


ND-ALPS 360


INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM PHASE 1 RECORDS SEARCH 2/1
FOR THE 187TH TAC. (U) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TECHNICAL
CENTER ROCKVILLE MD JUL 87 DLA900-82-C-4426

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 24/3

ML





MICROGRAPH RESOLUTION TEST CHART
 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

DTIC FILE COPY


①

INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM

AD-A195 368


Phase I Records Search

187th Tactical Fighter Group
Alabama Air National Guard
Dannelly Field Municipal Airport
Montgomery, Alabama



Hazardous Materials Technical Center
July 1987

This document has been approved
for public release and sale; its
distribution is unlimited.



This report has been prepared for the National Guard Bureau, Washington, DC, by the Hazardous Materials Technical Center for the purpose of aiding in the implementation of the Air Force Installation Restoration Program.

DISTRIBUTION: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

1

INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM
PHASE I - RECORDS SEARCH FOR

187th TACTICAL FIGHTER GROUP
ALABAMA AIR NATIONAL GUARD
DANNELLY FIELD MUNICIPAL AIRPORT
MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA



July 1987

Prepared for
National Guard Bureau
Washington, DC 20310

Prepared by
The Hazardous Materials Technical Center
The Dynamac Building
11140 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Contract No. DLA 900-82-C-4426

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

DTIC
ELECTE
MAY 16 1988
E

This document has been approved
for public release and sale; its
distribution is unlimited.

88 12 0 91

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
I. INTRODUCTION	I-1
A. Background	I-1
B. Purpose	I-1
C. Scope	I-2
D. Methodology	I-3
II. INSTALLATION DESCRIPTION	II-1
A. Location	II-1
B. Organization and History	II-1
III. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	III-1
A. Meteorology	III-1
B. Geology	III-1
C. Hydrology	III-3
IV. SITE EVALUATION	IV-1
A. Activity Review	IV-1
B. Disposal/Spill Site Identification, Evaluation, and Hazard Assessment	IV-1
C. Critical Habitats/Endangered or Threatened Species	IV-12
D. Other Pertinent Facts	IV-12
V. CONCLUSIONS	V-1
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS	VI-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	GL-1
BIBLIOGRAPHY	BI-1
APPENDIX A - Resumes of HMTG Search Team Members	A-1
APPENDIX B - Interviewee Information	B-1
APPENDIX C - Outside Agency Contact List	C-1
APPENDIX D - USAF Hazard Assessment Rating Methodology	D-1
APPENDIX E - Site Hazardous Assessment Rating Forms and Factor Rating Criteria	E-1
APPENDIX F - Analytical Results of Sampling at the 187th Tactical Fighter Group, Alabama Air National Guard, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama	F-1

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Records Search Methodology Flow Chart	I-4
2. Site Map of Alabama ANG, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama	II-2
3. Locations of Sites at Alabama ANG, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama	IV-4

LIST OF TABLES

1. Hazardous Waste Disposal Summary: Alabama ANG, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama	IV-2
2. Site Hazard Assessment Scores (as derived from HARM): Alabama ANG, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama	IV-5

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

The Hazardous Materials Technical Center (HMTc) was retained in November 1986 to conduct the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Phase I - Records Search of the 187th Tactical Fighter Group (TFG), Alabama Air National Guard Installation, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama (hereinafter referred to as the Base), under Contract No. DLA 900-82-C-4426 (Records Search). The Records Search included:

- o an onsite Base visit including interviews with 20 Base employees conducted by HMTc personnel during 19-21 November 1986;
- o the acquisition and analysis of pertinent information and records on hazardous materials use, and hazardous waste generation and disposal at the Base;
- o the acquisition and analysis of available geologic, hydrologic, meteorologic and environmental data from pertinent Federal, State and local agencies; and
- o the identification of sites on the Base which may be potentially contaminated with hazardous materials/hazardous waste.

B. MAJOR FINDINGS

The major operations of the 187th TFG that have used and disposed of hazardous materials/hazardous waste include aircraft maintenance; aerospace ground equipment (AGE) maintenance; ground vehicle maintenance; and petroleum, oil, and lubricant (POL) management and distribution. The operations involve such activities as corrosion control, nondestructive inspection (NDI), fuel cell maintenance, engine maintenance, aircraft refueling and pneudraulics. Varying quantities of waste oils, recovered fuels, paints, thinners, strippers, and solvents were generated and disposed of by these activities.

Interviews with 20 Base personnel and a field survey resulted in the identification of five disposal and/or spill sites at the Base which existed at the time of the HMTc site visit.

These sites are potentially contaminated with hazardous materials/hazardous waste:

- Site No. 1 - POL Facility
- Site No. 2 - Oil/Water Separator and Tank, Building 1304
- Site No. 3 - Storm Drainage Discharge Point, East
- Site No. 4 - Edge of Aircraft Parking Apron
- Site No. 5 - Storm Drainage Discharge Point, West

At Site No. 1, a shallow excavation revealed the presence of what smelled like JP-4 floating on shallow groundwater. Analysis by the Air Force Occupational and Environmental Health Laboratory (AF/OEHL) of groundwater samples taken from an excavation next to Site No. 2, also showed the presence of contamination. Oil or fuel sheens were noted floating on the storm water at Site Nos. 3 and 5, indicating possible offsite contaminant migration. There is evident vegetative discoloration or stress at Site No. 4 where contaminant releases have been reported.

C. CONCLUSION

Each of the identified potentially contaminated hazardous materials/hazardous waste sites have been evaluated and given a Hazard Assessment Score (HAS) utilizing the Air Force Hazard Assessment Rating Methodology (HARM):

Site No. 1 - POL Facility (HAS-64)

At the POL facility, there is evidence of past underground storage tank (UST) leakage and reports of minor JP-4 spillage. Groundwater entering a shallow hole that was dug here smelled of JP-4. JP-4 fumes were also evident in storm sewer manholes adjacent to the POL facility.

Site No. 2 - Oil/Water Separator and Tank, Building 1304 (HAS-64)

Vegetative stress around this UST and oil/water separator (OWS) indicates that some spillage of oils and waste JP-4 has occurred here. Contaminated groundwater is seeping from beneath a concrete conduit located 3 to 5 feet from the UST/OWS and it is likely that the UST/OWS is the source of contaminants in this leakage. The contents of the OWS includes solvents, paint strippers, and lacquer thinners. The total quantity of waste released at this site is not known.

Site No. 3 - Storm Drainage Discharge Point, East (HAS-63)

This site is the discharge point for storm drainage from a large portion of the Base. Spills from the AGE shop are routed to this point. Also, potentially contaminated groundwater underlying the POL facility discharges at this point. POL sheens have been observed on water at this site since 1982.

Site No. 4 - Edge of Aircraft Parking Apron (HAS-53)

It has been reported that PD-680 and hydraulic fluids have frequently been washed to the edge of the aircraft parking apron. Also, four to five hundred gallons of JP-4 were spilled at this site in 1980.

Site No. 5 - Storm Drainage Discharge Point, West (HAS-56)

A 500-gallon JP-4 spill was routed to this discharge point in 1976. Contaminants leaking from the ground at Site No. 2 are also discharged at this point.

The most likely receptors of potential groundwater contamination resulting from these sites are consumers of drinking water from nearby wells. However, potential threats to local wells are mitigated by the presence of the Mooreville Chalk, which confines the uppermost aquifer. Some sites present potential threats to nearby surface waters either as a result of direct discharge of contaminated storm drainage, or from discharge of potentially contaminated shallow groundwater into nearby surface streams. Likely receptors to any potential surface water contamination are persons using nearby streams for recreational purposes, such as fishing.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of the potential for contaminant migration to possible receptors, initial investigative stages of the IRP Phase II/IVA are recommended for the five sites potentially contaminated with hazardous materials/hazardous waste. The primary purposes of the subsequent investigations are:

1. To determine whether pollutants at Site Nos. 1 - 5 are present or determine that no pollutants are present, and
2. To determine whether surface or groundwater at each site has been contaminated, and if it has, to give quantification with respect to contaminant concentrations, the boundary of the contaminant plume, and the rate of contaminant migration.

Site No. 1 involves potential JP-4 contamination. It is recommended that soil and water samples be collected at Site No. 1 and analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons and aromatic volatile organics. It is also recommended that soil gas monitoring be conducted at Site No. 1 to determine the lateral extent of contamination.

Site Nos. 2 through 5 are potentially contaminated with POL products, solvents, paints, strippers or other waste products generated and disposed of by 187 TFG shops. Soil, sediment, and water samples should be collected and analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons, aromatic volatile organics, halogenated volatile organics and total organic carbon. Soil gas monitoring is also recommended at Site No. 2 to aid in delineation of the lateral extent of contamination.

Due to the Base's hydrogeologic setting, it is recommended that a health risk assessment be considered subsequent to confirmatory IRP Phase II/IVA investigations.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The 187th Tactical Fighter Group (TFG) is located at the Alabama Air National Guard Installation, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama (hereinafter referred to as the Base). The Base has been active since 1953, and over the years the types of military aircraft based and serviced there have varied. Both past and present operations have involved the use of hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous wastes. Because of the use of hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous wastes, the National Guard Bureau (NGB) has implemented its Installation Restoration Program (IRP). The IRP is a four-phase program consisting of the following:

Phase I - Records Search (Installation Assessment) - identify past spill or disposal sites posing a potential and/or actual hazard to public health or the environment.

Phase II/IVA - Site Characterization/Remedial Action Plan - acquiring data via field studies, for the confirmation and quantification of environmental contamination that may have an adverse impact on public health or the environment; preparing a Remedial Action Plan (RAP); and, if directed by the National Guard Bureau, preparing designs and specifications.

Phase III - Technology Base Development (if needed) - developing new technology for accomplishment of remediation.

Phase IVB - Implementation of Site Remedial Action.

B. Purpose

The purpose of this IRP Phase I - Records Search (hereinafter referred to as Records Search) is to identify and evaluate suspected problems associated

with past hazardous waste handling procedures, disposal sites, and spill sites on Base property. The potential for migration of hazardous contaminants was evaluated by visiting the Base, reviewing existing environmental information, analyzing Base records concerning the use and generation of hazardous materials/hazardous wastes, and conducting interviews with past and present Base personnel who are familiar with past hazardous materials management activities. Relevant information collected and analyzed as a part of the Records Search includes the history of the Base, with special emphasis on the history of the shop operations and their past hazardous materials management procedures; the local geological, hydrological, and meteorological conditions that may influence migration of contaminants; local land use, public utilities, and zoning requirements that affect the potentiality for exposure to contaminants, and the ecological settings that indicate environmentally sensitive habitats or evidence of environmental stress.

C. Scope

The scope of this Records Search is limited to spills, leaks, or disposal problems on Base property, and includes:

- o An onsite visit;
- o The acquisition of pertinent information and records on hazardous materials use and hazardous wastes generation and disposal practices at the Base;
- o The acquisition of available geologic, hydrologic, meteorologic, land use and zoning, critical habitat and utility data from various Federal and Alabama State agencies;
- o A review and analysis of all information obtained; and
- o The preparation of a report, to include recommendations for further actions.

The onsite visit, interviews with past and present personnel, and meetings with Federal and State agency personnel were conducted during the period 19-21 November 1986. The HMTc Records Search effort was conducted by Mrs. Lata Venkateshwara, Geologist, and Mr. Eric A. Kuhl, Staff Scientist. Resumes of Search Team members are included in Appendix A.


Individuals from the ANG who assisted in the Records Search include Mr. Arthur Lee of Air National Guard Support Center (ANGSC) and selected members of the 187th TFG. The Point of Contact at the Base was 2nd Lt. Michelle S. Fuller, Assistant Base Civil Engineer..

D. Methodology

A flow chart of the Records Search Methodology is presented in Figure 1. This Records Search Methodology ensures a comprehensive collection and review of pertinent site specific information, and is utilized in the identification and assessment of potentially contaminated hazardous waste spill/disposal sites.

The Records Search began with a site visit to the Base to identify all shop operations or activities on the installation that may have utilized hazardous materials or generated hazardous waste. Next, an evaluation of past and present hazardous materials/hazardous waste handling procedures at the identified locations was made to determine whether environmental contamination may have occurred. The evaluation of past hazardous materials/hazardous waste handling practices was facilitated by extensive interviews with 20 past and present employees familiar with the various operating procedures at the installation. These interviews were also utilized to define the areas on the Base where any waste materials (hazardous or non-hazardous), either intentionally or inadvertently, may have been used, spilled, stored, disposed of, or released into the environment.

Appendix B lists the interviewees principal areas of knowledge and their years of experience with the Base. Historic records contained in the Base's files were collected and reviewed to supplement the information obtained from interviews. Using the information outlined above, a list was compiled of past waste spill/disposal sites identified on the Base that required further evaluation. A general survey tour of the identified spill/disposal sites, the Base, and the surrounding area was conducted to determine the presence of visible contamination and to help assess the potential for contaminant migration. Particular attention was given to locating nearby drainage ditches, surface water bodies, residences, and wells.



Detailed geological, hydrological, meteorological, development (land use and zoning), and environmental data for the area of study was also obtained from appropriate Federal and State agencies as identified in Appendix C. Following a detailed analysis of all the information obtained, it was determined that five sites are potentially contaminated with hazardous materials/hazardous waste, and that the potential for contaminant migration exists. Under the IRP program, when sufficient information is available sites are numerically scored utilizing the Air Force Hazardous Assessment Rating Methodology (HARM). A description of HARM is presented in Appendix D. All five of the sites at the Base were scored and each of the sites was recommended for further investigation under the IRP Phase II/IVA process.

II. INSTALLATION DESCRIPTION

A. Location

The 187th TFG is located at Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama. Dannelly Field is approximately four and one half miles southwest of downtown Montgomery. Entrances to the Municipal Airport and the Base are off of Alabama Rt. 80, which runs north of Dannelly Field.

The 187th TFG occupies an area in the northwestern portion of the air field. Figure 2 shows the location and the boundaries of the Base property covered by this Records Search.

B. Organization and History

The ANG's presence at Dannelly Field dates back to 1953. From 1953 to 1962 the Dannelly ANG unit operated as the 160th Tactical Reconnaissance Squadron (TRS) which flew propeller driven RF-51D "Mustangs," and subsequently, RF-80 "Shooting Stars" and RF-84F "Thunderflash" jets.


In 1962, the 187th Tactical Reconnaissance Group (TRG) was reorganized to incorporate the 160th TRS. The 187th TRG began flying RF-4C's in 1971. In July 1983, the 187th TRG adopted a fighter group mission and was renamed the 187th Tactical Fighter Group (TFG). The 187th TFG currently flies F-4D fighter planes. The 187th TFG is dedicated to both its Federal mission as a Tactical Fighter Group and to its State role as an arm of the Alabama militia.

HMTC

Adapted From:
USGS Topographic Map,
Cantelous, Alabama,
7.5 Minute Series

Site Map of Alabama ANG,
Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama.

Figure 2.



III. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A. Meteorology

The following climatological data is largely derived from the Soil Survey of Montgomery County, Alabama (Burgess, 1960). Montgomery County has a humid, mild, almost subtropical climate. The average annual precipitation based on an 83 year record (1873-1958), was 51.12 inches and ranged from 26.82 inches in 1954 to 78.25 inches in 1929. By calculating net precipitation according to the method outlined in the Federal Register (47 FR 31224, July 16, 1982), a net precipitation value of 7.12 inches per year is obtained. Rainfall intensity based on 1 year, 24 hour rainfall is 2.75 inches (calculated according to 47 FR 31235, July 16, 1982, Figure 8.) Most rain that falls from late in April to early June occurs in the form of showers and thundershowers. Droughts occur in spring, late in summer and in early fall. From December until early April, average precipitation is high and rivers overflow frequently. The average annual temperature over an 83-year record (1873-1958) was 68° F. The average monthly temperature ranged from 49.2° F in January to 81.7° F in July. Winds are usually light. Strong winds generally last only a short time and dangerous or catastrophic winds are rare.

B. Geology

Montgomery County is in the northern part of the Coastal Plain physiographic province and encompasses parts of four physiographic divisions of the Coastal Plain: the Terraces, the Black Prairie, the Chunnennuggee Hills, and the Floodplain. The Base is located within the Black Prairie physiographic division (Knowles, 1963).

Geologic formations that crop out in Montgomery County are of sedimentary origin ranging in age from Late Cretaceous rocks overlying the crystalline basement complex, to Pleistocene terrace deposits and Recent alluvium (Knowles, 1963).

The northern part of the Black Prairie physiographic division, where the Base is located, developed on the Mooreville Chalk of Cretaceous age, which was formed in warm shallow seas. Various microfossils, which indicate warm shallow marine origins, comprise a large percent of the chalk (Knowles, 1960).

The Mooreville Chalk is a chiefly gray or yellowish gray to pale-olive silty to finely sandy, argillaceous, fossiliferous chalk. At the Base, the Mooreville Chalk is approximately 137 feet thick (Knowles, 1963). The basal 15 to 20 feet is slightly glauconitic and sandy. The Mooreville Formation dips southward about 40 feet per mile.

The Mooreville Chalk unconformably overlies the Eutaw Formation. The unconformable contact at the Base occurs at a depth of 137 feet from the ground surface. The Eutaw Formation averages between 250 and 300 feet thick at the Base and consists of light gray or greenish-gray cross-laminated fine-to medium-grained well sorted micaceous fossiliferous glauconitic sand that is interbedded with greenish-gray micaceous glauconitic fossiliferous clay. Beds of greenish-gray sandy clay are also common. The Eutaw Formation rests unconformably on the Gordo Formation and dips southward at a rate of about 40 to 65 feet per mile. The Eutaw Formation is extensively developed as a source of water in Montgomery County (Knowles, 1963).

Soils have formed over the Mooreville Chalk, the uppermost bedrock unit underlying the Base. The U.S. Soil Conservation Service (SCS) has not discretely mapped the soil series covering the Dannelly Field Municipal Airport. Often, soils in areas of heavy industrial development such as shopping malls, industrial parks, and airports, are not mapped by the SCS because such soils have been so altered or obscured that identification of specific soils is not feasible. Consequently, precise data describing characteristics of the soils at the Base are unavailable. The SCS has generally classified Base soils within the Sumpter-Oktibbeha-Leeper soil association. Sumpter-Oktibbeha-Leeper soils bordering the base, that have been discretely mapped by the SCS, predomi-

nately consist of clay soils with slow to moderately slow (4.23×10^{-5} cm/sec to 4.23×10^{-4} cm/sec) permeability rates (Burgess, 1960). Borings taken at the Base show a 3 to 5 foot layer of tan and gray plastic clay fill overlying deeper undisturbed clay soils. The character of the soil borings suggest that the source of the fill covering the Base is from cut and fill operations on the airport itself, and therefore, it is assumed that the Base clay fill has characteristics similar to natural clay soils in adjacent areas. Permeability rates for clay soils in general range from very slow to moderately slow ($< 4.23 \times 10^{-5}$ cm/sec to 4.23×10^{-4} cm/sec) (Burgess, 1960).

C. Hydrology

Surface Water

The Base is located within the Alabama River drainage basin (Knowles, 1963). All surface drainage from the Base flows north, through small unnamed streams, towards Catoma Creek. Catoma Creek, located approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the Base, flows northwest towards the Alabama River, which is approximately 5 miles from the Base. Officials of the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources stated that Catoma Creek is used for fishing and that tributaries to the creek in the area of the airport are probably fished. Manmade drainage ditches and storm drainage culverts channel storm runoff from the Base into tributaries of Catoma Creek. According to sources at the Alabama Highway Department, Urban Planning Division, the Base is not located within a floodplain associated with 100-year occurrence floods.

Groundwater

The Eutaw, Gordo, and Coker Formations are the principal aquifers used for drinking water in Montgomery County. Groundwater in each of these aquifers occurs under confined, or artesian, conditions. The Eutaw Formation, the uppermost of the three aquifers, occurs at a depth of approximately 140 feet from the land surface at the Base, and is approximately 500 to 525 feet thick. The Mooreville Chalk, which is the uppermost geologic unit underlying the Base, serves as an aquiclude overlying the Eutaw aquifer. The Mooreville Chalk is relatively impermeable and does not have sufficient water bearing ca-

capacity to serve as an aquifer (Knowles, 1963).

Underlying the Eutaw aquifer are successively, the Gordo and the Coker aquifers. Each of these three aquifers has been significantly developed by wells installed by the City of Montgomery (Knowles, 1963). The city's "West Well Field," which supplies water to a large portion of Montgomery, is located approximately 1.25 miles northwest of the Base. The city's wells are screened in the basal portion of the Eutaw Formation and throughout the Gordo and Coker Formations. The city has also recently installed two wells two miles northeast of the Base, north of Catoma Creek. These wells are screened in the Gordo and Coker Formations. A well is installed on the municipal airport property but is used only for industrial purposes or for grass watering, and not for drinking water. Until 15 years ago, the Base obtained its water from a well located near the vehicle maintenance shop. The Base now receives its drinking water supplies from the city of Montgomery. An additional well is installed on the Base at the Jet Engine Test Cell, on the south side of the runway. Water from this well is used for jet engine noise suppression and not for drinking. Both the Airport well and the Base wells are screened below the Mooreville Chalk, in the Eutaw, Gordo, or Coker Formations.

Persons living within a mile of the Base on the south side of the Airport are using private wells for drinking water because the city's water lines do not extend to this point. Local U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) authorities have stated that most of these private wells are screened within the Eutaw Formation.

The general direction of groundwater flow in the Eutaw Formation is due west towards the Alabama River. Locally, the flow direction is influenced by pumping of the City's "West Well Field." USGS sources in Montgomery indicate that there is insufficient data to determine the flow direction of aquifers below the Eutaw Formation, but that these two would be locally influenced by pumping of the city's well field.

Some unconfined groundwater occurs at the Base within soils and parent material overlying the Mooreville Chalk. Soil boring records (Christian

Testing Laboratories, 1982) and minor excavations performed by 198th IFG show the top of the water table (24 hours) to be within two feet of the surface at some locations on the Base. Such shallow unconfined groundwater is the most susceptible to contamination from surface pollutants. In general, risks associated with contamination of shallow groundwater arise from direct consumption of unconfined groundwater derived from shallow wells, contaminant percolation into deeper aquifers that are used for drinking water, or lateral flow of contaminated groundwater near the surface and subsequent discharge into local surface streams. The Mooreville Chalk, the uppermost geologic formation underlying the Base, is of insufficient water bearing capacity to serve as an aquifer and there are no wells installed in this formation. The chalk's relative impermeability restricts vertical penetration of shallow groundwater (Knowles, 1963). At the Base, contact with the chalk formation occurs between 11 and 20 feet from the land surface. The chalk extends to a depth of 137 feet. According to local USGS sources, water above the chalk is restricted from downward movement and flows laterally, following the gradient of the Mooreville Chalk and local topographic features. Thus, shallow groundwater at the Base flows northward over the chalk, ultimately discharging into local surface streams which are tributaries of Catoma Creek.

USGS personnel have recently conducted studies regarding the susceptibility of major aquifers in the Montgomery area to surface contamination. The studies indicate that where the Mooreville Chalk occurs, shallow groundwater is generally restricted from entering deeper underlying aquifers. Some interformational transmission of groundwater does occur in the form of upward leakage of groundwater from the Eutaw Formation into the Mooreville Chalk. Thus, although inadequate as an aquifer, the Mooreville Chalk is saturated from its base (137 feet below the land surface) to the level of the potentiometric surface of the underlying Eutaw Formation (approximately 65 feet below the land surface) (Knowles, 1963). Chalk above the potentiometric surface of the Eutaw Formation is much less saturated.

It is possible for contaminant migration to occur through fracture zones which may exist within the Mooreville Chalk. Whether or not such fracturing is present at the Base is undeterminable from available geologic data. Well shafts at the Base penetrating the Mooreville Chalk may also serve as pathways of cross contamination between the shallow and deeper aquifers. However, given that the hydraulic head of the Eutaw and other aquifers below the Mooreville Chalk is greater than that of shallow groundwater overlying the Chalk, downward vertical movement of shallow groundwater into deeper aquifers is unlikely even through fractures or improperly grouted well shafts. Significant downward vertical movement of shallow groundwater is likely to occur only if the potentiometric surface of the Eutaw aquifer falls below the Mooreville Chalk. The potentiometric surface of the Eutaw aquifer currently lies within the Mooreville Chalk.

IV. SITE EVALUATION

A. Activity Review

A review of Base records and interviews with past and present Base employees resulted in the identification of specific operations within each activity in which the majority of industrial chemicals are handled and hazardous wastes are generated. Table 1 summarizes the major operations associated with each activity, provides estimates of the quantities of waste currently being generated by these operations, and describes the past and present disposal practices for the wastes. If an operation is not listed in Table 1, that operation has been determined on a best-estimate basis to produce negligible (less than 1 gallon per year) quantities of wastes requiring disposal.

B. Disposal/Spill Site Identification, Evaluation, and Hazard Assessment

Interviews with 20 Base personnel (see Appendix B) and subsequent site inspections resulted in the identification of five waste disposal/spill sites. It was determined that all of the five sites are potentially contaminated with hazardous materials/hazardous waste with potential for migration; therefore, these sites should be further evaluated. Each of the five sites were rated using HARM (Appendix D). Figure 3 illustrates the locations of the sites. Copies of completed Hazardous Assessment Rating Forms and a summary and explanation of the factor rating criteria used for site scoring is found in Appendix E. Table 2 summarizes the Hazard Assessment Scores (HAS) of the scored sites.

There is a potential for contaminant migration at the five identified sites. At each of these sites, the contaminant pathways of primary concern are the ground and surface water routes. Site Nos. 3 and 5 are storm water discharge points, which have the potential to directly contribute contaminants to local surface streams. Site Nos. 1 and 2 may present indirect threats to surface water if potentially contaminated groundwater originating at these sites discharges into nearby surface streams. Also at Site No. 2, contaminated

Table 1. Hazardous Waste Disposal Summary: Alabama Air National Guard, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama

Shop Name	Building No.	Hazardous Waste/ Used Hazardous Material	Estimated Quantities (Gal./year)	Method of Treatment/Storage/Disposal			
				1953	1960	1970	1980 1986
Aerospace Ground Equip- ment	1108	Transmission fluid	100		CONTR		DRMO
		Used Oil Hydraulic Synthetic	900		CONTR		DRMO
		Used Batteries	100 units/year				DRMO
Corrosion Control	1403	Residual Laden Paint and Lacquer Cans (Solidified)	90 cans/year			DPSTR	
		Lacquer Thinner	60		CONTR		DRMO
		Paint Stripper	150		CONTR		DRMO
Photo Lab	1316	Acid Developer	3			NEUTR SAN	
Non Destruc- tive Inspec- tion	1305	Emulsifier	55		CONTR		DRMO
		Penetrant	55		CONTR		DRMO
		Activator	12			SIL REC	
		Developer (dry)	24 lbs.		CONTR		DRMO
		Magnaflux Bath	12		CONTR		DRMO
Engine Shop	1108	JP-4	60		CONTR		DRMO
		Used Oil	150		CONTR		DRMO
		PD-680	60		CONTR		DRMO

Table 1. Hazardous Waste Disposal Summary: Alabama Air National Guard, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery, Alabama (Continued)

Shop Name	Building No.	Hazardous Waste/Used Hazardous Material	Estimated Quantities (Gal./year)	Method of Treatment/Storage/Disposal 1953	1960	1970	1980	1986
Weapons Branch	1313	PD-680	120		CONTR		DRMO	
		Trichloroethane	4					f-DRMO-f
Vehicle Maintenance	1208	Used Oil	1800		CONTR		DRMO	
		PD-680	200		CONTR		DRMO	
		Transmission Fluid	20		CONTR		DRMO	
		Used Batteries	24 units				DRMO	
		Electrolyte	6		NEUTR SAN			
		Lacquer Thinner	12		CONTR		DRMO	
		Enamel	60			DPSIR		
Pneudraulics	1201	PD-680	150		CONTR		DRMO	
		Hydraulic Fluid	200		CONTR		DRMO	
Tire Shop	1109	PD-680	300		CONTR		DRMO	
		Paint Stripper	35		CONTR		DRMO	
Fuel Systems Shop	1304	JP-4	300		CONTR		DRMO	
Flightline Maintenance	1201	Hydraulic Fluid	20		CONTR		DRMO	
		Synthetic Oil	1200		CONTR		DRMO	

CONTR - Disposed of through contractor
 DPSTR - Disposed of in dumpster with general base refuse
 DRMO - Disposed of by Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office
 SAN SEW - Disposed of in sanitary sewer
 NEUTR SAN - Neutralized and disposed of in sanitary sewer
 CII per - Turned in for silver recovery (offhazard)




Table 2. Site Hazard Assessment Scores (as derived from HARM): Alabama
ANG, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery Alabama

Site Priority	Site No.	Site Description	Receptors	Waste Characteristics	Pathway	Waste Mgmt. Practices	Overall Score
1	1	POL Facility	56	54	82	1.0	64
2	2	Oil/Water Separ- tor and Tank, Building 1304	56	54	82	1.0	64
3	3	Storm Drainage Discharge Point, East	56	54	80	1.0	63
4	5	Storm Drainage Discharge Point, West	56	54	59	1.0	56
5	4	Edge of Aircraft Parking Apron	56	45	59	1.0	53

groundwater is seeping through a crack in a concrete conduit which discharges into a nearby surface stream. Likely receptors of potential surface water contamination from the Base are persons using Catoma Creek, its tributaries, or stream fed ponds for recreational fishing.

Site Nos. 1, 2, and 4 may present a threat to shallow groundwater underlying the Base. Unless breached or fractured, the Mooreville Chalk would tend to restrict the downward migration of potentially contaminated shallow groundwater to deeper aquifers (Eutaw, Gordo, Coker) used for drinking water. Without further investigation, however, it can not be positively determined if contaminants in shallow groundwater can reach these deeper aquifers. If contaminants do penetrate deeper aquifers, likely potential receptors include persons deriving their drinking water from the city of Montgomery's West Well Field, located approximately 1.25 miles from the Base.

Site No. 1 - POL Facility - (HAS-64)

The POL (petroleum, oil, and lubricant) Facility is located at the west corner of Phantom Street and Perimeter Road. The facility consists of an asphalt paved area with a raised, curbed fueling island in the center. Below the fueling island are six 25,000 gallon underground storage tanks (UST) containing JP-4. 187th TFG personnel excavated a 2 to 3 foot deep hole on the fueling island to determine if JP-4 was present in the ground. There was a distinct smell of JP-4 in water entering the hole at the time of excavation and at the time of the HMTc site visit in November, 1986.

The source of the JP-4 is not known. Interviewees familiar with POL facility operations recalled no major spills of JP-4. The POL source could be the occasional tank overfills that spill onto the fueling island. These spills typically result in a loss of anywhere from 1 to 10 gallons of fuel. Also, spills of up to 5 gallons occasionally occur when hoses are unhooked from the tank trucks after filling. Spills at the fueling island either evaporate, seep into the ground, or are cleaned up.

The source of the POL could be leaks from the underground storage tanks. Two of the tanks are 10 years old and the remaining four are 11 years old. There were problems with tank leakage prior to replacement of four of the tanks in 1976, and attempts were made to patch these leaks. Currently, tanks are inventoried for fuel loss and there is no evidence of leakage. Tank interiors are inspected every six years. The tanks are due to be inspected again in 1987. It is also possible that POL leakage may be occurring from the UST piping system. Fuel loss from piping leaks would not be detected during tank gauging.

A strong odor of POL was present in the storm drainage inlets that run along Phantom Street adjacent to the POL facility. Groundwater flows along the path of least resistance. Often, the path of least resistance for shallow groundwater, especially in areas of clayey soils, is the more permeable bedding or less consolidated fill materials underlying manmade structures such as subsurface drainage pipes. Thus, the source of POL fumes in the storm sewer may be from leaks at the POL facility that are flowing along underground sewer piping. If this is the case, contaminants would ultimately discharge at the termination of the sewer line - which is Site No. 3 in this report.

A HAS was applied at this site based on evidence of POL in groundwater, reports of past tank leakage, and reports of occasional JP-4 spillage during tank truck filling. However, precise data regarding the quantity of JP-4 released at this site is not known. No spills exceeding 10 gallons were reported to have occurred at this site, and only a portion of those spills that did occur could potentially impact groundwater; the rest was cleaned up or evaporated. Although the tanks at this site reportedly did leak, there were no reports of large amounts of fuel loss due to leakage. Consequently, in applying a HAS, a value corresponding to a "small quantity" release (1,000 gallons or less) was used. The hazard rating for this site was based on JP-4 since this is the only chemical that has been stored at this site.

Site No. 2 - Oil/Water Separator and Tank, Building 1304 - (HAS-64)

Site No. 2 consists of the area around an oil/water separator (OWS) and a related underground holding tank used to store hazardous waste. The site

is located between Building 1304 (south side, west end) and Buildings 1330 and 1331. The OWS receives contaminated wastewater from the aircraft washrack. Contaminants in washrack wastewater draining to the OWS include Stoddard Solvents, paint strippers and lacquer thinners. An underground overflow tank for the OWS is used to store hydraulic oils and waste POL prior to offsite disposal.

The ground for several feet in any direction of the opening to the OWS holding tank is oil stained, devoid of vegetation, and smells of POL product. Interviewees stated that small amounts (up to 1 gallon) of oil or fuel were frequently spilled on the ground when being poured into the tank opening.

Evidence at this site suggests that the OWS or the holding tank may be leaking. Oily water is seeping up from a small crack in a concrete drainage conduit located 3 to 5 feet from the OWS and holding tank. Contamination in water seeping from the ground at this point indicates that either the tank or the OWS is leaking, or that surface contaminants spilled at this site are infiltrating into shallow groundwater. No other likely sources of contamination exist in this area. As at Site No. 1, more permeable bedding underlying the concrete drainage conduit may represent the path of least resistance for contaminated shallow groundwater around the tank; as a result, groundwater may be flowing towards the conduit. Prior to the HMTc visit, 187th TFG personnel obtained samples of shallow groundwater from a hole dug next to the holding tank. Sample analyses show the presence of aromatic hydrocarbons. Analytical test results for this site are presented in Appendix F.

Application of a HAS was necessary in light of positive sampling results, visible evidence of surface soil contamination, and apparent contaminant migration through shallow groundwater. The only spills that are known to have occurred here are numerous small spills under 1 gallon. Although it is also likely that the UST or OWS is leaking, there are no reports of a major loss of contaminants from either of these sources. Thus, although the precise quantity of waste released at this site is undefined, it is considered for purposes of HAS calculation, to be in the "small quantity" range (1,000 gallons or

less). The hazard rating at this site was based on constituents detected in samples taken here; these include benzene. Benzene has a Sax rating of 3, which corresponds to a HARM hazard rating of 3.

Site 3 - Storm Drainage Discharge Point, East - (HAS-63)

This site is located between Perimeter Road and Route 80, across from the POL facility. Storm drainage from the majority of the northeastern portion of the Base, including the POL area and the AGE shop, is discharged here. Storm drainage routed to this point through underground piping discharges into an earthen stream channel; it then flows off the installation and into a small tributary of Catoma Creek.

187th TFG personnel first noticed contamination problems at this site in 1982, when they saw a POL sheen on the water discharging from the installation here. Installation bioenvironmental personnel sampled the discharge at this site and the sampling test results indicated elevated concentrations of JP-4. Sampling results are presented in Appendix E. The source of the JP-4 could not be determined, however the site is immediately adjacent to the installation POL facility (Site No. 1) where there are indications of POL leakage. The presence of the Mooreville Chalk Formation near the ground surface at the Base restricts the vertical flow of groundwater, and directs groundwater flow laterally towards surface discharge points such as this stream. Contaminated groundwater from the POL facility may be moving in the direction of the surface stream at Site No. 3. A strong odor of POL was detected at the time of the HMTc site visit in several storm drainage inlets along Phantom Road. POL fumes in the drainage inlets suggest that contaminants from some source, possibly the POL facility, are flowing along the storm sewage line which terminates at Site No. 3.

Storm runoff from the Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) parking lot flows into the abovementioned storm drainage inlets. Interviewees stated that small spills (up to 0.5 gallon) of hydraulic fuel occur several times a month on the AGE parking lot. Extensive portions of the asphalt lot are stained with absorbed oils. During rains, spilled oils leach from the asphalt and flow into

storm drains leading to the Site No. 3 discharge point. Also, JP-4 spills of up to 50 gallons periodically occur (3-5 times per year) on the AGE lot as a result of overflows from aircraft starting equipment. The portion of these spills which does not evaporate flows into the storm sewer and is discharged at Site No. 3.

An underground holding tank designed to catch overflow from the AGE shop OWS is being used to store used oil and, in past years, spent PD-680. The OWS is malfunctioning and occasionally backs up with water, forcing oils stored in the holding tank out of the tank opening and onto the AGE parking lot. Like other materials spilled on the AGE lot, a portion of these oils reach the Site No. 3 discharge point in runoff. The frequency of OWS back-ups and the amount of oils spilled or leaked onto the AGE parking lot could not be determined.

The 187th TFG personnel place absorbent bags at the discharge point to reduce the flow of contaminated water off the installation. When HMTG visited the site a sheen was visible on the water downstream of the bags. A viscous oily substance was observed in the bottom of the storm drainage inlet along Perimeter Road upstream and approximately 100 feet west of the discharge point. At the discharge point itself, the stream bank was oil stained and exhibited a distinct POL odor.

Visible evidence of offsite contaminant migration from this site requires that a HAS be applied. The total quantity of waste discharged at this site cannot be precisely quantified, although a cumulative total, including spills and leachate from the AGE shop, is estimated to be between two and four thousand gallons. However, the POL products released at this site are lighter than water and float; therefore, all but a small portion of the contaminants would be washed downstream and away from their point of discharge, and are now unrecoverable. Thus, a value corresponding to a "small quantity" spill (1,000 gallons or less), was used in applying a HAS. The intent of further IRP work is to determine if contaminants discharged at this point have, over the years, accumulated and resulted contaminated stream bed sediments which could serve as a potential leachate source. The HARM hazard rating at this site was based upon JP-4, which has a Sax level 3 rating. This results in a HARM "high"

hazard rating.

Site No. 4 - Edge of Aircraft Parking Apron - (HAS 53)

This site consists of the area abutting the southern edge of the aircraft parking apron. In the past, leaks and spills of hydraulic fluid from aircraft and AGE equipment were cleansed from the parking apron with PD-680 solvent. The resulting hydraulic fluid/PD-680 mixture was washed off of the runway and onto the adjacent grass. In 1980, a fuel bladder on a C-130 ruptured, resulting in the release of 400 to 500 gallons of JP-4. Much of this fuel was washed to the edge of the aircraft parking apron. Smaller fuel spills of several gallons which have occasionally occurred on the aircraft parking apron also drained or were washed to this site. Visible vegetative stress is evident along the southern edge of the parking apron.

A HAS was applied at this site because of visible environmental stress and potential threats to underlying groundwater. Beyond the 400 to 500 gallon JP-4 spill, the exact amount of materials released on the parking apron cannot be precisely quantified. However, it is quite likely that the total quantity of spillage reaching the aircraft parking apron since 1953 exceeds 1,000 gallons. This includes the above mentioned 400 to 500 gallon JP-4 spill, frequent JP-4 spills of several gallons, and hydraulic oils and PD-680 solvents released on the parking apron. Thus, for purposes of HARM scoring, a value corresponding to a "medium" quantity release was used. At this site the HARM hazard rating was based on JP-4 toxicity. JP-4 has a Sax toxicity rating of 3. Under HARM, this translates to a "high" hazard rating.

Site No. 5 - Storm Drainage Discharge Point, West (HAS-56)

Site No. 5 is located on the north side of Perimeter Road, approximately 150 feet northwest of Building 1312. Storm discharge from portions of the installation along the runway and most of the western portion of the Base, are channelled to this point. Drainage from this point flows into tributaries

of Catoma Creek. In 1976, a leaking valve on a tank truck resulted in a 500-gallon JP-4 spill, which entered the drainage pipe leading to the Site No. 5 discharge point. More recently, installation personnel have witnessed a POL sheen on water flowing in this drainage channel. The source of the pollution was traced to contaminant leakage from drainage conduit at Site No. 2.

It is likely that the majority of contaminants reaching this site have flowed off the installation and are now unrecoverable. However, it is possible that some contaminants may have accumulated in drainage ditch sediments. A surface water sample taken at the discharge point did not indicate the presence of contamination at the time of the sample; no sediment samples have yet been taken here. However, since chronic contaminant leakage from Site No. 2 drains to this site, it is certain that contaminants are being discharged off the Base at this point; therefore, a HAS was applied. Precise quantification of the total amount of contaminants released at this site is not possible; however, it is estimated to be below 1,000 gallons. Interviewees reported only one 500 gallon spill was discharged off the Base at this site. It is doubtful that the quantity of total leakage from Site No. 2 exceeds 500 gallons. Thus, for purposes of applying a HAS, a value corresponding to a "small" quantity release was employed. Hazard rating at this site was based on JP-4 toxicity, which has a Sax rating of 3. This corresponds to a HARM rating of 3.

C. Critical Habitats/Endangered or Threatened Species

Phone conversations with personnel from the Alabama Department of Conservation and National Resources confirmed that there are no endangered or threatened species of flora or fauna in the vicinity of the Base. There are no wetland areas in the vicinity of the Base or areas designated as wilderness areas.

D. Other Pertinent Facts

- o There are no drinking water wells on the Base;
- o Sanitary sewage is municipally treated offbase;

- o There are no active or inactive landfills on the Base;
- o There is no record of using waste oils for road dust control on the installation;
- o There are no former or currently operating Fire Training Areas on the installation.

V. CONCLUSIONS

- o Information obtained through interviews with 20 Base personnel, review of Base records, and field observations have resulted in the identification of five disposal/spill sites on Base property. Each of the sites are potentially contaminated with hazardous waste/hazardous materials and further IRP analysis should be performed.
- o At all of the sites, there are either signs of vegetative stress, a distinct odor of POL products, or visible oil sheens. At Site Nos. 2 and 3, analysis of preliminary samples indicates the presence of contamination. Each of these sites exhibits a potential for contaminant migration and they were all scored using HARM.
- o The potential for contamination of shallow groundwater exists at the Base. Base soil boring records show that the depth of the water table at the Base ranges from 2 to 15 feet (Christian Testing Labs, 1982). This relatively shallow water table makes groundwater susceptible to impacts from surface contaminants and from leaking UST or OWS.
- o The connection between shallow groundwater encountered within several feet of the surface, and the uppermost aquifer (Eutaw Formation) used as a drinking water source is restricted. The relatively impermeable Mooreville Chalk (137 feet thick at the Base) overlies and confines the Eutaw aquifer. There are no wells in the Montgomery area that use the Mooreville Formation as a water source. The Mooreville Chalk significantly impedes the downward transmission of surface water into lower aquifers. It is possible that contaminants could reach drinking water aquifers underlying the Mooreville Chalk through fractures which may be present in the chalk, or through well shafts penetrating the Mooreville Formation, if they are insufficiently grouted. However, given that the hydraulic head of Eutaw and other aquifers below the Mooreville Chalk is greater than that of shallow groundwater, downward vertical movement of shallow groundwater into deeper aquifers is unlikely.
- o Surface channels draining the Base are considered susceptible to contamination from several of the identified sites. Oil sheens have been sighted on water exiting the Base at Site Nos. 3 and 5, and a POL/water mixture is seeping from a crack in a storm drainage conduit at Site No. 2. Contaminants may reach area streams via runoff channelled through storm drains, or through discharge of contaminated groundwater into local streams. The presence of POL odors in storm sewers and seepage of oily water from beneath a surface drainage conduit, suggest that contaminated groundwater at some sites may be flowing along subsurface pathways of manmade structures towards discharge points at local surface streams.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following general recommendations are intended to determine if groundwater, surface water, sediments, or soils at the five identified sites have been contaminated, or to show that no contamination exists.

Site No. 1 - POL Facility

A shallow excavation (approximately 2 feet deep) installed in the POL facility fueling island by Base personnel revealed the presence of JP-4 in shallow groundwater filling the hole. The contaminant source is assumed to be the POL facility above the POL UST. POL fumes were present in storm drainage inlets adjacent to the POL facility. The source of these fumes may be POL tank or piping leakage that has spread horizontally to the storm sewers through shallow groundwater. The storm sewer pipe and pipe bedding may present a subsurface flow path of least resistance for shallow groundwater in this area.

To determine the extent of contamination at this site, it is recommended that soil borings be installed on the fueling island. Soil samples should be taken at 3 foot intervals down to a depth of 15 feet or to the interface of soil and underlying bedrock. On a one-time only basis, water samples should be taken from any groundwater entering the soil borings. Samples should be analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons, and aromatic volatile organics.

It is also recommended that soil gas monitoring be performed around the outside of the POL facility in order to delineate the lateral extension of contamination. The presence of POL fumes in storm sewers near the POL facility suggests the possibility that JP-4 may be migrating to storm drainage pipes from the POL area, through shallow groundwater. Soil gas analyses will assist in identification of the source of contamination and aid in determining if vapors in storm sewers are the result of leaks from the POL facility. If the soil gas monitoring indicates the presence of a contaminant plume, installation of groundwater monitoring wells at the site should be considered.

Site No. 2 - Oil/Water Separator and Tank, Building 1304

This site consists of an OWS and associated underground holding tank that were being used, at the time of the HMTQ site visit, for hazardous waste and used hazardous material storage. Vegetative stress and oil stained earth are evident around the opening of the holding tank. Water samples taken from a shallow excavation at this site showed the presence of benzene, toluene, and 1,3-dichlorobenzene. Oily groundwater is seeping from a crack in a concrete drainage conduit located several feet from this site, suggesting that either the OWS or holding tank is unsound and leaking contaminants, or that surface contaminants have infiltrated through soils into shallow groundwater.

In order to quantify and delineate the depth of contamination at this site, it is recommended that soil samples be taken at the edges of the tank and OWS. Samples should be taken at 3-foot intervals to a depth of 15 feet, or to the interface between soil and the underlying bedrock. On a one-time only basis, water samples should be taken from any groundwater entering the soil borings. Samples should be analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons, aromatic volatile organics, and halogenated volatile organics.

Soil gas monitoring should be conducted in areas around the holding tank and OWS and along the concrete drainage conduit to determine the horizontal extent of contamination at this site and to determine if the subsurface conduit is controlling contaminant migration.

Site No. 3 - Storm Drainage Discharge Point, East

Visible signs of contamination were present in water discharging from this site prior to, and at the time of the HMTQ site visit. Only liquids were seen flowing through pipes leading to the discharge point. There is a possibility that shallow groundwater, potentially contaminated with JP-4 from the POL facility, is discharging at this site. Storm drainage inlets upgradient of this site receive oil tainted leachate from the AGE parking lot. Inlets leading to the discharge point are emitting a strong odor of POL fumes.

Sediment samples should be obtained at Site No. 3 to determine if contaminants discharging here are bound up in stream bed sediments. Surface water samples should also be taken at Site No. 3. Samples should be analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons, and aromatic and halogenated volatile organics. Sampling results at this site should be compared with those from Site No. 1 to determine if suspected contaminants from the POL area are discharging at this point.

Site No. 4 - Edge of Aircraft Parking Apron

Hydraulic fluid which has leaked or spilled onto the aircraft parking apron has been cleansed from the apron using PD-680 solvents. The solvent/hydraulic fluid mixture is subsequently washed to the edge of the parking apron. A 500 gallon JP-4 spill also drained to the edge of the apron.

It is recommended that soil samples be taken at the south edge of the aircraft parking apron to verify the presence of contaminants. Samples should be taken at 3 foot intervals to a depth of 15 feet or to the occurrence of bed-rock, whichever comes first. On a one-time only basis, water samples should be taken of any water entering the soil borings. Samples should be analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons, aromatic volatile organics, and halogenated volatile organics.

Site No. 5 - Storm Drainage Discharge Point, West

Storm runoff from along the runway and much of the western portion of the installation discharges off Base property at this site. A fuel spill totalling approximately 500 gallons of JP-4, entered a drainage ditch which discharges at this site. POL tainted drainage emanating from Site No. 2 also discharges off the Base at this point. To determine if contaminants are exiting the Base at this site, it is recommended that surface water and sediment samples be obtained. Samples should be analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile aromatic organics, halogenated volatile organics, and total organic carbon.

If contamination of soil, sediments, or shallow groundwater is confirmed at the Base sites, it is suggested that a risk assessment be considered before undertaking remedial action. A risk assessment may be appropriate at the Base due to its hydrogeologic setting, which is not conducive to the transport of surface contaminants into lower drinking water aquifers. Although shallow groundwater at the Base may prove to be contaminated, the threat posed to deeper aquifers that are used for drinking water is largely mitigated by the presence of a thick confining layer (the Mooreville Chalk) near the surface that separates shallow groundwater from underlying aquifers. Given the increased hydraulic head of groundwater below the Mooreville Chalk, downward vertical movement of potentially contaminated shallow groundwater is unlikely.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

AQUICLUDE - A body of relatively impermeable rock that is capable of absorbing water slowly but does not transmit it rapidly enough to supply a well or spring.

AQUIFER - A geologic formation, or group of formations, that contains sufficient saturated permeable material to conduct groundwater and to yield economically significant quantities of groundwater to wells and springs.

CONTAMINANT - As defined by Section 101(f)(33) of SARA shall include, but not be limited to any element, substance, compound, or mixture, including disease-causing agents, which after release into the environment and upon exposure, ingestion, inhalation, or assimilation into any organism, either directly from the environment or indirectly by ingestion through food chains, will or may reasonably be anticipated to cause death, disease, behavioral abnormalities, cancer, genetic mutation, physiological malfunctions (including malfunctions in reproduction), or physical deformation in such organisms or their offspring; except that the term "contaminant" shall not include petroleum, including crude oil or any fraction thereof which is not otherwise specifically listed or designated as a hazardous substance under

- (a) any substance designated pursuant to Section 311(b)(2)(A) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act,
- (b) any element, compound, mixture, solution, or substance designated pursuant to Section 102 of this Act,
- (c) any hazardous waste having the characteristics identified under or listed pursuant to Section 3001 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (but not including any waste the regulation of which under the Solid Waste Disposal Act has been suspended by Act of Congress),
- (d) any toxic pollutant listed under Section 307(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act,
- (e) any hazardous air pollutant listed under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act, and
- (f) any imminently hazardous chemical substance or mixture with respect to which the administrator has taken action pursuant to Section 7 of the Toxic Substance Control Act;

and shall not include natural gas, liquefied natural gas, or synthetic gas of pipeline quality (or mixtures of natural gas and such synthetic gas).

DOWNGRAIENT - A direction that is hydraulically downslope, i.e., the direction in which groundwater flows.

ENDANGERED SPECIES - Plant or wildlife species designated as endangered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

GROUNDWATER - That part of subsurface water that is in the zone of saturation, including underground streams. Loosely, all subsurface water as distinct from surface water.

HARM - Hazard Assessment Rating Methodology - A system adopted and used by the United States Air Force to develop and maintain a priority listing of potentially contaminated sites on installations and facilities for remedial action based on potential hazard to public health, welfare, and environmental impacts. (Reference: DEQPPM 81-5, 11 December 1981.

HAS - Hazard Assessment Score - The score developed by utilizing the Hazardous Assessment Rating Methodology (HARM).

HAZARDOUS WASTE - A solid or liquid waste that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics may

- a. cause, or significantly contribute to, an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible or incapacitating reversible illness, or
- b. pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, transported, disposed of, or otherwise managed.

MIGRATION (Contaminant) - The movement of contaminants through pathways (groundwater, surface water, soil, and air).

UPGRAIENT - A direction that is hydraulically upslope.

PERMEABILITY - The capacity of a porous rock, sediment, or soil for transmitting a fluid without impairment of the structure of the medium; it is a measure of the relative ease of fluid flow under unequal pressure.

THREATENED SPECIES - Plant or Wildlife species designated as "threatened" by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

UPGRADIENT - A direction that is hydraulically upslope.

WATER TABLE - The upper limit of the portion of the ground wholly saturated with water.

WETLANDS - Those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs and similar areas.

WILDERNESS AREA - Areas designated under Federal or State laws as wilderness areas to be managed for their aesthetic or natural value.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Knowles, D.B. et.al.; "Geology and Groundwater Resources of Montgomery County, Alabama, with Special Reference to the Montgomery Area, Alabama Geologic Survey Bulletin, 68 Part A and B, United States Geological Survey, University of Alabama, 1963.
2. Burgess, Leland H. et.al.; Soil Survey of Montgomery County, Alabama, United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Series 1957, No. 7, Government Printing Office, 1960.
3. United States Geological Survey, Montgomery South Quadrangle, Alabama - Montgomery County, 7.5 Minute Series (Topographic), USGS, 1958, Revised 1981.
4. United States Geological Survey, Cantelous, Alabama, 7.5 Minute Series (Topographic) USGS, 1981
5. Alabama Air National Guard, Base Master Plan, Montgomery Air National Guard Station, Montgomery, Alabama MPCP, Tab A-C, Alabama Air National Guard, 1986.
6. Singh, Pretap N., Case Study of Product Detection in Groundwater, Hazardous Wastes and Hazardous Materials, p. 273-277, Hazardous Materials Control Research Institute, Silver Spring, Maryland, 1986.
7. Christian Testing Laboratories, Inc., Test Boring Records, SS-171-82 187 TRG (ANG) Military Construction Projects, Dannelly Field, Montgomery, Alabama, 1982.
8. Alabama Air National Guard, Welcome to the 187th Tactical Fighter Group, Alabama Air National Guard, Dannelly Field ANG, Montgomery, Alabama.
9. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Register, Vol. 47, July 18, 1982, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Appendix A

Resumes of Search Team Members

ERIC A. KUHL

EDUCATION

B.A., political science/environmental policy, St. Mary's College of Maryland, 1982

Right To Know/Hazard Communication Seminar, Executive Enterprises, Inc.
April 10-11, 1985

Environmental Laws and Regulations Course, Government Institutes, Inc.
May 16-17, 1985

Geographic Aspects of Pollution, University of Maryland, University College,
Fall 1984

EXPERIENCE

Three years of experience with on-line information systems, including analysis and summarization of legal/technical documentation pertinent to large-scale computerized litigation support projects. Regulatory experience involving research, tracking and analysis of federal and state transportation/motor carrier safety, environmental and occupational safety regulations, for eventual input into on-line data base systems. Currently conducting site investigations and preliminary assessments for the Air Force's Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

EMPLOYMENT

Dynamac Corporation (1984-present): Staff Scientist

Responsibilities include site investigations, preliminary assessments, and report writing for the Phase I portion of the IRP for the Air National Guard. Also performs similar work for the Department of Justice's Federal Bureau of Prisons. Activities for these tasks entail hazardous waste site identification and assessment, and development of advisory recommendations for further site investigation. Authored the Army Materiel Command's Solvent Recovery Regulatory Impact Report, and performed regulatory analysis for DLA's used drum recycling study.

Previously, participated in the construction of an environmental regulatory information system. This task required detailed familiarization with key environmental regulations including RCRA, CERCLA, and the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act. Was also responsible for tracking relevant legislation and regulations at the federal and state levels.

Automated Sciences Group (1983-1984): Regulatory Analyst

Performed regulatory analysis of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's regulatory dockets for the OSHA Technical Information System. Also assisted in the compilation of technical guidelines for the OSHA Technical Information System.

Aspen Systems Corporation (1982-1983): Document Analyst

Analyzed and summarized technical documents on the various aspects of nuclear power plant construction for a large-scale litigation project. Was also responsible for screening large numbers of documents to determine their relevance to the case.

PUBLICATIONS

Controversies Emerge on OSHA's Hazard Communication Standard, co-author, HMTC Update 4(4), July 1985.

Used Oil Regulation Proposed, co-author, HMTC Technical Bulletin, HMTC Update 5(4), July 1986.

AMC Solvent Study, Evaluation of Regulatory Impact on Solvent Recovery, July 1986.

LATA R. VENKATESHWARA

EDUCATION

M.S., geology, Ohio State University, 1984
B.A. (cum laude), chemistry, Ohio Wesleyan University, 1982

EXPERIENCE

One year of technical experience in hazardous waste and environmental science fields. Experience includes preparation of statements of work for the Air Force and Air National Guard, groundwater assessment and monitoring, and data base development.

EMPLOYMENT

Dynamac Corporation (1985-present): Junior Staff Scientist

Primarily responsible for preparing statements of work for the Phase IV-A of the Air Force's Installation Restoration Program (IRP). Phase IV-A of the IRP is concerned with determining remedial methods for mitigating site problems. Work involves utilizing technical and field data to determine contaminant plumes at hazardous waste disposal sites on nine Department of Defense installations, visiting sites to assess conditions and developing cost estimates to support feasibility studies of remedial action plans.

Assisted in developing the disposal file for hazardous materials for the Defense Logistics Agency. Researched, through the use of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 40 and 49, information for solid waste disposal, transportation, storage, and mobile incineration.

University of Michigan (1984): Research Assistant, Geology and Mineralogy Department

Performed analyses on Great Lake organic sediments. Utilized gas chromatography for carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon isotope analyses.

Ohio State University (1982-1984): Instructor, Geology and Mineralogy Department

Taught laboratory courses in junior- and senior-level geology.

Appendix B

Interviewee Information

INTERVIEWEE INFORMATION FOR PERSONNEL OF THE 187 TFG,
ALABAMA ANG, DANNELLY FIELD MUNICIPAL AIRPORT,
MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

Interviewee No.	Primary Duty Assignment	Years Associated with the 187th TFG, Dannelly Field Municipal Airport Montgomery, Alabama
1	Civil Engineering	8 months
2	AGE	6
3	Tire Shop	6
4	Aircraft Maintenance	2
5	Fuel Maintenance	14
6	Supply	18
7	Civil Engineering	15
8	Photo Lab	22
9	NDI	6
10	Corrosion Control	5
11	Fire Protection	9
12	Grounds Maintenance	20
13	Engine Shop	18
14	Supply	8
15	Weapons Branch	3
16	Field Maintenance	30
17	Flightline Maintenance	34
18	Vehicle Maintenance	31
19	Civil Engineering	11
20	Bioenvironmental	3

Appendix C
Outside Agency Contact List

OUTSIDE AGENCY CONTACT LIST

1. United States Geological Survey
Montgomery, Alabama
P.O. Box 210337
John Scott
(205) 832-7510
2. Alabama Highway Department
Urban Planning Division
1409 Colosseum Blvd.
Montgomery, Alabama 36130
(205) 261-6078
3. Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Nongame Wildlife Section
64 North Union Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36130
(205) 261-3486
4. Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Fisheries Section
64 North Union Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36130
Bill Reeves
(205) 261-3471
5. USDA Soil Conservation Service
4510 S. Court Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36105
(205) 821-8070
6. United States Geological Survey
Library/Mapping Department
12201 Reston, Virginia
(703) 648-4301

Appendix D
USAF Hazard Assessment
Rating Methodology

USAF HAZARD ASSESSMENT RATING METHODOLOGY

The Department of Defense (DoD) has established a comprehensive program to identify, evaluate, and control problems associated with past disposal practices at DoD facilities. One of the actions required under this program is to:

develop and maintain a priority listing of contaminated installations and facilities for remedial action based on potential hazard to public health, welfare, and environmental impacts.
(Reference: DEQPPM 81-5, 11 December 1981).

Accordingly, the United States Air Force (USAF) has sought to establish a system to set priorities for taking further actions at sites based upon information gathered during the Records Search phase of its Installation Restoration Program (IRP).

PURPOSE

The purpose of the site rating model is to provide a relative ranking of sites of suspected contamination from hazardous substances. This model will assist the Air National Guard in setting priorities for follow-on site investigations.

This rating system is used only after it has been determined that (1) potential for contamination exists (hazardous wastes present in sufficient quantity), and (2) potential for migration exists. A site can be deleted from consideration for rating on either basis.

DESCRIPTION OF MODEL

Like the other hazardous waste site ranking models, the U.S. Air Force's site rating model uses a scoring system to rank sites for priority attention. However, in developing this model, the designers incorporated some special features to meet specific DoD program needs.

The model uses data readily obtained during the Records Search portion (Phase I) of the IRP. Scoring judgment and computations are easily made. In assessing the hazards at a given site, the model develops a score based on the most likely routes of contamination and the worst hazards at the site. Sites are given low scores only if there are clearly no hazards. This approach meshes well with the policy for evaluating and setting restrictions on excess DoD properties.

Site scores are developed using the appropriate ranking factors according to the method presented in the flow chart (Figure 1 of this report). The site rating form and the rating factor guideline are provided at the end of this appendix.

As with the previous model, this model considers four aspects of the hazard posed by a specific site: possible receptors of the contamination, the waste and its characteristics, the potential pathways for contamination migration, and any efforts that were made to contain the wastes resulting from a spill.

The receptors category rating is based on four rating factors: the potential for human exposure to the site, the potential for human ingestion of contaminants should underlying aquifers be polluted, the current and anticipated uses of the surrounding area, and the potential for adverse effects upon important biological resources and fragile natural settings. The potential for human exposure is evaluated on the basis of the total population within 1,000 feet of the site, and the distance between the site and the base boundary. The potential for human ingestion of contaminants is based on the distance between the site and the nearest well, the groundwater use of the uppermost aquifer, and population served by the groundwater supply within 3 miles of the site. The uses of the surrounding area are determined by the zoning within a 1-mile radius. Determination of whether or not critical environments exist within a 1-mile radius of the site predicts the potential for

adverse effects from the site upon important biological resources and fragile natural settings. Each rating factor is numerically evaluated (0-3) and increased by a multiplier. The maximum possible score is also computed. The factor score and maximum possible scores are totaled, and the receptors subscore computed as follows: receptors subscore = (100 x factor score subtotal / maximum score subtotal).

The waste characteristics category is scored in three steps. First, a point rating is assigned based on an assessment of the waste quantity and the hazard (worst case) associated with the site. The level of confidence in the information is also factored into the assessment. Next, the score is multiplied by a waste persistence factor, which acts to reduce the score if the waste is not very persistent. Finally, the score is further modified by the physical state of the waste. Liquid wastes receive the maximum score, while scores for sludges and solids are reduced.

The pathways category rating is based on evidence of contaminant migration or an evaluation of the highest potential (worst case) for contaminant migration along one of three pathways: surface-water migration, flooding, and groundwater migration. If evidence of contaminant migration exists, the category is given a subscore of 80 to 100 points. For indirect evidence, 80 points are assigned, and for direct evidence, 100 points are assigned. If no evidence is found, the highest score among the three possible routes is used. The three pathways are evaluated and the highest score among all four of the potential scores is used.

The scores for each of the three categories are added together and normalized to a maximum possible score of 100. Then the waste management practice category is scored. Scores for sites with no containment are not reduced. Scores for sites with limited containment can be reduced by 5 percent. If a site is contained and well managed, its score can be reduced by 90 percent. The final site score is calculated by applying the waste management practices category factor to the sum of the scores for the other three categories.

HAZARDOUS ASSESSMENT RATING FORM

Page 1 of 2

NAME OF SITE _____

LOCATION _____

DATE OF OPERATION OR OCCURRENCE _____

OWNER/OPERATOR _____

COMMENTS/DESCRIPTION _____

SITE RATED BY _____

I. RECEPTORS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
A. Population within 1,000 feet of site		4		
B. Distance to nearest well		10		
C. Land use/zoning within 1 mile radius		3		
D. Distance to installation boundary		6		
E. Critical environments within 1 mile radius of site		10		
F. Water quality of nearest surface water body		6		
G. Ground water use of uppermost aquifer		9		
H. Population served by surface water supply within 3 miles downstream of site		6		
I. Population served by ground-water supply within 3 miles of site		6		

Subtotals _____

Receptors subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal) _____

II. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

A. Select the factor score based on the estimated quantity, the degree of hazard, and the confidence level of the information.

1. Waste quantity (S = small, M = medium, L = large) _____
2. Confidence level (C = confirmed, S = suspected) _____
3. Hazard rating (H = high, M = medium, L = low) _____

Factor Subscore A (from 20 to 100 based on factor score matrix) _____

B. Apply persistence factor

Factor Subscore A X Persistence Factor = Subscore B

_____ X _____ = _____

C. Apply physical state multiplier

Subscore B X Physical State Multiplier = Waste Characteristics Subscore

_____ X _____ = _____

III. PATHWAYS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
A. If there is evidence of migration of hazardous contaminants, assign maximum factor subscore of 100 points for direct evidence or 80 points for indirect evidence. If direct evidence exists then proceed to C. If no evidence or indirect evidence exists, proceed to B.				
				Subscore _____
B. Rate the migration potential for 3 potential pathways: surface water migration, flooding, and ground-water migration. Select the highest rating, and proceed to C.				
1. Surface water migration				
Distance to nearest surface water		8		
Net precipitation		6		
Surface erosion		8		
Surface permeability		6		
Rainfall intensity		8		
Subtotals				_____
Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)				_____
2. Flooding				
		1		
Subscore (100 X factor score/3)				_____
3. Ground water migration				
Depth to ground water		8		
Net precipitation		6		
Soil permeability		8		
Subsurface flows		8		
Direct access to ground water		8		
Subtotals				_____
Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)				_____
C. Highest pathway subscore.				
Enter the highest subscore value from A, B-1, B-2 or B-3 above.				
Pathways Subscore				=====

IV. WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

A. Average the three subscores for receptors, waste characteristics, and pathways.

Receptors	_____
Waste Characteristics	_____
Pathways	_____
Total _____ divided by 3 =	_____
	Gross Total Score

B. Apply factor for waste containment from waste management practices

Gross Total Score X Waste Management Practices Factor = Final Score

HAZARDOUS ASSESSMENT RATING METHODOLOGY GUIDELINES

1. RECEPTORS CATEGORY

Rating Factors	Rating Scale Levels			Multiplier
	0	1	2	
A. Population within 1,000 feet (includes on-base facilities)	0	1-25	26-100	Greater than 100 4
B. Distance to nearest water well	Greater than 3 miles	1 to 3 miles	3,001 feet to 1 mile	0 to 3,000 feet 10
C. Land Use/Zoning (within 1-mile radius)	Completely remote (zoning not applicable)	Agricultural	Commercial or Industrial	Residential 3
D. Distance to installation boundary	Greater than 2 miles	1 to 2 miles	1,001 feet to 1 mile	0 to 1,000 feet 6
E. Critical environments (within 1-mile radius)	Not a critical environment	Natural areas	Pristine natural areas; minor wetlands; preserved areas; presence of economically important natural resources susceptible to contamination	Major habitat of an endangered or threatened species; presence of recharge area; major wetlands 10
F. Water quality/use designation of nearest surface water body	Agricultural or Industrial use	Recreation, propagation and management of fish and wildlife	Shellfish propagation and harvesting	Potable water supplies 5
G. Ground-water use of uppermost aquifer	Not used, other sources readily available	Commercial, Industrial, or irrigation, very limited other water sources	Drinking water, municipal water available	Drinking water, no municipal water available; commercial, industrial, or irrigation, no other water source available 9
H. Population served by surface water supplies within 3 miles downstream of site	0	1-15	51-1,000	Greater than 1,000 6
I. Population served by aquifer supplies within 3 miles of site	0	1-50	51-1,000	Greater than 1,000 6

11. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

A-1 Hazardous Waste Quantity

- S = Small quantity (5 tons or 20 drums of liquid)
- M = Moderate quantity (5 to 20 tons or 21 to 85 drums of liquid)
- L = Large quantity (20 tons or 85 drums of liquid)

A-2 Confidence level of information

C = Confirmed confidence level (minimum criteria below)

- o Verbal reports from interviewer (at least 2) or written information from the records
- o Knowledge of types and quantities of wastes generated by shops and other areas on base

S = Suspected confidence level

- o No verbal reports or conflicting verbal reports and no written information from the records
- o Logic based on a knowledge of the types and quantities of hazardous wastes generated at the base, and a history of past waste disposal practices indicate that these wastes were disposed of at a site

A-3 Hazard Rating

D-7

Rating Factors	Rating Scale Levels		
	0	1	2
Toxicity	Sax's Level 0	Sax's Level 1	Sax's Level 2
Ignitability	Flash point greater than 200°F	Flash point at 140°F to 200°F	Flash point at 80°F to 140°F
Radioactivity	At or below background levels	1 to 3 times background levels	3 to 5 times background levels
			Over 5 times background levels

Use the highest individual rating based on toxicity, ignitability and radioactivity and determine the hazard rating.

Hazard Rating	Points
High (H)	3
Medium (M)	2
Low (L)	1

11. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS--Continued

Waste Characteristics Matrix

Point Rating	Hazardous Waste Quantity	Confidence Level of Information	Hazard Rating
100	I	C	II
80	I	C	H
70	M	C	II
60	I	S	II
60	S	C	II
50	M	C	H
50	I	S	I
50	M	S	II
50	S	C	H
40	I	S	II
40	M	S	H
40	S	C	I
30	I	S	I
30	S	C	L
20	M	S	I
20	S	S	H
20	S	S	I

Notes:

For a site with more than one hazardous waste, the waste quantities may be added using the following rules:

Confidence Level

o Confirmed confidence levels (C) can be added.

o Suspected confidence levels (S) can be added.

o Confirmed confidence levels cannot be added with suspected confidence levels.

Waste Hazard Rating

o Wastes with the same hazard rating can be added.

o Wastes with different hazard ratings can only be added in a downgrade mode, e.g., MCH + SCH = LCH if the total quantity is greater than 20 tons.

Example: Several wastes may be present at a site, each having an MCH designation (60 points). By adding the quantities of each waste, the designation may change to LCH (80 points). In this case, the correct point rating for the waste is 80.

B. Persistence Multiplier for Point Rating

Multiply Point Rating Persistence Criteria

Metals, polycyclic compounds, and halogenated hydrocarbons
Substituted and other ring compounds
Straight chain hydrocarbons
Easily biodegradable compounds

From Part A by the Following

1.0
0.9
0.8
0.4

C. Physical State Multiplier

Physical State

Liquid
Sludge
Solid

Multiply Point Total From Parts A and B by the Following

1.0
0.75
0.50

111. PATHWAYS CATEGORY

A. Evidence of Contamination

Direct evidence is obtained from laboratory analyses of hazardous contaminants present above natural background levels in surface water, ground water, or air. Evidence should confirm that the source of contamination is the site being evaluated.

Indirect evidence might be from visual observation (i.e., leachate), vegetation stress, sludge deposits, presence of taste and odors in drinking water, or reported discharges that cannot be directly confirmed as resulting from the site, but the site is greatly suspected of being a source of contamination.

B-1 Potential for Surface Water Contamination

Rating Factors	Rating Scale Levels			Multiplier	
	0	1	2		3
Distance to nearest surface water (includes drainage ditches and storm sewers)	Greater than 1 mile	2,001 feet to 1 mile	501 feet to 2,000 feet	0 to 500 feet	8
Net precipitation	less than -10 inches	-10 to +5 inches	+5 to +20 inches	Greater than +20 inches	6
Surface erosion	None	Slight	Moderate	Severe	8
Surface permeability	0% to 15% clay (>10 ⁻² cm/sec)	15% to 30% clay (10 ⁻³ to 10 ⁻⁴ cm/sec)	30% to 50% clay (10 ⁻⁴ to 10 ⁻⁶ cm/sec)	Greater than 50% clay (>10 ⁻⁶ cm/sec)	6
Rainfall Intensity based on 1-year 24-hour rainfall (Thunderstorms)	<1.0 inch 0-5 0	1.0 to 2.0 inches 6-35 30	2.1 to 3.0 inches 36-49 60	>3.0 inches	8

B-2 Potential for Flooding

Floodplain	Beyond 100-year Floodplain	In 100-year floodplain	In 10-year floodplain	Floods annually	1
------------	----------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------	---

B-3 Potential for Ground-Water Contamination

Depth to ground water	Greater than 500 feet	50 to 500 feet	11 to 50 feet	0 to 10 feet	8
Net precipitation	Less than -10 inches	-10 to +5 inches	+5 to +20 inches	Greater than +20 inches	6
Soil permeability	Greater than 50% clay (>10 ⁻⁶ cm/sec)	30% to 50% clay (10 ⁻⁴ to 10 ⁻⁶ cm/sec)	15% to 30% clay (10 ⁻² to 10 ⁻⁴ cm/sec)	0% to 15% clay (<10 ⁻² cm/sec)	8

N-3 Potential for Ground-Water Contamination--Continued

Rating Factors	Rating Scale Levels			Multiplier
	0	1	2	
Subsurface flows	Bottom of site greater than 5 feet above high ground-water level	Bottom of site occasionally submerged	Bottom of site frequently submerged	Bottom of site located below mean ground-water level
Direct access to ground water (through faults, fractures, faulty well casings, subsidence, fissures, etc.)	No evidence of risk	Low risk	Moderate risk	High risk
				8

IV. WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES CATEGORY

A. This category adjusts the total risk as determined from the receptors, pathways, and waste characteristics categories for waste management practices and engineering controls designed to reduce this risk. The total risk is determined by first averaging the receptors, pathways, and waste characteristics subscores.

B. Waste Management Practices Factor

The following multipliers are then applied to the total risk points (from A):

Waste Management Practice	Multiplier
No containment	1.0
Limited containment	0.95
Fully contained and in full compliance	0.10

Guidelines for fully contained:

Landfills:

- o Clay cap or other impermeable cover
- o Leachate collection system
- o Liners in good condition
- o Adequate monitoring wells

Spills:

- o Quick spill cleanup action taken
- o Contaminated soil removed
- o Soil and/or water samples confirm total cleanup of the spill

Surface Impoundments:

- o Liners in good condition
- o Sound dikes and adequate freeboard
- o Adequate monitoring wells

Fire Protection Training Areas:

- o Concrete surface and berms
- o Oil/water separator for pretreatment of runoff
- o Effluent from oil/water separator to treatment plant

General Note: If data are not available or known to be complete the factor ratings under items I-A through I, III-B-1, or III-6-3, then leave blank for calculation of factor score and maximum possible score.

CNR122

Appendix E
Site Hazardous Assessment Rating Forms

HAZARDOUS ASSESSMENT RATING FORM

Page 1 of 2

NAME OF SITE Site No. 1 - POL FacilityLOCATION Corner of Perimeter Rd. and Pantom St.DATE OF OPERATION OR OCCURRENCE Since late 1960'sOWNER/OPERATOR 187th TFG, Alabama Air National Guard

COMMENTS/DESCRIPTION _____

SITE RATED BY Hazardous Materials Technical Center (HMTTC)

1. RECEPTORS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
A. Population within 1,000 feet of site	3	4	12	12
B. Distance to nearest well	2	10	20	30
C. Land use/zoning within 1 mile radius	3	3	9	9
D. Distance to installation boundary	3	6	18	18
E. Critical environments within 1 mile radius of site	0	10	0	30
F. Water quality of nearest surface water body	1	6	6	18
G. Ground water use of uppermost aquifer	2	9	18	27
H. Population served by surface water supply within 3 miles downstream of site	0	6	0	18
I. Population served by ground-water supply within 3 miles of site	3	6	18	18

Subtotals 101 180

Receptors subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

56

II. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

A. Select the factor score based on the estimated quantity, the degree of hazard, and the confidence level of the information.

1. Waste quantity (S = small, M = medium, L = large)

S

2. Confidence level (C - confirmed, S - suspected)

C

3. Hazard rating (H - high, M - medium, L - low)

H

Factor Subscore A (from 20 to 100 based on factor score matrix)

60

B. Apply persistence factor

Factor Subscore A X Persistence Factor = Subscore B

60 x 0.9 = 54

C. Apply physical state multiplier

Subscore B X Physical State Multiplier = Waste Characteristics Subscore

54 x 1.0 = 54

III. PATHWAYS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
A. If there is evidence of migration of hazardous contaminants, assign maximum factor subscore of 100 points for direct evidence or 30 points for indirect evidence. If direct evidence exists then proceed to C. If no evidence or indirect evidence exists, proceed to B.				

Subscore 30

- B. Rate the migration potential for 3 potential pathways: surface water migration, flooding, and ground-water migration. Select the highest rating, and proceed to C.

1. Surface water migration

Distance to nearest surface water	3	8	24	24
Net precipitation	2	6	12	18
Surface erosion	0	8	0	24
Surface permeability	2	6	12	18
Rainfall intensity	2	8	16	24

Subtotals 64 108

Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

59

2. Flooding

	0	1	0	3
--	---	---	---	---

Subscore (100 X factor score/3)

0

3. Ground water migration

Depth to ground water	3	8	24	24
Net precipitation	1	6	6	18
Soil permeability	2	8	16	24
Subsurface flows	3	8	24	24
Direct access to ground water	3	8	24	24

Subtotals 94 114

Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

82

- C. Highest pathway subscore.

Enter the highest subscore value from A, B-1, B-2 or B-3 above.

Pathways Subscore 82

IV. WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

- A. Average the three subscores for receptors, waste characteristics, and pathways.

Receptors	<u>56</u>
Waste Characteristics	<u>54</u>
Pathways	<u>82</u>

Total 192 divided by 3 =64

Gross Total Score.

- B. Apply factor for waste containment from waste management practices

Gross Total Score X Waste Management Practices Factor = Final Score

64 x 1.0 = 64

HAZARDOUS ASSESSMENT RATING FORM

Page 1 of 2

NAME OF SITE Site No. 2-Oil/Water Separator and Tank, Building 1304

LOCATION South Side, West end of Building 1304

DATE OF OPERATION OR OCCURRENCE Chronic release, date of original occurrence unknown

OWNER/OPERATOR 187th TFG, Alabama Air National Guard

COMMENTS/DESCRIPTION _____

SITE RATED BY Hazardous Materials Technical Center (HMTc)

I. RECEPTORS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
A. Population within 1,000 feet of site	3	4	12	12
B. Distance to nearest well	2	10	20	30
C. Land use/zoning within 1 mile radius	3	3	9	9
D. Distance to installation boundary	3	6	18	18
E. Critical environments within 1 mile radius of site	0	10	0	30
F. Water quality of nearest surface water body	1	6	6	18
G. Ground water use of uppermost aquifer	2	9	18	27
H. Population served by surface water supply within 3 miles downstream of site	0	6	0	18
I. Population served by ground-water supply within 3 miles of site	3	6	18	18

Subtotals 101 180

Receptors subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

56

II. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

A. Select the factor score based on the estimated quantity, the degree of hazard, and the confidence level of the information.

1. Waste quantity (S = small, M = medium, L = large)
2. Confidence level (C - confirmed, S - suspected)
3. Hazard rating (H - high, M - medium, L - low)

S

C

H

Factor Subscore A (from 20 to 100 based on factor score matrix)

60

B. Apply persistence factor
Factor Subscore A X Persistence Factor = Subscore B

$$\underline{60} \times \underline{0.9} = \underline{54}$$

C. Apply physical state multiplier

Subscore B X Physical State Multiplier = Waste Characteristics Subscore

$$\underline{54} \times \underline{1.0} = \underline{54}$$

III. PATHWAYS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
A. If there is evidence of migration of hazardous contaminants, assign maximum factor subscore of 100 points for direct evidence or 30 points for indirect evidence. If direct evidence exists then proceed to C. If no evidence or indirect evidence exists, proceed to B.				
				Subscore <u>80</u>
B. Rate the migration potential for 3 potential pathways: surface water migration, flooding, and ground-water migration. Select the highest rating, and proceed to C.				
1. Surface water migration				
Distance to nearest surface water	3	8	24	24
Net precipitation	2	6	12	18
Surface erosion	0	8	0	24
Surface permeability	2	6	12	18
Rainfall intensity	2	8	16	24
Subtotals				<u>64</u> <u>108</u>
Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)				<u>59</u>
2. Flooding				
	0	1	0	
Subscore (100 X factor score/3)				<u>0</u>
3. Ground water migration				
Depth to ground water	3	8	24	24
Net precipitation	1	6	6	18
Soil permeability	2	8	16	24
Subsurface flows	3	8	24	24
Direct access to ground water	3	8	24	24
Subtotals				<u>94</u> <u>114</u>
Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)				<u>82</u>
C. Highest pathway subscore.				
Enter the highest subscore value from A, B-1, B-2 or B-3 above.				
Pathways Subscore				<u>82</u>

IV. WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

- A. Average the three subscores for receptors, waste characteristics, and pathways.

Receptors	<u>56</u>
Waste Characteristics	<u>54</u>
Pathways	<u>82</u>
Total <u>192</u> divided by 3 =	<u>64</u>
	Gross Total Score

- B. Apply factor for waste containment from waste management practices

Gross Total Score X Waste Management Practices Factor = Final Score

$$\underline{64} \times \underline{1.0} = \boxed{64}$$

HAZARDOUS ASSESSMENT RATING FORM

Page 1 of 2

NAME OF SITE Site No. 3 - Storm Drainage Discharge Point, East

LOCATION Between Perimeter Rd. and Rt. 80, across from POL facility

DATE OF OPERATION OR OCCURRENCE First detected in 1982

OWNER/OPERATOR 187th TFG, Alabama Air National Guard

COMMENTS/DESCRIPTION _____

SITE RATED BY Hazardous Materials Technical Center (EMTC)

I. RECEPTORS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
A. Population within 1,000 feet of site	3	4	12	12
B. Distance to nearest well	2	10	20	30
C. Land use/zoning within 1 mile radius	3	3	9	9
D. Distance to installation boundary	3	6	18	18
E. Critical environments within 1 mile radius of site	0	10	0	30
F. Water quality of nearest surface water body	1	6	6	18
G. Ground water use of uppermost aquifer	2	9	18	27
H. Population served by surface water supply within 3 miles downstream of site	0	6	0	18
I. Population served by ground-water supply within 3 miles of site	3	6	18	18
Subtotals			101	180

Receptors subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

56

II. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

A. Select the factor score based on the estimated quantity, the degree of hazard, and the confidence level of the information.

1. Waste quantity (S = small, M = medium, L = large)
2. Confidence level (C - confirmed, S - suspected)
3. Hazard rating (H - high, M - medium, L - low)

SCH

Factor Subscore A (from 20 to 100 based on factor score matrix)

60

B. Apply persistence factor
Factor Subscore A X Persistence Factor = Subscore B

$$\underline{60} \times \underline{0.9} = \underline{54}$$

C. Apply physical state multiplier

Subscore B X Physical State Multiplier = Waste Characteristics Subscore

$$\underline{54} \times \underline{1.0} = \underline{54}$$

III. PATHWAYS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
---------------	---------------------	------------	--------------	------------------------

- A. If there is evidence of migration of hazardous contaminants, assign maximum factor subscore of 100 points for direct evidence or 80 points for indirect evidence. If direct evidence exists then proceed to C. If no evidence or indirect evidence exists, proceed to B.

Subscore 30

- B. Rate the migration potential for 3 potential pathways: surface water migration, flooding, and ground-water migration. Select the highest rating, and proceed to C.

1. Surface water migration

Distance to nearest surface water	3	8	24	24
Net precipitation	2	6	12	18
Surface erosion	0	8	0	24
Surface permeability	2	6	12	18
Rainfall intensity	2	8	16	24

Subtotals 64 108

Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

59

2. Flooding

	0	1	0	3
--	---	---	---	---

Subscore (100 X factor score/3)

0

3. Ground water migration

Depth to ground water	3	8	24	24
Net precipitation	1	6	6	18
Soil permeability	2	8	16	24
Subsurface flows	0	8	0	24
Direct access to ground water	0	8	0	24

Subtotals 46 114

Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

40

- C. Highest pathway subscore.

Enter the highest subscore value from A, B-1, B-2 or B-3 above.

Pathways Subscore

80

IV. WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

- A. Average the three subscores for receptors, waste characteristics, and pathways.

Receptors	<u>56</u>
Waste Characteristics	<u>54</u>
Pathways	<u>80</u>

Total 190 divided by 3 =63

Gross Total Score

- B. Apply factor for waste containment from waste management practices

Gross Total Score X Waste Management Practices Factor = Final Score

63 x 1.0 = 63

HAZARDOUS ASSESSMENT RATING FORM

Page 1 of 2

NAME OF SITE Site No. 4 - Edge of Aircraft Parking Apron

LOCATION Southern Edge of Aircraft Parking Apron

DATE OF OPERATION OR OCCURRENCE At least since 1980

OWNER/OPERATOR 187th TFG, Alabama Air National Guard

COMMENTS/DESCRIPTION _____

SITE RATED BY Hazardous Materials Technical Center (HMTTC)

1. RECEPTORS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
A. Population within 1,000 feet of site	3	4	12	12
B. Distance to nearest well	2	10	20	30
C. Land use/zoning within 1 mile radius	3	3	9	9
D. Distance to installation boundary	3	6	18	18
E. Critical environments within 1 mile radius of site	0	10	0	30
F. Water quality of nearest surface water body	1	6	6	18
G. Ground water use of uppermost aquifer	2	9	18	27
H. Population served by surface water supply within 3 miles downstream of site	0	6	0	18
I. Population served by ground-water supply within 3 miles of site	3	6	18	18
Subtotals			101	180

Receptors subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

56

11. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

A. Select the factor score based on the estimated quantity, the degree of hazard, and the confidence level of the information.

1. Waste quantity (S = small, M = medium, L = large)

M

2. Confidence level (C - confirmed, S - suspected)

S

3. Hazard rating (H - high, M - medium, L - low)

H

Factor Subscore A (from 20 to 100 based on factor score matrix)

50

B. Apply persistence factor

Factor Subscore A X Persistence Factor = Subscore B

50 x 0.9 = 45

C. Apply physical state multiplier

Subscore B X Physical State Multiplier = Waste Characteristics Subscore

45 x 1.0 = 45

III. PATHWAYS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
---------------	---------------------	------------	--------------	------------------------

- A. If there is evidence of migration of hazardous contaminants, assign maximum factor subscore of 100 points for direct evidence or 80 points for indirect evidence. If direct evidence exists then proceed to C. If no evidence or indirect evidence exists, proceed to B.

Subscore 0

- B. Rate the migration potential for 3 potential pathways: surface water migration, flooding, and ground-water migration. Select the highest rating, and proceed to C.

1. Surface water migration

Distance to nearest surface water	3	8	24	24
Net precipitation	2	6	12	18
Surface erosion	0	8	0	24
Surface permeability	2	6	12	18
Rainfall intensity	2	8	16	24
Subtotals			64	108

Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal) 59

2. Flooding	0	1	0	3
-------------	---	---	---	---

Subscore (100 X factor score/3) 0

3. Ground water migration

Depth to ground water	3	8	24	24
Net precipitation	1	6	6	18
Soil permeability	2	8	16	24
Subsurface flows	1	8	8	24
Direct access to ground water	0	8	0	24
Subtotals			54	114

Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal) 47

- C. Highest pathway subscore.

Enter the highest subscore value from A, B-1, B-2 or B-3 above.

Pathways Subscore 59**IV. WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

- A. Average the three subscores for receptors, waste characteristics, and pathways.

Receptors	56
Waste Characteristics	45
Pathways	59

Total 160 divided by 3 = 53

Gross Total Score

- B. Apply factor for waste containment from waste management practices

Gross Total Score X Waste Management Practices Factor = Final Score

53 x 1.0 = 53

HAZARDOUS ASSESSMENT RATING FORM

Page 1 of 2

NAME OF SITE Site No. 5 - Storm Drainage Discharge Point, West
 LOCATION North side of Perimeter Rd., 150 feet northwest of Building 1312
 DATE OF OPERATION OR OCCURRENCE At least since 1980
 OWNER/OPERATOR 187th TFG, Alabama Air National Guard
 COMMENTS/DESCRIPTION _____
 SITE RATED BY Hazardous Materials Technical Center (HMTTC)

1. RECEPTORS

Rating Factor	Factor Rating (0-3)	Multiplier	Factor Score	Maximum Possible Score
A. Population within 1,000 feet of site	3	4	12	12
B. Distance to nearest well	3	10	30	30
C. Land use/zoning within 1 mile radius	3	3	9	9
D. Distance to installation boundary	3	6	18	18
E. Critical environments within 1 mile radius of site	0	10	0	30
F. Water quality of nearest surface water body	1	6	6	18
G. Ground water use of uppermost aquifer	2	9	18	27
H. Population served by surface water supply within 3 miles downstream of site	0	6	0	18
I. Population served by ground-water supply within 3 miles of site	3	6	18	18

Subtotals 101 180

Receptors subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

56

11. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

A. Select the factor score based on the estimated quantity, the degree of hazard, and the confidence level of the information.

1. Waste quantity (S = small, M = medium, L = large)

S

2. Confidence level (C - confirmed, S - suspected)

C

3. Hazard rating (H - high, M - medium, L - low)

H

Factor Subscore A (from 20 to 100 based on factor score matrix)

60

B. Apply persistence factor

Factor Subscore A X Persistence Factor = Subscore B

60 x 0.9 = 54

C. Apply physical state multiplier

Subscore B X Physical State Multiplier = Waste Characteristics Subscore

54 x 1.0 = 54

III. PATHWAYS

- A. If there is evidence of migration of hazardous contaminants, assign maximum factor subscore of 100 points for direct evidence or 30 points for indirect evidence. If direct evidence exists then proceed to C. If no evidence or indirect evidence exists, proceed to B.

Subscore 0

- B. Rate the migration potential for 3 potential pathways: surface water migration, flooding, and ground-water migration. Select the highest rating, and proceed to C.

1. Surface water migration

Distance to nearest surface water	3	8	24	24
Net precipitation	2	6	12	18
Surface erosion	0	8	0	24
Surface permeability	2	6	12	18
Rainfall intensity	2	8	16	24
Subtotals			64	108

Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

59

2. Flooding

0	1	0	3
---	---	---	---

Subscore (100 X factor score/3)

0

3. Ground water migration

Depth to ground water	3	8	24	24
Net precipitation	1	6	6	18
Soil permeability	2	8	16	24
Subsurface flows	0	8	0	24
Direct access to ground water	0	8	0	24
Subtotals			46	114

Subscore (100 X factor score subtotal/maximum score subtotal)

40

C. Highest pathway subscore.

Enter the highest subscore value from A, B-1, B-2 or B-3 above.

Pathways Subscore 59**IV. WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

- A. Average the three subscores for receptors, waste characteristics, and pathways.

Receptors	56
Waste Characteristics	54
Pathways	59

Total 169 divided by 3 =Gross Total Score 56

- B. Apply factor for waste containment from waste management practices

Gross Total Score X Waste Management Practices Factor = Final Score

56 x 1.0 = 56

187th TACTICAL FIGHTER GROUP
ALABAMA AIR NATIONAL GUARD
DANNELLY FIELD MUNICIPAL AIRPORT
MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

USAF Hazard Assessment Rating Methodology
Rating Factor Criteria

The following is a summary and explanation of the rating factor criteria used to score the Base sites under HARM. The majority of the factors in the receptors and pathway categories are the same for each of the rated sites and are therefore stated only once. In those instances where a rating factor varies according to a specific site, the factor is addressed separately for each of the respective sites.

I. RECEPTORS

- A. Population within 1,000 feet of site. Factor Rating 3 - Accounting for the population of the Base itself, and the Army National Guard and Airport installations, the total population exceeds 100 people.
- B. Distance to nearest well. Factor Rating 2 - Persons living within a mile but farther than 3,000 feet from the airport, use private wells for drinking water. City water lines do not extend to all residences within 1 mile of the Base.
- C. Land use/zoning (within one mile radius). Factor Rating 3 - Areas within a one mile radius of the Base are zoned for residential development. Populated neighborhoods exist within 2,000 feet of the Base.
- D. Distance to installation boundary. Factor Rating 3 - The base itself at its widest point is only 1,200 to 1,300 feet. Consequently, all sites identified on the Base are within 1,000 feet of the boundary.
- E. Critical environments (within 1 mile radius). Factor Rating 0 - There are no areas that are considered critical or fragile environments within 1 mile of the Base.
- F. Water quality/use designation of nearest surface water body. Factor Rating 1 - Streams nearest the Base are used for fishing, however they do not serve as drinking water sources.

- G. Groundwater use of uppermost aquifer. Factor Rating 3 - The uppermost aquifer at the Base is the Eutaw aquifer, which is a drinking water source and thus warrants a factor rating of 2. However, to avoid confusion, it should be noted that this aquifer is confined by the Mooreville Chalk Formation - a 137 foot thick aquiclude. Groundwater that occurs above and to a small extent with the Mooreville Chalk, is actually the nearest groundwater to the surface and it is this groundwater that is referred to in the "depth to groundwater" factor under the Pathways Category, as being 0-10 feet from the surface. However, this shallow groundwater is not present in sufficient quantity to serve as an aquifer and would not be considered the uppermost aquifer.
- H. Population served by surface water supplies within 3 miles downstream of the site. Factor Rating 0 - Surface water is not used as a drinking water source, so no one is served by this source.
- I. Population served by aquifer supplies within 3 miles of the site. Factor Rating 3 - The city of Montgomery's "West Well Field", a major municipal water source, is located approximately 1.25 miles from the Base. Some of these wells tap the uppermost Eutaw aquifer.

II. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Site No. 1:

- o A-1: Waste Quantity - Factor Rating S (small). The precise amount of waste released at this site is undefined, but in the absence of large spill reports or reports of significant leaks from UST, the total amount is assumed to be below 1,000 gallons.
- o A-2: Confidence Level - Factor Rating C. Interviewees were able to verify that at least a "small quantity" of waste has been released at this site.
- o A-3: Hazard Rating - Factor Rating H (high). The site was rated for JP-4, which has a Sax toxicity rating of 3, and a corresponding HARM hazard rating of 3.

Site No. 2

- o A-1: Waste Quantity - Factor Rating S. The precise amount is unknown, but only small spills are known to have occurred and there were no reports of noticeable loss from the tank. Therefore, total loss is assumed to be less than 1,000 gallons.
- o A-2: Confidence Level - Factor Rating C. Interviewees were able to verify that at least a "small quantity" of waste was released at this site.

- o A-3: Hazard Rating - Factor Rating H. Hazard rating was based upon chemical constituents detected in samples taken at this site which showed the presence of benzene (probably a fraction of a POL compound). Benzene has a Sax rating of 3.

Site No. 3

- o A-1: Waste Quantity - Factor Rating S. Although between two and four thousand gallons of contaminants may have been discharged at this point, the majority floated on water and were washed downstream and never actually settled at this site. Therefore, a more accurate amount associated with this site is under 1,000 gallons.
- o A-2: Confidence Level - Factor Rating C. Interviewees were able to verify that at least a "small quantity" of hazardous waste has been released at this site.
- o A-3: Hazard Rating - Factor Rating H. The hazard rating was based on JP-4 which has a Sax toxicity of 3, which equates to a HARM rating of "high".

Site No. 4

- o A-1: Waste Quantity - Factor Rating M. Accounting for one reported 400 to 500 gallon spill, and numerous routine flightline releases of 0.5 to several gallons, the total quantity washed to this site is estimated to exceed 1,000 gallons.
- o A-2: Confidence Level - Factor Rating S. It is was confirmed that at least a "small quantity" of waste has been released at this site and interviewee reports suggest that a medium quantity has been released.
- o A-3: Hazard Rating - Factor Rating H. Scoring was based on JP-4 toxicity, which has a Sax toxicity of 3. This corresponds to a HARM toxicity of "high".

Site No. 5

- o A-1: Waste Quantity - Factor Rating S. The total quantity released at this site, including a 500 gallon JP-4 spill and contaminants from a slow leaking tank or OWS that discharge here, is estimated to be under 1,000 gallons.
- o A-2: Confidence Level - Factor Rating C. Interviewees were able to confirm that spills and leaks mentioned above were discharged at this site.
- o A-3: Hazard Rating - Factor Rating H. Scoring was based upon JP-4 toxicity, which has a Sax toxicity rating of 3. This corresponds to a HARM toxicity of "high".

B. Persistence Multiplier

Sites Nos. 1 - 5 = 0.9

The Persistence Multiplier for Site Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5 were based on JP-4 persistence, which falls into the HARM category of "substituted and other ring compounds".

The Persistence Factor at Site No. 3 was based on benzene, which also falls within the HARM category of "substituted and other ring compounds".

C. Physical State Multiplier

Site Nos. 1 - 5 = 1.0

The substances released at Site Nos. 1 - 5 were liquids; therefore these sites were scored using a multiplier of 1.0.

III. PATHWAYS CATEGORY

A. Evidence of Contamination.

Site No. 1: Indirect Evidence - Factor Rating 80. Indirect evidence of contaminant migration at this site consists of a strong POL odor in groundwater, in a shallow hole dug above the JP-4 storage tanks. There is also a strong odor of POL in several manholes next to the POL facility.

Site No. 2: Indirect Evidence - Factor Rating 80. Contaminated groundwater seeping through a crack in a nearby concrete conduit constitutes the indirect evidence of contamination at this site. Besides this site, there are no other likely sources for this contamination.

Site No. 3: Indirect Evidence - Factor Rating 80. Indirect evidence of contaminant migration from this site consists of a visible POL sheen on water discharging at this point and the distinct odor of POL in storm sewer pipes leading to this site.

Site No. 4: No Evidence - Factor Rating 0.

Site No. 5: No Evidence - Factor Rating 0.

B-1: Potential for Surface Water Contamination.

- o Distance to nearest surface water: Factor Rating 3. All of the sites on the Base are within 500 feet of surface water. Surface water includes drainage ditches and storm sewers.
- o Net precipitation: Factor Rating 2. Net precipitation at the Base is calculated to be 7.12 inches per year.
- o Soil erosion: Factor Rating 0. There is no visible evidence of soil erosion at the Base.
- o Surface permeability: Factor Rating 2. Permeability rates for soils at the Base is estimated to be between 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} , according to U.S. Soil Conservation Service Reports.
- o Rainfall intensity based on 1-year, 24-hour rainfall: Factor Rating 2. The 1-year, 24-hour rainfall is 2.75 inches, according to NOAA storm maps.

B-2: Potential for Flooding - Factor Rating 0. According to officials of the Alabama Department of Highways' Planning Bureau, the Base does not lie within a 100 year floodplain.

B-3: Potential for Groundwater Contamination.

- o Depth to groundwater: Factor Rating 3. Base soil boring records show that in some places, the water table lies within 2.5 feet of the surface.
- o Net precipitation: Factor Rating 1. See B-1.
- o Soil permeability: Factor Rating 2. See B-1.
- o Subsurface Flows

Site No. 1: Factor Rating 3. Leaking UST or tank piping are suspected at this site; both of which exist below the groundwater level and therefore warrant the maximum rating of 3.

Site No. 2: Factor Rating 3. A leaking OWS or UST is suspected at this site; at least a portion of each of these structures are below the water table level and, therefore, a factor rating of 3 was applied.

Site No. 3: Factor Rating 0. None of the four rating scale levels for this HARM category adequately fit this site. This site is a surface stream, which cannot accurately be described as being above or below the groundwater table, but is actually a discharge point for shallow groundwater occurring above the Mooreville Chalk Formation. Since this site is, in effect, a point at which groundwater becomes surface water, the lowest subsurface flow factor rating was applied here.

Site No. 4: Factor Rating 1. There is at this time no evidence to suggest that this site is more than occasionally submerged below the groundwater table; therefore, the factor rating of 1 was applied.

Site No. 5: Factor Rating 0. Conditions at this site are equivalent to those at Site No. 3, and therefore, this factor was treated the same.

- o Direct access to groundwater (through faults, fractures, faulty well casings, subsidence, fissures, etc.

Site No. 1: Factor Rating 3. A leaking UST is suspected at this site; any contaminants leaking from this tank would flow directly into shallow groundwater.

Site No. 2: Factor Rating 3. An OWS or tank may be leaking at Site No. 2. Portions of each of these structures are normally submerged under shallow groundwater. Consequently, any contaminants leaking from the OWS or tank are considered to have direct access to groundwater.

Site No. 3: Factor Rating 0.

Site No. 4: Factor Rating 0

Site No. 5: Factor Rating 0

IV. WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FACTOR MULTIPLIER

Site Nos. 1-5 = 1.0 None of the sites identified on the Base have any form of contaminant containment.

APPENDIX F

ANALYTICAL RESULTS OF SAMPLING AT THE 187th TACTICAL
FIGHTER GROUP, ALABAMA AIR NATIONAL GUARD INSTALLATION (ANGI),
DANNELLY FIELD MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

ANALYTICAL RESULTS OF SAMPLES
TAKEN AT SITE NO. 2

ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLING DATA (TRACE ORGANICS)				OEHL USE ONLY			
<i>(Use this space for mechanical imprint)</i> 3				SAMPLING SITE IDENTIFIER 0349 NS 002 (AFR 19-7) BASE WHERE SAMPLE COLLECTED DANNIELLY FIELD (ANG) SAMPLING SITE DESCRIPTION UNDERGROUND DUMP TANK OF ISLUG 1304			
DATE COLLECTION BEGAN (YYMMDD) 85 10 23		TIME COLLECTION BEGAN (24 hour clock) 0945		COLLECTION METHOD ☒ GRAB ☐ COMPOSITE _____ HOURS			
MAIL REPORTS TO (circle if changed)	ORIGINAL 0349 1871 MC CRINIC 15608 P O Box 2584 Moncks AL 36196-0001						
	COPY 1						
	COPY 2						
SAMPLE COLLECTED BY (Name, Grade, AFSC) MARK S. BARRETT, 1SGT 90770				SIGNATURE _____		AUTOVON _____	
REASON FOR SUBMISSION ☒		A-ACCIDENT/INCIDENT R-ROUTINE/PERIODIC		C-COMPLAINT N-NPDES		F-FOLLOWUP/CLEANUP O-OTHER (specify) _____	
BASE SAMPLE NUMBER 0349 0003				OEHL PID _____			
ANALYSES REQUESTED (check appropriate blocks)							
VOLATILE HALOCARBONS (VOH) (10860)		Trichlorofluoromethane 34488		MISCELLANEOUS			
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ PRES GROUP T1		Vinyl Chloride 39175		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ PRES GROUP T1			
Volatile Halocarbon Screen 1001460PH				Xylene 81710			
Bromodichloromethane 32101				Methyleneethyl ketone 81595			
Bromoform 32104		TRIHALOMETHANES (THM) (10860)		Methylisobutyl ketone 81596			
Bromomethane 34413		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ PRES GROUP T1		Total organic halides 10021060H			
Carbon Tetrachloride 32102		Trihalomethane Potential 1001465MT					
Chlorobenzene 34301		Total Trihalomethanes 82080					
Chloroethane 34311							
2-Chloroethylvinyl ether 34576							
Chlorotorm 32106		VOLATILE AROMATICS (VOA) (10850)					
Chloromethane 34418		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ PRES GROUP T1					
Dibromochloromethane 32105		☒ Volatile Aromatic Screen 1001461PA					
1, 2-dichlorobenzene 34536		Benzene 34030		MISCELLANEOUS			
1, 3-dichlorobenzene 34566		Chlorobenzene 34301		EXTRACTABLES			
1, 4-dichlorobenzene 34571		1, 2-dichlorobenzene 34536		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ PRES GROUP T4			
Dichlorodifluoromethane 34668		1, 3-dichlorobenzene 34566		PCB's 34516			
1, 1-dichloroethane 34496		1, 4-dichlorobenzene 34571		Phthalate Esters Screen 1000069PH			
1, 2-dichloroethane 34531		Ethylbenzene 34371		bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate 39100			
1, 1 dichloroethene 34501		Toluene 34010		Butyl Benzyl phthalate 34292			
trans-1, 2-dichloroethene 34546				Di-n-butyl phthalate 39110			
1, 2-dichloropropane 34541				Diethyl phthalate 34336			
cis-1, 3-dichloropropene 34704				Dimethyl phthalate 34341			
trans-1, 3-dichloropropene 34699				Di-n-octyl phthalate 34546			
Methylene Chloride 34423							
1, 1, 2, 2-tetrachloroethane 34516							
Tetrachloroethylene 34475							
1, 1, 1-trichloroethane 34506							
1, 1, 2-trichloroethane 34511							
Trichloroethylene 39180							
REMARKS							

LABORATORY ANALYSIS REPORT AND RECORD (General)					DATE 7 NOV 1985	
TO:			FROM: USAF OEHL/SA BROOKS AFB TX 78235-5501			
SAMPLE IDENTITY			DATE RECEIVED 24 OCT 1985			
Water			LAB CONTROL NO.			
SAMPLE FROM						
TEST FOR Volatile Aromatics						
Methodology: EPA 602						
OEHL NO:	75326				Detection Limit	
BASE NO:	6N850003				ND	TR
Benzene	226				1.0	2.0
Chlorobenzene	ND				1.0	2.0
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND				2.0	3.0
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	128				2.0	3.0
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND				2.0	3.0
Ethylbenzene	63				1.0	2.0
Toluene	216				1.0	2.0

Results in micrograms per liter.

ND-None Detected. Less than the detection limit.
TRACE-Present but less than the quantitative limit.

DATE ANALYZED: 29 OCT 1985

Edward J. Brown
 6 NOV 1985

REQUESTING AGENCY (Mailing Address)
 187 TAC Clinic/SGPB
 P.O. BOX 2584
 Montgomery, AL
 36196-0001

ANNA WILLIS
 Technician

ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLING DATA (TRACE ORGANICS)				OEHL USE ONLY															
(Use this space for mechanical imprint) (B)				SAMPLING SITE IDENTIFIER (AFR 19-7) 0349 NS 002															
				BASE WHERE SAMPLE COLLECTED DANNERTY FIELD (ANG)															
				SAMPLING SITE DESCRIPTION WIDE NEXT TO UNDERGROUND DUMP TANK															
DATE COLLECTION BEGAN (YYMMDD) 05/02/3				TIME COLLECTION BEGAN (24 hour clock) 0945				COLLECTION METHOD ☒ GRAB ☐ COMPOSITE _____ HOURS											
MAIL REPORTS TO (circle if changed)	ORIGINAL	0349			1BT TAC CLINIC/SGPB PO Box 2589 Montgomery AL 36196-0001														
	COPY 1																		
	COPY 2																		
SAMPLE COLLECTED BY (Name, Grade, AFSC)								SIGNATURE				AUTOVON							
REASON FOR SUBMISSION		☒ E-C A-ACCIDENT/INCIDENT R-ROUTINE/PERIODIC		C-COMPLAINT N-NPDES		F-FOLLOWUP/CLEANUP O-OTHER (specify) _____													
BASE SAMPLE NUMBER				GN 85 0002				OEHL PID											
ANALYSES REQUESTED (check appropriate blocks)																			
VOLATILE HALOCARBONS (VOH) (10860)				Trichlorofluoromethane 34488				MISCELLANEOUS											
☒ PRES GROUP T1 Volatile Halocarbon Screen 1001460PH				Vinyl Chloride 39175				VOLATILES											
Bromodichloromethane 32101								Xylene 81710											
Bromotorm 32104								Methylethyl ketone 81595											
Bromomethane 34413				TRihalOMETHANES (THM) (10860)				Methylisobutyl ketone 81596											
Carbon Tetrachloride 32102				PRES GROUP T1				Total organic halides 10021060H											
Chlorobenzene 34301				Trihalomethane Potential 1001465MT															
Chloroethane 34311				Total Trihalomethanes 82080															
2-Chloroethylvinyl ether 34576																			
Chlorotorm 32106				VOLATILE AROMATICS (VOA) (10850)															
Chloromethane 34418				PRES GROUP T1															
Dibromochloromethane 32105				Volatile Aromatic Screen 1001461PA															
1, 2-dichlorobenzene 34536				Benzene 34030				MISCELLANEOUS											
1, 3-dichlorobenzene 34566				Chlorobenzene 34301				EXTRACTABLES											
1, 4-dichlorobenzene 34571				1, 2-dichlorobenzene 34536				PRES GROUP T4											
Dichlorodifluoromethane 34668				1, 3-dichlorobenzene 34566				PCB's 34510											
1, 1-dichloroethane 34496				1, 4-dichlorobenzene 34571				Phthalate Esters Screen 1001069PH											
1, 2-dichloroethane 34531				Ethylbenzene 34371				bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate 34100											
1, 1-dichloroethene 34501				Toluene 34010				Butyl Benzyl phthalate 34292											
trans-1, 2-dichloroethene 34546								Di-n-butyl phthalate 34110											
1, 2-dichloropropane 34541								Diethyl phthalate 34336											
cis-1, 3-dichloropropene 34704								Dimethyl phthalate 34341											
trans-1, 3-dichloropropene 34699								Di-n-octyl phthalate 34596											
Methylene Chloride 34423																			
1, 1, 2, 2-tetrachloroethane 34516																			
Tetrachloroethylene 34475																			
1, 1, 1-trichloroethane 34506																			
1, 1, 2-trichloroethane 34511																			
Trichloroethylene 39180																			
REMARKS																			

LABORATORY ANALYSIS REPORT AND RECORD (General)

DATE

19 NOV 1985

TO:

FROM: USAF OEH, SA
BROOKS AFB TX 78235 - 5501

SAMPLE IDENTIFY

WATER

DATE RECEIVED

24 OCT 1985

SAMPLE FROM

LAB CONTROL NO

VEIN FOR

Volatile Halocarbons

Methodology: EPA Method 601

OEH NO:	75325	75327	75328			DET.
BASE NO:	CN850062	CN850064	CN850065			LIMIT
Bromodichloromethane	NO	NO	NO			0.1
Bromoform						0.2
Bromomethane						1.0
Carbon Tetrachloride						0.1
Chlorobenzene						0.2
Chloroethane						0.5
2-Chloroethylvinyl ether						0.1
Chloroform						0.1
Chloromethane						0.1
Dibromochloromethane						0.1
1,2-Dichlorobenzene						0.2
1,3-Dichlorobenzene						0.2
1,4-Dichlorobenzene						0.2
Dichlorodifluoromethane						0.1
1,1-Dichloroethane						0.2
1,2-Dichloroethane						0.2
1,1-Dichloroethene						0.1
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene						0.1
1,2-Dichloropropane						0.1
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene						0.2
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene						0.2
Methylene Chloride	1.6					0.2
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	NO					0.1
Tetrachloroethylene						0.1
1,1,1-Trichloroethane						0.1
1,1,2-Trichloroethane						0.1
Trichloroethylene						0.1
Trichlorofluoromethane						0.1
Vinyl Chloride						0.2

Results in Micrograms per Liter

DATE ANALYZED: 05 NOV 1985

Edward J. Brown

19 NOV 1985

REQUESTING AGENCY (Please Address)

197 TAC CLINIC/SCPB

P.O. Box 2584

Montgomery AL 36146

-0001

ND-NONE DETECTED, LESS THAN THE DETECTION LIMIT.

TRACE-PRESENT BUT LESS THAN THE QUANTITATIVE LIMIT

TRACE = 2 times Detection Limit.


ERIC A. BANKS, Capt, USAF
Chemist

ANALYTICAL RESULTS OF SAMPLES
TAKEN AT SITE NO. 3

ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLING DATA				OEHL USE ONLY			
(Use this space for mechanical imprint) A				SAMPLING SITE IDENTIFIER (AFR 19-7) 0349 NS 001			
				BASE WHERE SAMPLE COLLECTED DANIELLY FIELD (ANG)			
				SAMPLING SITE DESCRIPTION STORM DRAIN RUN OFF			
DATE COLLECTION BEGAN (YYMMDD) 8151/01213		TIME COLLECTION BEGAN (24 hour clock) 0930		COLLECTION METHOD ☒ GRAB ☐ COMPOSITE _____ HOURS			
MAIL REPORTS TO (circle if changed)	ORIGINAL	0349		187 TAC CLINIC/SGPB PO BOX 2584 MONTGOMERY, AL 36196-0001			
	COPY 1						
	COPY 2						
SAMPLE COLLECTED BY (Name, Grade, AFSC) BARRETT, MARK S 90770 TS6T				SIGNATURE 		AUTOVON 742-9402	
REASON FOR SUBMISSION EC		A-ACCIDENT/INCIDENT R-ROUTINE/PERIODIC		C-COMPLAINT N-NPDES		F-FOLLOWUP/CLEANUP O-OTHER (specify) _____	
BASE SAMPLE NUMBER G7N 85 0001				OEHL NO. _____			
ANALYSES REQUESTED (Check appropriate blocks)							
GROUP A		Hardness 00900		Silica 00955		2, 4, 5-T 39740	
Ammonia 00610		Iron 01045		Specific Conductance 00095		2, 4, 5-TP-Silvex 39760	
Chemical Oxygen Demand 00340		Lead 01051		Sulfate 00945			
Kjeldahl Nitrogen 00625		Magnesium 00927		Surfactants-MBAS 38260			
Nitrate 00620		Manganese 01055		Turbidity 00076			
Nitrite 00615		Mercury 71900					
Oil & Grease 00560		Nickel 01067					
Organic Carbon 00680		Potassium 00937					
Orthophosphate 00671		Selenium 01147					
Phosphorus, Total 00665		Silver 01077		Aldrin 39330			
X JP4		Sodium 00929		BHC Isomers 39340			
		Thallium 01059		a-BHC 39337			
		Zinc 01092		b-BHC 39338			
Cyanide, Total 00720				d-BHC 34259			
Cyanide, Free 00722				Chlordane 39350		GROUP J	
GROUP E		GROUP G		DDT Isomers 39370		Sulfides 00745	
Phenols 32730		Acidity, Total 70508		p, p-DDD 39310			
		Alkalinity, Total 00410		p, p-DDE 39320			
GROUP F		Alkalinity, Bicarbonate 00425		p, p-DDT 39300			
Antimony 01097		Bromide 71870		Dieldrin 39380		ON SITE ANALYSES	
Arsenic 01002		Carbon Dioxide 00405		Dursban 77969			
Barium 01007		Chloride 00940		Endrin 39390		Flow 50050	mgd
Beryllium 01012		Color 00080		Heptachlor 39410		Chlorine, Total 50060	mg/l
Boron 01022		Fluoride 00951		Heptachlor Epoxide 39420		Dissolved Oxygen 00300	mg/l
Cadmium 01027		Residue, Total 00500		Lindane 39782		pH 00400	units
Calcium 00916		Residue, Filterable (TDS) 70300		Methoxychlor 39480		Temperature 00010	°C
Chromium, Total 01034		Residue, Nonfilterable 00530		Pramitol (Prameton) XY4200000		Odor 00086	
Chromium VI 01032		Residue, Settleable 50085		Toxaphene 39400		Iodide 71865	
Copper 01042		Residue, Volatile 00505		2, 4-D 39730		Sulfite 00740	
REMARKS							

15.24

3. LABORATORY PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS DEHL			4. LAB SAMPLE NUMBER 75324			5. REQUESTOR SAMPLE NO GN 850001		
6. SAMPLE COLLECTION INFORMATION DATE RECEIVED BY LAB 24 DEC 85						7. DATE ANALYSIS COMPLETED 14 NOV 85		
8. SITE LOCATION NO		9. FLOW RATE BY METER 00000 GAL/MIN		10. DEPTH 0000'		11. WATER TEMP 00.00 °C		
12. COLLECTION DATE/PERIOD		13. COLLECTOR'S NAME		14. RESULTS OF OTHER ON-SITE ANALYSES		15. DISTANCE 00000 M/L		
16. SAMPLING TECHNIQUE		17. PHONE NUMBER						
18. REASON FOR SAMPLE SUBMISSION								
19. NOTES								
ANALYSES REQUESTED AND RESULTS								
PRESERVATION GROUP A			PRESERVATION GROUP F			PRESERVATION GROUP G		
PARAMETER	TOTAL	MG/L	PARAMETER	DIS	TOTAL	MG/L	PARAMETER	TOTAL
CHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND	00340		ARSENIC	01000	01003		BORON	01022
TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON @ C	00480		BARIUM	01005	01007		BORON, Dissolved	01020
			CADMIUM	01025	01027		CHLORIDE	00940
PRESERVATION GROUP B			CHROMIUM			COLOR		
PARAMETER	TOTAL	MG/L	01030 01034			00080 Units		
OIL & GREASE FRICTION Method	00300	136.0	CHROMIUM Hexavalent			01032		
JP-4			COPPER			01040 01042		
PRESERVATION GROUP C			IRON			Residue Filterable (TDS)		
PARAMETER	TOTAL	MG/L	01046 01043			00515		
AMMONIA as N	00610		LEAD			Residue Non Filterable (SS)		
NITRATE as N Cd Reduct Method	00670		01049 01051			00500		
NITRITE as N	00615		MANGANESE			Residue Volatile		
TOTAL NITROGEN as N	00625		01055 01053			00505		
PHOSPHORUS as P	00507		MERCURY			Specific Conductance		
PHOSPHORUS as P	00645		01060 01060			00095		
			NICKEL			SULFATE as SO ₄		
			01065 01067			00045		
PRESERVATION GROUP D			SELENIUM			SURFACTANTS MBAS as LAS		
PARAMETER	TOTAL	MG/L	01145 01147			28200		
CYANIDE	00720		SILVER			TURBIDITY		
CYANIDE Free Ammonia as Cl ₂	00722		01066 01077			00075 Units		
			ZINC					
			01080 01082					
PRESERVATION GROUP E			CALCIUM as Ca					
PARAMETER	TOTAL	MG/L	00915 00916					
			MAGNESIUM as Mg					
			00925 00927					
			POTASSIUM					
			00935 00937					
			SODIUM					
			00930 00929					
PRESERVATION GROUP F			PRESERVATION GROUP G					
PARAMETER	TOTAL	MG/L	PARAMETER					
PHENOLS	23720							
L. ORGANIZATION REQUESTING ANALYSIS						CHEMIST		
SITE C Dannelly Field						REVIEWED BY		
						APPROVED BY		
						D-23-Q		

LABORATORY ANALYSIS REPORT AND RECORD (General)		DATE 19 NOV 1985
TO: 187 TAC Clinic	FROM:	
SAMPLE IDENTITY GN850001	DATE RECEIVED 24 Oct 85	
SAMPLE FROM	LAB CONTROL NR 75324	
TEST FOR Fuel Characterization		
$0+G = \overset{136}{\cancel{226}} \text{ mg/l}$ Capillary gas chromatography shows sample GN850001 contains the n-alkane components C-9 - C-15 in the same relative concentration as some types of JP-4 analyzed in this lab.  John C. Bonnin 2Lt. USAF Chemist, Special Projects Function		
REQUESTING AGENCY (Mailing Address) 187 TAC Clinic/SCAB PO Box 2584 Montgomery, AL 36196-0001		

F-7

END

DATE

FILMED

8-88

DTIC