		1.9 U						70.4	
Mar-05	24.7 U	24.7 U	24.7 U		24.7 U		24.7 U						70.4	
Sep-05	2.9 U		31.9 U		31.9 U		31.9 U	31.9 U					70.4	
Mar-06													70.4	
Sep-06	3.3 UC		1.2 U	1.2 U	1.2 U		1.2 U						70.4	5
Mar-07	2.8 U		2.8 U		2.8 U	2.8 U	2.8 U						70.4	5
Sep-07	3.3 U		3.3 U	3.3 U	3.3 U		3.3 U							5
Mar-08	3 U				3 U	3 U			3 U		3 U			5
Jun-08									3 U		3 U			5
Sep-08	1.5 U				1.5 U				1.5 U		1.5 U	1.5 U		5
Dec-08									5 U		5 U	5 U		5
Mar-09	5 U				5 U				5 U		5 U	5 U		5
Sep-09	5 U	5 U			5 U				5 U		5 U			5
April-10	5 U				5 U				5 U	5 U	5 U			5

Table A-4. Lead Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Nov-10	5 U				5 U				5 U	5 U	5 U			5
Mar-11	7.15				7.64	7.5			7.23		7.74			5
Sep-11	5U				5U	5U			5U		5U			5
Mar-12	5U				5U				5U	5U	5U			5
Sep-12	5U				5U	5U			5U		5U			5
Mar-13	4.3B				4.2B	4B			4.2B		4.1B			5
Sep-13	12				6B				12.1	11.3	11.1			5

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-5. Selenium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	2.1 B		2.6 B		3.5 B		3.4 B	3.6B					5.6	
Sep-96	3.1 B	0.003 U	3.8 B		4.1 B		4.8 B						5.6	
Mar-97	2.6 BN	2.3 BN	3.5 BN		3.1 BN		3.9 BN						5.6	
Sep-97	3.2 B	2.9 B	3.6 B		4.8 B		4.6 B						5.6	
Mar-98	3.2 B		3.6 B	3.6 B	4.4 B		4.2 B						5.6	
Aug-98	3.2 B		4.5 B		5.8		5.8	5.5					5.6	
Mar-99	5.2		3.6 U	4.5	7.6		4.2						5.6	
Sep-99	3.7 U	5.2	3.7 U		7.3		4.6 B						5.6	
Mar-00													5.6	
Sep-00	3.4		3.5		4	5.5							5.6	
Mar-01	2.6 U		3.1		3.4		2.6	2.6 U					5.6	
Sep-01	5.9		5 U	19.8	62.1 U		62.1 U						5.6	
Mar-02	7.7	7.9	3.6 U		7.8		7.7						5.6	
Sep-02	4.1 U		4.1 U	4.1 U	7.4		4.1 U						5.6	
Mar-03	3.6 U		5.7		4.4 U		3.8 U						5.6	
Sep-03	3.8	4.4	3.6		6.9		5.7						5.6	
Mar-04	4.2		5.6		7.4		3.4 U	3.4 U					5.6	
Sep-04	3.9 U		3.9 U	3.9 U	3.9 U		3.9 U						5.6	
Mar-05	48.5 U	48.5 U	48.5 U		48.5 U		48.5 U						5.6	
Sep-05	6.2 C		44 U		44 U		44 U	44.0 U					5.6	
Mar-06													5.6	
Sep-06	4.4		3.3	5.2	3.7		3						5.6	5.6
Mar-07	5.9		5.1		9.7		5.9						5.6	5.6
Sep-07	4.8		4.3 U	4.3 U	4.3 U		4.3 U						5.6	5.6
Mar-08	6 U				7.8	9.3			6.5		6 U		5.6	5.6
Jun-08									6 U		6 U		5.6	5.6
Sep-08	4.3				3.4 C				4.7		6	5.1	5.6	5.6
Dec-08									10 U		10 U	10 U	5.6	5.6
Mar-09	6.98 B				6.65 B				5.56 B		6.07 B	6.78 B	5.6	5.6
Sep-09	3.23 B	5.53 B			4.61 B				4.64 B		3.66 B		5.6	5.6
April-10	5.24 B				4.28 B				5.7 B	6.6 B	4.8 B		5.6	5.6

Table A-5. Selenium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Nov-10	10 U				10 U				10 U	10 U	10 U			5.6
Mar-11	10 U				10 U	10 U			10 U		10 U			5.6
Sep-11	10 U				3.48B	10 U			4.05B		10 U			5.6
Mar-12	5U				4.45B				6.78	5.36	4.94B			5.6
Sep-12	4.77B				4.16B	4.16B			4.96B		4.55B			5.6
Mar-13	6.9B				4.6B	4.6B			4.2B		4.3B			5.6
Sep-13	6.3B				2.7U				5.9B	6.5B	5.1B			5.6

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was \leq 5x the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-6. Tin Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	35.3 U		35.3 U		35.3 U		40.1 B	35.3 U					55.6	
Sep-96	33.5 U	0.033 U	33.5 U		33.5 U		33.5 U						55.6	
Mar-97	24.7 U	24.7 U	24.7 U		29 B		24.7 U						55.6	
Sep-97	5.6 U	5.6 U	5.6 U		5.6 U		33.2 U						55.6	
Mar-98	4.9 U		4.9 U	4.9 U	4.9 U		4.9 U						55.6	
Aug-98	28 U		28 U		28 U		28 U	28 U					55.6	
Mar-99	2.7 U		2.7 U	2.7 U	2.7 U		2.7 U						55.6	
Sep-99	2.1 U	2.1 U	2.1 U		2.1 U		2.1 U						55.6	
Mar-00													55.6	
Sep-00													55.6	
Mar-01	3.5 U		3.5 U		3.5 U		3.5 U	3.5 U					55.6	
Sep-01	2.4 U		100 U	100 U	13.9 U		13.9 U						55.6	
Mar-02	3.3 U	3.3 U	3.3 U		3.3 U		3.3 U						55.6	
Sep-02	4.7 U		4.7 U	4.7 U	4.7 U		4.7 U						55.6	
Mar-03	3.6 U		5.8 U		3.6 U		3.6 U						55.6	
Sep-03	5.6 U	5.6 U	5.6 U		5.6 U		5.6 U						55.6	
Mar-04	3.6 U		3.6 U		3.6 U		3.6 U	3.6 U					55.6	
Sep-04	4 U		4 U	4 U	4 U		4 U						55.6	
Mar-05													55.6	
Sep-05	5.1 U												55.6	
Mar-06													55.6	
Sep-06	3.5 U		3.5 U	4.6	3.5 U		3.5 U						55.6	10
Mar-07	4.4		3.4 U		3.4 U	4.1	3.8						55.6	10
Sep-07	6.3 U		6.3 U	6.3 U	6.3 U		6.3 U							10
Mar-08	6 U				6 U	6.5			8.1		6 U			10
Jun-08									6 U		6 U			10
Sep-08	3 U				3 U				3 U		3 U	3 U		10
Dec-08									100 U		100 U	100 U		10
Mar-09	100 U				100 U				100 U		100 U	100 U		10
Sep-09	100 U	100 U			100 U				100 U		100 U			10
April-10	100 U				100 U				100 U	100 U	100 U			10

Table A-6. Tin Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Nov-10	1 U				1 U				1 U	1 U	1 U			10
Mar-11	1 U				1 U	1 U			1 U		1 U			10
Sep-11	1 U				1 U	1 U			1 U		1 U			10
Mar-12	1U				1U				1U	19.5	1U			10
Sep-12	1U				1U	1U			1U		1U			10
Mar-13	13.5U				13.5U	13.5U			13.5U		13.5U			10
Sep-13	13.5U				13.5U				13.5U		13.5U			10

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-7. Uranium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-95					2.98 U								3.4	
Mar-96	2.64		2.24		2.94		2.74	2.77					3.4	
Sep-96	2.4		2.26		2.42		2.21						3.4	
Mar-97	2.7		2.69		3.16		2.87						3.4	
Sep-97	2.76	2.55	2.43		3.01		2.38						3.4	
Mar-98	2.33		2.49	2.44	2.99		2.32						3.4	
Aug-98	2.59		2.48		3.34		2.34	2.36					3.4	
Mar-99	2.6		2.8	3	3.4		2.7						3.4	
Sep-99	2.65	2.53	2.63		3.41		2.58						3.4	
Mar-00													3.4	
Sep-00	3.27		3.19		3.17	3.62							3.4	
Mar-01	2.31		2.36		3.12		2.83	2.79					3.4	
Sep-01	2.42		2.25	2.28	3.06		2.65						3.4	
Mar-02	2.44	2.52	2.46		3.22		2.84						3.4	
Sep-02	2.25		2.27	2.14	2.99		2.58						3.4	
Mar-03	2.33		4.22		3.27		2.79						3.4	
Sep-03	2.19	2.22	2.49		2.97		2.58						3.4	
Mar-04	2.24		2.12		2.94		2.8	3.07					3.4	
Sep-04	2.35 B		2.15 B	2.38 B	2.95 B		2.59 B						3.4	
Mar-05	2.26	2.3	2.14		2.86		2.85						3.4	
Sep-05	2		1.63		2.34		2.09	2.2					3.4	
Mar-06	2.35	2.3	2.14		2.94		2.68						3.4	
Sep-06	2.12		1.94	1.95	2.53		2.72						3.4	3.4
Mar-07	1.91		2.57		2.6	2.16	2.53						3.4	3.4
Sep-07	2.55		1.84	1.93	2.59		2.47						3.4	3.4
Mar-08	2.12				2.32	2.53			1.64		2.5			3.4
Jun-08									1.63		2.51			3.4
Sep-08	2.45				2.49				1.96		2.48	2.53		3.4
Dec-08									1.65		2.48	2.61		3.4
Mar-09	2.13				2.4				1.61		2.46	2.38		3.4
Sep-09	2.29	2.35			2.43				1.67		2.56			3.4

Table A-7. Uranium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
April-10	2.07				2.34				1.56	1.6	2.48			3.4
Nov-10	2.02				2.34				1.59	1.61	2.34			3.4
Mar-11	2.17				1.96	1.94			1.81		2.5			3.4
Sep-11	2.19				2.27	3.82			1.65		2.25			3.4
Mar-12	2.22				2.33				1.67	1.69	2.45			3.4
Sep-12	2.1				2.32	2.29			1.68		2.44			3.4
Mar-13	2.36				2.37	2.25			1.59		2.43			3.4
Sep-13	1.93				2.04				1.51	1.5	2.1			3.4

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-8. Vanadium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	26.8 J		12.6 J		23.6 J		14.4 J	15.1 J					41	
Sep-96	33.4 B	0.0258 B	25.1 B		32.9 B		24.3 B						41	
Mar-97	33.2 B	30.3 B	26 B		28.9 B		25.3 B						41	
Jun-97					36.2								41	
Sep-97	27.8 B	27.2 B	18.8 B		25.7 B	28.8	24.9 B						41	
Mar-98	29		18.6	18.3	26.8	28.4	23						41	
Aug-98	39.5 B		30.1 B		39.5 B		36 B	33.9 B					41	
Mar-99	28.3		13.9	15	25.2	30	23.6						41	
Sep-99	28.7 B	28.6 B	17.5 B		26.4 B		23.5 B						41	
Jan-00					25.7 B								41	
Mar-00													41	
Sep-00	27.5		15.5		27.2	27.3							41	
Dec-00					27.1 B								41	
Mar-01	27.1		16.5		25.8		25	25.3					41	
Sep-01	28.5		50 U	50 U	26.2		22.8						41	
Dec-01					26.2 B								41	
Mar-02	26.6	27.4	23.4		25.6		23.4						41	
Sep-02	28.6		26.7	1.1	28.8		24.3						41	
Mar-03	28.5		22.1		26.8		23.8						41	
Sep-03	25.9	26.9	24.4		26.2		16.2						41	
Mar-04	26.8		24.9		24.6		24.2	24.7					41	
Sep-04	27 C		25.4 C	25.2	26.1		24.8 C						41	
Mar-05	25.8	27.4	25.1		25.9		23.3						41	
Sep-05	25.4		21.5		24.9		27.4	23.4					41	
Mar-06	25.3	27.1	24.9		26.4		22.9						41	
Sep-06	28.8 C		23.7 C	23.2 C	28.6 C		22.7 C						41	40
Mar-07	27.6		25.1		27.6	21.1	25						41	40
Sep-07	28.5		23.8	23.6	29.1		25.9							40
Mar-08	27.7				28.8	29			23.2		22.1			40
Jun-08									24.3		24.4			40
Sep-08	28.9				30.2				22.6		24.5	23.9		40
Dec-08									27.3		25.9	28.6		40
Mar-09	31.2				32.8				30		29.4	28.4		40

Table A-8. Vanadium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-09	31.2	30.6			30				24.5		29			40
April-10	41.8				41.7				40.5	41	39.1			40
Nov-10	36.9				38.6				35.7	37.7	36.9			40
Mar-11	36				37.6	37.3			36.3		36.4			40
Sep-11	34.8				37.6	37.4			33.2		35.2			40
Mar-12	31.6				39.1				37.2	36.7	35			40
Sep-12	35.6				39.4	38.8			34.2		35.5			40
Mar-13	32.2B				33B	35.2B			26B		27.6B			40
Sep-13	27.3B				32.4B				21.4B	20.4 B	25.9B			40

B = Estimated results
 C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
 D = Reported from dilution
 J = Estimated results
 U = Result is nondetected

Table A-9. Zinc Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	13.7 U		146		8.5 U		368	155					757	
Sep-96	15.4 B	0.003 U	260		23.1		665						757	
Mar-97	26.5	26.7	382		55.4		507						757	
Jun-97					12								757	
Sep-97	8.1 B	5.7	339		10.3	5.1 U	394						757	
Mar-98	5.8 B		318	321	6.1 B	2.2 U	386						757	
Aug-98	10.3 B		241		4.7 B		663	629					757	
Mar-99	2.6		164	144	10.6	0.8 U	347						757	
Sep-99	2.9 B	3.5 B	215		0.8 U		350						757	
Jan-00					10.4 B								757	
Mar-00													757	
Sep-00	7.4		357		2.8	4.2							757	
Dec-00					7.1 U								757	
Mar-01	4.4		262		0.94		17.4	17.5					757	
Sep-01	5.8		310	325	17.1		24.6						757	
Dec-01					1.3 U								757	
Mar-02	3.1	2.6	280		0.4 U		33.4						757	
Sep-02	7.1		329	0.54	2.3		33.6						757	
Mar-03	13.4 C		180		15 C		34.4 C						757	
Sep-03	23.7 C	2.6 C	296		3.1		8.9 C						757	
Mar-04	7.8 C		317 C		5.1 C		12.9 C	9.9 C					757	
Sep-04	6.9		288	286 C	7.3 C		12.8						757	
Mar-05	29.6 UC	5.6 UC	316 C		3.8 UC		15.4 UC						757	
Sep-05	14.5 UC		266 C		8.5 UC		9.1 UC	8.6 UC					757	
Mar-06	9 UC	15.9 UC	286 C		17 UC		12.4 UC						757	
Sep-06	8.7 UC		259 C	260 C	10.3 UC		6.6 UC						757	26.5
Mar-07	5.8 UCJ		341		7 UCJ	6.1 UCJ	11.7 UCJ						757	25.5
Sep-07	11.8 UC		378	375	3.8 UC		10.3 UC							26.5
Mar-08	6 U				6 U	6 U			6 U		19			26.5
Jun-08									6 U		6 U			26.5
Sep-08	4.7				3 U				3 U		6.9	5.9		26.5
Dec-08									10 U		10 U	10 U		26.5
Mar-09	10 U				10 U				10 U		8.16 B	4.83 B		26.5

Table A-9. Zinc Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-09	10 U	10 U			10 U				10 U		10 U			26.5
April-10	10 U				10 U				10 U		10 U			26.5
Nov-10	10 U				10 U				12.6	10 U	10 U			26.5
Mar-11	10 U				10 U	10 U			10 U		10 U			26.5
Sep-11	10 U				10 U	10 U			10 U		10 U			26.5
Mar-12	10U				10U				10U	10U	10U			26.5
Sep-12	10U				10U	10U			10U		10U			26.5
Mar-13	6.5B				7.8B	9.4B			8.3B		7.2B			26.5
Sep-13	7.7BC				5.2U				5.2U	5.2U	5.2U			26.5

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-10. Alkalinity Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	138		121		113		124	125					151.8	
Sep-96	143		125		117		129						151.8	
Mar-97	147		129		113		121						151.8	
Jun-97					114								151.8	
Sep-97	138	142	125		119		125						151.8	
Dec-97					121								151.8	
Mar-98	140		122	123	120		127						151.8	
Jun-98					122								151.8	
Aug-98	143		124		124		131	131					151.8	
Dec-98					127								151.8	
Mar-99	143		124	124	123		129						151.8	
Jun-99					118								151.8	
Sep-99	140	139	123		122		130						151.8	
Jan-00					135								151.8	
Mar-00													151.8	
Jun-00					137								151.8	
Sep-00	160		137		119	123							151.8	
Mar-01	137		145		120		152	144					151.8	
Jun-01					130								151.8	
Sep-01	132		126	128	124		130						151.8	
Mar-02	138	135	124		126		132						151.8	
Sep-02	135		130	128	131		146						151.8	
Mar-03	128		120		111		113						151.8	
Sep-03	130	129	128		114		123						151.8	
Mar-04	147		132		140		136	141					151.8	
Sep-04	137		121	130	126		121						151.8	
Mar-05	142	138	128		128		130						151.8	
Sep-05	138		132		126		126	130					151.8	
Mar-06	139	139	128		124		128						151.8	
Sep-06	137		125	117	120		123						151.8	152.9
Mar-07	138 J		126 J		126 J	126 J	124 J						151.8	152.9
Sep-07	129 J		117 J	120 J	118 J		120 J							152.9
Mar-08	123				111	100			117		129			152.9
Jun-08									121		131			152.9
Sep-08	133				121				125		137	135		152.9
Mar-09	143				121				127		141	137		152.9
Sep-09	137	139			126				135		141			152.9
April-10	138				119				125	140	136			152.9

Table A-10. Alkalinity Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Nov-10	139				127				134	132	143			152.9
Mar-11	138				122	124			136		146			152.9
Sep-11	139				125	124			135		146			152.9
Mar-12	143				127				132	132	143			152.9
Sep-12	143				139	127			134		145			152.9
Mar-13	135				124	122			132		140			152.9
Sep-13	125				121				138	130	135			152.9

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-11. Chloride Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	21.1		24.2		24.2		20.2	20.6					25.9	
Sep-96	19		22.9		21.7		20.1						25.9	
Mar-97	19.2		23.7				20.08						25.9	
Jun-97					22 D								25.9	
Sep-97	20.5	19.9	22.9		22.4		21						25.9	
Dec-97					20.6 D								25.9	
Mar-98	16.1 CD		21.4 D	21.4 D	20.9 CD		19.6 CD						25.9	
Jun-98					21								25.9	
Aug-98	18.3		23.7		21.4		20.7	21					25.9	
Dec-98					20.5 D								25.9	
Mar-99	19.5		24.9	24.4	20.2 CD	23.3	21.7						25.9	
Jun-99					21.2 CD								25.9	
Sep-99	18.9	19.9	26.3		23.2		28.1						25.9	
Jan-00					20.4 D								25.9	
Mar-00													25.9	
Jun-00					20.5 CD								25.9	
Sep-00	18.4		25.7		21.4	22.4							25.9	
Dec-00					21.9 D								25.9	
Mar-01	18.6		25.7		17.2		22.3	27.6					25.9	
Jun-01					16.8 D								25.9	
Sep-01	19		23.4	24.4	20.5		23.3						25.9	
Dec-01					18.6 D								25.9	
Mar-02	16.6	16.8	22.6		19.3		25.2						25.9	
Sep-02	18		25.6	24.5	20.7		26.6						25.9	
Mar-03	18.3		22.5		22.8		28.2						25.9	
Sep-03	15.7 D	15.6 D	22.6 D		23 D		23.8 D						25.9	
Mar-04	15 D		21.9 D		16.5 D		23.8 D	24.3 D					25.9	
Sep-04	15.7		22.3	23.1	17.4		24.1						25.9	
Mar-05	20.7	20.1	27.7		22.5		19						25.9	
Sep-05	13.4 D		23 D		17.1 D		24.8 D	24.5 D					25.9	
Mar-06	13.2 D	13.9 D	23.5 D		16.7 D		20.6 D						25.9	
Sep-06	15.2		21.2 D	21 D	17.5		24.5 D						25.9	26
Mar-07	16.4 D		24.3 D		19.1 D	18.9 D	27.2 D						25.9	26
Sep-07	15.8 D		21.3 D	21.9 D	16.2 D		23.9 D							26
Mar-08	17 D				18.3 D	18 D			18.1 D		22.2 D			26
Jun-08									15.4 D		18.8 D			26
Sep-08	14.4 D				15.2 D						19.6 D	19.8 D		26
Mar-09	12 D				13 D				16 D		18.6 D	18.7		26

Table A-11. Chloride Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-09	14.3 D	13.8 D			15.4				16.8 D		20.8			26
April-10	11.9 D				12.3 D				15.7 D	15.9 D	18.9 D			26
Nov-10	16.1 D				17.7 D				17.1 D	17.1 D	20.6 D			26
Mar-11	14.5D				15.2D	16.4D			15D		19.2D			26
Sep-11	13.5D				13.4D	13.4D			16.2D		19.4D			26
Mar-12	14.4D				13.8D				16.9D	16.7D	20.6D			26
Sep-12	12.8D				13.6D	13.4D			16.7D		20.6D			26
Mar-13	13D				13.7D	14D			17.6D		21.2D			26
Sep-13	13.3D				13.6D				18.1D	18.1D	21.6			26

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-12. Fluoride Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	0.34		0.4		0.42		0.36	0.36					0.5	
Sep-96	0.34		0.37		0.41		0.33						0.5	
Mar-97	0.34		0.36				0.3						0.5	
Jun-97					0.406								0.5	
Sep-97	0.39	0.334	0.348		0.415		0.331						0.5	
Dec-97					0.378								0.5	
Mar-98	0.304		0.363	0.364	0.371		0.33						0.5	
Jun-98					0.383								0.5	
Aug-98	0.342		0.355		0.362		0.343	0.34					0.5	
Dec-98					0.399								0.5	
Mar-99	0.5 U		0.5 U	0.5 U	0.335	0.5 U	0.5 U						0.5	
Jun-99					0.373								0.5	
Sep-99	0.5 U	0.5 U	0.5 U		0.5 U		0.5 U						0.5	
Jan-00					0.41								0.5	
Mar-00													0.5	
Jun-00					0.39								0.5	
Sep-00	0.5 U		0.5 U		0.5 U	0.5 U							0.5	
Dec-00					0.36 C								0.5	
Mar-01	0.5 U		2.5 U		0.5 U		2.5 U	2.5U					0.5	
Jun-01					0.35								0.5	
Sep-01	1 U		1 U	1 U	0.5 U		0.5 U						0.5	
Dec-01					0.36								0.5	
Mar-02	0.25 U	0.25 U	0.26		0.28		0.25 U						0.5	
Sep-02	0.25 U		0.25 U	0.25 U	0.25 U		0.357						0.5	
Mar-03	0.25 U		0.34		0.3		0.34						0.5	
Sep-03	0.3	0.31	0.28		0.3		0.25 U						0.5	
Mar-04	0.3		0.32		0.37		0.286	0.327					0.5	
Sep-04	0.28		0.34	0.29	0.3		0.26						0.5	
Mar-05	0.25	.25 U	0.27		0.28		0.29						0.5	
Sep-05	0.268		0.316		0.343		0.289	0.284					0.5	
Mar-06	0.27	0.3	0.29		0.31		0.26						0.5	
Sep-06	0.3		0.35	0.37	0.28		0.26						0.5	0.45
Mar-07	0.29		0.25		0.27	0.27	0.25 U						0.5	0.45
Sep-07	0.28		0.3	0.35	0.42		0.33							0.45
Mar-08	0.25 U				0.3	0.3			0.25 U		0.25 U			0.45
Jun-08									0.26		0.29			0.45
Sep-08	0.27				0.35				1.2 UD		0.5 UD	.5 UD		0.45
Mar-09	0.25				0.3				0.28		0.29	.25 D		0.45

Table A-12. Fluoride Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-09	0.4	0.43			0.31				0.34		0.37			0.45
April-10	0.23				0.3				.019 B	0.23 B	0.24 B			0.45
Nov-10	0.27				0.32				0.24 B	0.21 B	0.22 B			0.45
Mar-11	0.32B				0.28B	0.29B			0.29B		0.31B			0.45
Sep-11	0.33B				0.54	0.38B			0.26B		0.32B			0.45
Mar-12	0.46B				0.54				0.42B	0.41B	0.46B			0.45
Sep-12	0.32B				0.35B	0.35B			0.32B		0.32B			0.45
Mar-13	0.33				0.39	0.38			0.28		0.3			0.45
Sep-13	0.31				0.37				0.25	0.26	0.28			0.45

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-13. Sulfate Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	24.2		29.9		30.7		28.9	28.7					37.8	
Sep-96	25.2		32.2		33.2		30.3						37.8	
Mar-97	27		31.5				30.5						37.8	
Jun-97					33.8 D								37.8	
Sep-97	26.6	26.1	32.6		34.9		31.4						37.8	
Dec-97					34.5 D								37.8	
Mar-98	22.7 D		31.6 D	31.4 D	34.8 D		31.2 D						37.8	
Jun-98					35								37.8	
Aug-98	26		30.7		35.4		31.8	31.5					37.8	
Dec-98					36.8 D								37.8	
Mar-99	26.8		32.4	32	37.3	35.2 D	30.8						37.8	
Jun-99					33.2 D								37.8	
Sep-99	25.9	25.8	32.5		34.6		31.3						37.8	
Jan-00					34.5 D								37.8	
Mar-00													37.8	
Jun-00					34.2 D								37.8	
Sep-00	30.5		31.7		37.6	35.9							37.8	
Dec-00					36.8 D								37.8	
Mar-01	26.9		36		31.6		37.8	39.5					37.8	
Jun-01					36.9 D								37.8	
Sep-01	27.8		30.3	30.8	34.5		31						37.8	
Dec-01					33.1 D								37.8	
Mar-02	25.6	25.6	29.2		33.8		30.5						37.8	
Sep-02	26.2		30.2	29.2	32.7		31.1						37.8	
Mar-03	26		30		34.7		31						37.8	
Sep-03	26.6 D	26.7 D	31.3 D		34.3 D		31.5 D						37.8	
Mar-04	26.7 D		31 D		32.2 D		31.5 D	32.4 D					37.8	
Sep-04	29.2		33.7	36	37.4		34.5						37.8	
Mar-05	27.7	27.3	32.7		33		24						37.8	
Sep-05	24 D		32.8 D		32.3 D		31.5 D	31.1 D					37.8	
Mar-06	27.3 D	27.4 D	30.9 D		30.5 D		30.9 D						37.8	
Sep-06	26.6		30.2 D	29.4 D	29.9		29.8 D						37.8	37.8
Mar-07	27.1 D		30.7 D		32.1 D	31.8 D	31.7 D						37.8	37.8
Sep-07	26.6 D		31.2 D	30.1 D	29 D		30.5 D						37.8	37.8
Mar-08	28 D				30.7 D	31.1			27.1 D		29.9 D		37.8	37.8
Jun-08									27.4 D		30.9 D		37.8	37.8
Sep-08	26.7 D				28.4 D				26		28.3 D	29.3 D	37.8	37.8
Mar-09	23.9 D				26.3 D				25 D		27.3 D	28.3 D	37.8	37.8

Table A-13. Sulfate Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-09	29.2 D	28 D			30.4 D				28.2 D		31.1 D			37.8
April-10	23.4 D				24.6 D				25.7 D	22.5 D	27.2 D			37.8
Nov-10	26.7				27.7				26.5	26.6	29.8			37.8
Mar-11	26.9D				29.2D	30.1D			26.5D		28.6D			37.8
Sep-11	36.8D				29.7D	26.2D			26.3D		28.7D			37.8
Mar-12	27.4D				27D				27.6D	27.3D	29.8D			37.8
Sep-12	27.1D				27.2D	26.9			27.7D		29.9D			37.8
Mar-13	26.3D				25D	25.9D			26.2D		29D			37.8
Sep-13	26.2D				24.7D				26.9D	26.8D	28.4D			37.8

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-14. Gross Alpha Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	1.45 J		2.12 J		2.28 J		2.43 J	1.73 J					3.3	
Sep-96	1.69 J		0.109 U		1.57 J		1.15 U						3.3	
Mar-97	1.69 J	0.199 U	1.31 U		1.26 J		0.837 U						3.3	
Jun-97					1.68 J								3.3	
Sep-97	0.39 U	1.66 J	0.791 U		1.2 J		2.5 J						3.3	
Dec-97					2.36 J								3.3	
Mar-98	1.32 J		0.659 U	1.4J	2.17 J		0.683 U						3.3	
Jun-98					2.17 U								3.3	
Aug-98	0.431 U		2.3 J		2.89 J		2.45 J	3.37					3.3	
Dec-98					1.87 J								3.3	
Mar-99	2.7 J		3	1.3U	1.68 U	1.3 U	1.5 U						3.3	
Jun-99					2.75 J								3.3	
Sep-99	2.64 J	0.565 U	0.535 U		1.31 U	0.928 U	1.55 U						3.3	
Jan-00					3.75								3.3	
Mar-00													3.3	
Jun-00					3.29								3.3	
Sep-00	0.34 U		0.5 U		0.266 U	1.28 U							3.3	
Dec-00					2.06 U								3.3	
Mar-01	0.303 U		1.01 U		2.33 J		0.812 U	1.43 U					3.3	
Sep-01	-0.386 U		0.976 U	0.751 U	1.12 U		0.374 U						3.3	
Mar-02	0.884 U	0.227 U	0.522 U		0.363 U		0.016 U						3.3	
Sep-02	0.348 U		0.38 U	0.91 U	0.289 U		-0.377 U						3.3	
Mar-03	0.748 U		6.01		0.865 U		1.68						3.3	
Sep-03	1.44	0.882 U	1.11 U		1.16 U		1.64						3.3	
Mar-04	2.26		1.73 U		1.83 U		1.52	2.13					3.3	
Sep-04	1.21		-0.435 U	-0.173 U	0.487 U		0.531 U						3.3	
Mar-05	1.53	0.817 U	1.33		0.913 U		1.68						3.3	
Sep-05	0.862 U		1.06 U		0.646 U		1.16 U	1.78					3.3	
Mar-06	-0.264 U	1.16 U	-0.146 U		1.12 U		0.117 U						3.3	
Sep-06	-0.059 U		1.34 U	3.05	1.86		-0.156 U						3.3	2.98
Mar-07	0.083 U		-0.0265 U		-0.442 U	-0.857 U	-0.864 U						3.3	2.98
Sep-07	-0.352 U		4.71	1.05 U	3.62		-0.194 U							2.98
Mar-08	0.897 U				1.06 U	0.656 U			0.119 U		-0.095 U			2.98
Jun-08									2.1		0.673 U			2.98
Sep-08	-0.474 U				2.76				1.41 U		0.125 U	-.134 U		2.98
Dec-08									0.066 U		-0.187 U	.841 U		2.98

Table A-14. Gross Alpha Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-09	1.56 U				0.767 U				-0.179 U		3.92	.583 U		2.98
Dec-09	1.38 U	1.26 U			1.9 U				0.576 U		1.54 U			2.98
April-10	2.41 U				1.99				1.38 U	2.67	1.8 U			2.98
Nov-10	0.97 U				1.22U				0.946 U	.926 U	0.767 U			2.98
Mar-11	1.42U				1.49U	2.06			1.56U		0.74U			2.98
Sep-11	2.05U				2.05U	1.98U			2.04U		-0.311U			2.98
Mar-12	1.7U				0.464U				2.08U	0.866	2.62			2.98
Sep-12	3.96				1.74U	1.47U			2.7U		1.82U			2.98
Mar-13	1.56U				1.38U	0.487U			1.38		2.87			2.98
Sep-13	0.945U				1.6U				1.23U	2.21	0.799U			2.98

B = Estimated results
 C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
 D = Reported from dilution
 J = Estimated results
 U = Result is nondetected

Table A-15. Gross Beta Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	10.9		22.4		20.4		16	15.5					31.7	
Sep-96	13.2		26.9		25.7		17.6						31.7	
Mar-97	11.2	10.5	21.6		23.2		13.5						31.7	
Jun-97					16.3								31.7	
Sep-97	10.2	12.7	20.7		21		15.9						31.7	
Dec-97					21.4								31.7	
Mar-98	10.5		26.4	25.4	20.2		14.5						31.7	
Jun-98					44.7								31.7	
Aug-98	17.1		27.4		25.1		19.1	13.4					31.7	
Dec-98					21.3								31.7	
Mar-99	25		17	67	25.1	56	27						31.7	
Jun-99					25.8								31.7	
Sep-99	25.1	25.8	57.2		38	50.2	27.1						31.7	
Jan-00					21.7								31.7	
Mar-00													31.7	
Jun-00					21.6								31.7	
Sep-00	27.6		49.2		49.9	47.4							31.7	
Dec-00					23.4								31.7	
Mar-01	26.2		59.4		47.8		31.9	35.5					31.7	
Sep-01	29.8		41.2	39.6	41.2		29.8						31.7	
Mar-02	28	28.5	39.1		42.7		30.8						31.7	
Sep-02	23.3		28.3	26.3	28.7		21.4						31.7	
Mar-03	38.8		47		44.3		36.8						31.7	
Sep-03	38.1	38.1	35.6		44		41.5						31.7	
Mar-04	25.8		28.1		29.8		36.2	41.3					31.7	
Sep-04	39.1		34.1	34.3	33.8		38.3						31.7	
Mar-05	41.4	38.4	32.9		33.2		36.9						31.7	
Sep-05	44.6		35.8		27.8		41.6	41.2					31.7	
Mar-06	45.4	44.6	30		30		45.4						31.7	
Sep-06	45.5		27.6	33.2	29		40.5						31.7	31.5
Mar-07	52.1		35.3		27.8	24	39.6						31.7	31.5
Sep-07	52.5		34.6	38.2	26.4		46.2						31.7	31.5
Mar-08	45.7				20	23.6			38.7		33.4			31.5
Jun-08									31.9		39.2			31.5
Sep-08	42.1				22.8				44.8		38.1	60.3		31.5
Dec-08									39.9		33.7 J	41.8 J		31.5

Table A-15. Gross Beta Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-09	46.8				24.9				37.8		42.4	39.6		31.5
Sep-09	46.4	50.7			19.9				37		38.9			31.5
April-10	54.4				21.3				34.9	41.8	38.6			31.5
Nov-10	53.7				21.4				36.5	34.7	34.6			31.5
Mar-11	54.2				22.5	19.4			34.2		31.8			31.5
Sep-11	54.8				18.1	19.2			32.6		36.8			31.5
Mar-12	54.3				18.1				32.5	34.2	32.9			31.5
Sep-12	60.1				16.7	17			29.9		32.4			31.5
Mar-13	30.1				10.3	10.2			18.7		21.8			31.5
Sep-13	27.8				10.4				18.5	16.3	17.8			31.5

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-16. Carbon-14 Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	22.3 J		6.76 J		4.26 J		4.72 J	2.48 U					26.8	
Sep-96													26.8	
Mar-97	21.6 J	22.2 J	11.1 J		3.94 U		3.81 U						26.8	
Sep-97	16.7 J	10.7 J	3.27 U		1.6 U		5.43 U						26.8	
Mar-98	19.4 J		4.5 U	7.16 U	3.69 U		-1.49 U						26.8	
Aug-98	18.5 J		8.63 J		2.07 U		6.46 U	6.4 U					26.8	
Mar-99	25 U		9.9 U	12 U	-6.1 U		-6.5 U						26.8	
Sep-99	14.1 U	7.43 U	-2.74 U		-9.54 U		-5.94 U						26.8	
Mar-00													26.8	
Sep-00	35.2 U		13.7 U		3.75 U	4.81 U							26.8	
Mar-01	9.56 U		43.4 U		-28.1 U		47.2 U	57 J					26.8	
Sep-01	32.5 U		6.73 U	22.5 U	-15.1 U		-1.16 U						26.8	
Mar-02	14 U	21.4 U	11.6 U		21.7 U		13.2 U						26.8	
Sep-02	5.02 U		17 U	32.6 U	-1.55 U		8.45 U						26.8	
Mar-03	-6.69 U		-0.225 U		25.2 U		1.78 U						26.8	
Sep-03	0.446 U	3.32 U	5.74 U		-10.3 U		-4.5 U						26.8	
Mar-04	33.9 U		16.4 U		10.2 U		9.75 U	-12.4 U					26.8	
Sep-04	8.8 U		0 U	6.99 U	1.22 U		2.45 U						26.8	
Mar-05	11.8 U	42.2 U	38.6 U		17.8 U		28.9 U						26.8	
Sep-05	19.9 U		8.17 U		-2.4 U		-2.37 U	-10.7 U					26.8	
Mar-06	34.2 U	16.1 U	1.44 U		-22.6 U		6.04 U						26.8	
Sep-06	15.8 U		1.42 U	-5.16 U	13.6 U		-4.74 U						26.8	58.1
Mar-07	20.8 U		29.4 U		21.2 U	7.41 U	16.1 U						26.8	58.1
Sep-07	22.4 U		26.8 U	26.4 U	-0.045 U		44.9 U							58.1
Mar-08	30.6 U				23.5 U	-3.8 U			0.956 U		18.1 U			58.1
Jun-08									-20.6 U		-4.28 U			58.1
Sep-08	27.6 U				-20.8 U				-8.35 U		-12.9 U	-4.33 U		58.1
Dec-08									19.6 U		34.6 UJ	49.2 UJ		58.1
Mar-09	-18.3 U				-0.458 U				-13.9 U		-13.9 U	17.5 U		58.1
Sep-09	35 U	14.3 U			7.52 U				-8.42 U		11.5 U			58.1
April-10	41.9 U				33.5 U				8.23 U	6.81 U	18.3 U			58.1

Table A-16. Carbon-14 Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Nov-10	10.3 U				0.452 U				-31.7 U	-7.42 U	30.6 U			58.1
Mar-11	35.8U				-2.96U	1.26U			3.96U		4.31U			58.1
Sep-11	25.7U				12.4U	16.7U			-0.939U		29.8U			58.1
Mar-12	15.5U				6.32U				15.2U	21.6U	6.85U			58.1
Sep-12	28U				27U	20.1U			14.1U		43.8U			58.1
Mar-13	16.8U				17.2U	20.6			10.7U		27			58.1
Sep-13	10.8U				-3.61U				-6.43U	3.26U	10.4U			58.1

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5 \times$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-17. Iodine-129 Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Jan-95					38.8 J								21.5	
Jun-95					19.9								21.5	
Jan-96			3.06 U				1.04 U						21.5	
Mar-96	9.4		9.42		18.7		6.01	3.69 U					21.5	
Sep-96	7.54		11.9		13.7		2.22 U						21.5	
Mar-97	10.1	11	7.81		11.8		2.82 J						21.5	
Jun-97					12.3								21.5	
Sep-97	9.52	11.3	9.73		16.2		3.03 J						21.5	
Mar-98	8.07	4.54 U	13.2	9.83 U	15.2	15.2	1.62 U	1.62 U					21.5	
Aug-98	9.6		12.2		15.2		2.57	2.78					21.5	
Mar-99	6.1		7.9	1.2 U	14.4	3.8 U	2.9 U						21.5	
Sep-99	5.68	6.96	9.24		6.54 U		1.87 U						21.5	
Jan-00					12.9								21.5	
Mar-00													21.5	
Sep-00	0.307 U		11		13.9	13.1							21.5	
Dec-00					13.3								21.5	
Mar-01	4.63 U		13.8		16.7		6.72	2.74 U					21.5	
Jun-01					7.37								21.5	
Sep-01	3.1 U		12.3	-5.52 U	13.8		4.59 J						21.5	
Dec-01					9.14								21.5	
Mar-02	4.09	3.79	9.71	10.7	13.9		2.2	2.16 U					21.5	
Sep-02	4.66 J		8.34	12	14.3		2.3 U						21.5	
Mar-03	4.97		12.1		14.2		3.43						21.5	
Sep-03	2.91 U	-9.28 U	7.88 U		13.4		-1.82 U						21.5	
Mar-04	4.86		11.8		11		2.44 U	1.64 U					21.5	
Sep-04	4.99		13.6	13.3	6.53		2.52 U						21.5	
Mar-05	5.25 U	3.66 U	15.5		10.6		-1.61 U						21.5	
Sep-05	5.30		14.6		12.5		2.42 U	2.45 U					21.5	
Mar-06	2.87 U	1.91 U	13.5		7.66		0.379 U						21.5	
Sep-06	3.02 U		12.7	15.4	10.1		3.58 U						21.5	21.1
Mar-07	5.18		14.3		14.3	11.5	3.51						21.5	21.1
Sep-07	5.59		17	16	11.3		2.63 U						21.5	21.1
Mar-08	6.32				12.6	11.6			1.58 U		7.66			21.1
Jun-08									0.236 U		7.94			21.1
Sep-08	3.29				11.2				0.953 U		7.44	7.8		21.1
Dec-08									0.784 U		5.59	7.69		21.1
Mar-09	4.6				11.2				1.1 U		7.28	4.82		21.1
Sep-09	6.15	4.7 U			11.6				2.83		8.26			21.1

Table A-17. Iodine-129 Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
April-10	2.99 U				10				1.05 U	-0.853 U	5.52			21.1
Nov-10	4.82				10.6				.0651 U	0.767 U	5.3			21.1
Mar-11	3.21U				4.23	1.92U			1.44U		5.52			21.1
Sep-11	2.31U				8.68	7.81			1.12U		4.79			21.1
Mar-12	4.77				13.3				1.22	1.46	6.31			21.1
Sep-12	3.82				10.9	11.8			1.32		6.02			21.1
Mar-13	3.2				6.15	6.94			1.46		4.83			21.1
Sep-13	1.81				5.92				1.58	1.44	7.52			21.1

B = Estimated results
 C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
 D = Reported from dilution
 J = Estimated results
 U = Result is nondetected

Table A-18. Technetium-99 Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-95					60.2								94.9	
Mar-96	25.5		65		64.2		31	32					94.9	
Sep-96	20.3		53.5		52.3		32.1						94.9	
Mar-97	20	21.6	77.5		59.9		30						94.9	
Jun-97					64								94.9	
Sep-97	18.9	17.3	66.8		57		34.8						94.9	
Dec-97					64.2								94.9	
Mar-98	23.2		68.6	75.4	78.2		23.5						94.9	
Jun-98					73.6								94.9	
Aug-98	29.4		74.9		77.4		36.5	16.5					94.9	
Dec-98					72								94.9	
Mar-99	0 U		86	83	70.5	0 U	36						94.9	
Jun-99					0.0737 J								94.9	
Sep-99	40.4	34.3	85.2		90.1		44.6						94.9	
Jan-00					126								94.9	
Mar-01													94.9	
Jun-00					85.7								94.9	
Sep-00	35.6		80.1		85.6	76.5							94.9	
Dec-00					60.9								94.9	
Mar-01	45.5		75.9		92		40.2	42.3					94.9	
Jun-01					61.3								94.9	
Sep-01	47.6		56.5	63.7	72.3		46.9						94.9	
Dec-01					66.3								94.9	
Mar-02	51.4	61.3	71.8		76.1		46.3						94.9	
Sep-02	52.8		59.7	51.6	67.1		58.8						94.9	
Mar-03	61.3		62.1		66.3		56.5						94.9	
Sep-03	57.7	59.5	54.5		58.3		58.7						94.9	
Mar-04	59.4		54.7		56.4		66.7	68.1					94.9	
Sep-04	67.2		60.6	63.5	56.5		66.3						94.9	
Mar-05	68.6	78.4	66.2		57.2		65.5						94.9	
Sep-05	73.1		57		50.9		71.8	73					94.9	
Mar-06	74.3	80	59.2		46		60.4						94.9	
Sep-06	75.2		47.1	48.3	40.7		64.5						94.9	93.8
Mar-07	73.3		51.5		40.6	39	67.7						94.9	93.8
Sep-07	84.3		46.7	51.5	37		72.8							93.8
Mar-08	76.9				39	33.2			63.4		67.7			93.8
Jun-08									63.8		65.4			93.8
Sep-08	74.8				33.7				61.3		64.5	66.6		93.8
Dec-08									64.8		64.1	62.3		93.8

Table A-18. Technetium-99 Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-09	94.7				38.6				77.8		74	71.8		93.8
Sep-09	95.4	99.5			38				69.1		70.6			93.8
April-10	102				38				73.7	78.6	70.6			93.8
Nov-10	100				35.8				73.5	68.5	70.8			93.8
Mar-11	113				35.1	6.84			73.3		74.4			93.8
Sep-11	124				32.1	33.7			76.6		68.6			93.8
Mar-12	114				32.2				66.1	32.5	61.8			93.8
Sep-12	128				29.1	34.6			66.8		67.7			93.8
Mar-13	91				24.8	27.5			54.7		48.8			93.8
Sep-13	103				28.7				54.4	56	48.2			93.8

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-19. Radium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	0.141 U		0.207 U		0.521 U		0.276 U	0.235 J					0.5	
Sep-96	0.0497 U		0.135 J		0.0482 U		0.0248 U						0.5	
Mar-97	0.0235 U		0.065 J		0.0577 U		0.07 U						0.5	
Sep-97	0.0723 U	0.0358U	0.0353 U		0.123 U		0.0748 U						0.5	
Mar-98	0.078 U		0.21 J	0.103 U	0.148 U		0.114 U						0.5	
Aug-98	0.0391 U		0.0864 U		0.14 U		0.135 U	0.0544 U					0.5	
Mar-99	0.001 U		0.088 U	0 U	0.087 U		0.017 U						0.5	
Sep-99	0.025 U	.088 U	0.083 U		0.195 U		-0.068 U						0.5	
Mar-00													0.5	
Sep-00	0.827 U		1.99 J		-0.261 U	0.182 U							0.5	
Mar-01	0.144 U		0.431 U		-0.037 U		0.033 U	0.931 U					0.5	
Sep-01	-0.387 U		-0.537 U	0.506 U	0.675 U		0.18 U						0.5	
Mar-02	0.94 J	0.599 U	0.063 U		0.383 U		0.258 U						0.5	
Sep-02	-0.147 U		0.332 U	-0.143 U	0.147 U		-0.271 U						0.5	
Mar-03	0.345 U		0.474 U		-0.392 U		0.637 U						0.5	
Sep-03	-0.063 U	-.009 U	0.092 U		0.039 U		0.039 U						0.5	
Mar-04	0.232 U		0.611 U		0.57 U		0.265 U	0.411 U					0.5	
Sep-04	-0.022 U		-0.05 U	-0.128 U	-0.083 U		-0.051 U						0.5	
Mar-05	0.144 U	-.045 U	0.089 U		0.037 U		-0.058 U						0.5	
Sep-05	0.168 U		0.085 U		0.059 U		0.036 U	0.04 U					0.5	
Mar-06	-0.294 U	-0.042 U	0.045 U		-0.199 U		-0.194 U						0.5	
Sep-06	-0.215 U		-0.117 U	0.073 U	-0.327 U		0.06 U						0.5	0.695
Mar-07	-0.136 UJ		-0.395 UJ		-0.301 U	-.21 UJ	-0.327 UJ						0.5	0.695
Sep-07	-0.229 U		-0.008 U	.067 U	-0.121 U		-0.399 U							0.695
Mar-08	-0.019 U				-0.052 U	0.096 U			0.102 U		0.046 U			0.695
Jun-08									0.077 U		0.174 U			0.695
Sep-08	0.023 U				0.027 U				0.1 U		-0.033 U	.424 U		0.695
Dec-08									0.088 U		-0.069 U	.024 U		0.695
Mar-09	-0.14 U				-0.104 U				-0.281 U		-0.1 U	.021 U		0.695
Sep-09	0.078 U				0.053 U				0.036 U		0.271 U			0.695
April-10	0.148 U				-0.005 U				0.089 U	0.048 U	0.015 U			0.695
Nov-10	0.056 U				0.006 U				0.013 U	0.004 U	0.144 U			0.695
Mar-11	-0.032U				0.163U	.045U			0.104U		0.098U			0.695
Sep-11	0.028U				0.057U	.021U			0.072U		0.1U			0.695
Mar-12	-0.038U				0.054U				0.049U	0.188U	0.026U			0.695

Table A-19. Radium Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-12	0.23U				0.177U	0.295U			0.25U		0.121U			0.695
Mar-13	0.048U				0.021U	-0.331U			0.039U		0U			0.695
Sep-13	0.0296U				0.0762				0.0759U	0.0636U	-0.0703U			0.695

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was \leq 5x the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-20. Carbon Tetrachloride Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	5 U		2 J		4 J		5 U	5 U					10.6	
Sep-96	4 J	5 U	7		7		5 J						10.6	
Mar-97	4 J	3 J	6		7		4 J						10.6	
Jun-97					7								10.6	
Sep-97	5 U	5 U	4 J		11		5 U						10.6	
Mar-98													10.6	
Jun-98					10 U								10.6	
Aug-98	2 J		6		5		3 J	3 J					10.6	
Mar-99	1 J		4 J	4 J	7		3 J						10.6	
Sep-99	5 U	1 J	4 J		5		3 J						10.6	
Mar-00													10.6	
Jun-00					7.1								10.6	
Sep-00	1 J		5		9	9							10.6	
Mar-01	1 J		6		7		5.26	5					10.6	
Sep-01	5 U		4 J	4 J	7		5 J						10.6	
Mar-02	1 J	1 J	5		9		5						10.6	
Sep-02	1,011 J		5,018	5,243	8		5,854						10.6	
Mar-03	5 U		4 J		6		5 J						10.6	
Sep-03	5 U	5 U	4 J		6		5						10.6	
Mar-04	1 J		6		8		7.416						10.6	
Sep-04	1 J		5	6	8		7	7,223					10.6	
Mar-05	1 J	1 J	6	6	7		8						10.6	
Sep-05	5 U		6		7		8	8					10.6	
Mar-06	1 J	1 J	4 J		5 J		10						10.6	
Sep-06	5 U		5 J	5 J	6		6						10.6	11
Mar-07	1 J		5 J		4 J	5 J	7 J						10.6	11
Sep-07	5 U		6	6	5		8							11
Mar-08	5 U				5 J	4 J			5 U		2 J			11
Jun-08									5 U		2 J			11
Sep-08	5 U				4 J				5 U		2 J	2 J		11
Dec-08									1.14 J		2.33 J	2.32 J		11
Mar-09	5 U				4.05 J				5 U		1.52 J	1.6 J		11
Sep-09	5 U	5 U			4.35 J				5 U		1.85 J			11
April-10	5 U				3.02 J				5 U	5 U	1.63 J			11
Nov-10	5 U				4.61 J				1 J	5 U	2.01 J			11
Mar-11	5 U				3.22J	3.33J			5U		1.96J			11

Table A-20. Carbon Tetrachloride Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-11	5 U				3.08J	2.94J			1.07J		3.22J			11
Mar-12	5U				3.7J				5U	5U	1.69J			11
Sep-12	5U				4.51J	4.34J			1.21J		2.02J			11
Mar-13	0.95J				4.2	4.4			1.4		2.6			11
Sep-13	0.97J				3.7				1.6	1.6	2.1			11

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-21. Nitrogen Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-95					36.6								51.5	
Mar-96	4.58		20.2		31.9		35.6	36.5					51.5	
Sep-96	4.19		20.6		26.1		33.7						51.5	
Mar-97	0.419	40	22.6		21.3		34.1						51.5	
Sep-97	4.13	4.19	18.9		24.6		35.4						51.5	
Mar-98	4.62 D		20.4 D	20.1 D	25.3 D		34.3 D						51.5	
Aug-98	4.14		24		26.3		35.2	34.5					51.5	
Mar-99	4.53		20.8	20.6	24.6		31.8						51.5	
Sep-99	4.6	4.5	20		23.7		33						51.5	
Mar-00													51.5	
Sep-00	4.7		19.1		24.6	23.2							51.5	
Mar-01	5.5		19.9		24.7		31.3	32.2					51.5	
Sep-01	4.6		17.3	17.6	23		29.3						51.5	
Mar-02	4.6	4.5	16.3		18.9		27.9						51.5	
Sep-02	4.48		15.8	15.8	19		26.6						51.5	
Mar-03	4.8		17		21.4		29.7						51.5	
Sep-03	5.1 D	5.1 D	15.9 D		19.3 D		29.2 D						51.5	
Mar-04	4.8 D		14.4 D		16.8 D		32.4 D	26 D					51.5	
Sep-04	4.9		15.3	15.8	16.8		26.8						51.5	
Mar-05	5.1	5.1	14.3		15.6		25.8						51.5	
Sep-05	7.72 D		12.5 D		14.4 D		24.6 D	24 D					51.5	
Mar-06	4.6 D	4.6 D	12.9 D		13.8 D		23.7 D						51.5	
Sep-06	5.3		13.4 D	13.2 D	13.3		22.8 D						51.5	51.1
Mar-07	4.8 D		13 D		13.8 D	14 D	28.9 D						51.5	51.1
Sep-07	4.4 D		12.7 D	12.7 D	10.7 D		22.7 D							51.1
Mar-08	3.1 D				6.2 D	6.1 D			39.8 D		9.4 D			51.1
Jun-08									36.2 D		13.4 D			51.1
Sep-08	3.4				6.6 D				38.3 D		9.4 D	9.7 D		51.1
Mar-09	4.6 D				8.3 D				35.1 D		13.3 D	12.6 D		51.1
Sep-09	4.44 D	4.36 D			7.52 D				33.8 D		12.4 D			51.1
April-10	5.28 D				7.72 D				35.1 D	91.2	12.4 D			51.1
Nov-10	4.73 D				6.6 D				32.1 D	33.8 D	6.8 D			51.1
Mar-11	5.27D				7.3D	7.28D			37.8D		13.8D			51.1
Sep-11	5.68D				7.31D	7.31D			35.8D		7.3D			51.1

Table A-21. Nitrogen Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-12	5.27D				6.95D				34.1D	33D	11.4D			51.1
Sep-12	5.2D				6.74D	6.92D			34.1D		11.9D			51.1
Mar-13	5.7D				7.01D	6.7D			34.8D		12.5D			51.1
Sep-13	6.3D				7.15D				39.8D	39.6D	14.1D			51.1

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-22. Total Organic Halides Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	6.6 J		10.5 J		5.6 J		6.6 J	5					9.5	
Sep-96	5 U		5 U		5 U		5 U						9.5	
Mar-97	5 U		5 U		2.9		5 U						9.5	
Jun-97					11.7								9.5	
Sep-97	6.05	4.62 U	7.05		4.62 U		5 U						9.5	
Mar-98	4.62 U		4.62 U	4.62 U	4.62 U		4.62 U						9.5	
Aug-98	5.9		5.85		6.7		5 U	5 U					9.5	
Mar-99	24 U		12 U	24 U	34.5		14.3						9.5	
Sep-99	128	12 U	206		12 U		12 U						9.5	
Jan-00					14								9.5	
Mar-00													9.5	
Jun-00					4.4 B								9.5	
Sep-00	206		271		180	181							9.5	
Dec-00					10.6								9.5	
Mar-01	17.1 U		20 U		20 U		20 U	20 U					9.5	
Sep-01	6.5 U		8.7 U	7.4 U	6.5 U		6.6 U						9.5	
Dec-01					13.2								9.5	
Mar-02	5.2 U	6.1	9.3		9.5		5.2 U						9.5	
Sep-02	10.5		5.6	5.2 U	8.5		60.6						9.5	
Mar-03	5.2 U		6.3		5.3		5.2 U						9.5	
Sep-03	5.2 U	5.2 U	6.2		6.8		6.3						9.5	
Mar-04	6.7		5.7		9.8		5.2 U	6.4					9.5	
Sep-04	5.2 U		5.2 U	5.2 U	6.7		5.2 U						9.5	
Mar-05	5 U	6.3	8.1		12.8		11.4						9.5	
Sep-05	5 U		8.83		12.2		7.46	5.51					9.5	
Mar-06	5.2 UC	15.9 C	5.2 UC		9.2 C		10.6 D						9.5	
Sep-06	16.9		5 U	5 U	6.1		38.9						9.5	5
Mar-07	5.2 U		5.2 U		5.2 U	5.2 UJ	7.2						9.5	5
Sep-07	5.2 U		5.2 U	5.2 U	5.2 U		5.2 U							5
Mar-08	5.2 U				5.2 U	5.2			9.8		7.1			5
Jun-08	5.5								5.2 U		5.2 U			5
Sep-08					5 U	5.2 U					5.2 U	5.9		5
Mar-09	5 U				5 U				5 U		5 U	5 U		5
Sep-09	2.77 B	5.38			4.96 B				5.23		14.5			5

Table A-22. Total Organic Halides Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
April-10	5 U				5 U				1.89 B	3.8 B	0.72 B			5
Nov-10	40 U				40 U				40 U	26.4 B	40 U			5
Mar-11	40U				40U	40U			40U		40U			5
Sep-11	20U				10U	10U			10U		20U			5
Mar-12	10U				10U				10U	10U	10U			5
Sep-12	20U				20U	20U			20U		20U			5
Mar-13	6.8M				11.9M	10.3M			6.6M		7.6M			5
Sep-13	1.8U				5.7				3.7B	1.8U	3.9B			5

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-23. Total Dissolved Solids Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	254		340		384		401	420					573.6	
Sep-96	236		367		411		457						573.6	
Mar-97	283	279	404		390		514						573.6	
Jun-97					398								573.6	
Sep-97	277	278	377		401		463						573.6	
Dec-97					379								573.6	
Mar-98	322		320	309	327		456						573.6	
Jun-98					472								573.6	
Aug-98	296		406		422		491	507					573.6	
Dec-98					344								573.6	
Mar-99	280		380	400	390	406	440						573.6	
Jun-99					407								573.6	
Sep-99	270	280	370		410		470						573.6	
Jan-00					355								573.6	
Mar-00													573.6	
Jun-00					434								573.6	
Sep-00	270		340		550	520							573.6	
Mar-01	278		407		400		349	436					573.6	
Sep-01	305		384	391	420		535						573.6	
Mar-02	265	258	333		358		430						573.6	
Sep-02	276		326	328	344		446						573.6	
Mar-03	260		337		349		407						573.6	
Sep-03	269	271	361		381		5U						573.6	
Mar-04	262		323		326		438	442					573.6	
Sep-04	262		331	330	355		392						573.6	
Mar-05	205	253	278		339		386						573.6	
Sep-05	292		387		403		460	500					573.6	
Mar-06	274	269	314		302		391						573.6	
Sep-06	270		464	409	311		521						573.6	570
Mar-07	271 J		312 J		310 J	314 J	388 J						573.6	570
Sep-07	259 J		309 J	363 J	304 J		498 J							570
Mar-08	274				295	341			438		344			570
Jun-08									508		222			570
Sep-08	268				285				477		337	345		570
Mar-09	263				291				439		326	301		570
Sep-09	262	286			290				520		344			570

Table A-23. Total Dissolved Solids Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
April-10	270				285				485	481	336			570
Nov-10	257				258				442	430	323			570
Mar-11	260				305	295			414		301			570
Sept-11	240				267	272			396		289			570
Mar-12	282				291				458	478	346			570
Sep-12	269				295	295			476		441			570
Mar-13	266				270	270			446		266			570
Sep-13	301				266				514	518	357			570

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was \leq 5x the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-24. Turbidity Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Mar-96	0.34 J		0.3 J		0.26 J		3.21 J	1.48 J					50	
Sep-96													50	
Mar-97	0.71		8.91		0.84		60.6						50	
Jun-97					1.78								50	
Sep-97	1.9		14.4		1.33		4.56						50	
Dec-97					1.38								50	
Mar-98	1.65		23.4		3.52		4.85						50	
Jun-98					3.99								50	
Aug-98	1.29		90.5				2.95						50	
Dec-98					2.62								50	
Mar-99			52.6		4.54								50	
Jun-99					3.25								50	
Sep-99	2.29		87.2		2.68								50	
Jan-00					4.12								50	
Mar-00													50	
Jun-00					1.63								50	
Sep-00	2.3		142		2.6								50	
Dec-00					2.41								50	
Mar-01	1.71		38.2		1.06		16.7						50	
Jun-01					1.71								50	
Sep-01	1.54		3.35		1.17		6.62						50	
Dec-01					4.12								50	
Mar-02	1.85		11.1		5		7.4						50	
Sep-02	2.2		5.6		4.7		6.7						50	
Mar-03	1.86		962		1.29		15						50	
Sep-03	2.41		41.6		2.68		49.7						50	
Mar-04	2.01		16.3		2.49		15						50	
Sep-04	2.93		16.9		4.65		4.19						50	
Mar-05	2.78		7.53		2.13		4.16						50	
Sep-05	0.73		4.61		3.88		3.94						50	
Mar-06	1.93		7.21		1.39		4.07						50	
Sep-06	1.12		4.02		4.41		4.6						50	49.8
Mar-07	1.65		4.99		1.94		7.02						50	49.8
Sep-07	1.17		4.57		3.94		13.5							49.8
Mar-08	2.77				4.74				0.87		3.56			49.8
Jun-08									3.95		2.61			49.8

Table A-24. Turbidity Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Sep-08	2.83				1.31				1.93		1.24			49.8
Dec-08									1.65		2.23			49.8
Mar-09	3.49				2.52				0.8		0.57			49.8
Sep-09	1.85				0.97				3.01		1.12			49.8
April-10	3.27				2.43				0.77		2.1			49.8
Nov-10	2.69				1.32				4.03		0.73			49.8
Mar-11	4.12				1.71				2.3		1.26			49.8
Sept-11	3.11				1.38				0.62		0.32			49.8
Mar-12	3.49				2				2.51		0.93			49.8
Sep-12	4.49				1.55				2.35		0.59			49.8
Mar-13	4.36				2.15				0.33		1.12			49.8
Sep-13	4.28				4.33				0.86		0.42			49.8

B = Estimated results
 C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
 D = Reported from dilution
 J = Estimated results
 U = Result is nondetected

Table A-25. pH Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Jan-96			7.71				7.68						8	
Mar-96	7.66				7.8								8	
Sep-96					7.7								8	
Mar-97	7.82		7.68		7.67		7.64						8	
Jun-97					7.75								8	
Sep-97	7.86		7.86		7.76		7.74						8	
Dec-97					7.81								8	
Mar-98	7.86		7.8		7.64		7.71						8	
Jun-98					7.72								8	
Aug-98	7.95		8.31		7.95		7.77						8	
Dec-98					7.8								8	
Mar-99			7.72		7.71								8	
Jun-99					7.61								8	
Sep-99	7.95		7.69		7.82								8	
Jan-00					7.77								8	
Jun-00					7.71								8	
Sep-00	7.9		7.7		7.8								8	
Dec-00					7.75								8	
Mar-01	8.56		7.7		7.84		7.74						8	
Jun-01					7.68								8	
Sep-01	7.77		7.7		7.7		7.78						8	
Dec-01					7.74								8	
Mar-02	7.89		7.83		7.73		7.8						8	
Sep-02	7.9		7.8		7.7		7.8						8	
Mar-03	7.9		7.79		7.71		7.76						8	
Sep-03	7.85		7.76		7.63		7.67						8	
Mar-04	7.89		7.77		7.63		7.78						8	
Sep-04	7.76		7.78		7.68		7.76						8	
Mar-05	7.86		7.74		7.64		7.83						8	
Sep-05	7.84		7.74		7.59		7.81						8	
Mar-06	7.9		7.74		7.69		7.86						8	
Sep-06	7.81		7.78		7.72		7.8						8	8.01
Mar-07	7.86		7.78		7.77		8.08						8	8.01
Sep-07	8.07		7.79		7.8		7.9							8.01
Mar-08	7.77				7.62				7.51		7.55			8.01
Jun-08									7.5		7.56			8.01
Sep-08	7.35				7.56				7.47		7.52			8.01

Table A-25. pH Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Dec-08									7.67		7.75			8.01
Mar-09	7.91				7.77				7.67		7.75			8.01
Sep-09	7.95				7.8				7.6		7.73			8.01
April-10	7.99				7.84				7.7		7.82			8.01
Nov-10	7.97				7.8				7.5		7.71			8.01
Mar-11	8.09				7.77				7.72		7.89			8.01
Sept-11	7.95				7.79				7.76		7.9			8.01
Mar-12	7.9				7.81				7.66		7.72			8.01
Sep-12	7.9				7.68				7.65		7.79			8.01
Mar-13	7.87				7.97				7.8		7.74			8.01
Sep-13	7.9				7.82				7.69		7.82			8.01

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

Table A-26. Specific Conductance Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Jan-96			461				547						743	
Mar-96	402				618								743	
Sep-96					595								743	
Mar-97	428		545		562		630						743	
Jun-97					591								743	
Sep-97	423		540		575		614						743	
Dec-97					483								743	
Mar-98	441		534		565		671						743	
Jun-98					505								743	
Aug-98	405		510		546		270						743	
Dec-98					558	571 C							743	
Mar-99			577		585	552 C							743	
Jun-99					556 C	571 C							743	
Sep-99	413		541		578								743	
Jan-00					533 C	584							743	
Mar-00													743	
Jun-00					576								743	
Sep-00	412		537		565								743	
Dec-00					537 C	563							743	
Mar-01	416		533		555		618						743	
Jun-01					547								743	
Sep-01	423		522		540		601						743	
Dec-01					460	530							743	
Mar-02	473		518		522		605						743	
Sep-02	412		517		537		605						743	
Mar-03	409		505		535		594						743	
Sep-03	395		502		500		425						743	
Mar-04	409		500		487		604						743	
Sep-04	406		486		483		588						743	
Mar-05	405		487		470		596						743	
Sep-05	402		471		469		562						743	
Mar-06	402		482		465		573						743	
Sep-06	407		475		454		553						743	774
Mar-07	408		482		455		567						743	774
Sep-07	400		491		441		574							774
Mar-08	408				429				667		515			774
Jun-08									676		507			774
Sep-08	397				400				648		500			774


Table A-26. Specific Conductance Data. (2 Pages)

Sample Date	699-35-66A (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-67 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-36-70A (Up-gradient)	DUP	699-37-68 (Retired 2007)	DUP	699-37-66 (Down-gradient)	DUP	699-36-66B (Down-gradient)	DUP	Old Limit (Through 2006)	New Limit (2007 Onward)
Dec-08									666		504			774
Mar-09	402				421				636		504			774
Sep-09	378				411				617		472			774
April-10	394				396				634		490			774
Nov-10	401				402				656		498			774
Mar-11	404				414				648		500			774
Sept-11	409				400				627		479			774
Mar-12	422				392				641		492			774
Sep-12	401				394				638		491			774
Mar-13	400				383				630		489			
Sep-13	402				389				640		481			

- B = Estimated results
- C = Detected in both the sample and QC blank, and sample concentration was $\leq 5x$ the blank concentration
- D = Reported from dilution
- J = Estimated results
- U = Result is nondetected

APPENDIX B
GROUNDWATER SAMPLING TRENDS, 1996-2013

Figure B-1 Arsenic (Filtered)



Note - Open markers identify non-detects at the indicated concentration

Date




Figure B-2 Barium (Filtered)






Figure B-3 Chromium (Filtered)



Note - Open markers identify non-detects at the indicated concentration **Date**




Figure B-4 Lead (Filtered)






Figure B-5 Selenium (Filtered)



Note - Open markers identify non-detects at the indicated concentration **Date**




Figure B-6 Uranium




Figure B-7 Tin (Filtered)





Figure B-8 Vanadium (Filtered)



Note - Open markers identify non-detects at the indicated concentration **Date**





Figure B-9 Zinc (Filtered)



Note - Open markers identify non-detects at the indicated concentration **Date**




Figure B-10 Alkalinity





Figure B-11 Fluoride



Note - Open markers identify non-detects at the indicated concentration

Date




Figure B-12 Chloride




Figure B-13 Sulfate




Figure B-14 Gross Alpha





Figure B-15 Gross Beta





Figure B-16 Carbon-14



Note - Open markers identify non-detects at the indicated concentration **Date**




Figure B-17 Iodine-129






Figure B-18 Technetium-99



Note - Open markers identify non-detects at the indicated concentration Date




Figure B-19 Radium





Figure B-20 Carbon Tetrachloride




Figure B-21 Nitrogen in Nitrite and Nitrate




Figure B-22 Total Organic Halides





Figure B-23 Total Dissolved Solids




Figure B-24 Turbidity




Figure B-25 pH





Figure B-26 Specific Conductance



APPENDIX C
LEACHATE SAMPLING RESULTS SUMMARY, 2011-2013

Table C-1. Leachate Sample Data. (2 Pages)

Constituent	Mar-11	Mar-11	Oct-11	Oct-11	Mar-12	Mar-12	Sep-12	Sep-12	Mar-13	Mar-13	Feb-14	Feb-14	Units
Aluminum	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	17.8U	21.5U	NR	NR	NR	NR	ug/L
Antimony	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	6U	6U	NR	NR	NR	NR	ug/L
Arsenic*	11.6	17.5	4.62	5.93	5.55	6.64	4.02	5.67	6 B	6.4 B	6.6	6.6	ug/L
Barium*	183	317	94.3	90.4	99	104	72.8	72.5	97	96	90	90	ug/L
Beryllium*	1U	1U	1U	1U	1U	1U	2U	2U	0.47 U	0.47 U	0.47 U	0.47 U	ug/L
Calcium	278000	405000	204000	194000	265000	274000	180000	184000	267000	261000	292000	286000	ug/L
Chromium*	43.6	79.5	13.8	13.4	19.9	20.5	21.5	21.5	53	50	54	53	ug/L
Copper	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	145	145	NR	NR	NR	NR	ug/L
Iron	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	15.5B	13B	NR	NR	NR	NR	ug/L
Lead*	15.6	21.6	10	9.86	10	10	5	5	2.6 U	2.6 U	2.6 U	2.6 U	ug/L
Magnesium	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	53000	54500	NR	NR	NR	NR	ug/L
Nickel	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	6.34B	6.29B	NR	NR	NR	NR	ug/L
Potassium*	18400	19800	16300	15800	19000	19800	14000	14000	20600	20500	20000	19900	ug/L
Selenium*	9.84	12.2	6.84	8.02	10	10	3.28	3.44	4.9 U	4.9 U	14	9.7 B	ug/L
Silicon*	26300	36500	18500	17700	20900	21800	16200	16600	19600	19800	21000	20500	ug/L
Sodium*	213000	213000	191000	184000	209000	213000	154000	153000	212000	212000	235000	233000	ug/L
Tin*	5	5	5	5	5	5	100	100	5.8 U	5.8 U	5.8 U	5.8 U	ug/L
Thallium*	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	4.9 U	4.9 U	4.9 U	4.9 U	ug/L
Vanadium*	67.4	102	35.5	34.1	27.1	27.9	33.2	33.2	19	19	18	18	ug/L
Zinc*	33	81.5	20	20	20	20	10	13.3	4.5 U	4.5 U	5.3 BC	6 BC	ug/L
Carbon tetra-chloride*	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	0.19 U	0.19 U	0.19 U	0.19 U	ug/L
Trichloro-ethene*	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	5U	0.16 U	0.16 U	0.16 U	0.16 U	ug/L
Methyl alcohol	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	5U	5U	NR	NR	NR	NR	ug/L
Trichloro-fluoromethane	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	5U	5U	NR	NR	NR	NR	ug/L
pH*	7.54	7.55	7.99	7.84	7.61	7.68	8.09	8.09	7.39	7.77	7.58	7.63	Ph
Specific conductance*	2300	2280	2500	2350	3270D	3240D	1970	1960	2600	2670	2670	2700	umS/cm
Bromide*	25000U D	25000U D	1500	1520	1820	1900	1320	1350	2300 BD	2300 BD	3400	3500 N	ug/L
Chloride*	240000D	210000D	221000D	223000D	273000D	273000D	168000	170000	261000D	258000D	309000D	310000D	ug/L
Fluoride*	25000U D	25000U D	240B	240B	240B	240B	250B	270B	270 B	290 B	330 B	330 G	ug/L
Nitrate*	311000D	426000D	202000D	206000D	281000D	283000D	172000	171000	244100D	242800D	293300D	290600D	ug/L
Nitrite*	25000U D	25000U D	25000U D	25000U D	5000UD	5000UD	1000U	1000U	160 U	160 U	160 U	160 U	ug/L
Sulfate*	597000D	556000D	488000D	489000D	538000D	542000D	379000	383000	599000D	582000D	582000D	576000D	ug/L

Groundwater Leachate, and Lysimeter Monitoring and Sampling at ERDF, CY 2013
August 2014

C-1

MCH-590
Rev. 0


Table C-1. Leachate Sample Data. (2 Pages)

Constituent	Mar-11	Mar-11	Oct-11	Oct-11	Mar-12	Mar-12	Sep-12	Sep-12	Mar-13	Mar-13	Feb-14	Feb-14	Units
Total organic carbon	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	6350	6380	NR	NR	NR	NR	ug/L
Total organic halides*	42.1	27.5B	27.8	43	33.9B	28B	20U	20U	52	59	69	79	ug/L
Oil and grease	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	2000U	5700B	NR	NR	NR	NR	ug/L
Total dissolved solids*	1670000	1700000	1780000	1800000	1760000	2080000	1350000	1370000	1820000	1830000	1970000	1970000	ug/L
Total suspended solids*	10000	112000	7000	15000	5000	5000	5000	5000	1100 U	2000 B	1100 U	2800 U	ug/L
Alkalinity*	238000	245000	298000	361000	380000	378000	234000	234000	303000	308000	307000	309000	ug/L
Gross alpha*	845	864	410	520	536	558	502	466	528	603	350	380	pCi/L
Gross beta*	426	432	323	310	474	498	340	355	468	477	396	390	pCi/L
Carbon-14*	26.7U	43.7	22.6U	11.4U	43.1U	19.5U	48.2U	54.4U	280	181	218	210	pCi/L
Technetium-99*	363	376	280	295	409	413	259	253	255	248	309	300	pCi/L
Uranium (total) *	1480	1520	812	865	1320	1350	744	714	889	982	1350	1370	ug/L
Iodine-129*	3U	0.436U	-0.46U	-1.34U	-0.811U	-1.62U	-0.45U	0.16U	-.179 U	.861 U	.984 U	.219 U	pCi/L
Total radium alpha emissions*	0.051U	0.028U	0.137U	0.248U	0.021U	0.022U	0.046U	0.049U	.0512 U	.0058 U	.644 U	.402 U	pCi/L
Tritium*	66600	65300	53000	54700	70800	69800	53400	53600	73400	73800	95400	96900	pCi/L


*Routine short list analyses performed on 6 month cycle. Routine analysis includes gamma energy analysis, no detected analytes reported to date.

APPENDIX D
LEACHATE SAMPLING TRENDS, 1998-2013


ARSENIC




BARIUM




CHROMIUM



LEAD




POTASSIUM




Groundwater, Leachate, and Lysimeter Monitoring and Sampling at ERDF, CY 2013
August 2014


SELENIUM




Silicon




SODIUM




TIN



VANADIUM




ZINC




Note - Open markers identify non-detects at the indicated concentration


DATE




CHLORIDE




NITRATE




SULFATE




TDS




GROSS ALPHA




GROSS BETA




Tc-99



URANIUM



TRITIUM



APPENDIX E
ERDF LYSIMETER SAMPLING, CY 2013

Table E-1. Lysimeter Analytical Results.

Constituent	Cell 5 April 2013	Cell 5 Oct 2013	Cell 6 April 2013	Cell 6 Oct 2013	Cell 7 April 2013	Cell 7 Oct 2013	Units
Calcium	568,000	525,000	313,000	322,000	331,000	309,000	ug/L
Magnesium	102,000	979,000 X	650	750	71400	68900	ug/L
Potassium	28400	26100	24500	24500	27900	23700	ug/L
Sodium	175,000	163,000	163,000	173,000	281,000	294,000	ug/L
Chloride	88.0 D	88.3 D	102 D	105 D	80.1 D	83.5 D	mg/L
Nitrogen (in nitrite/nitrate)	55.8 D	58.9 D	57.1 D	47.3 D	6 D	5.7 D	mg/L
Nitrate	52.8 D	49.1D	55.3 D	55 D	5.8 D	5.3 D	mg/L
Sulfate	1970 D	1850 D	885 D	912 D	1440 D	1410 D	mg/L
Total dissolved solids	3260	3180	1750	1850	2180	2350	mg/L
Total suspended solids	45.6	10.8	14	1.1	691	50.8	mg/L
Total organic carbon	9.1	9.3	12.6	12.8	8.5	8.9	mg/L
Gross alpha	17 U	21.4 U	-0.43 U	9.24	21.5	28	pCi/L
Gross beta	39.9	38.1	21	21.2	33.3	26.3	pCi/L
Technetium-99	-4.56 U	-2.33 U	0.856 U	-0.46 U	0.096 U	0.312 U	pCi/L
Uranium (total)	36	24.8	0.214	0.058 U	29.9	22.7	ug/L
Uranium (filtered)	37.9	37.2	0.089	0.146	32	28.7	ug/L
pH	7.94	7.8	8.76	9.64	7.89	7.91	pH
Specific conductance	3470	27000	2160	2240	2730	2800	μS/cm

B = Organics: Method blanks contamination. Inorganics: Value is an estimate.

D = Result reported from secondary dilution

U = Result is nondetected

Table E-2. Lysimeter Analytical Results.

Constituent	Cell 8 April 2013	Cell 8 Oct 2013	Cell 9 April 2013	Cell 9 Oct 2013	Cell 10 April 2013	Cell 10 Oct 2013	Units
Calcium	492,000	546,000	328,000	342,000	204,000	193,000	ug/L
Magnesium	116,000	138,000	24,000	27,900	1300	1600	ug/L
Potassium	27200	27400	17200	16900	14100	12700	ug/L
Sodium	155,000	169,000	119,000	120,000	119000	109,000	ug/L
Chloride	1390 D	1670 D	104 D	94.8 D	54.5 D	57 D	mg/L
Nitrogen (in nitrite/nitrate)	51.9 D	58 D	59.3 D	61.5 D	19.9 D	28.6 D	mg/L
Nitrate	50.1 D	51.8 D	50.7 D	52.2 D	17.7 D	23 D	mg/L
Sulfate	1540 D	1930 D	1070	1100	647 D	644 D	mg/L
Total dissolved solids	2760	3340	1970	2080	1160	1190	mg/L
Total suspended solids	65.2	48.4	8	604	11.2	24.8	mg/L
Total organic carbon	14	12.1	8.7	8.6	8.8	9.3	mg/L
Gross alpha	27.5	0.57 U	4.46 U	1.76 U	1.28 U	1.67U	pCi/L
Gross beta	38	45.8	18.6	22	9.59	4.21 U	pCi/L
Technetium-99	3.04 U	3.19 U	-0.13 U	8.08 U	-4.47 U	-1.92 U	pCi/L
Uranium (total)	43.4	8.29	1.24	0.825	0.253	1.57	ug/L
Uranium (filtered)	42.5	31.6	0.111	1.27	0.182	0.137	ug/L
pH	7.69	7.66	7.93	7.92	7.99	7.81	pH
Specific conductance	3230	3700	2350	2400	1510	1540	μS/cm

B = Organics: Method blanks contamination. Inorganics: Value is an estimate.

D = Result reported from secondary dilution

U = Result is nondetected

DISTRIBUTION

Washington Closure Hanford

W. A. Borlaug	T2-03
M. A. Casbon	T2-03
J. A. Lerch	H4-22
B. L. Lawrence (3)	T2-03
D. W. St. John	H4-21
R. L. Weiss	H4-21

Document Control	H4-11
DOE-RL Public Reading Room	H2-53
Hanford Technical Library	K3-78

