

LOAN DOCUMENT

	DTIC ACCESSION NUMBER		PHOTOGRAPH THIS SHEET	(0)																								
		LEVEL		INVENTORY																								
Site-Specific Tech. Rpt. for Bioslurper...																												
DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION 30 Jan 96																												
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A Approved for Public Release Distribution Unlimited																												
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT																												
<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">ACCESSION FOR</td></tr><tr><td>NTIS</td><td>GRAM ☒</td></tr><tr><td>DTIC</td><td>TRAC ☐</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">UNANNOUNCED ☐</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">JUSTIFICATION</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"> </td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">BY</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">DISTRIBUTION/</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">AVAILABILITY CODES</td></tr><tr><td>DISTRIBUTION</td><td>AVAILABILITY AND/OR SPECIAL</td></tr><tr><td>A-1</td><td></td></tr></table>		ACCESSION FOR		NTIS	GRAM ☒	DTIC	TRAC ☐	UNANNOUNCED ☐		JUSTIFICATION						BY		DISTRIBUTION/		AVAILABILITY CODES		DISTRIBUTION	AVAILABILITY AND/OR SPECIAL	A-1				
ACCESSION FOR																												
NTIS	GRAM ☒																											
DTIC	TRAC ☐																											
UNANNOUNCED ☐																												
JUSTIFICATION																												
BY																												
DISTRIBUTION/																												
AVAILABILITY CODES																												
DISTRIBUTION	AVAILABILITY AND/OR SPECIAL																											
A-1																												
DISTRIBUTION STAMP		DATE ACCESSIONED																										
		DATE RETURNED																										
20001129 070		REGISTERED OR CERTIFIED NUMBER																										
DATE RECEIVED IN DTIC																												
PHOTOGRAPH THIS SHEET AND RETURN TO DTIC-FDAC																												

H
A
N
D
L
E
W
I
T
H
C
A
R
E

**SITE-SPECIFIC TECHNICAL REPORT
FOR BIOSLURPER TESTING AT
LANDFILL 3, OPERABLE UNIT 1
AND BUILDING 870,
HILL AFB, UTAH**

DRAFT



PREPARED FOR:

**AIR FORCE CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EXCELLENCE
TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER DIVISION
(AFCEE/ERT)
8001 ARNOLD DRIVE
BROOKS AFB, TEXAS 78235-5357**

AND

HILL AFB, UTAH

30 JANUARY 1996

AQ M01-02-0377

**DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER
REQUEST FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REPORTS**

Title

AFCEE Collection

1. Report Availability (Please check one box)

- ☒ This report is available. Complete sections 2a - 2f.
☐ This report is not available. Complete section 3.

**2a. Number of
Copies Forwarded**

1 each

2b. Forwarding Date

July/2000

2c. Distribution Statement (Please check ONE box)

DoD Directive 5230.24, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents," 18 Mar 87, contains seven distribution statements, as described briefly below. Technical documents **MUST** be assigned a distribution statement.

- ☒ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.
- ☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT B: Distribution authorized to U.S. Government Agencies only.
- ☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT C: Distribution authorized to U.S. Government Agencies and their contractors.
- ☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT D: Distribution authorized to U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) and U.S. DoD contractors only.
- ☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT E: Distribution authorized to U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) components only.
- ☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT F: Further dissemination only as directed by the controlling DoD office indicated below or by higher authority.
- ☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT X: Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies and private individuals or enterprises eligible to obtain export-controlled technical data in accordance with DoD Directive 5230.25, Withholding of Unclassified Technical Data from Public Disclosure, 6 Nov 84.

2d. Reason For the Above Distribution Statement (in accordance with DoD Directive 5230.24)**2e. Controlling Office**

HQ AFCEE

**2f. Date of Distribution Statement
Determination**

15 Nov 2000

3. This report is NOT forwarded for the following reasons. (Please check appropriate box)

- ☐ It was previously forwarded to DTIC on _____ (date) and the AD number is _____
- ☐ It will be published at a later date. Enter approximate date if known. _____
- ☐ In accordance with the provisions of DoD Directive 3200.12, the requested document is not supplied because: _____

Print or Type Name

Laura Peña

Signature

Laura Peña

Telephone

210-536-1431

(For DTIC Use Only)

AQ Number

M01-02-0377

DRAFT

SITE-SPECIFIC TECHNICAL REPORT (A003)

for

**BIOSLURPER TESTING AT LANDFILL 3, OPERABLE UNIT 1 AND BUILDING 870,
HILL AFB, UTAH**

by

A. Leeson, J. Kramer, J.A. Kittel, G Headington, and R. Gillespie

for

**Mr. Patrick Haas
U. S. Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence
Technology Transfer Division
(AFCEE/ERT)
Brooks AFB, Texas 78235**

January 30, 1996

**Battelle
505 King Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201-2693**

Contract No. F41624-94-C-8012

This report is a work prepared for the United States Government by Battelle. In no event shall either the United States Government or Battelle have any responsibility or liability for any consequences of any use, misuse, inability to use, or reliance upon the information contained herein, nor does either warrant or otherwise represent in any way the accuracy, adequacy, efficacy, or applicability of the contents hereof.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Objectives	1
1.2 Testing Approach	2
2.0 LANDFILL 3, OU1 SITE DESCRIPTION	2
3.0 BIOSLURPER SHORT-TERM PILOT TEST METHODS AT LANDFILL 3, OU1	4
3.1 Initial LNAPL/Groundwater Measurements and Baildown Testing	4
3.2 Well Construction Details	4
3.3 Soil Gas Monitoring Point Construction Detail	7
3.4 Soil Sampling and Analysis	8
3.5 LNAPL Recovery Testing	8
3.5.1 System Setup	8
3.5.2 Initial Skimmer Pump Test	9
3.5.3 Bioslurper Pump Test	9
3.5.4 Second Skimmer Pump Test	12
3.5.5 Drawdown Pump Test	12
3.5.6 Off-Gas Sampling and Analysis	12
3.5.7 Groundwater Sampling and Analysis	14
3.6 Soil Gas Permeability Testing	14
3.7 In Situ Respiration Testing	14
4.0 RESULTS AT LANDFILL 3, OU1	15
4.1 Baildown Test Results	15
4.2 Soil Sample Analyses	15
4.3 LNAPL Pump Test Results	17
4.3.1 Initial Skimmer Pump Test Results	17
4.3.2 Bioslurper Pump Test Results	17
4.3.3 Second Skimmer Pump Test	17
4.3.4 Drawdown Pump Test	22
4.4 Extracted Groundwater and Off-Gas Analyses	23
4.5 Bioventing Analyses	23
4.5.1 Soil Gas Permeability and Radius of Influence	23
4.5.2 In Situ Respiration Test Results	23
5.0 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AT LANDFILL 3, OU1	26
6.0 METHODS AND RESULTS AT BUILDING 870	27

7.0 REFERENCES	30
APPENDIX A: SITE-SPECIFIC TEST PLAN FOR BIOSLURPER FIELD ACTIVITIES AT HILL AFB, UTAH	A-1
APPENDIX B: LABORATORY ANALYTICAL REPORTS	B-1
APPENDIX C: SYSTEM CHECKLIST	C-1
APPENDIX D: DATA SHEETS FROM THE SHORT-TERM PILOT TEST	D-1
APPENDIX E: SOIL GAS PERMEABILITY TEST RESULTS	E-1
APPENDIX F: IN SITU RESPIRATION TEST RESULTS	F-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Initial Soil Gas Compositions at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT	7
Table 2.	Results of Baildown Testing in Monitoring Well U1-101	16
Table 3.	BTEX and TPH Concentrations in Soil Samples from Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT	16
Table 4.	Physical Characterization of Soil from Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT	18
Table 5.	Depths to Groundwater and LNAPL Prior to Each Pump Test	18
Table 6.	Pump Test Results at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT	19
Table 7.	Oxygen Concentrations During the Bioslurper Pump Test at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT	22
Table 8.	BTEX and TPH Concentrations in Extracted Groundwater During the Bioslurper Pump Test at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT	24
Table 9.	BTEX and TPH Concentrations in Off-Gas During the Bioslurper Pump Test at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT	24
Table 10.	In Situ Respiration Test Results at Hill AFB, UT	26
Table 11.	Results of Baildown Testing in Monitoring Well MW-14	28

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Location of Operable Units, Including Site OU1, at Hill AFB, UT	3
Figure 2.	Monitoring Well Locations and Free-Product Thicknesses (1994) at Landfill 3 and CDP 1, OU1, Hill AFB, UT	5
Figure 3.	Schematic Diagram Illustrating Construction Details of the Bioslurper Well and Soil Gas Monitoring Points at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT	6
Figure 4.	Slurper Tube Placement and Valve Position for the Skimmer Pump Test	10
Figure 5.	Slurper Tube Placement and Valve Position for the Bioslurper Pump Test	11
Figure 6.	Slurper Tube Placement and Valve Position for the Drawdown Pump Test	13
Figure 7.	LNAPL Recovery Versus Time During Each Pump Test	20
Figure 8.	LNAPL Recovery Rate Versus Time During The Bioslurper Pump Test	21
Figure 9.	Soil Gas Pressure Change as a Function of Distance During the Soil Gas Permeability Test	25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the field activities conducted at Hill AFB, for a short-term field pilot test to compare vacuum-enhanced free-product recovery (bioslurping) to traditional free-product recovery techniques to remove light, nonaqueous-phase liquid (LNAPL) from subsurface soils and aquifers. The field testing at Hill AFB is part of the Bioslurper Initiative, which is funded and managed by the U.S. Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE) Technology Transfer Division. The AFCEE Bioslurper Initiative is a multisite program designed to evaluate the efficacy of the bioslurping technology for (1) recovery of LNAPL from groundwater and the capillary fringe, and (2) enhancing natural in situ degradation of petroleum contaminants in the vadose zone via bioventing.

The main objective of the Bioslurper Initiative is to develop procedures for evaluating the potential for recovering free-phase LNAPL present at petroleum-contaminated sites. The overall study is designed to evaluate bioslurping and identify site parameters that are reliable predictors of bioslurping performance. To measure LNAPL recovery in a wide variety of in situ conditions, tests are being performed at many sites. The test at Hill AFB is one of over 40 similar field tests to be conducted at various locations throughout the United States and its possessions.

The intent of field testing is to collect data to support determination of the predictability of LNAPL recovery and to evaluate the applicability, cost, and performance of the bioslurping technology for removal of free product and remediation of the contaminated area. The on-site testing is structured to allow direct comparison of the LNAPL recovery achieved by bioslurping with the performance of more conventional LNAPL recovery technologies. The test method included an initial site characterization followed by LNAPL recovery testing. The three LNAPL recovery technologies tested at Hill AFB were skimmer pumping, bioslurping, and drawdown pumping.

Site characterization activities were conducted at Landfill 3, Operable Unit 1 to evaluate site variables that could affect LNAPL recovery efficiency and to determine the bioventing potential of the site. Testing included baildown testing, soil sampling, soil gas permeability testing, and in situ respiration testing.

Following the site characterization activities, the pilot tests for skimmer pumping, bioslurping, and drawdown pumping were conducted at Landfill 3. The LNAPL recovery testing was conducted in the following sequence: 48 hours in the skimmer configuration, approximately 92 hours in the bioslurper configuration, an additional 24 hours in the skimmer configuration, and 47 hours in the drawdown configuration. Measurements of extracted soil gas composition, LNAPL thickness, and

groundwater level were taken throughout the testing. The volume of LNAPL recovered and groundwater extracted were quantified over time.

Skimmer and drawdown pumping were not as effective as bioslurping at recovering LNAPL at this site. Free product recovery rates were lower on average during skimmer and drawdown pumping, with average LNAPL recovery rates of 0.80 gallons/day during the skimmer pump test and 0.50 gallons/day during the drawdown pump test. In contrast, LNAPL recovery rates during bioslurping initially were approximately 7.5 gallons/day and stabilized at approximately 1.5 gallons/day after the first day.

Groundwater recovery rates during the bioslurper pump test were high in comparison to rates during the skimmer pump tests, but were comparable to recovery rates during the drawdown pump test. On average, groundwater was extracted at rates of 260 gallons/day during skimming, 1,500 gallons/day during bioslurping, and 2,400 gallons/day during drawdown pumping.

Soil gas concentrations were measured at monitoring points during the bioslurper pump test to determine whether the vadose zone was being oxygenated. Oxygen concentrations changed little until the end of the bioslurper pump test. At this time, oxygen concentrations increased slightly at depths of 16 and 24 ft at all distances from the bioslurper well. Over time, it is likely that the area would become well oxygenated. These results correlate with the radius of influence of 80 ft determined during the soil gas permeability test.

Implementation of bioslurping at Landfill 3 probably would facilitate enhanced recovery of LNAPL from the water table and simultaneous in situ biodegradation of hydrocarbons in the vadose zone via bioventing. Bioslurping will result in extraction of significant quantities of groundwater; however, if disposal at the Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant is permissible, this will not impact the economic viability of bioslurping.

A baildown test and short-term bioslurper pump test were conducted at Building 870. During the baildown test, free-product levels did not recover to initial levels by the end of the 26-hour test period. During the short-term bioslurper pump test, only minimal quantities of free product were recovered, with a total volume of 0.2 gallons collected at an average rate of 0.11 gallons/day. In contrast, large volumes of groundwater were recovered, with a total volume of 2,033 gallons collected at an average rate of 1,100 gallons/day. These results indicated that the Building 870 site was not suitable for bioslurping probably due to the small quantities of free product.

DRAFT SITE-SPECIFIC TECHNICAL REPORT (A003)

for

BIOSLURPER TESTING AT LANDFILL 3, OPERABLE UNIT 1 AND BUILDING 870, HILL AFB, UTAH

January 30, 1996

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report describes activities performed and data collected during a field test at Hill Air Force Base (AFB), Utah, to compare vacuum-enhanced free-product recovery (bioslurping) to traditional free-product recovery technologies for removal of light, nonaqueous-phase liquid (LNAPL) from subsurface soils and aquifers. The field testing at Hill AFB is part of the Bioslurper Initiative, which is funded and managed by the U.S. Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE) Technology Transfer Division. The AFCEE Bioslurper Initiative is a multisite program designed to evaluate the efficacy of the bioslurping technology for (1) recovery of LNAPL from groundwater and the capillary fringe and (2) enhancing natural in situ degradation of petroleum contaminants in the vadose zone via bioventing.

1.1 Objectives

The main objective of the Bioslurper Initiative is to develop procedures for evaluating the potential for recovering free-phase LNAPL present at petroleum-contaminated sites. The overall study is designed to evaluate bioslurping and identify site parameters that are reliable predictors of bioslurping performance. To measure LNAPL recovery in a wide variety of in situ conditions, tests are being performed at many sites. The test at Hill AFB is one of over 40 similar field tests to be conducted at various locations throughout the United States and its possessions. Aspects of the testing program that apply to all sites are described in the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping* (Battelle, 1995). Test provisions specific to activities at Hill AFB were described in the Site-Specific Test Plan provided in Appendix A.

The intent of field testing is to collect data to support determination of the predictability of LNAPL recovery and to evaluate the applicability, cost, and performance of the bioslurping

technology for removal of free product and remediation of the contaminated area. The on-site testing is structured to allow direct comparison of the LNAPL recovery achieved by bioslurping with the performance of more conventional LNAPL recovery technologies. The test method included an initial site characterization followed by LNAPL recovery testing. The three LNAPL recovery technologies tested at Hill AFB were skimmer pumping, bioslurping, and drawdown pumping. The specific test objectives, methods, and results for the Hill AFB test program are discussed in the following sections.

1.2 Testing Approach

Site characterization activities were conducted at Landfill 3, Operable Unit 1 (OU1) to evaluate site variables that could affect LNAPL recovery efficiency and to determine the bioventing potential of the site. Testing included baildown testing to evaluate the mobility of LNAPL, soil sampling to determine physical/chemical site characteristics, soil gas permeability testing to determine the radius of influence, and in situ respiration testing to evaluate site microbial activity.

Following the site characterization activities, the pilot tests for skimmer pumping, bioslurping, and drawdown pumping were conducted at Landfill 3. The LNAPL recovery testing was conducted in the following sequence: 48 hours in the skimmer configuration, approximately 92 hours in the bioslurper configuration, an additional 24 hours in the skimmer configuration, and 47 hours in the drawdown configuration. Measurements of extracted soil gas composition, LNAPL thickness, and groundwater level were taken throughout the testing. The volume of LNAPL recovered and groundwater extracted were quantified over time.

A baildown test and short-term bioslurping pump test were conducted at Building 870. Little free product was recovered; therefore, the full scope of pilot tests was not conducted. Results from the baildown test and bioslurper pump test at Building 870 are presented in Section 6.0.

2.0 LANDFILL 3, OU1 SITE DESCRIPTION

Operable Unit 1 is located near the northeast boundary of Hill AFB and contains Landfills 3 and 4, Chemical Disposal Pits (CDPs) 1 and 2, the Waste Phenol Pit, and the Base golf course (Figure 1). Site activities for this study were conducted at Landfill 3. Landfill 3 was operated as a general refuse landfill from 1947 through 1967. Materials dumped and burned at Landfill 3 included




Figure 1. Location of Operable Units, Including Site OU1, at Hill AFB, UT

industrial sludge, waste solvents, and residues from solvent cleaning operations. In 1993, monitoring well U1-101 produced approximately 7 gallons of fuel in a 24-hour extraction period, while monitoring well U1-069 produced negligible amounts (Battelle unpublished data). Monitoring well locations and associated free-product thicknesses measured in January 1994 at Landfill 3 and CDP 1 are shown in Figure 2. Relevant data for monitoring wells U1-101 and U1-069, including well construction data and site geology, are presented in the Site-Specific Test Plan provided in Appendix A.

3.0 BIOSLURPER SHORT-TERM PILOT TEST METHODS AT LANDFILL 3, OUI

This section documents the initial conditions at the test site and describes the test equipment and methods used for the short-term pilot test at Hill AFB.

3.1 Initial LNAPL/Groundwater Measurements and Baildown Testing

Monitoring well U1-101 was evaluated for use in the bioslurper pilot testing. Initial depths to LNAPL and to groundwater were measured using an oil/water interface probe (ORS Model #1068013). LNAPL was removed from the well with a Teflon™ bailer until the LNAPL thickness could no longer be reduced. The rate of increase in the thickness of the floating LNAPL layer was monitored for approximately 18 hours using the oil/water interface probe.

3.2 Well Construction Details

Existing monitoring well U1-101 was selected for use in the bioslurper pilot testing. The well is constructed of 2-inch-diameter, schedule 40 polyvinyl chloride (PVC) with a total depth of 33.5 ft and 10 ft of screen. A schematic diagram illustrating well construction details is provided in Figure 3.

An additional well was installed approximately 20 ft north/northwest of monitoring well U1-101 to monitor changes in depths to free product and groundwater during pump tests. The well was constructed of 2-inch-diameter PVC with a total depth of 33 ft and 10 ft of screen. The well was labeled Batt Well.





Figure 2. Monitoring Well Locations and Free-Product Thicknesses (1994) at Landfill 3 and CDP 1, OU1, Hill AFB, UT

U1-101

OU101-10

OU101-30

OU101-48



FILESON/55-1

Figure 3. Schematic Diagram Illustrating Construction Details of the Bioslurper Well and Soil Gas Monitoring Points at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT

3.3 Soil Gas Monitoring Point Construction Detail

Three soil gas monitoring points were already in existence in the area of monitoring well U1-101; therefore, no additional soil gas monitoring points were installed. The soil gas monitoring points were located 10, 30, and 48 ft from U1-101 and were identified by Battelle as OU101-10, OU101-30, and OU101-48, respectively. Precise construction details of the soil gas monitoring points are not know. General construction details are illustrated in Figure 3. Screened intervals for all monitoring point were located at depths of 8.0, 16, and 24 ft. Thermocouples were not installed with these monitoring points.

After installation of the monitoring points, initial soil gas measurements were taken with a GasTechtor portable O₂/CO₂ meter and a GasTech Trace-Techtor portable hydrocarbon meter. Oxygen limitation was observed at all depths, with oxygen concentrations ranging from 0 to 0.5% and elevated levels of carbon dioxide and total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) (Table 1).

Table 1. Initial Soil Gas Compositions at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT

Monitoring Point	Depth (ft)	Oxygen (%)	Carbon Dioxide (%)	TPH (ppmv)
OU101-10	8.0	0.0	11	500
	16	0.25	10	360
	24	0.0	11	500
OU101-30	8.0	0.0	10	230
	16	0.50	11	240
	24	0.0	11	320
OU101-48	8.0	0.0	12	450
	16	0.0	13	250
	24	0.0	12	720

3.4 Soil Sampling and Analysis

Four soil samples were collected during installation of the Batt Well. The soil samples were collected in brass sleeves driven down the center of the hollow-stem auger used to drill the monitoring well. The samples were labeled as follows: HAFB-BW-22.0'-22.5', HAFB-BW-25.5'-26.0', HAFB-BW-23.0'-24.0', and HAFB-BW-25.0'-25.5'. The samples were placed in insulated coolers, chain-of-custody records and shipping papers were completed, and the samples were sent to Alpha Analytical, Inc., in Sparks, Nevada by overnight express. Samples HAFB-BW-22.0'-22.5' and HAFB-BW-25.5'-26.0' were analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX) and TPH. Samples HAFB-BW-23.0'-24.0' and HAFB-BW-25.0'-25.5' were composited and analyzed for bulk density, moisture content, particle size, and porosity. Laboratory analytical reports for all samples are provided in Appendix B.

3.5 LNAPL Recovery Testing

3.5.1 System Setup

The bioslurping pilot test system is a trailer-mounted mobile unit. The vacuum pump (Atlantic Fluidics Model A100, 7.5-hp liquid ring pump), oil/water separator, and required support equipment were carried to the test location on a trailer. The trailer was located near monitoring well U1-101, the well cap was removed, a coupling and tee were attached to the top of the well, and the slurper tube was lowered into the well. The slurper tube was attached to the vacuum pump. Different configurations of the tee and the placement depth of the slurper tube allow for simulation of skimmer pumping, operation in the bioslurping configuration, or simulation of drawdown pumping as described in Sections 3.5.2, 3.5.3, and 3.5.5, respectively.

Vapor emissions were discharged directly to the atmosphere for these short-term tests, since the mass of BTEX and TPH emitted were low. After treatment through the oil/water separator, groundwater was transferred to a Baker tank where it was stored until disposal at the Base Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant.

A brief system startup test was performed prior to LNAPL recovery testing to ensure that all system components were working properly. The system checklist is provided in Appendix C. All


site data and field testing information were recorded in a field notebook and then transcribed onto pilot test data sheets provided in Appendix D.

3.5.2 Initial Skimmer Pump Test

Prior to test initiation, depths to LNAPL and groundwater were measured. The slurper tube was then set at the LNAPL/groundwater interface with the wellhead open to the atmosphere via a PVC connecting tee (Figure 4). The liquid ring pump and oil/water separator were primed with known amounts of groundwater to ensure that any LNAPL or groundwater entering the system could be quantified. The flow totalizers for the LNAPL and aqueous effluent were zeroed, and the liquid ring pump was started on October 28, 1995, to begin the skimmer pump test. The test was operated continuously for approximately 48 hours. The LNAPL and groundwater extraction rates were monitored throughout the test, as were all other relevant data for the skimmer pump test. Test data sheets are provided in Appendix D.


3.5.3 Bioslurper Pump Test

Upon completion of the skimmer pump test, preparations were made to begin the bioslurper pump test. Prior to test initiation, depths to LNAPL and groundwater were measured. The slurper tube was then set at the LNAPL/groundwater interface, as in the skimmer pump test. However, in contrast to the skimmer pump test, the PVC connecting tee was removed, sealing the wellhead and allowing the pump to establish a vacuum in the well (Figure 5). A pressure gauge was installed at the wellhead to measure the vacuum inside the extraction well. The liquid ring pump and oil/water separator were primed with known amounts of groundwater to ensure that any LNAPL or groundwater entering the system could be quantified. The flow totalizers for the LNAPL and aqueous effluent were zeroed, and the liquid ring pump was started on October 30, 1995, to begin the bioslurper pump test. The test was initiated approximately 3 hours after the skimmer pump test and was operated continuously for approximately 92 hours. The LNAPL and groundwater extraction rates were monitored throughout the test, as were all other relevant data for the bioslurper pump test. Test data sheets are provided in Appendix D.



NKA/Kttd/10-01c

Figure 4. Slurper Tube Placement and Valve Position for the Skimmer Pump Test



NKA/Kittel/10-01b

Figure 5. Slurper Tube Placement and Valve Position for the Bioslurper Pump Test

3.5.4 Second Skimmer Pump Test


Upon completion of the bioslurper pump test, preparations were made to begin the second skimmer pump test. Prior to test initiation, depths to LNAPL and groundwater were measured. The valve and slurper tube configuration were identical to that used for the initial skimmer pump test. The liquid ring pump and oil/water separator were primed with known amounts of groundwater to ensure that any LNAPL or groundwater entering the system could be quantified. The flow totalizers for the LNAPL and aqueous effluent were zeroed, and the liquid ring pump was started on November 3, 1995, to begin the second skimmer pump test. The test was initiated approximately one hour after the bioslurper pump test and was operated continuously for 24 hours. The LNAPL and groundwater extraction rates were monitored throughout the test, as were all other relevant data for the bioslurper pump test. Test data sheets are provided in Appendix D.

3.5.5 Drawdown Pump Test

Upon completion of the second skimmer pump test, preparations were made to begin the drawdown pump test. Prior to test initiation, depths to LNAPL and groundwater were measured. The slurper tube was then set so that the tip was 12 inches below the oil/water interface with the PVC connecting tee open to the atmosphere (Figure 6). The liquid ring pump and oil/water separator were primed with known amounts of groundwater to ensure that any LNAPL or groundwater entering the system could be quantified. The flow totalizers for the LNAPL and aqueous effluent were zeroed, and the liquid ring pump was started on November 4, 1995, to begin the drawdown pump test. The test was initiated approximately 15 minutes after the second skimmer pump test and was operated continuously for 47 hours. The LNAPL and groundwater extraction rates were monitored throughout the test, as were all other relevant data for the drawdown pump test. Test data sheets are provided in Appendix D.

3.5.6 Off-Gas Sampling and Analysis

Soil gas samples were collected from the bioslurper off-gas during the bioslurper pump test. Samples were collected in Summa™ canisters approximately 2 and 75 hours after test initiation and were labeled HAFB-OGS-STK1 and HAFB-OGS-STK2, respectively. The samples were sent under



NKA/KRtel/10-01d

Figure 6. Slurper Tube Placement and Valve Position for the Drawdown Pump Test

chain of custody to Air Toxics, Ltd., in Rancho Cordova, California, for analyses of BTEX and TPH.

3.5.7 Groundwater Sampling and Analysis

Two groundwater samples were collected during the bioslurper pump test. One sample was collected from the outlet of the oil/water separator and was labeled HAFB-OWS-1. The other sample was collected from the bottom of the Baker tank and was labeled HAFB-Baker-1. Samples were collected in 40-mL septa vials containing HCl preservative. Samples were checked to ensure no headspace was present and were then shipped on ice and sent under chain of custody to Alpha Analytical, Inc., in Sparks, Nevada for analyses of BTEX and TPH.

3.6 Soil Gas Permeability Testing

The soil gas permeability test data were collected during the bioslurper pump test. Before a vacuum was established in the extraction well, the initial soil gas pressures at the three installed monitoring points were recorded. The start of the bioslurper pump test created a steep pressure drop in the extraction well which was the starting point for the soil gas permeability testing. Soil gas pressures were measured at each of the three monitoring points at all depths to track the rate of outward propagation of the pressure drop in the extraction well. Soil gas pressure data were collected frequently during the first 20 minutes of the test. The soil gas pressures were recorded 40 minutes into the bioslurper pump test at which time they leveled off. Pressures were used to determine the radius of influence in the vadose zone. Test data are provided in Appendix E.

3.7 In Situ Respiration Testing

Air containing approximately 2% helium was injected into four monitoring points for approximately 24 hours beginning on November 3, 1995. The setup for the in situ respiration test is described in the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol a Field Treatability Test for Bioventing* (Hinchee et al., 1992). A ½-hp diaphragm pump was used for air and helium injection. Air and helium were injected through the following monitoring points at the depths indicated: OU101-10-24.0', OU101-10-8.0', OU101-30-8.0', and OU101-48-8.0'. After the air/helium injection was terminated, soil gas

concentrations of oxygen, carbon dioxide, TPH, and helium were monitored periodically. The respiration test was terminated on November 5, 1995. Oxygen utilization and biodegradation rates were calculated as described in Hinchey et al. (1992). Raw data for these tests are presented in Appendix F.

Helium concentrations were measured during the in situ respiration test to quantify helium leakage to or from the surface around the monitoring points. Helium loss over time is attributable to either diffusion through the soil or leakage. A rapid drop in helium concentration usually indicates leakage. A gradual loss of helium along with a first-order curve generally indicates diffusion. As a rough estimate, the diffusion of gas molecules is inversely proportional to the square root of the molecular weight of the gas. Based on molecular weights of 4 for helium and 32 for oxygen, helium diffuses approximately 2.8 times faster than oxygen, or the diffusion of oxygen is 0.35 times the rate of helium diffusion. As a general rule, we have found that if helium concentrations at test completion are at least 50 to 60% of the initial levels, measured oxygen uptake rates are representative. Greater helium loss indicates a problem, and oxygen utilization rates are not considered representative.

4.0 RESULTS AT LANDFILL 3, OU1

This section documents the results of the site characterization, the comparative LNAPL recovery pump test, and other supporting tests conducted at Hill AFB.

4.1 Baildown Test Results

Results from the baildown test in monitoring well U1-101 are presented in Table 2. A total volume of 370 mL (0.098 gallons) was removed by hand bailing from monitoring well U1-101. The LNAPL thickness recovered to approximately initial levels by the end of the 18-hour test period. These results indicated that monitoring well U1-101 was suitable for bioslurper field testing.

4.2 Soil Sample Analyses

Table 3 shows the BTEX and TPH concentrations measured in soil samples collected at Landfill 3, OU1. TPH concentrations were relatively high, with an average TPH concentration of

Table 2. Results of Baildown Testing in Monitoring Well U1-101

Sample Collection Time	Depth to Groundwater (ft)	Depth to LNAPL (ft)	LNAPL Thickness (ft)
Initial Reading 10/27/95-1550	29.97	28.37	0.60
10/27/95-1600	28.49	28.44	0.05
10/27/95-1617	28.61	28.43	0.18
10/27/95-1633	28.68	28.43	0.25
10/27/95-1648	28.69	28.42	0.27
10/27/95-1705	28.70	28.43	0.27
10/27/95-1720	28.71	28.42	0.29
10/27/95-1735	28.73	28.42	0.31
10/27/95-1750	28.74	28.42	0.32
10/27/95-1805	28.76	28.42	0.34
10/28/95-0956	28.95	28.39	0.56

Table 3. BTEX and TPH Concentrations in Soil Samples from Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT

Parameter	Concentration (mg/kg)	
	HAFB-BW-22.0'-22.5'	HAFB-BW-25.5'-26.0'
TPH ¹	1,800	3,500
Benzene	< 1.0	< 1.0
Toluene	< 1.0	< 1.0
Ethylbenzene	< 1.0	< 1.0
Xylenes	< 1.0	< 1.0

¹ Components are primarily in the range of jet fuel, kerosene, and diesel #1.

2,650 mg/kg. BTEX concentrations were below the detection limit of 1.0 mg/kg in both samples. The results of the physical characterization of the soils are presented in Table 4.

4.3 LNAPL Pump Test Results

4.3.1 Initial Skimmer Pump Test Results

The LNAPL thickness prior to the initial skimmer pump test was 0.56 ft (Table 5). A total of 1.64 gallons of LNAPL was recovered during this test, with an average recovery rate of 0.8 gallons/day (Table 6). A total of 255 gallons of groundwater was extracted with an average extraction rate of 126 gallons/day (Table 6). Results of LNAPL recovery versus time are shown in Figure 7.

4.3.2 Bioslurper Pump Test Results

LNAPL recovery rates increased significantly during the bioslurper pump test (Figure 7). The increase in recovery rate indicates that LNAPL was mobilized to the extraction well under vacuum-enhanced conditions. A total of 12.1 gallons of LNAPL and 5,575 gallons of groundwater was extracted during the bioslurper pump test, with daily average recovery rates of 3.2 gallons/day for LNAPL and 1,456 gallons/day for groundwater (Table 6). The LNAPL recovery rate versus time is shown in Figure 8. The vacuum-exerted wellhead pressure on monitoring well U1-101 was kept relatively constant throughout the bioslurper pump test at approximately 0.09 inches of mercury.

Soil gas concentrations were measured at monitoring points during the bioslurper pump test to determine whether the vadose zone was being oxygenated. Oxygen concentrations changed little until the end of the bioslurper pump test (Table 7). At this time, oxygen concentrations increased slightly at depths of 16 and 24 ft at all distances from the bioslurper well. Over time, it is likely that the area would become well oxygenated. These results correlate with the radius of influence as described in Section 4.5.1.

4.3.3 Second Skimmer Pump Test

Totals of 0.6 gallons of LNAPL and 404 gallons of groundwater were recovered during the second skimmer pump test, with daily average recovery rates of 0.6 gallons/day for LNAPL and 404

Table 4. Physical Characterization of Soil from Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT

Parameter		Sample	
		HAFB-BW-23.0'-24.0'	HAFB-BW-25.0'-25.5'
Moisture Content (%)		3.8	4.8
Porosity (%)		58.1	58.8
Specific Gravity (g/cm ³)		1.11	1.09
Particle Size	Gravel (%)	0	0
	Sand (%)	58.6	63.1
	Silt (%)	25.6	18.3
	Clay (%)	15.8	18.6

Table 5. Depths to Groundwater and LNAPL Prior to Each Pump Test

Test	Test Start Date	Depth to LNAPL (ft)	Depth to Groundwater (ft)	LNAPL Thickness (ft)
Initial Skimmer Pump Test	10/28/95	28.39	28.95	0.56
Bioslurper Pump Test	10/30/95	28.735	28.79	0.055
Second Skimmer Pump Test	11/3/95	28.82	28.825	0.0050
Drawdown Test	11/4/95	29.18	29.20	0.020

Table 6. Pump Test Results at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT

Recovery Rate (gal/day)	Initial Skimmer Pump Test		Bioslurper Pump Test		Second Skimmer Pump Test		Drawdown Pump Test	
	LNAPL	Groundwater	LNAPL	Groundwater	LNAPL	Groundwater	LNAPL	Groundwater
Day 1	0	140	7.5	1,200	0.60	400	0.3	2,700
Day 2	1.6	120	1.7	800	NA	NA	0.7	2,100
Day 3	NA	NA	1.4	1,300	NA	NA	NA	NA
Day 4	NA	NA	1.5	2,200	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0.80	130	3.2	1,500	0.60	400	0.50	2,400
Total Recovery (gal)	1.6	260	12	5,600	0.60	400	1.0	4,700

NA = Not applicable.





Figure 7. LNAPL Recovery Versus Time During Each Pump Test



c:\plot50\bioslurp\hill\fuelrate.sp5

Figure 8. LNAPL Recovery Rate Versus Time During The Bioslurper Pump Test

Table 7. Oxygen Concentrations During the Bioslurper Pump Test at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT

Monitoring Point	Oxygen Concentrations (%) Versus Time (hours)			
	0	27	45	116
OU101-10-8'	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OU101-10-16'	0.25	0.0	0.0	0.0
OU101-10-24'	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
OU101-30-8'	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OU101-30-16'	0.50	0.0	0.0	3.0
OU101-30-24'	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
OU101-48-8'	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OU101-48-16'	0.0	0.0	0.80	6.5
OU101-48-24'	0.0	0.0	0.80	18

¹ One hour after bioslurper pump shut off.

gallons/day for groundwater (Table 6). These results demonstrate that operation of the bioslurper system in the skimmer mode was not as effective a means of free-product recovery as the bioslurper system at this site.

4.3.4 Drawdown Pump Test

Totals of 1.0 gallon of LNAPL and 4,748 gallons of groundwater were recovered during the drawdown pump test, with daily average recovery rates of 0.50 gallons/day for LNAPL and 2,400 gallons/day for groundwater (Table 6). These results demonstrate that operation of the bioslurper system in the drawdown mode was not as effective a means of free-product recovery as the bioslurper system at this site.

4.4 Extracted Groundwater and Off-Gas Analyses

During the bioslurper pump test, groundwater samples were collected from the oil/water separator and from the Baker tank used for storage prior to disposal. BTEX concentrations were less than 0.10 mg/L, while TPH concentrations ranged from 7.4 mg/L in the Baker tank up to 180 mg/L in the oil/water separator (Table 8).

Off-gas samples from the bioslurper system also were collected during the bioslurper pump test. The results from the off-gas analyses are presented in Table 9. Given a vapor discharge rate of 32 scfm and using an average concentration of 4,900 ppmv TPH, approximately 92 lb/day of TPH was emitted to the air during the bioslurper pump test. Benzene emissions were approximately 0.045 lb/day.

4.5 Bioventing Analyses

4.5.1 Soil Gas Permeability and Radius of Influence

The radius of influence is calculated by plotting the log of the pressure change at a specific monitoring point versus the distance from the extraction well. The radius of influence is then defined as the distance from the extraction well where 0.1 inch of H₂O can be measured. Based on this definition, the radius of influence at this site is approximately 80 ft (Figure 9).

4.5.2 In Situ Respiration Test Results

Results from the in situ respiration test are presented in Table 12. Oxygen depletion was relatively rapid, with oxygen utilization rates ranging from 0.29 to 0.72 %O₂/hr. Biodegradation rates ranged from 4.8 to 12 mg/kg-day. The helium concentration was steady, indicating that leakage and diffusion were insignificant.

Table 8. BTEX and TPH Concentrations in Extracted Groundwater During the Bioslurper Pump Test at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT


Parameter	Concentration (mg/L)	
	HAFB-OWS-1	HAFB-Baker-1
TPH ¹	180	7.4
Benzene	<0.0050	0.0017
Toluene	<0.0050	0.00057
Ethylbenzene	<0.0050	0.0019
Total Xylenes	0.038	0.015

¹ Components are in the range of jet fuel, diesel, light oil, and motor oil.

Table 9. BTEX and TPH Concentrations in Off-Gas During the Bioslurper Pump Test at Landfill 3, OU1, Hill AFB, UT

Parameter	Concentration (ppmv)	
	HAFB-OGS-STK1	HAFB-OGS-STK2
TPH as jet fuel	6,000	3,800
Benzene	5.2	4.3
Toluene	4.4	3.2
Ethylbenzene	7.0	3.6
Xylenes	20M	7.9M

M = Reported value may be biased due to apparent matrix interferences.



c:\plot50\bioturb\hill\radius.sp5

Figure 9. Soil Gas Pressure Change as a Function of Distance During the Soil Gas Permeability Test

Table 10. In Situ Respiration Test Results at Hill AFB, UT

Monitoring Point	Oxygen Utilization Rate (%/hr)	Biodegradation Rate (mg/kg-day)
OU101-10-24.0'	0.29	4.8
OU101-10-8.0'	0.61	9.9
OU101-30-8.0'	0.67	11
OU101-48-8.0'	0.72	12

5.0 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AT LANDFILL 3, OU1

Skimmer and drawdown pumping were not as effective as bioslurping at recovering LNAPL at this site. Free product recovery rates were lower on average during skimmer and drawdown pumping, with average LNAPL recovery rates of 0.80 gallons/day during the skimmer pump test and 0.50 gallons/day during the drawdown pump test. In contrast, LNAPL recovery rates during bioslurping initially were approximately 7.5 gallons/day and stabilized at approximately 1.5 gallons/day after the first day.

Groundwater recovery rates during the bioslurper pump test were high in comparison to rates during the skimmer pump tests, but were comparable to recovery rates during the drawdown pump test. On average, groundwater was extracted at rates of 260 gallons/day during skimming, 1,500 gallons/day during bioslurping, and 2,400 gallons/day during drawdown pumping.

Soil gas concentrations were measured at monitoring points during the bioslurper pump test to determine whether the vadose zone was being oxygenated. Oxygen concentrations changed little until the end of the bioslurper pump test. At this time, oxygen concentrations increased slightly at depths of 16 and 24 ft at all distances from the bioslurper well. Over time, it is likely that the area would become well oxygenated. These results correlate with the radius of influence of 80 ft determined during the soil gas permeability test.

Implementation of bioslurping at the Hill AFB test site probably would facilitate enhanced recovery of LNAPL from the water table and simultaneous in situ biodegradation of hydrocarbons in the vadose zone via bioventing. Bioslurping will result in extraction of significant quantities of

groundwater; however, if disposal at the Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant is permissible, this will not impact the economic viability of bioslurping.

6.0 METHODS AND RESULTS AT BUILDING 870

Monitoring well MW-14 was evaluated for use in the bioslurper pilot testing. Initial depths to LNAPL and to groundwater were measured using an oil/water interface probe (ORS Model #1068013). LNAPL was removed from the well with a Teflon™ bailer until the LNAPL thickness could no longer be reduced. The rate of increase in the thickness of the floating LNAPL layer was monitored for approximately 26 hours using the oil/water interface probe. Results from the baildown test in monitoring well MW-14 are presented in Table 11. A total volume of 8 L (2.1 gallons) was removed by hand bailing. The LNAPL thickness did not recover to initial levels by the end of the 26-hour test period. The initial free-product thickness was approximately 7.8 ft and the free-product thickness at the end of the test period was approximately 1.1 ft.

Upon completion of the baildown test, preparations were made to begin a short-term bioslurper pump test. Setup for the bioslurper pump test was the same as that described in Section 3.5.3. The liquid ring pump was started on November 7, 1995, to begin the bioslurper pump test and was operated intermittently for approximately 43 hours. The LNAPL and groundwater extraction rates were monitored throughout the test, as were all other relevant data for the bioslurper pump test. Only minimal quantities of free product were recovered, with a total volume of 0.2 gallons collected at an average rate of 0.11 gallons/day. In contrast, large volumes of groundwater were recovered, with a total volume of 2,033 gallons collected at an average rate of 1,100 gallons/day. These results indicated that this site was not suitable for bioslurping probably due to the small quantities of free product.

Table 11. Results of Baildown Testing in Monitoring Well MW-14

Sample Collection Time (Date-Time)	Depth to Groundwater (ft)	Depth to LNAPL (ft)	LNAPL Thickness (ft)
Initial Reading 11/2/95-0923	25.57	17.81	7.76
11/2/95-0952	20.07	20.05	0.02
11/2/95-0953	20.41	20.21	0.20
11/2/95-0954	20.26	20.05	0.21
11/2/95-0955	20.17	19.89	0.28
11/2/95-0956	20.11	19.80	0.31
11/2/95-0957	20.08	19.72	0.36
11/2/95-0958	20.04	19.64	0.40
11/2/95-1000	20.01	19.57	0.44
11/2/95-1002	20.00	19.54	0.46
11/2/95-1003	19.99	19.53	0.46
11/2/95-1004	19.99	19.50	0.49
11/2/95-1005	19.99	19.48	0.51
11/2/95-1006	19.99	19.47	0.52
11/2/95-1007	19.99	19.46	0.53
11/2/95-1009	19.99	19.45	0.54
11/2/95-1010	20.00	19.44	0.56
11/2/95-1011	20.00	19.44	0.56
11/2/95-1012	20.00	19.43	0.57
11/2/95-1013	20.00	19.42	0.58
11/2/95-1014	20.00	19.415	0.59
11/2/95-1016	20.00	19.41	0.59
11/2/95-1017	20.00	19.41	0.59
11/2/95-1018	20.00	19.40	0.60
11/2/95-1019	20.01	19.40	0.61
11/2/95-1020	20.01	19.39	0.62
11/2/95-1021	20.01	19.39	0.62
11/2/95-1022	20.01	19.39	0.62

Table 11. Results of Baildown Testing in Monitoring Well MW-14 (continued)

Sample Collection Time (Date-Time)	Depth to Groundwater (ft)	Depth to LNAPL (ft)	LNAPL Thickness (ft)
11/2/95-1023	20.01	19.38	0.63
11/2/95-1024	20.01	19.38	0.63
11/2/95-1026	20.01	19.375	0.64
11/2/95-1027	20.01	19.375	0.64
11/2/95-1028	20.02	19.37	0.65
11/2/95-1030	20.02	19.37	0.65
11/2/95-1032	20.03	19.36	0.67
11/2/95-1033	20.03	19.36	0.67
11/2/95-1034	20.03	19.36	0.67
11/2/95-1036	20.03	19.35	0.68
11/2/95-1037	20.04	19.35	0.69
11/2/95-1038	20.04	19.35	0.69
11/2/95-1039	20.05	19.35	0.70
11/2/95-1042	20.05	19.35	0.70
11/2/95-1044	20.05	19.35	0.70
11/2/95-1046	20.05	19.345	0.71
11/2/95-1048	20.05	19.34	0.71
11/2/95-1050	20.05	19.34	0.71
11/2/95-1054	20.07	19.34	0.73
11/2/95-1058	20.07	19.34	0.73
11/2/95-1103	20.08	19.34	0.74
11/2/95-1108	20.09	19.33	0.76
11/2/95-1118	20.11	19.31	0.80
11/2/95-1128	20.11	19.31	0.80
11/2/95-1310	20.17	19.27	0.90
11/2/95-1445	20.21	19.25	0.96
11/2/95-2034	20.31	19.27	1.04
11/3/95-0715	20.40	19.29	1.11
11/3/95-1131	20.38	19.26	1.12

7.0 REFERENCES

Battelle. 1995. *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping*, Report prepared by Battelle Columbus Operations for the U.S. Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

Hinchee, R.E., S.K. Ong, R.N. Miller, D.C. Downey, and R. Frandt. 1992. *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for a Field Treatability Test for Bioventing* (Rev. 2), Report prepared by Battelle Columbus Operations, U.S. Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, and Engineering Sciences, Inc. for the U.S. Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

APPENDIX A

**SITE-SPECIFIC TEST PLAN FOR BIOSLURPER FIELD ACTIVITIES
AT HILL AFB, UTAH**



Battelle

... Putting Technology To Work

505 King Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201-2693
Telephone (614) 424-6424
Facsimile (614) 424-5263

October 24, 1995

Headquarters, Air Force Center
for Environmental Excellence
8001 Arnold Drive (Bldg. 642)
Brooks AFB, TX 78235-5357

Attention: Mr. Patrick Haas

Dear Patrick:

**SITE-SPECIFIC TEST PLAN FOR
BIOSLURPER TESTING AT HILL AFB
CONTRACT NO. F41624-94-C-8012**

This brief letter report is the site specific test plan for bioslurper field activities at Hill Air Force Base, Utah. This site-specific test plan outlines the field activities to be performed at the OU1 site at Hill AFB. General field procedures are outlined in the accompanying generic "Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping." We would like to begin field activities October 27, 1995, with well installation and soil sampling. The bioslurper field test would be completed over the next 2 weeks.

TEST PLAN FOR BIOSLURPER FIELD ACTIVITIES AT HILL AFB, UTAH

The Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence is conducting a nationwide application of an innovative technology for free-product recovery and soil bioremediation. The technology tested in the Bioslurper Initiative is vacuum-mediated free-product recovery/bioremediation (bioslurping). The field test and evaluation are intended to demonstrate the initial feasibility of bioslurping by measuring system performance in the field. System performance parameters, mainly free-product recovery, will be determined at numerous sites. Field testing will be performed at many sites to determine the effects of different organic contaminant types and concentrations and different geologic conditions on bioslurping effectiveness.

Plans for the field test activities are presented in two documents. The first is the overall test plan and technical protocol for the entire program titled, *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping* (January, 1995). The overall plan is supplemented by plans specific for each test site. This letter report is the site-specific supplement for Hill Air Force Base, Utah.

The overall test plan and protocol was developed as a generic plan for the Bioslurper Initiative to improve the accuracy and efficiency of test plan preparation. The field program requires installation and operation of the bioslurping system supported by a wide variety of site characterization, performance monitoring, and chemical analysis activities. The basic methods to be applied from site to site do not change. Preparation and review of the overall plan allows efficient documentation and review of the basic approach to the test program. Details required for application at each site are covered by individual supplements for that site. The concise site-specific plan effectively communicates regulatory background to base personnel. This letter report was prepared based on site-specific information received by Battelle from Hill AFB and other pertinent site-specific information to support the generic test plan.

Site Descriptions

Operable Unit 1 is located near the northeast boundary of Hill AFB, and as depicted in Figure 1, contains Landfills 3 and 4, Chemical Disposal Pits (CDPs) 1 and 2, the Waste Phenol Pit, and the Base golf course. Monitoring well MW U101 in Landfill 3 and MW U069 in CDP 1 are the wells to be evaluated for use in the short-term pilot test. Well MW U101 the most likely location for the pilot test based on results of a previous bioslurper pilot test conducted by Hill AFB in 1993. Well MW U101 produced approximately 7 gallons of fuel in a 24-hour extraction period, while well MW U069 produced negligible recovery (Battelle unpublished data). The purpose of this bioslurper test will be to assess the relative efficacy of bioslurping for fuel recovery compared to passive skimming and pump drawdown technologies.

Since soil gas monitoring points are already present next to MW U101 a new monitoring well will be installed adjacent to OU-101 during soil sampling activities. The new well will be used as the bioslurper extraction well or for radius of influence testing during the pilot test.

Landfill 3 was operated as a general refuse landfill from 1947 through 1967. Materials dumped and burned at Landfill 3 included industrial sludge, waste solvents, and residues from solvent cleaning operations (Montgomery Watson, 1993). Relevant data for MW U101 and MW U069, including well construction data and site geology, are presented in Appendix A.

Project Activities

The following field activities are planned for the pilot test to be conducted at Hill AFB. Additional details about the activities are presented in the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping*. Table 1 shows the schedule of activities for the OU1 site at Hill AFB.

1. Mobilization to the Site

When the site-specific test plan has been approved, Battelle staff will mobilize equipment to the test site. All equipment will be shipped via truck and trailer to Hill AFB. Battelle personnel will be mobilized to the site with all the equipment. The Battelle POC will provide the Air Force POC with personal information for each Battelle employee who will be on site. The exact mobilization date will be confirmed with the Base POC as far in advance of fieldwork as is possible.




Figure 1. Location of OU1 at Hill Air Force Base




Figure 2. Well and Boring Locations OU1

TABLE 1. SCHEDULE OF BIOSLURPER TEST ACTIVITIES

Pilot Test Activity	Schedule
Test Plan Approval	day (to be determined)
Mobilization	day 1-2
Site Characterization	day 2-3
Baildown Tests	
Soil Gas Survey (limited)	
Extraction Well Installation (3 MPs are already present on the site)	
Soil Sampling	
System Installation	day 2-3
Test Startup	day 4
Skimmer Test (2 day)	day 4
Bioslurper Pump Test (4 days)	day 5-9
Air Permeability Testing	day 5
Skimmer Test (1 day)	day 9
Drawdown Pump Test (2 day)	day 10-11
In Situ Respiration Test (air/helium injection)	day 10
In Situ Respiration Test (monitoring)	day 10-12
Demobilization/Mobilization	day 12-14

2. Site Characterization Tests

2.1 Soil Gas Survey (Limited)

The soil gas survey will be conducted in the existing soil gas monitoring points. The soil gas survey will be used to assist in locating the new extraction well to be installed at the site. To obtain further information about the soil gas survey, consult Section 5.2 of the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping*.

2.2 Baildown Tests

The baildown test is used to assess the mobility and recoverability of LNAPL in site monitoring wells. Baildown tests will be performed at wells that contain measurable LNAPL thicknesses to estimate the LNAPL recovery potential at those particular wells. Detailed procedures for the baildown tests are provided in Section 5.6 of the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping*.

2.3 Soil Sampling

Soil sampling will be done to assess soil contaminant and physical characteristics. The scope of soil sampling activities is limited to contaminant screening and does not represent pretreatment characterization. Soil samples from the chosen site will be collected from the borehole advanced for monitoring well installation. Two to three soil samples will be collected from the site. Samples will be collected across the capillary fringe to characterize the soils which affect LNAPL mobility.

Soil samples will be analyzed for particle size distribution; bulk density; porosity; moisture content; benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX); and TPH. Section 5.5.1 of the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping* will be consulted for information on the field measurements and sample collection procedures for soil sampling.

3. Bioslurper System Installation and Operation

Once the well to be used for the bioslurper test installation at Hill AFB has been identified, the bioslurper system and support equipment will be installed and operated.

3.1 System Setup

All the previously transported equipment will be mobilized to the selected extraction well, and the bioslurper system will be assembled. Figure 3 shows a flow diagram of the bioslurper process. Prior to the initiation of the LNAPL recovery tests, all the relevant baseline field data will be collected and recorded. These data will include soil gas concentrations, initial soil gas pressures, the depth to groundwater, and the LNAPL thickness. Also, ambient soil and relevant atmospheric conditions (weather conditions, temperature, humidity, barometric pressure, etc.) will be recorded. All emergency equipment (i.e., emergency shutoff switches and fire extinguishers) will be installed and checked for proper operation at this time.

A clear level area near the selected extraction well must be identified for the 20-ft by 10-ft flatbed trailer that carries the 7.5-hp pump and all other equipment required for the bioslurper system operation. For more information on the bioslurper system installation, consult Section 6.0 of the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping*.

3.2 System Shakedown

A brief startup test will be conducted to ensure that the system is properly constructed and operates safely. All system components will be checked for problems and/or malfunctions. A checklist will be provided to document the system shakedown.

3.3 System Startup and Test Operations

After installation is complete and the bioslurper system is confirmed to be operating properly, the LNAPL recovery tests will be started. The Bioslurper Initiative has been designed to evaluate the effectiveness of bioslurping as a LNAPL recovery technology relative to conventional gravity-driven LNAPL recovery technologies. The Bioslurper Initiative includes three separate LNAPL recovery tests: (1) a skimmer simulation test; (2) a vacuum-assisted bioslurper test; and (3) a groundwater drawdown LNAPL recovery test. The three recovery tests are described in detail in Section 7.3 of the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping*.




Figure 6. Bioslurper Process Flow.

Bioslurper operating parameters measured during operation are vapor discharge analysis, aqueous effluent analysis, LNAPL recovery volume rates, vapor discharge volume rates, and groundwater discharge volume rates. Vapor monitoring will consist of periodic on-line monitoring of TPH supplemented by two samples collected for detailed laboratory analysis. A total of two samples of aqueous effluent will be collected for analysis of BTEX and TPH content. Recovered LNAPL volume will be recorded using an in-line flow-totalizing meter. The off-gas discharge volume will be measured using a calibrated pilot tube, and groundwater discharge volume will be recorded using an in-line flow-totalizing meter. Section 8.0 of the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping* describes the process monitoring of the bioslurper system.

3.4 Soil Gas Permeability Tests

A soil gas permeability test will be conducted concurrently with startup of the vacuum-assisted bioslurper operation. Soil gas permeability data support the process of estimating the vadose zone radius of influence of the bioslurper system. Soil gas permeability results also help in determining the number of wells required if it is decided to treat the site with a large-scale bioslurper system. The soil gas permeability test method is described in Section 5.8 of the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping*.

3.5 *In Situ Respiration Tests*

The rate of oxygen utilization will be used to estimate the biodegradation rate for the site. An in situ respiration test will be conducted after completion of the bioslurper operating tests. The in situ respiration testing will consist of air/helium injection into selected soil gas monitoring points followed by monitoring changes in concentration of oxygen, carbon dioxide, petroleum hydrocarbons, and helium in soil gas near the injection point. Measurement of the soil gas composition typically will be conducted at 2, 4, 6, and 8 hours and then every 4 to 12 hours for about 2 days. Timing of the tests will be adjusted based on oxygen use rate. If oxygen depletion occurs rapidly, more frequent monitoring will be required. If oxygen depletion is slow, less frequent readings will be acceptable. Further information on the procedures and data collection for in situ respiration testing is given in Section 5.9 of the *Test Plan and Technical Protocol for Bioslurping*.

3.6 *Extended Testing*

The Air Force has the option of extending the operation of the bioslurper system for up to 6 months at Hill AFB, if LNAPL recovery rates are promising. If extended testing is to be performed, additional site support will be required. The Air Force will need to provide electrical power for long-term operation of the bioslurper pump. Disposition of all generated wastes and routine operation and maintenance of the system will be the Air Force's responsibility. Battelle will provide technical support during the extended testing operation.

If the extended testing option is exercised, Battelle is scoped to remain on site an additional 2 days after the short-term pilot test is completed. The additional time on site will allow for connection of the bioslurper system to Air Force supplied power. Battelle will provide the base with a detailed operation manual for the bioslurper system and will provide training to Air Force personnel. The Base POC will be provided with a project record book to record system data. The POC will be given a Battelle contact and an alternate contact for technical assistance and will be contacted weekly for updates on system operation. At the end of the extended testing option (up to 6 months of operation) Battelle will return to the site to remove all bioslurper equipment. All waste generated during the operation of the bioslurper system will be the responsibility of the Air Force.

4. Demobilization

Once all the necessary tests have been completed at the Hill AFB sites, all the equipment will be disassembled by Battelle staff. The equipment will then be transported to the next bioslurper site location.

Bioslurper System Discharge

1. Vapor Discharge Disposition

Battelle has been informed by Hill AFB that the bioslurper vapor discharge may be released directly to the atmosphere for the short-term pilot test. To ensure the safety and compliability of the bioslurper system, vapor discharge samples (TPH, O₂, and CO₂) will be collected periodically throughout the bioslurper pilot test. Also, field soil gas screening instruments will be used to monitor vapor discharge concentration variability.

2. Aqueous Influent/Effluent Disposition

It is estimated that the groundwater extraction rate will be less than 5 gpm. Battelle will discharge extracted groundwater directly to a 10,000-gallon wastewater tank. The tank will be periodically discharged to the base industrial wastewater treatment plant (IWTP).

3. LNAPL Recovery Disposition

The bioslurper system will recover free-phase LNAPL from the pilot tests performed at Hill AFB. LNAPL recovered by the bioslurping tests will be turned over to the Base for disposal and/or recycling. The volume of free product recovered from the Base will not be known until the tests have been performed. The maximum expected fluid recovery rate for this test is 5 gpm. However, the actual rate of LNAPL recovery will be much lower.

Schedule

Drilling activities at OU1 are scheduled to begin on October 27, 1995. The bioslurper pilot test will begin immediately after drilling activities are complete.

Project Support Roles

This section outlines the some of the major functions of personnel from Battelle, Hill AFB, and AFCEE during the bioslurper field test.

1. Battelle Activities

The obligations of Battelle in the Bioslurper Initiative at Hill AFB will be to supply all the necessary staff and equipment to perform the initial pilot-tests on the bioslurper system. Also Battelle will provide technical support in the areas of water and vapor discharge permitting, digging permits, technical support during the extended testing period, and any other technical areas that need to be addressed.

2. Hill AFB Support Activities

To conduct the necessary field tests at Hill AFB, the Base must be able to provide the following items:

- a. Any and all digging permits and utility clearances that need to be obtained prior to the initiation of the fieldwork. Any underground utilities should be clearly marked to reduce the chance of utility damage and/or personal injury during soil gas probe and well installation (if needed). Battelle will not begin field operations without these clearances and permits.
- b. The Air Force will be responsible for obtaining Base and site clearance for the Battelle staff that will be working at the Base. The Base POC will be furnished with all the pertinent personal information for each staff member prior to field startup.
- c. Access to the IWTP sewer must be furnished, so that staff can discharge the bioslurper aqueous effluent directly to the Base treatment facility.

- d. Regulatory approval, if any is required, will need to be obtained by the Base POC prior to startup of the bioslurper pilot test.
- e. The Base also will be responsible for the disposition of all waste generated from the pilot testing. Such waste includes any soil cuttings generated from drilling, and all aqueous wastestreams produced from the bioslurper tests. Also, all free product recovered from the bioslurper operation will be disposed of or recycled by the Base. Battelle will provide technical assistance in disposing of the waste generated from the bioslurper pilot test.
- f. The Health and Safety Plan for Hill AFB will be finalized with information provided by the Base POC. Table 2 is a checklist for the necessary information required to complete the Health and Safety Plan.

3. AFCEE Activities

The Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE) POC will act as a liaison between Battelle and Hill Base staff. The AFCEE POC will ensure that all necessary permits are obtained and the required space to house the bioslurper field equipment is found. The following is a listing of Battelle, AFCEE, and Hill Base staff that can be contacted in cases of emergency and/or required technical support during the bioslurper field initiative tests at Hill AFB:

Battelle POCs	—	Jeff Kittel	614-424-6122
		Greg Headington	614-424-5417
AFCEE POC	—	Patrick Haas	210-536-4331
Hill AFB POC	-	Darrin Wray	801-777-8790 ext.360

TABLE 2. HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION CHECKLIST

The following emergency information will be obtained by the Site Health and Safety Officer prior to beginning operations:

<u>Emergency Contacts</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Telephone No.</u>
Hospital Emergency Room:	_____	_____
Point of Contact:	_____	_____
Fire Department:	_____	_____
Emergency Unit (Ambulance):	_____	_____
Security:	_____	_____
Explosives Unit:	_____	_____
Community Emergency Response Coordinator:	_____	_____
Other:	_____	_____

Program Contacts

Air Force: _____

Battelle: _____

Other: _____


Emergency Routes

Hospital (maps attached): _____

Other: _____

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (614) 424-6122.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey A. Kittel". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Jeffrey" being more prominent.

Jeffrey A. Kittel
Program Manager
Environmental Restoration Department

JAK:gm

cc: Darrin Wray (Hill AFB)

APPENDIX A

01-101

DEPTH (FEET)	Project: Hill Air Force Base										JMM Boring No.: M-63 (SB-28)										ELEVATION (FEET)																																																																																																																													
	Date Drilled: 8-22-92 Date Completed: 8-22-92										Northing: 289,349.9 Easting: 1,874,419.9																																																																																																																																							
	Logged By: Mark Loucks										Ground Surface Elevation (ft.): 4,798.95																																																																																																																																							
	Drilling Contractor: Layne Environmental										Measuring Point (MP) Elevation (ft.): 4,800.71																																																																																																																																							
Drilling Method: Mobile Drill B-80										MP is Top of Casing Datum: NGVD (1929)																																																																																																																																								
Borehole: Total Depth (ft.) <u>33.5</u> Diameter (in.) <u>8 1/4</u> Well Screen: Diameter (in. I.D.) <u>2</u> Depth (ft.) <u>31-21</u> Type <u>304 Stainless Steel</u> Slot Size <u>0.010 inch</u> Blank Casing: Diameter (in. I.D.) <u>2</u> Length (ft.) <u>21-0</u> Type <u>PVC Schedule 40</u> Interval: Sand (ft.) <u>33.5-16.2</u> Bentonite Seal (ft.) <u>16.2-14.2</u> Cement Grout Seal (ft.) <u>14.2-0</u> Depth to Water from MP (ft.) <u>28.3</u> Date Measured <u>8-22-92</u>																																																																																																																																																		
LITHOLOGIC LOG																																																																																																																																																		
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">GRAIN SIZE</th> <th rowspan="2">MAX. PID READING (ppm)</th> <th rowspan="2">BLOWS (6 IN.)</th> <th rowspan="2">SAMPLE TYPE*</th> <th rowspan="2">SAMPLE RECOVERY</th> <th rowspan="2">GRAPHIC LOG</th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2">WELL COMPLETION DETAIL</th> </tr> <tr> <th>% GRAVEL</th> <th>% SAND</th> <th>% FINES</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>30</td> <td>60</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4,799.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>30</td> <td>70</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> <td>C</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4,798.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>17</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4,797.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>14</td> <td>C</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>16</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4,796.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>20</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>30</td> <td>35</td> <td>35</td> <td>11</td> <td></td> <td>11</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4,795.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>16</td> <td>C</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>27</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>																						GRAIN SIZE				MAX. PID READING (ppm)	BLOWS (6 IN.)	SAMPLE TYPE*	SAMPLE RECOVERY	GRAPHIC LOG		WELL COMPLETION DETAIL	% GRAVEL	% SAND	% FINES		10	30	60	0		6					4,799.0		30	70	1		10	C				4,798.0						17									0		10					4,797.0				0		14	C								0		16					4,796.0						20						30	35	35	11		11					4,795.0						16	C										27					
GRAIN SIZE				MAX. PID READING (ppm)	BLOWS (6 IN.)	SAMPLE TYPE*	SAMPLE RECOVERY	GRAPHIC LOG		WELL COMPLETION DETAIL																																																																																																																																								
% GRAVEL	% SAND	% FINES																																																																																																																																																
10	30	60	0		6					4,799.0																																																																																																																																								
	30	70	1		10	C				4,798.0																																																																																																																																								
					17																																																																																																																																													
			0		10					4,797.0																																																																																																																																								
			0		14	C																																																																																																																																												
			0		16					4,796.0																																																																																																																																								
					20																																																																																																																																													
30	35	35	11		11					4,795.0																																																																																																																																								
					16	C																																																																																																																																												
					27																																																																																																																																													

JMM James M. Montgomery

* C California Split Spoon Sampler (2.5" I.D.)
 S Standard penetration test sampler
 c Cuttings
 X Elevation of ground water

HILL AIR FORCE BASE
 01-101 M-63 (SB-28)

PAGE 1 OF 4

PROJECT NO. 2208.0504

01-101

DEPTH (FEET)	GRAIN SIZE			MAX. PID READING (ppm)	BLOWS (6 IN.)	SAMPLE TYPE*	SAMPLE RECOVERY	GRAPHIC LOG	Project: Hill Air Force Base JMM Boring No.: M-63 (SB-28)	WELL COMPLETION DETAIL	ELEVATION (FEET)
	% GRAVEL	% SAND	% FINES						LITHOLOGIC LOG		
5	20	60	20	104	7				Fill—sand with gravel and silt; (10YR3/1); fine to medium sand, rounded to subangular; fine to coarse gravel, rounded to subrounded; loose; moist; hydrocarbon stained throughout; glass fragments.		4,794.0
6		40	60	87	14	C			Fill—clay with sand and silt; (7.5YR6/6); clay, soft, high plasticity; medium to fine sand, thin lenses up to 0.5 cm thick; loose; moist; hydrocarbon staining in sand lenses, not in clay.		4,793.0
					16				As above with very poor recovery.		Grout
7					9						4,792.0
					16	C					2" Schedule 40 PVC Casing
					18						4,791.0
8					21						4,791.0
9	10	45	45	0	14				Fill—sand with silt, clay, and gravel; (10YR3/2); fine to coarse sand, rounded to subangular; fine gravel, rounded to angular; clay, high plasticity, soft; moist; some hydrocarbon staining.		4,790.0
					20	C					
					27						4,789.0
10		65	35	27	1				Sand with silt; (10YR3/2); medium to fine sand; loose; moist; hydrocarbon staining in most of sample.		4,789.0
					30	C					4,788.0
11					1						4,788.0
12	5	95		5	8				Fill—sand with gravel; (10YR6/6); fine to coarse sand, rounded to subangular; fine gravel, rounded to subrounded; loose; moist; 10-20% dark, asphalt type balls up to 1.5 cm thick composed of sand and fine gravel, crumble at touch.		4,787.0
					11						
	40	60		0	17	C			Fill—sand with gravel; (10YR4/2); coarse to fine sand, trace silt balls, rounded to subangular; fine to coarse gravel, rounded to subangular; loose; moist; trace hydrocarbon staining.		4,786.0
13					24						
		80	20	19	37				Fill—sand with silt; (10YR3/2); fine to coarse sand, rounded to subangular; loose; moist; hydrocarbon staining.		4,785.0
14	40	60		35	62	C			Fill—sand with gravel; (10YR7/3); fine to coarse sand, rounded to subangular; fine to coarse gravel up to 5 cm in diameter, rounded to subangular; trace silt; loose to dense; slightly moist; trace hydrocarbon staining around gravels.		4,785.0
				189	77						1/4" Bentonite Pellets


JMM James M. Montgomery



- * C California Split Spoon Sampler (2.5" I.D.)
- S Standard penetration test sampler
- c Cuttings
- ▼ Elevation of ground water

HILL AIR FORCE BASE
M-63 (SB-28)

01-101




JMM James M. Montgomery



- * C California Split Spoon Sampler (2.5" I.D.)
- S Standard penetration test sampler
- c Cuttings
- ∇ Elevation of ground water

HILL AIR FORCE BASE

01-101 M-63 (SB-28)



JMM James M. Montgomery



- C California Split Spoon Sampler (2.5" I.D.)
- S Standard penetration test sampler
- c Cuttings
- Y Elevation of ground water

HILL AIR FORCE BASE
M-63 (SB-28)

U1-101

TABLE 7-4
SUMMARY OF VOC, BNAE, PESTICIDE/PCB, DIOXIN/FURAN
AND TPH RESULTS FOR LNAPL SAMPLES COLLECTED
AT FIRE TRAINING AREA 1 DURING THE PHASE II RI

Analytes	Sample Location:	Results	
		U1-101	U1-101 (Blind Duplicate Sample)
VOCs (µg/kg)			
Acetone		<43,000	1,100,000(a)
Ethylbenzene		210,000	200,000
Total xylene		540,000	<23,250
BNAEs (µg/kg)			
Naphthalene		1,400,000	1,500,000
2-Methylnaphthalene		520,000 J	540,000
Pesticides (µg/ml)			
Alpha-BHC		0.65	0.51
Delta-BHC		<0.05	0.11
Lindane		<0.05	0.39
Dieldrin		0.08	0.08
Endosulfan Sulfate		<0.25	0.37
Furans (pg/ml)			
TCDFs (total)		8,300	3,700
2,3,7,8-TCDF		1 g	89 g
PeCDFs (total)		3,300	1,800
1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF		<96	88
2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF		220	200
HxCDFs (total)		1,600	1,300
1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF		160	160
1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF		150	140
2,3,4,6,8-HxCDF		180	110
1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF		<57	26
HpCDFs (total)		480	690
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF		480	410
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF		<54	69
OCDF		<220	210
Dioxins (pg/ml)			
TCDDs (total)		220	430
2,3,7,8-TCDD		<16	17
PeCDDs (total)		340	800
1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD		<54	70
HxCDDs (total)		1,200	2,100
1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD		<38	45
1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD		190	210
1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD		<110	110
HpCDDs (total)		5,200	6,000
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD		2,800	3,300
OCDD		11,000	12,000
TPH (mg/ml)			
JP-4		240	250

(a) Based on the QCSR for the Phase II OU 1 RI, this datum has been qualified and is not considered representative of the environment.

g 2,3,7,8-TCDF results were confirmed on DB-225 column

< Not detected at or above the specified detection limit

√ Value is an estimated concentration below the practical quantitation limit




TABLE 6-10

WELL 01-101 IS

IN THIS AREA

RANGE OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS FOR SOIL SAMPLES
COLLECTED AT FIRE TRAINING AREA 1
(1 of 2)

Analyte (Units)	General Compound Type	Range of Concentrations Detected	Number of Detections per Analyses
Volatile Organic Compounds (µg/kg)			
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	1.4	1 of 13
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	41,000	1 of 13
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	15,000	1 of 13
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	520 J	1 of 13
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	2,600 J	1 of 13
Acetone	Organic Solvent of Lab Contaminant	7.1 to 3,200 ^(a)	10 of 13
Acrylonitrile	Lab Contaminant	3,400 to 10,000 ^(a)	2 of 13
Chlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	17	1 of 13
Ethylbenzene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	59 to 3,500	6 of 13
Methylene Chloride	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon or Lab Contaminant	1.7 to 4.4 ^(a)	3 of 13
Naphthalene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	340 to 9,900	5 of 12
Tetrachloroethene (PCE)	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	11	1 of 13
Toluene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	0.77 J ^(a)	1 of 13
Total 1,2-Dichloroethene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	2.2	1 of 13
Trichloroethene (TCE)	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	2.2 J	1 of 13
Xylenes, Total	Fuel Hydrocarbon	1.9 to 37,000	8 of 13
BNAEs (µg/kg)			
Benzoic Acid	Fuel Hydrocarbon	190 J	1 of 13
2-Methylnaphthalene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	4,200 to 7,700	3 of 13
Acenaphthene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	130 J to 270 J	2 of 13
Fluorene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	360 to 930	2 of 13
Phenanthrene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	450 to 1400	2 of 13
Anthracene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	240 J	1 of 13
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	Ubiquitous Plasticizer	260 J	1 of 13
Fluoranthene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	65 J	1 of 13
Pyrene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	100 J to 290 J	2 of 13
4-Aminobiphenyl	Amine	210 J to 1000	2 of 13
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (mg/kg)			
Jet Fuel #4	Fuel Hydrocarbon	270 to 3,200	7 of 13
Pesticides and PCBs (mg/kg)			
p,p'-DDE	Pesticide	0.0048 to 0.0065	2 of 5
p,p'-DDD	Pesticide	0.0042	1 of 5
p,p'-DDT	Pesticide	0.0048 to 0.33	2 of 5
PCB-1260 (Arochlor 1260)	PCB	0.072 to 5	2 of 5

(a) These data have been qualified and are not considered to be representative of the environment. See the Final QCSR for the Phase II Operable Unit 1 Remedial Investigation (Montgomery Watson, 1994) for a detailed discussion.

J indicates an estimated concentration.

TABLE 6-10

RANGE OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS FOR SOIL SAMPLES
COLLECTED AT FIRE TRAINING AREA 1

(2 of 2)

Analyte (Units)	General Compound Type	Range of Concentrations Detected	Number of Detections per Analyses
Dioxin/Furans (pg/g)			
Tetrachlorinated Dibenzofurans, (Total)	Furan	17 to 1,600	5 of 5
2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	1.6 to 37	4 of 5
Pentachlorinated Dibenzofurans, (Total)	Furan	21 to 1,100	5 of 5
1,2,3,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	51	1 of 5
2,3,4,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	5 to 100	3 of 5
Hexachlorinated Dibenzofurans, (Total)	Furan	13 to 580	5 of 5
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	9.7 to 75	3 of 5
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	6.3 to 50	3 of 5
2,3,4,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	6 to 71	3 of 5
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	16	1 of 5
Heptachlorinated Dibenzofurans, (Total)	Furan	11 to 850	5 of 5
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	8.1 to 350	4 of 5
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-Heptachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	7.4 to 22	2 of 5
Octachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	12 to 400	4 of 5
Tetrachlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins, (Total)	Dioxin	11 to 250	4 of 5
2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	7 to 13	3 of 5
Pentachlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins, (Total)	Dioxin	11 to 390	4 of 5
1,2,3,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	25 to 42	3 of 5
Hexachlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins, (Total)	Dioxin	34 to 1,800	4 of 5
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	22 to 50	3 of 5
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	56 to 220	3 of 5
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	35 to 120	3 of 5
Heptachlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins, (Total)	Dioxin	21 to 5,700	5 of 5
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	11 to 3,000	5 of 5
Octachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	83 to 15,000	5 of 5
Metals (µg/g)			
Arsenic	Metal	0.7 to 4.6	13 of 13
Beryllium	Metal	1	1 of 13
Cadmium	Metal	3 to 6	3 of 13
Chromium	Metal	4 to 52	13 of 13
Copper	Metal	2 to 120	13 of 13
Lead	Metal	2 to 150	8 of 13
Mercury	Metal	0.06 to 0.12	3 of 13
Zinc	Metal	10 to 96	13 of 13

(a) These data have been qualified and are not considered to be representative of the environment. See the Final QCSR for the Phase II Operable Unit 1 Remedial Investigation (Montgomery Watson, 1994) for a detailed discussion.

J indicates an estimated concentration.

TABLE 6-15

SUMMARY OF CONTAMINANT AREA, VOLUME, AND MASS
FOR FIRE TRAINING AREA 1

Depth Interval (ft bgs)	Concentration Range (mg/kg)	Median Concentration (mg/kg)	Area of Contamination (sq ft)	Volume of Contamination (cubic yards)	Mass of TPH (kg)
0 to 5	100 to 500	300	0	0	0
	501 to 1,000	750	0	0	0
	>1,000	1,000	0	0	0
			0	0	0
5 to 15	100 to 500	300	2,510	930	4,140
	501 to 1,000	750	1,730	640	7,140
	>1,000	2,000	670	250	7,370
			4,910	1,820	18,650
15 to 25	100 to 500	300	7,550	2,800	12,460
	501 to 1,000	750	4,990	1,850	20,580
	>1,000	1,000	0	0	0
			12,540	4,650	33,040
25 to 29	100 to 500	300	6,960	1,030	4,590
	501 to 1,000	750	10,300	1,530	17,000
	>1,000	2,100	2,220	330	10,260
			19,480	2,890	31,850
Grand Total				9,360	83,540

Boring or Well No. M-31 (01-069)
 Location Chemical Pit No.1 and 2
 Log Recorded by Leslie Campbell
 Type Drill Rig and Operator HSA-Dave's Drilling
 Ground Level Elevation 4799.84 ft. MSL

Project Hill AFB IRP Phase II Stage 2
 Beginning 28 May 1986 and end
29 May 1986 of drilling operation
 Sampling Interval (Est.) 5 ft

Depth	Sample Method	ID No. of Sample Taken	Graphic Log	Lithologic Description	Remarks
—	C			SAND: Red-brown; fine- to medium-grained; minor gravel; unconsolidated; moist.	poly=neg.
5—					
10—					
15—					
20—	SS			Dark brown; medium- to coarse-grained; gravelly; wet.	poly=pos.
25—	SS			Black.	poly=pos.
30—	SS			Dark brown.	poly=pos.
35—	SS			CLAY: Dark red-brown; silty; fine-grained sand stringers; cohesive; moist.	poly=pos. Total Depth= 35.5 ft.
40—					
45—					

TEST WELL COMPLETION DATA
HILL AIR FORCE BASE INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM

Draft Field Form: Radian/SAIC Test Well/Hole Completion

TEST WELL/HOLE NO. (01 - 069)

Location
Geologist
Drilled by
Elevation (Surface)
Elevation Measuring Point (MP)

M-31
Chemical Pits No.1 and 2
Leslie Campbell
Dave's Drilling
4799.89 ft. MSL
4801.08 ft. MSL

CONSTRUCTION

Start Date
Completion Date
Drilling Method
Depth Drilled (ft.)
Hole Diameter (in.)
Water Source

5/28/86
5/29/86
Hollow Stem Auger
33.1 ft.
8 in.
Base Potable

COMPLETION

Completion Type
Blank Casing 2" PVC
Schedule
Blank Stainless Steel 2"
Stainless Steel Screen 2"
Slot Size (in.)
Grout
No. of sacks
Bentonite
Amount (gal.)
Sand Pack
Type
Size
Amount (gal.)
Water Level (ft.) below MP
Date
Depth inside Well (ft.) below MP
Comment(s)/Problems

Above Ground Level
+3-14.5 ft.
40
-
14.5-31.0 ft.
0.02
0-8.5 ft.
5
8.5-11.0 ft.
5
11.0-14.5 ft.
Colorado Silica
10-20
40
25.58 ft.
8/14/86
33.37 ft.
-

FORMATION SAMPLING

Sampling Type
Sampling Total Depth (ft.)
Number of Samples

Cuttings, Split Spoon
35 ft.
8

TABLE 7-3

**SUMMARY OF VOC, BNAE, PESTICIDE/PCB, DIOXIN/FURAN, AND TPH
RESULTS FOR LNAPL SAMPLES COLLECTED DOWNGRADIENT
OF THE CHEMICAL DISPOSAL PITS DURING THE PHASE II RI**

Analytes	Sample Location:	Results	
		U1-065	U1-004
VOCs (µg/kg)			
Acetone		1,100,000(a)	<43,000
Total 1,2-dichloroethene		<52,500	87,000
1,1,1-Trichloroethane		<27,500	92,000
Tetrachloroethene		<35,000	38,000
Toluene		<35,000	770,000
Chlorobenzene		2,300,000	<13,000
Ethylbenzene		<27,500	210,000
Total xylene		<23,250	1,400,000
BNAEs (µg/kg)			
1,2-Dichlorobenzene		<400,000	2,700,000
Naphthalene		430,000	640,000
2-Methylnaphthalene		<400,000	810,000
bis(2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate		<400,000	730,000(a)
Pesticides/PCBs (µg/ml)			
Aldrin		<0.05	0.41
Alpha-BHC		<0.05	0.15
Dieldrin		<0.05	0.35
Endosulfan Sulfate		3.5	5.3
Endrin		<0.25	0.73
Heptachlor		0.12	0.13
Heptachlor Epoxide		0.41	0.45
PCB-1260		230	190
Dioxin/Furans			
Furans (pg/ml)			
TCDFs (total)		3,800	320
2,3,7,8-TCDF		940 g	11 g

(a) Based on QCSR for the Phase II OU 1 RI, the datum has been qualified and is not considered representative of the environment

g 2,3,7,8-TCDF results confirmed on DB-225 column

√ Value is an estimated concentration below the practical quantitation limit

< Not detected at or above the specified detection limit

µg/kg Microgram per kilogram

mg/ml Milligram per milliliter

µg/ml Microgram per milliliter

pg/ml Picogram per milliliter

U1-069
IS IN THE
IMMEDIATE
VICINITY
OF THESE
TWO WELLS.

TABLE 7-3

**SUMMARY OF VOC, BNAE, PESTICIDE/PCB, DIOXIN/FURAN, AND TPH
RESULTS FOR LNAPL SAMPLES COLLECTED DOWNGRAIDENT
OF THE CHEMICAL DISPOSAL PITS DURING THE PHASE II RI
(CONTINUED)**

Analytes	Sample Location:	Results	
		U1-065	U1-004
Furans (pg/ml) (continued)			
PeCDFs (total)		44,000	350
1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF		1,200	<11
2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF		3,000	32 √
HxCDFs (total)		50,000	370
1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF		8,900	86
1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF		3,700	37 √
2,3,4,6,8-HxCDF		3,200	32
1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF		1,400	<13
HpCDFs (total)		32,000	290
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF		22,000	200
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF		1,800	29 √
OCDF		11,000	220
Dioxins (pg/ml)			
TCDDs (total)		8,300	16
2,3,7,8-TCDD		110	<2.3
PeCDDs (total)		14,000	57
1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD		550	<3.3
HxCDDs (total)		23,000	86
1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD		560	<4.10
1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD		2,700	<18
1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD		1,300	<8.2
HpCDDs (total)		49,000	320
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD		29,000	180
OCDD		63,000	630
TPH (mg/ml)			
JP-4		120	72





(a) Based on QCSR for the Phase II OU 1 RI, the datum has been qualified and is not considered representative of the environment

g 2,3,7,8-TCDF results confirmed on DB-225 column

✓ Value is an estimated concentration below the practical quantitation limit

< Not detected at or above the specified detection limit

μg/kg Microgram per kilogram
 mg/ml Milligram per milliliter
 μg/ml Microgram per milliliter
 pg/ml Picogram per milliliter

**EXPLANATION**

HILL AIR FORCE BASE
OPERABLE UNIT 1
LNAPL THICKNESS vs. GROUND-WATER ELEVATION
FOR WELLS U1-069, U1-070, AND, U1-071
FIGURE 7-9

TABLE 6-6

RANGE OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS FOR SOIL SAMPLES
COLLECTED AT CDPs 1 and 2
(1 of 3)

Analyte (Units)	General Compound Type	Range of Concentrations Detected	Number of Detections per Analyses
Volatile Organic Compounds (µg/kg)			
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	1.3 to 8,100	37 of 88
1,1-Dichloroethane	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	1.2 to 230	8 of 88
1,1-Dichloroethene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	34 to 790	3 of 88
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	0.99 to 2,900	6 of 32
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	0.06 to 19,000	34 of 88
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	0.66 to 54,000	21 of 32
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	1.9 to 170,000	42 of 88
1,2-Dichloroethane	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	2.9 to 64	4 of 88
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene (Mesitylene)	Fuel Hydrocarbon	0.89 to 20,000	20 of 32
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	1.0 to 3,200	13 of 85
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	2.4 to 21,000	37 of 86
2-Butanone (MEK)	Organic Solvent or Lab Contaminant	1,800 to 5,200(a)	10 of 56
2-Hexanone	Organic Solvent	8,000	1 of 56
Acetone	Organic Solvent or Lab Contaminant	7.3 to 1,400(b)	22 of 56
Benzene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	1.3 to 140 J	4 of 88
Chlorobenzene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	37 to 2,000	9 of 88
Chloroform	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	120 J	1 of 88
Ethylbenzene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	1.2 to 6,200	27 of 88
Isopropylbenzene (Cumene)	Fuel Hydrocarbon	7.1 to 1,200	5 of 32
Methyl Isobutyl Ketone	Organic Solvent	4.8 to 6.5	2 of 45
Methylene Chloride	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon or Lab Contaminant	1.2 to 670(b)	12 of 88
Naphthalene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	42 to 17,000	33 of 88
Styrene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	1.5	1 of 88
Tetrachloroethene (PCE)	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	1.8 to 9,100	37 of 88
Toluene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	0.92 to 57,000	49 of 88
Total 1,2-Dichloroethene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	3.9 to 14,000	13 of 56
Trichloroethene (TCE)	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	1.9 to 40,000	28 of 88
Xylenes, Total	Fuel Hydrocarbon	8.3 to 51,000	20 of 56
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	Chlorinated Hydrocarbon	3.6 to 4,200	19 of 32
m,p-Xylene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	5.5 to 30,000	19 of 32
n-Propylbenzene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	770 to 6,000	8 of 32
o-Xylene (1,2-Dimethylbenzene)	Fuel Hydrocarbon	15 to 12,000	18 of 32
p-Cymene (p-Isopropyltoluene)	Fuel Hydrocarbon	35 to 4,500	11 of 32
sec-Butylbenzene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	6.7 to 4,100	8 of 32

(a) Introduced into sample during analyses (Datachem, 1992)

(b) These data have been qualified and are not considered to be representative of the environment.

See the Final QCSR for Operable Unit 1 (Montgomery Watson, 1994) and the Final QCSR for the Phase II Operable Unit 1 Remedial Investigation (Montgomery Watson, 1994) for a detailed discussion.

J indicates an estimated concentration.

TABLE 6-6
RANGE OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS FOR SOIL SAMPLES
COLLECTED AT CDPs 1 and 2
(2 of 3)

Analyte (Units)	General Compound Type	Range of Concentrations Detected	Number of Detections per Analyses
BNAEs (µg/kg)			
Aniline	Laquer/Wood Stain	1,000	1 of 56
Phenol	Phenol	1,200 J	1 of 54
4-Methylphenol (P-Cresol)	Phenol	30 J	1 of 56
2,4-Dimethylphenol	Phenol	3,500	1 of 55
2-Methylnaphthalene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	1,200 to 17,000	18 of 56
Diethylphthalate	Ubiquitous Plasticizer	20 J	1 of 56
Fluorene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	250 J to 1,400 J	5 of 56
Phenanthrene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	30 J to 1,800	7 of 55
Anthracene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	220 J	1 of 55
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	Ubiquitous Plasticizer	30 J to 190 J	8 of 56
Fluoranthene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	50 J to 200 J	7 of 55
Pyrene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	30 J to 810 J	11 of 54
Benzyl Butyl Phthalate	Ubiquitous Plasticizer	40 J to 130 J	2 of 56
Benzo(a)Anthracene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	60 J to 80 J	2 of 56
Chrysene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	70 J to 380 J	5 of 56
Bis(2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	Ubiquitous Plasticizer or Lab Contaminant	20 J to 14,000(b)	30 of 56
Di-n-Octyl Phthalate	Ubiquitous Plasticizer	60 J	1 of 56
Benzo(a)Pyrene	Fuel Hydrocarbon	40 J to 540 J	3 of 56
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (mg/kg)			
Jet Fuel #4	Fuel Hydrocarbon	500 to 42,100	14 of 88
Jet Fuel #8	Fuel Hydrocarbon	2,700 to 8,600	5 of 77
Petroleum Hydrocarbons	Fuel Hydrocarbon	14 to 16,000	26 of 32
Gasoline Components	Fuel Hydrocarbon	1.4 to 2,200	23 of 77
Pesticides and PCBs (mg/kg)			
Alpha BHC	Pesticide	0.006 to 0.007	2 of 12
Delta BHC	Pesticide	0.007 to 0.02	2 of 12
Aldrin	Pesticide	0.003 to 0.02	6 of 12
Dieldrin	Pesticide	0.007 to 0.015	4 of 12
p,p'-DDE	Pesticide	0.006 to 0.053	4 of 12
Endrin	Pesticide	0.005 to 0.073	5 of 12
Beta Endosulfan	Pesticide	0.005 to 0.2	3 of 12
p,p'-DDD	Pesticide	0.009 to 0.37	6 of 12
p,p'-DDT	Pesticide	0.035 to 0.46	2 of 12
Methoxychlor	Pesticide	0.087 to 1.2	3 of 12
Endrin Aldehyde	Pesticide	0.14	1 of 12

(a) Introduced into sample during analyses (Datachem, 1992)

(b) These data have been qualified and are not considered to be representative of the environment. See the Final QCSR for Operable Unit 1 (Montgomery Watson, 1994) and the Final QCSR for the Phase II Operable Unit 1 Remedial Investigation (Montgomery Watson, 1994) for a detailed discussion.

J indicates an estimated concentration.

TABLE 6-6

RANGE OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS FOR SOIL SAMPLES
COLLECTED AT CDPs 1 and 2
(3 of 3)

Analyte (Units)	General Compound Type	Range of Concentrations Detected	Number of Detections per Analyses
Pesticides and PCBs (mg/kg) <continued>			
Alpha-Chlordane	Pesticide	0.005 to 0.016	3 of 8
PCB-1016 (Arochlor 1016)	PCB	0.15 to 0.29	3 of 12
PCB-1260 (Arochlor 1260)	PCB	0.07 to 8.3	10 of 12
Dioxin/Furans (pg/g)			
Tetrachlorinated Dibenzofurans, (Total)	Furan	1.5 to 190	5 of 5
2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	1.4 to 8.3	3 of 5
Pentachlorinated Dibenzofurans, (Total)	Furan	57 to 190	3 of 5
1,2,3,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	7.8 to 8.4	2 of 5
2,3,4,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	5.6 to 20	3 of 5
Hexachlorinated Dibenzofurans, (Total)	Furan	26 to 210	4 of 5
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	22 to 55	3 of 5
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	6.2 to 16	3 of 5
2,3,4,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	5.6 to 20	3 of 5
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	6 to 8.1	2 of 5
Heptachlorinated Dibenzofurans, (Total)	Furan	13 to 370	5 of 5
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	30 to 140	4 of 5
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-Heptachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	13 to 26	3 of 5
Octachlorodibenzofuran	Furan	17 to 310	5 of 5
Tetrachlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins, (Total)	Dioxin	3.6 to 40	4 of 5
Pentachlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins, (Total)	Dioxin	18 to 39	3 of 5
Hexachlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins, (Total)	Dioxin	14 to 150	4 of 5
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	7.1	1 of 5
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	7.5 to 20	2 of 5
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	5.1 to 16	2 of 5
Heptachlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins, (Total)	Dioxin	29 to 840	5 of 5
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	15 to 480	5 of 5
Octachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin	Dioxin	45 to 3,500	5 of 5
Metals (µg/g)			
Arsenic	Metal	0.8 to 6.6	56 of 56
Cadmium	Metal	2 to 3	2 of 50
Chromium	Metal	5 to 62	50 of 50
Copper	Metal	2 to 200	50 of 50
Lead	Metal	1 to 860	45 of 50
Mercury	Metal	0.05 to 0.3	2 of 56
Zinc	Metal	9 to 79	50 of 50

(a) Introduced into sample during analyses (Datachem, 1992)

(b) These data have been qualified and are not considered to be representative of the environment.

See the Final QCSR for Operable Unit 1 (Montgomery Watson, 1994) and the Final QCSR for the Phase II Operable Unit 1 Remedial Investigation (Montgomery Watson, 1994) for a detailed discussion.

J indicates an estimated concentration.

TABLE 6-14

SUMMARY OF CONTAMINANT AREA, VOLUME, AND MASS
FOR THE CHEMICAL DISPOSAL PITS

Depth Interval (ft bgs)	Concentration Range (mg/kg)	Median Concentration (mg/kg)	Area of Contamination (sq ft)	Volume of Contamination (cubic yards)	Mass of TPH (kg)
0 to 5	1 to 50	25	1,070	200	70
	51 to 100	75	1,160	210	240
	101 to 500	300	110	20	90
	501 to 1,000	750	0	0	0
	1,001 to 5,000	3,000	0	0	0
	> 5,000	5,000	0	0	0
			2,340	430	400
5 to 13	1 to 50	25	3,130	930	340
	51 to 100	75	2,900	860	960
	101 to 500	300	3,740	1,110	4,940
	501 to 1,000	750	9,050	2,680	29,860
	1,001 to 5,000	3,000	380	110	5,020
	> 5,000	5,000	0	0	0
			19,200	5,690	41,120
13 to 23	1 to 50	25	5,650	2,090	780
	51 to 100	75	6,410	2,370	2,640
	101 to 500	300	8,380	3,100	13,830
	501 to 1,000	750	9,030	3,340	37,250
	1,001 to 5,000	3,000	27,020	10,010	445,830
	> 5,000	6,550	7,190	2,660	259,020
			63,680	23,570	759,350
23 to 31	1 to 50	25	8,540	2,530	940
	51 to 100	75	13,900	4,120	4,590
	101 to 500	300	7,210	2,140	9,520
	501 to 1,000	750	6,710	1,990	22,140
	1,001 to 5,000	3,000	3,920	1,160	51,740
	> 5,000	23,550	1,600	470	165,790
			41,880	12,410	254,720
Grand Total				42,100	1,055,590

APPENDIX B
LABORATORY ANALYTICAL REPORTS

Alpha Analytical, Inc.

255 Glendale Avenue, Suite 21
Sparks, Nevada 89431
(702) 355-1044
FAX: 702-355-0406
1-800-283-1183

Boise, Idaho
(208) 336-4145

Las Vegas, Nevada
(702) 386-6747

ANALYTICAL REPORT

Battelle
505 King Ave
Columbus Ohio 43201

Job#: 90106
Phone: (614) 424-6199
Attn: Al Pollock

Sampled: 10/27/95 Received: 10/31/95 Analyzed: 11/02-04/95

Matrix: [X] Soil [] Water [] Waste

Analysis Requested: TPH - Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons-Extractable
Quantitated As Diesel
BTXE - Benzene,Toluene,Xylenes,Ethylbenzene

Methodology: TPH - Modified 8015/DHS LUFT Manual/BLS-191
 BTXE - EPA Method 624/8240

TPH/BTXE Results:

Client ID/ Lab ID	Parameter	Concentration	Detection Limit
HAFB-BW-22.0'- 22.5'	TPH *	1,800	200 mg/Kg
	Benzene	ND	1,000 ug/Kg
BMI103195-01	Toluene	ND	1,000 ug/Kg
	Total Xylenes	ND	1,000 ug/Kg
	Ethylbenzene	ND	1,000 ug/Kg
HAFB-BW-25.5'- 26.0'	TPH **	3,500	200 mg/Kg
	Benzene	ND	1,000 ug/Kg
BMI103195-02	Toluene	ND	1,000 ug/Kg
	Total Xylenes	ND	1,000 ug/Kg
	Ethylbenzene	ND	1,000 ug/Kg

- * - Components are primarily in the range of jet fuel, kerosene and diesel #1 with minor amounts of light oil and motor oil.
- ** - Components are primarily in the range of jet fuel, kerosene and diesel #1 with minor amounts of diesel #2, light oil and motor oil.

Note: Hydrocarbons outside the range of diesel may have varying recoveries.

ND - Not Detected

Approved By: Roger L. Scholl Date: 11/15/93
 Roger L. Scholl, Ph.D.
 Laboratory Director

Laboratory
Analysis Report




Sierra
Environmental
Monitoring, Inc.

ALPHA ANALYTICAL
255 GLENDALE AVENUE, SUITE 21
SPARKS NV 89431

Date : 11/15/95
Client : ALP-855
Taken by: CLIENT
Report : 14817
PO# :

Page: 1

Sample	Collected		MOISTURE CONTENT %	PARTICLE SIZE CLASSIF. HYDROMETER	DENSITY G/CM3	POROSITY %		
	Date	Time						
BMI103195-03 - HAFB-BW-23-24	10/27/95	:	3.8	YES	1.11	58.1		
BMI103195-04 - HAFB-BW-25-25.5	10/27/95	:	4.8	YES	1.09	58.8		

Approved By: 

This report is applicable only to the sample received by the laboratory. The liability of the laboratory is limited to the amount paid for this report. This report is for the exclusive use of the client to whom it is addressed and upon the condition that the client assumes all liability for the further distribution of the report or its contents.

William F. Pillsbury
President

1135 Financial Blvd.
Reno, NV 89502
Phone (702) 857-2400
FAX (702) 857-2404

John C. Seher
Manager



Sierra
Environmental
Monitoring, Inc.

November 14, 1995

TO: Alpha Analytical

FROM: Sierra Environmental Monitoring, Inc.

RE: Particle Size Distribution Analysis for Samples:

SEM 9510-0907 AAI BMI103195-03
SEM 9502-0908 AAI BMI103195-04

As per your request, we have performed particle size analysis on the samples submitted to our laboratory. Test results are as follows:

	9510-0907	9510-0908
% Sand	58.6	63.1
% Silt	25.6	18.3
% Clay	15.8	18.6

The sample was passed through a #10 sieve prior to analysis as per procedure. All results are based on oven dry sample weights.

We appreciate this opportunity to provide our laboratory testing services. If you have any questions or require further testing, please feel free to contact us at your convenience.

Sincerely,
SIERRA ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING, INC.

John Seher
Laboratory Manager

1135 Financial Blvd.
Reno, NV 89502
Phone (702) 857-2400
FAX (702) 857-2404

William F. Pillsbury
President

John C. Seher
Manager



1
2
3
4

Form No. 001




Billing information:

Name _____
Address _____
City, State, Zip _____
Phone Number _____




Alpine Analytical, Inc.
2555 Glendale Avenue, Suite 21
Sparks, Nevada 89431
Phone (702) 355-1044
Fax (702) 355-0406

Page # 1 of 1[illegible]

Signature	Print Name	Company	Date	Time
Relinquished by 	Linda B. Clark	AAZ	10/31/75	1000
Received by 				
Relinquished by 				
Received by 		Sepp	10/31/75	12/4/75
Relinquished by 				
Received by 				

NOTE: Samples are discarded 60 days after results are reported unless other arrangements are made. Hazardous samples will be returned to client or disposed of at client expense.

*Kev: AQ - Aqueous
SO - Soil
WA - Waste
OT - Other



Alpha Analytical, Inc.

255 Glendale Avenue, Suite 21
Sparks, Nevada 89431
(702) 355-1044
FAX: 702-355-0406
1-800-283-1183

Boise, Idaho
(208) 336-4145

Las Vegas, Nevada
(702) 386-6747

ANALYTICAL REPORT

Battelle
505 King Ave
Columbus Ohio 43201

Job#:
Phone: (614) 424-6199
Attn: Al Pollock

Sampled: 10/30-11/02/95 Received: 11/06/95 Analyzed: 11/09-10/95

Matrix: [] Soil [X] Water [] Waste

Analysis Requested: TPH - Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons-Extractable
Quantitated As Diesel
BTXE - Benzene, Toluene, Xylenes, Ethylbenzene

Methodology: TPH - Modified 8015/DHS LUFT Manual/BLS-191
BTXE - EPA Method 624/8240

TPH/BTXE Results:

Client ID/ Lab ID	Parameter	Concentration	Detection Limit
HAFB-OWS-1 /BMI110695-01	TPH *	180	5.0 mg/L
	Benzene	ND	5.0 ug/L
	Toluene	ND	5.0 ug/L
	Total Xylenes	38	5.0 ug/L
	Ethylbenzene	ND	5.0 ug/L
HAFB-Baker-1 /BMI110695-02	TPH *	7.4	5.0 mg/L
	Benzene	1.7	1.0 ug/L
	Toluene	0.57	1.0 ug/L
	Total Xylenes	15	1.0 ug/L
	Ethylbenzene	1.9	1.0 ug/L

* - Components are in the range of jet fuel, diesel, light oil and motor oil.

Note: Hydrocarbons outside the range of diesel may have varying recoveries.

ND - Not Detected

Approved By:

Roger L. Scholl
Roger L. Scholl, Ph.D.
Laboratory Director

Date:

11/15/95



Columbus Laboratories

CHAIN OF CUSTODY RECORD

Form No.

[illegible]

Billing information:

Name _____
Address _____
City, State, Zip _____
Phone Number _____



Alpha Analytical, Inc.
255 Glendale Avenue, Suite 21
Sparks, Nevada 89431
Phone (702) 355-1044
Fax (702) 355-0406

Page # 1 of 1[illegible]

NOTE: Samples are discarded 60 days after results are reported unless other arrangements are made. Hazardous samples will be returned to client or disposed of at client expense.

*Kev: AQ - Aqueous SO - Soil WA - Waste OT - Other

@ AIR TOXICS LTD.

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

WORK ORDER #: 9511063

Work Order Summary

CLIENT: Mr. Eric Dreschler
Battelle Memorial Institute
505 King Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

BILL TO: Same

PHONE: 614-424-3753
FAX: 614-424-3667
DATE RECEIVED: 11/6/95
DATE COMPLETED: 11/15/95

INVOICE # 8658
P.O. # 268.01
PROJECT # G462201-30C0701 Bioslurper Hill AFB
AMOUNT\$: \$282.12

<u>FRACTION #</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>TEST</u>	<u>RECEIPT</u> <u>VAC./PRES.</u>	<u>PRICE</u>
01A	HAFB-OGS-STK1	TO-3	4.5 "Hg	\$120.00
02A	HAFB-OGS-STK2	TO-3	3.5 "Hg	\$120.00
03A	Lab Blank	TO-3	NA	NC

Misc. Charges	1 Liter Summa Canister Preparation (2) @ \$10.00 each.	\$20.00
	Shipping (10/23/95)	\$22.12

CERTIFIED BY:

Amelia J. Furman
Laboratory Director

DATE:

11/15/95

180 BLUE RAVINE ROAD, SUITE B FOLSOM, CA 95630
(916) 985-1000 • (800) 985-5955 • FAX (916) 985-1020

AIR TOXICS LTD.

SAMPLE NAME: HAFB-OGS-STK1

ID#: 9511063-01A

EPA METHOD TO-3

(Aromatic Volatile Organics in Air)

GC/PID

File Name:	6110812	Date of Collection: 10/30/95		
Dil. Factor:	300	Date of Analysis: 11/8/95		
	Det. Limit	Det. Limit	Amount	Amount
Compound	(ppmv)	(uG/L)	(ppmv)	(uG/L)
Benzene	0.30	0.97	5.2	17
Toluene	0.30	1.1	4.4	17
Ethyl Benzene	0.30	1.3	7.0	31
Total Xylenes	0.30	1.3	20 M	88 M

TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS

GC/FID

(Quantitated as Jet Fuel)

File Name:	6110812	Date of Collection: 10/30/95		
Dil. Factor:	300	Date of Analysis: 11/8/95		
	Det. Limit	Det. Limit	Amount	Amount
Compound	(ppmv)	(uG/L)	(ppmv)	(uG/L)
TPH* (C5+ Hydrocarbons)	3.0	19	6000	39000
C2 - C4** Hydrocarbons	3.0	5.5	61	110

*TPH referenced to Jet Fuel (MW=156)

**C2 - C4 Hydrocarbons referenced to Propane (MW=44)

M = Reported value may be biased due to apparent matrix interferences.

Container Type: 1 Liter Summa Canister

AIR TOXICS LTD.

SAMPLE NAME: HAFB-OGS-STK2

ID#: 9511063-02A

EPA METHOD TO-3

(Aromatic Volatile Organics in Air)

GC/PID

File Name:	6110813	Date of Collection: 11/2/95		
Dil. Factor:	140	Date of Analysis: 11/8/95		
	Det. Limit	Det. Limit	Amount	Amount
Compound	(ppmv)	(uG/L)	(ppmv)	(uG/L)
Benzene	0.14	0.45	4.3	14
Toluene	0.14	0.54	3.2	12
Ethyl Benzene	0.14	0.62	3.6	16
Total Xylenes	0.14	0.62	7.9 M	35 M

TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS

GC/FID

(Quantitated as Jet Fuel)

File Name:	6110813	Date of Collection: 11/2/95		
Dil. Factor:	140	Date of Analysis: 11/8/95		
	Det. Limit	Det. Limit	Amount	Amount
Compound	(ppmv)	(uG/L)	(ppmv)	(uG/L)
TPH* (C5+ Hydrocarbons)	1.4	9.1	3800	25000
C2 - C4** Hydrocarbons	1.4	2.6	62	110

*TPH referenced to Jet Fuel (MW=156)

**C2 - C4 Hydrocarbons referenced to Propane (MW=44)

Container Type: 1 Liter Summa Canister

AIR TOXICS LTD.

SAMPLE NAME: Lab Blank

ID#: 9511063-03A

EPA METHOD TO-3

(Aromatic Volatile Organics in Air)

GC/PID

File Name:	6110808	Date of Collection:	NA
Dil. Factor:	1.0	Date of Analysis:	11/8/95

Compound	Det. Limit (ppmv)	Det. Limit (uG/L)	Amount (ppmv)	Amount (uG/L)
Benzene	0.001	0.003	Not Detected	Not Detected
Toluene	0.001	0.004	Not Detected	Not Detected
Ethyl Benzene	0.001	0.004	Not Detected	Not Detected
Total Xylenes	0.001	0.004	Not Detected	Not Detected

TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS

GC/FID

(Quantitated as Jet Fuel)

File Name:	6110808	Date of Collection:	NA
Dil. Factor:	1.0	Date of Analysis:	11/8/95

Compound	Det. Limit (ppmv)	Det. Limit (uG/L)	Amount (ppmv)	Amount (uG/L)
TPH* (C5+ Hydrocarbons)	0.010	0.065	Not Detected	Not Detected
C2 - C4** Hydrocarbons	0.010	0.018	Not Detected	Not Detected

*TPH referenced to Jet Fuel (MW=156)

**C2 - C4 Hydrocarbons referenced to Propane (MW=44)

Container Type: NA



CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY RECORD

180 BLUE RAVINE ROAD, SUITE B
FOLSOM, CA 95630-4719
(916) 985-1000 FAX: (916) 985-1020

035555-12

Page 1 of 1

Contact Person Al Pollack

Company Battelle

Address 505 King Avenue City Calverton State OH Zip 43221

Phone 614-421-3753 FAX 614-421-3667

Collected By: Signature Greg Heeding / Dick Gillespie

Project info:

P.O. # 91221

Project # 6462201-30C0701

Project Name Busslurper

Turn Around Time:

☒ Normal☐ Rush

Specify

[illegible]

Relinquished By: (Signature) Date/Time

Print Name: _____

Relinquished By: (Signature) Date/Time

Received By: (Signature) Rick Gillespie Date/Time 1/11/2011

Relinquished By: (Signature) Date/Time

Received By: (Signature) _____ Date/Time _____

Notes: // ~~Call~~ Call All Black

for method

Shipper Name

Air Bill #

Opened By:

Date/Time

Temp. (°C)

Condition

Custody Seals Intact?

Work Order #

Lab
Use
Only

18-1

7037741217

75

11/6/95 10x

Andler

1000

Yes No None N/A

9511063

APPENDIX C
SYSTEM CHECKLIST

Checklist for System Shakedown

Site: Hill AFB, OH

Date: 10-27-95

Operator's Initials: RR

Equipment	Check if Okay	Comments
Liquid Ring Pump		Installed new recirculation flow valve
Aqueous Effluent Transfer Pump	✓	
Oil/Water Separator	✓	
Vapor Flowmeter	✓	
Fuel Flowmeter	✓	
Water Flowmeter	✓	
Emergency Shut off Float Switch Effluent Transfer Tank		
Analytical Field Instrumentation GasTector™ O ₂ /CO ₂ Analyzer TraceTector™ Hydrocarbon Analyzer Oil/Water Interface Probe Magnehelic Boards Thermocouple Thermometer	✓	

Figure 12. Bioslurper Pilot Test Shakedown Checklist

APPENDIX D

DATA SHEETS FROM THE SHORT-TERM PILOT TEST

Baildown Test Record Sheet

Site: Hill AFB

Well Identification: 00101

Well Diameter (OD/ID): 2" I.D.

Date at Start of Test: 27 Oct 95

Sampler's Initials: RG

Time at Start of Test: 1600

Initial Readings

Depth to Groundwater (ft)	Depth to LNAPL (ft)	LNAPL Thickness (ft)	Total Volume Bailed (L)
28.97	28.37	0.6	370 L

Test Data

Sample Collection Time	Depth to Groundwater (ft)	Depth to LNAPL (ft)	LNAPL Thickness (ft)
1600	28.49'	28.44'	0.05'
1617	28.61'	28.43'	0.18'
1633	28.68'	28.43'	0.25'
1648	28.69'	28.42'	0.27'
1705	28.70'	28.43'	0.27'
1720	28.71'	28.42'	0.29'
1735	28.73'	28.42'	0.31'
1750	28.74'	28.42'	0.32'
1805	28.76'	28.42'	0.34'
28 Oct 95 / 0956	28.95'	28.39'	0.56'

Figure 9. Typical Baildown Test Record Sheet

Fuel and Water Recovery Data

Site: ~~Travis AFB~~ Hill AFB
Well ID: ~~Area G Wells~~ 06101
Test Type: ~~Vacuum Enhancement~~ Skinner 481

Start Date: 28 Oct 95

End Date: 30 Oct 95

Operators: Rick Gillespie

Date/Time (mm/dd/yr hr:min)	Elapsed Time (hours)	LNAPL Recovery				Groundwater Recovery			
		Collected (gal)	Total (gal)	Rate (gph)	Avg. Rate (gph)	Collected (gal)	Total (gal)	Rate (gph)	Avg. Rate (gph)
10-28/95 1000	0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0
10/29/95 1056	25'52"	-	-			140.0	140.0		
10/30/95 0930	22'34"	1.64	1.64			115.0	255.0		
Total Time (hours)	48.5 0.00	Rate (gph) #DIV/0!	Rate (gpd) #DIV/0!	Rate (gph) #DIV/0!	Rate (gpd) #DIV/0!	Rate (gph) #DIV/0!	Rate (gpd) #DIV/0!	Rate (gph) #DIV/0!	Rate (gpd) #DIV/0!

Fuel and Water Recovery Data

Site: Travis AFB Hill AFB
Well ID: Area G Wells 04101
Test Type: Vacuum Enhancement

Start Date: 30 Oct 95
End Date: 3 Nov 95
Operators: Rick Gillespie

[illegible]

Fuel and Water Recovery Data

Site: Travis AFB Hill AFB Start Date: 3 Nov 95
 Well ID: Area G Wells 06101 End Date: 4 Nov 95
 Test Type: Vacuum Enhancement Skinner 2nd Operators: Rick Gillespie

Date/Time (mm/dd/yr hr:min)	Elapsed Time (hours)	LNAPL Recovery				Groundwater Recovery			
		Collected (gal)	Total (gal)	Rate (gph)	Avg. Rate (gph)	Collected (gal)	Total (gal)	Rate (gph)	Avg. Rate (gph)
11-3-95/0930	0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	~~565~~ 60	0.0	0.0
1440	7' 10"	-	-			5715	60		
2030	13'	-	-			5829	114		
11-4-95/0930	23' 30"	.6	.6			6059	230		
Total hrs = ~~24'~~ 24'		Total = .6 gals				Total = 404 gals			
Total Time (hours)	0.00	Rate (gph) #DIV/0!	Rate (gpd) #DIV/0!	Rate (gph) #DIV/0!	Rate (gpd) #DIV/0!	Rate (gph) #DIV/0!	Rate (gpd) #DIV/0!	Rate (gph) #DIV/0!	Rate (gpd) #DIV/0!

Fuel and Water Recovery Data

Site:	~~Trans AFB~~ Hill AFB	Start Date:	4 Nov 95
Well ID:	~~Area C Wells~~ OU 101	End Date:	6 Nov 95
Test Type:	Vacuum Enhancement Drawdown 48hr	Operators:	Rick Gillespie

[illegible]

Bioslurping Pilot Test
(Data Sheet 2)
Pilot Test Pumping Data

Page ____ of ____

Site: HillAFB

Operators: R. Gillespie

Test Type: Skinner 48L

Depth to Groundwater: 28.95' Depth to Fuel: 28.39'

Start Date: 28 Oct 95

Start Time: 1000

Well ID: 0W101

Depth of Tube: 28.15'

Date/Time	Run Time	Vapor Extraction			Pump Stack Temp (°C)	Pump Head Vacuum (in. Hg)	Extraction Well Vacuum (in. H ₂ O)
		Stack Pressure (in. H ₂ O)	Carbon Drums (in. H ₂ O)	Flowrate (scfm)			
28 Oct 95/1010		.65	—		—	10.0	—
1410		.37	—		43.3	13.5	—
1730		.35	—		43.3	13.0	—
2100		.32	—		43.3	13.0	—
29 Oct 95/0530		.28	—		40.0	13.0	—
1041		.34	—		43.3	13.0	—
1915		.31	—		43.3	13.0	—
30 Oct 95/0600		.26	—		42.2	13.0	—
0900		.31	—		43.3	13.0	—

Figure 14. Typical Record Sheets for Bioslurper Pilot Testing (continued)

Bioslurping Pilot Test
(Data Sheet 2)
Pilot Test Pumping Data

Page ____ of ____

Site: Hill AFB

Start Date: 30 Oct 95

Operators: R. Gillespie / Greg Headington

Start Time: 1230

Test Type: Vacuum-Enhanced

Well ID: 04101

Depth to Groundwater: 28.79' Depth to Fuel: 28.735'

Depth of Tube: _____

Date/Time	Run Time	Vapor Extraction			Pump Stack Temp (°C)	Pump Head Vacuum (in. Hg)	Extraction Well Vacuum (in. H ₂ O)
		Stack Pressure (in. H ₂ O)	Carbon Drums (in. H ₂ O)	Flowrate (scfm)			
30 Oct 95/1310		~~1.12~~ .17	—	22	32.2	18.0	~~1.20~~
	1540	.17	—	22	32.2	18.5	1.20
	2020	.19	—	24	30.0	18.0	1.15
31 Oct 95/0720		.18	—	23	32.2	18.0	1.20
		.19	—	24	32.2	18.0	1.25
		.19	—	24	31.1	18.0	1.20
		.20	—	25	29.4	18.0	1.20
		.21	—	26	28.8	17.5	1.20
		.21	—	26	27.7	18.0	1.15
		.23	—	28	33.3	17.5	1.25
		.17	—	22	31.1	17.5	1.20
		.19	—	24	27.7	17.5	1.20

Figure 14. Typical Record Sheets for Bioslurper Pilot Testing (continued)

Figure 14. Typical Record Sheets for Bioslurper Pilot Testing (continued)

Bioslurping Pilot Test
(Data Sheet 2)
Pilot Test Pumping Data

Page ____ of ____

Site: Hill AFB

Start Date: 4 Nov 95

Operators: R. Gillespie

Start Time: 0945

Test Type: Drawdown 48hr

Well ID: OU101

Depth to Groundwater: _____ Depth to Fuel: _____

Depth of Tube: _____

Date/Time	Run Time	Vapor Extraction			Pump Stack Temp (°C)	Pump Head Vacuum (in. Hg)	Extraction Well Vacuum (in. H ₂ O)
		Stack Pressure (in. H ₂ O)	Carbon Drums (in. H ₂ O)	Flowrate (scfm)			
4 Nov 95/0945		.10	~~21.0~~	17	24.4	21.0	.015
1100		.06	—	10	23.3	21.0	.035
1325		.06	—	10	24.4	21.0	.04
1720		.06	—	10	21.1	20.0	.03
2110		.07	—	12	20.0	20.0	.04
5 Nov 95/0930		.09	—	16	25.5	20.0	.04
1500		.10	—	17	25.5	20.0	.05
2000		.10	—	17	24.4	19.5	.04
6 Nov 95/0715		.10	—	17	24.4	19.5	.04

Figure 14. Typical Record Sheets for Bioslurper Pilot Testing (continued)

APPENDIX E
SOIL GAS PERMEABILITY TEST RESULTS

BATTELLE DISTANCE FROM VENT WELL (ft. & tenths)	RECORD SHEET FOR AIR PERMEABILITY TEST				DATE/TIME: <u>30 Oct 95 / 1230</u>
	10'	10'	10'	10'	
TIME FROM START-UP (MIN.)	PT. CODE	PT. CODE	PT. CODE	PT. CODE	SITE: <u>HILL AFB: ON 101</u>
	Green (8')	Blue (16')	Red (24')		
	PRESSURE (IN H ₂ O)	PRESSURE (IN H ₂ O)	PRESSURE (IN H ₂ O)	PRESSURE (IN H ₂ O)	RECORDED BY: <u>R. Gillespie / Greg Headington</u>
0	0.035	0.19	—	—	* For the first 4 minutes No readings were taken b/c of a faulty magnehelic board. (—) denotes no reading
1	—	—	—	—	
2	—	—	—	—	
3	—	—	—	—	
4	—	—	—	—	
5	0.105	0.28	0.43	—	
6	0.11	0.29	0.45	—	
7	0.115	0.30	0.46	—	
8	0.12	0.30	0.46	—	
9	0.125	0.30	0.46	—	
10	0.125	0.30	0.46	—	
12	0.125	0.31	0.46	—	
14	0.130	0.32	0.46	—	
16	—	—	—	—	

[illegible]

BATTELLE DISTANCE FROM VENT WELL (ft. & tenths)	RECORD SHEET FOR AIR PERMEABILITY TEST				DATE/TIME: 30 Oct 95 / 1230	
	30'	30'	30'	30'	SITE: Hill AFB: 000101	
TIME FROM START-UP (MIN.)	PT. CODE	PT. CODE	PT. CODE	PT. CODE	RECORDED BY: R. Gillespie	
	Pressure (IN H ₂ O)	Pressure (IN H ₂ O)	Pressure (IN H ₂ O)	Pressure (IN H ₂ O)	COMMENTS	
0	0	0	0.06			
1	0.015	0.14	0.21			
2	0.04	0.18	0.25			
3	0.08	0.19	0.25			
4	0.065	0.215	0.27			
5	0.085	0.22	0.27			
6	0.09	0.23	0.29			
7	0.09	0.235	0.30			
8	0.09	0.235	0.30			
9	0.09	0.235	0.30			
10	0.10	0.235	0.30			
12	0.095	0.24	0.31			
14	0.09	0.24	0.30			
16	0.095	0.24	0.30			

[illegible]

BATTELLE		RECORD SHEET FOR AIR PERMEABILITY TEST				DATE/TIME: 30 Oct 95 / 1230	
DISTANCE FROM VENT WELL (ft. & tenths)		48'		48'		48'	
TIME FROM START-UP (MIN.)	PT. CODE	PT. CODE	PT. CODE	PT. CODE	PT. CODE	RECORDED BY: R. Gillespie / W. Ziebeckist	
	Pressure (IN H ₂ O)	Pressure (IN H ₂ O)	Pressure (IN H ₂ O)	Pressure (IN H ₂ O)	Pressure (IN H ₂ O)	COMMENTS	
0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
1	0.01	0.1	0.12	0.12	0.12		
2	0.04	0.13	0.15	0.15	0.15		
3	0.05	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.15		
4	0.06	0.16	0.17	0.17	0.17		
5	0.07	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.18		
6	0.07	0.18	0.19	0.19	0.19		
7	0.085	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.20		
8	0.09	0.19	0.205	0.205	0.205		
9	0.09	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.20		
10	0.085	0.185	0.20	0.20	0.20		
12	0.09	0.19	0.21	0.21	0.21		
14	0.09	0.195	0.21	0.21	0.21		
16	0.095	0.195	0.21	0.21	0.21		


[illegible]

APPENDIX F
IN SITU RESPIRATION TEST RESULTS

In Situ Respiration Test

Date: 12/13/95
 Monitoring Point: OU101-10-Red
 Site Name: Hill AFB, UT
 Depth of M.P. (ft): 24

Date/Time (mm/dd/yr hr:min)	Time (hr)	Oxygen (%)	Carbon Dioxide (%)	Helium (%)
11/4/95 10:30	0.0	18.00	1.50	0.92
11/4/95 11:30	1.0	7.50	7.00	0.45
11/4/95 13:30	3.0	4.00	7.50	0.49
11/4/95 17:30	7.0	3.25	8.00	0.46
11/4/95 21:30	11.0	5.10	7.00	0.35
11/5/95 1:30	15.0	3.00	8.00	0.35
11/5/95 5:30	19.0	3.00	7.70	0.30
11/5/95 9:30	23.0	3.00	7.80	0.22
11/5/95 15:00	28.5	3.00	7.00	




Regression Lines	O ₂	CO ₂
Slope	-0.2922	0.0888
Intercept	9.0296	5.7725
Determination Coef.	0.3648	0.1945
No. of Data Points.	9	9

O₂ Utilization Rate
 Ko 0.005 %/min
 0.292 %/hr
 7.014 %/day

In Situ Respiration Test

Date: 12/14/95
 Site Name: Hill AFB, UT
 Monitoring Point: OU101-10-Green
 Depth of M.P. (ft): 8

Date/Time (mm/dd/yr hr:min)	Time (hr)	Oxygen (%)	Carbon Dioxide (%)	Helium (%)
11/4/95 10:30	0.0	20.90	0.00	1.40
11/4/95 13:30	3.0	19.50	0.50	1.30
11/4/95 17:30	7.0	17.00	0.50	1.40
11/4/95 21:30	11.0	14.50	0.60	1.50
11/5/95 1:30	15.0	13.00	0.60	1.00
11/5/95 5:30	19.0	10.00	0.70	1.30
11/5/95 9:30	23.0	7.80	0.70	1.10
11/5/95 15:00	28.5	3.10	0.70	



Regression Lines	O ₂	CO ₂
Slope	-0.6082	0.0185
Intercept	21.3214	0.2918
Determination Coef.	0.9926	0.6192
No. of Data Points.	8	8

O₂ Utilization Rate

K_o 0.010 %/min
 0.608 %/hr
 14.596 %/day

In Situ Respiration Test

Date: 12/14/95

Site Name: Hill AFB, UT


Monitoring Point: OU101-30-Green

Depth of M.P. (ft): 8

Date/Time (mm/dd/yr hr:min)	Time (hr)	Oxygen (%)	Carbon Dioxide (%)	Helium (%)
11/4/95 10:30	0.0	20.90	0.00	1.20
11/4/95 11:30	1.0	20.90	0.25	1.00
11/4/95 13:30	3.0	19.00	0.25	1.10
11/4/95 17:30	7.0	16.00	0.25	1.70
11/4/95 21:30	11.0	13.50	0.50	1.60
11/5/95 1:30	15.0	8.50	0.50	1.20
11/5/95 5:30	19.0	7.20	0.60	1.50
11/5/95 9:30	23.0	5.00	0.70	1.10
11/5/95 15:00	28.5	3.50	0.80	

O₂ Utilization Rate

K_o 0.011 %/min
0.668 %/hr
16.040 %/day



Regression Lines	O ₂	CO ₂
Slope	-0.6683	0.0244
Intercept	20.7051	0.1367
Determination Coef.	0.9740	0.9217
No. of Data Points	9	9

In Situ Respiration Test


Date: 12/14/95

Site Name: Hill AFB, UT

Monitoring Point: OU101-48-Green

Depth of M.P. (ft): 8

Date/Time (mm/dd/yr hr:min)	Time (hr)	Oxygen (%)	Carbon Dioxide (%)	Helium (%)
11/4/95 10:30	0.0	20.90	0.00	1.10
11/4/95 11:30	1.0	20.90	0.25	1.00
11/4/95 13:30	3.0	17.00	0.50	1.50
11/4/95 17:30	7.0	13.50	0.50	1.80
11/4/95 21:30	11.0	11.00	0.50	1.50
11/5/95 1:30	15.0	7.25	0.75	1.40
11/5/95 5:30	19.0	5.00	0.90	1.50
11/5/95 9:30	23.0	2.50	0.90	1.10
11/5/95 15:00	28.5	1.80	1.00	



Regression Lines	O ₂	CO ₂
Slope	-0.7200	0.0304
Intercept	19.6942	0.2262
Determination Coef.	0.9586	0.8684
No. of Data Points.	9	9

O₂ Utilization Rate

K_o 0.012 %/min
0.720 %/hr
17.279 %/day