

Data Validation Package

October 2011
Groundwater and Surface Water
Sampling at the Canonsburg,
Pennsylvania, Disposal Site

February 2012



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY

Legacy
Management

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Sampling Event Summary	1
Sample Location Map, Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, Disposal Site	3
Data Assessment Summary	5
Water Sampling Field Activities Verification Checklist	7
Laboratory Performance Assessment	9
Sampling Quality Control Assessment	14
Certification	16

Attachment 1—Assessment of Anomalous Data

Potential Outliers Report

Attachment 2—Data Presentation

Groundwater Quality Data
Surface Water Quality Data
Static Water Level Data
Hydrograph
Time-Concentration Graphs

Attachment 3—Sampling and Analysis Work Order

Attachment 4—Trip Report

This page intentionally left blank

Sampling Event Summary

Site: Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, Disposal Site

Sampling Period: October 18, 2011

Five groundwater samples and one surface water sample were collected at the Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, Disposal Site to demonstrate compliance with standards as set forth in the 2000 *Ground Water Compliance Action Plan for the Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, UMTRA Project Site*. Water levels were measured at each sampled well. Sampling and analysis were conducted as specified in *Sampling and Analysis Plan for U.S. Department of Energy Office of Legacy Management Sites* (LMS/PLN/S04351, continually updated). One duplicate sample was collected from location 0412.

The U.S. Department of Energy monitors groundwater and surface water at the Canonsburg site to demonstrate that uranium concentrations do not exceed U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission-approved alternate concentration limits (ACL) of 1.0 milligram per liter (mg/L) in groundwater and 0.01 mg/L at the point of exposure in Chartiers Creek.

The ACL for uranium was not exceeded in the point-of-compliance wells 0412, 0413, and 0414B, nor was the ACL exceeded at surface location 0602.




Michele L. Miller
Project Manager, SM Stoller Corporation. Contractor to US
Department of Energy- Office of Legacy Management
2012.02.15 14:41:57 -05'00'

Michele Miller
Site Lead, S.M. Stoller Corporation

Date

This page intentionally left blank



M:\LTS\1111\0001\16\000\0\S08227\0\S0822700-11x17.mxd smithw 09/12/2011 1:53:57 PM

Sample Location Map, Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, Disposal Site

This page intentionally left blank

Data Assessment Summary

This page intentionally left blank

Water Sampling Field Activities Verification Checklist

Project	Canonsburg, Pennsylvania	Date(s) of Water Sampling	October 18, 2011
Date(s) of Verification	January 13, 2012	Name of Verifier	Steve Donovan

	Response (Yes, No, NA)	Comments
1. Is the SAP the primary document directing field procedures? List other documents, SOPs, instructions.	Yes	Work Order letter dated September 20, 2011.
2. Were the sampling locations specified in the planning documents sampled?	Yes	
3. Was a pre-trip calibration conducted as specified in the above-named documents?	NA	Calibration data were not available for review.
4. Was an operational check of the field equipment conducted daily? Did the operational checks meet criteria?	NA	
	NA	
5. Were the number and types (alkalinity, temperature, specific conductance, pH, turbidity, DO, ORP) of field measurements taken as specified?	Yes	
6. Was the category of the well documented?	Yes	
7. Were the following conditions met when purging a Category I well: Was one pump/tubing volume purged prior to sampling?	Yes	
Did the water level stabilize prior to sampling?	Yes	
Did pH, specific conductance, and turbidity measurements stabilize prior to sampling?	Yes	
Was the flow rate less than 500 mL/min?	Yes	
If a portable pump was used, was there a 4-hour delay between pump installation and sampling?	NA	

Water Sampling Field Activities Verification Checklist (continued)

	Response (Yes, No, NA)	Comments
8. Were the following conditions met when purging a Category II well:		
Was the flow rate less than 500 mL/min?	Yes	
Was one pump/tubing volume removed prior to sampling?	Yes	
9. Were duplicates taken at a frequency of one per 20 samples?	Yes	A duplicate sample was collected from location 0412.
10. Were equipment blanks taken at a frequency of one per 20 samples that were collected with nondedicated equipment?	NA	All samples were collected with new, or dedicated, tubing.
11. Were trip blanks prepared and included with each shipment of VOC samples?	NA	
12. Were QC samples assigned a fictitious site identification number?	Yes	Location ID 2817 was used for the duplicate sample.
Was the true identity of the samples recorded on the Quality Assurance Sample Log or in the Field Data Collection System (FDCS) report?	Yes	
13. Were samples collected in the containers specified?	Yes	
14. Were samples filtered and preserved as specified?	Yes	
15. Were the number and types of samples collected as specified?	Yes	
16. Were chain of custody records completed and was sample custody maintained?	Yes	
17. Are field data sheets signed and dated by both team members (hardcopies) or are dates present for the "Date Signed" fields (FDCS)?	Yes	
18. Was all other pertinent information documented on the field data sheets?	Yes	
19. Was the presence or absence of ice in the cooler documented at every sample location?	NA	Sample cooling was not required.
20. Were water levels measured at the locations specified in the planning documents?	Yes	

Laboratory Performance Assessment

General Information

Report Number (RIN): 11104125
Sample Event: October 18, 2011
Site(s): Canonsburg, Pennsylvania
Laboratory: ALS Laboratory Group, Fort Collins, Colorado
Work Order No.: 1110359
Analysis: Metals
Validator: Steve Donovan
Review Date: January 4, 2012

This validation was performed according to the *Environmental Procedures Catalog* (LMS/PRO/S04325, continually updated), "Standard Practice for Validation of Laboratory Data." The procedure was applied at Level 3, Data Validation. See attached Data Validation Worksheets for supporting documentation on the data review and validation. All analyses were successfully completed. The sample was prepared and analyzed using accepted procedures based on methods specified by line item code, which are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Analytes and Methods

Analyte	Line Item Code	Prep Method	Analytical Method
Uranium	LMM-02	SW-846 3005A	SW-846 6020

Data Qualifier Summary

Analytical results were qualified as listed in Table 2. Refer to the sections below for an explanation of the data qualifiers applied.

Table 2. Data Qualifier Summary

Sample Number	Location	Analyte	Flag	Reason
1110359-2	0412	Uranium	J	Poor duplicate precision
1110359-6	0412 Duplicate	Uranium	J	Poor duplicate precision

Sample Shipping/Receiving

ALS Laboratory Group, Fort Collins, Colorado, received seven water samples on October 27, 2011, accompanied by a Chain of Custody form. The Chain of Custody form was checked to confirm that all of the samples were listed on the form and that signatures and dates were present indicating sample relinquishment and receipt. The sample submittal had no errors or omissions. Copies of the air waybill labels were included with the sample receiving documentation.

Preservation and Holding Times

The sample shipments were received cool and intact at ambient temperature which complies with requirements. All samples were received in the correct container types and had been preserved correctly for the requested analyses. All samples were analyzed within the applicable holding times.

Laboratory Instrument Calibration

Compliance requirements for satisfactory instrument calibration are established to ensure that the instrument is capable of producing acceptable qualitative and quantitative data for all analytes. Initial calibration demonstrates that the instrument is capable of acceptable performance in the beginning of the analytical run and of producing a linear curve. Compliance requirements for continuing calibration checks are established to ensure that the instrument continues to be capable of producing acceptable qualitative and quantitative data. All laboratory instrument calibrations were performed correctly in accordance with the cited methods.

Method SW-846 6020

Calibration for uranium was performed November 1, 2011. The initial calibration was performed using four calibration standards resulting in calibration curves with correlation coefficient (r^2) values greater than 0.995. The absolute values of the curve intercepts were less than 3 times the MDL. Calibration and laboratory spike standards were prepared from independent sources. Initial and continuing calibration verification checks were made at the required frequency resulting in ten verification checks. All initial and continuing calibration verification results were within the acceptance range. Reporting limit verification checks were made at the required frequency to verify the linearity of the calibration curves near the practical quantitation limit (PQL). The check results were within the acceptance range. The mass calibration and resolution was checked at the beginning of each analytical run in accordance with the procedure. Internal standard recoveries were stable and within acceptance ranges.

Method and Calibration Blanks

Method blanks are analyzed to assess any contamination that may have occurred during sample preparation. Calibration blanks are analyzed to assess instrument contamination prior to and during sample analysis. All initial and continuing calibration blank results were below the method detection limits.

Inductively Coupled Plasma Interference Check Sample Analysis

Interference check samples were analyzed at the required frequency to verify the instrumental interelement and background correction factors. All check sample results met the acceptance criteria.

Matrix Spike Analysis

Matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate (MS/MSD) pairs were analyzed for all analytes as a measure of method performance in the sample matrix. Matrix spike data are not evaluated when the concentration of the unspiked sample is greater than 4 times the spike concentration. The MS/MSD recoveries met the acceptance criteria for all analytes evaluated.

Laboratory Replicate Analysis

Laboratory replicate analyses are used to determine laboratory precision for each sample matrix. The relative percent difference (RPD) for replicate results that are greater than 5 times the PQL should be less than 20 percent. For results less than 5 times the PQL, the range should be no greater than the PQL. The replicate results met these criteria demonstrating acceptable laboratory precision.

Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples were analyzed at the correct frequency to provide information on the accuracy of the analytical method and the overall laboratory performance, including sample preparation. The laboratory control sample results were acceptable.

Metals Serial Dilution

Serial dilutions were performed during the metals analysis to monitor physical or chemical interferences that may exist in the sample matrix. A serial dilution was prepared and analyzed for manganese and uranium with acceptable results.

Detection Limits/Dilutions

Samples were diluted in a consistent and acceptable manner when required. The required detection limits were achieved.

Completeness

Results were reported in the correct units for all analytes requested using contract-required laboratory qualifiers.

Electronic Data Deliverable (EDD) File

The EDD file arrived on November 22, 2011. The Sample Management System EDD validation module was used to verify that the EDD file was complete and in compliance with requirements. The module compares the contents of the file to the requested analyses to ensure all and only the requested data are delivered. The contents of the EDD were manually examined to verify that the sample results accurately reflect the data contained in the sample data package.

SAMPLE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

General Data Validation Report

RIN: 11104125 Lab Code: PAR Validator: Steve Donovan Validation Date: 1/13/2012
Project: Canonsburg Analysis Type: ☒ Metals ☐ General Chem ☐ Rad ☐ Organics
of Samples: 7 Matrix: WATER Requested Analysis Completed: Yes

Chain of Custody

Present: OK Signed: OK Dated: OK

Sample

Integrity: OK Preservation: OK Temperature: OK

Select Quality Parameters

- ☒ Holding Times
- ☒ Detection Limits
- ☐ Field/Trip Blanks
- ☒ Field Duplicates

All analyses were completed within the applicable holding times.

The reported detection limits are equal to or below contract requirements.

There was 1 duplicate evaluated.

SAMPLE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Page 1 of 1

Metals Data Validation Worksheet

RIN: 11104125

Lab Code: PAR

Date Due: 11/24/2011

Matrix: Water

Site Code: CAN01

Date Completed: 11/24/2011

Analyte	Method Type	Date Analyzed	CALIBRATION						Method Blank	LCS %R	MS %R	MSD %R	Dup. RPD	ICSAB %R	Serial Dil. %R	CRI %R
			Int.	R^2	ICV	CCV	ICB	CCB								
Uranium	ICP/MS	11/01/2011	0.0000	1.0000	OK	OK	OK	OK		102.0	108.0	106.0	1.0	103.0		130.0
Uranium	ICP/MS	11/01/2011											0.0			115.0

Sampling Quality Control Assessment

The following information summarizes and assesses quality control for this sampling event.

Sampling Protocol

All monitoring well sample results were qualified with an “F” flag in the database indicating the wells were purged and sampled using the low-flow sampling method. Additionally, sample results for wells 0412, 0413, and 0414B were qualified with a “Q” flag indicating the data are qualitative because these wells are Category II based on water level drawdown.

Equipment Blank Assessment

An equipment blank was not necessary because dedicated or new pump-head tubing was used at each location.

Field Duplicate Assessment

Field duplicate samples are collected and analyzed as an indication of overall precision of the measurement process. The precision observed includes both field and laboratory precision and has more variability than laboratory duplicates, which measure only laboratory performance. The RPD for duplicate results that are greater than 5 times the PQL should be less than 20 percent. For results less than 5 times the PQL, the range should be no greater than the PQL. A duplicate sample was collected from location 0412. The duplicate results were not in agreement and indicated that samples 1110359-6 (location 0602) and 1110359-7 (duplicate from location 0412) may have been switched during analysis. On January 4, 2012, the laboratory was requested to re-analyze the samples. It was confirmed that samples 1110359-6 and 1110359-7 had been switched during the original analysis. Revised deliverables correcting the error were received January 18, 2012. Evaluation of the revised duplicate data resulted in an RPD greater than 20 percent. The associated sample and duplicate results are qualified with a “J” flag as estimated values.

SAMPLE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
Validation Report: Field Duplicates

Page 1 of 1

RIN: 11104125 Lab Code: PAR Project: Canonsburg Validation Date: 1/13/2012

Duplicate: 2817

Sample: 0412

Analyte	Sample				Duplicate				RPD	RER	Units
	Result	Flag	Error	Dilution	Result	Flag	Error	Dilution			
Uranium	200			10	250			10	22.22		UG/L

Certification

All laboratory analytical quality control criteria were met except as qualified in this report. The data qualifiers listed on the SEEPro database reports are defined on the last page of each report. All data in this package are considered validated and available for use.

Laboratory Coordinator:

Steve Donovan
Steve Donovan

2-14-2012

Date

Data Validation Lead:

Steve Donovan
Steve Donovan

2-14-2012

Date

Attachment 1

Assessment of Anomalous Data

This page intentionally left blank

Potential Outliers Report

This page intentionally left blank

Potential Outliers Report

Potential outliers are measurements that are extremely large or small relative to the rest of the data and, therefore, are suspected of misrepresenting the population from which they were collected. Potential outliers may result from transcription errors, data-coding errors, or measurement system problems. However, outliers may also represent true extreme values of a distribution and indicate more variability in the population than was expected.

Statistical outlier tests give probabilistic evidence that an extreme value does not "fit" with the distribution of the remainder of the data and is therefore a statistical outlier. These tests should only be used to identify data points that require further investigation. The tests alone cannot determine whether a statistical outlier should be discarded or corrected within a data set.

There are three steps involved in identifying extreme values or outliers:

1. Identify extreme values that may be potential outliers by generating the Outliers Report using the Sample Management System from data in the SEEPro database. The application compares the new data set with historical data and lists the new data that fall outside the historical data range. A determination is also made if the data are normally distributed using the Shapiro-Wilk Test.
2. Apply the appropriate statistical test. Dixon's Extreme Value test is used to test for statistical outliers when the sample size is less than or equal to 25. This test considers both extreme values that are much smaller than the rest of the data (case 1) and extreme values that are much larger than the rest of the data (case 2). This test is valid only if the data without the suspected outlier are normally distributed. Rosner's Test is a parametric test that is used to detect outliers for sample sizes of 25 or more. This test also assumes that the data without the suspected outliers are normally distributed.
3. Scientifically review statistical outliers and decide on their disposition.

There were no potential outliers identified, and the data for this event are acceptable as qualified.

This page intentionally left blank

Attachment 2

Data Presentation

This page intentionally left blank

Groundwater Quality Data

This page intentionally left blank

Groundwater Quality Data by Location (USEE100) FOR SITE CAN01, Canonsburg Disposal Site

REPORT DATE: 1/13/2012

Location: 0406A WELL Replacement well for 0406.

Parameter	Units	Sample Date	ID	Depth Range (Ft BLS)	Result	Lab	Qualifiers Data	QA	Detection Limit	Uncertainty
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	5 - 15	1.01		F	#		
Oxidation Reduction Potential	mV	10/18/2011	N001	5 - 15	-75.2		F	#		
pH	s.u.	10/18/2011	N001	5 - 15	6.7		F	#		
Specific Conductance	umhos /cm	10/18/2011	N001	5 - 15	1755		F	#		
Temperature	C	10/18/2011	N001	5 - 15	18.86		F	#		
Turbidity	NTU	10/18/2011	N001	5 - 15	9.95		F	#		
Uranium	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	5 - 15	0.0005		F	#	0.000029	

Groundwater Quality Data by Location (USEE100) FOR SITE CAN01, Canonsburg Disposal Site

REPORT DATE: 1/13/2012

Location: 0412 WELL

Parameter	Units	Sample Date	ID	Depth Range (Ft BLS)	Result	Lab	Qualifiers Data	QA	Detection Limit	Uncertainty
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	13.21 - 18.21	1.5		FQ	#		
Oxidation Reduction Potential	mV	10/18/2011	N001	13.21 - 18.21	34.8		FQ	#		
pH	s.u.	10/18/2011	N001	13.21 - 18.21	6.22		FQ	#		
Specific Conductance	umhos /cm	10/18/2011	N001	13.21 - 18.21	2590		FQ	#		
Temperature	C	10/18/2011	N001	13.21 - 18.21	14.21		FQ	#		
Turbidity	NTU	10/18/2011	N001	13.21 - 18.21	4.05		FQ	#		
Uranium	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	13.21 - 18.21	0.2		FQJ	#	0.000029	
Uranium	mg/L	10/18/2011	N002	13.21 - 18.21	0.25		FQJ	#	0.000029	

Groundwater Quality Data by Location (USEE100) FOR SITE CAN01, Canonsburg Disposal Site

REPORT DATE: 1/13/2012

Location: 0413 WELL

Parameter	Units	Sample Date	ID	Depth Range (Ft BLS)	Result	Lab	Qualifiers Data	QA	Detection Limit	Uncertainty
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	6.05 - 11.05	1.92		FQ	#		
Oxidation Reduction Potential	mV	10/18/2011	N001	6.05 - 11.05	50.4		FQ	#		
pH	s.u.	10/18/2011	N001	6.05 - 11.05	6.54		FQ	#		
Specific Conductance	umhos /cm	10/18/2011	N001	6.05 - 11.05	799		FQ	#		
Temperature	C	10/18/2011	N001	6.05 - 11.05	15.01		FQ	#		
Turbidity	NTU	10/18/2011	N001	6.05 - 11.05	9.45		FQ	#		
Uranium	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	6.05 - 11.05	0.23		FQ	#	0.000029	

Groundwater Quality Data by Location (USEE100) FOR SITE CAN01, Canonsburg Disposal Site

REPORT DATE: 1/13/2012

Location: 0414B WELL Replacement well for 0414A.

Parameter	Units	Sample Date	ID	Depth Range (Ft BLS)			Result	Lab	Qualifiers Data	QA	Detection Limit	Uncertainty
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	0	-	0	1.83		FQ	#		
Oxidation Reduction Potential	mV	10/18/2011	N001	0	-	0	114.1		FQ	#		
pH	s.u.	10/18/2011	N001	0	-	0	6.45		FQ	#		
Specific Conductance	umhos /cm	10/18/2011	N001	0	-	0	611		FQ	#		
Temperature	C	10/18/2011	N001	0	-	0	3.05		FQ	#		
Turbidity	NTU	10/18/2011	N001	0	-	0	9.8		FQ	#		
Uranium	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	0	-	0	0.0028		FQ	#	0.000029	

Groundwater Quality Data by Location (USEE100) FOR SITE CAN01, Canonsburg Disposal Site

REPORT DATE: 1/13/2012

Location: 0424 WELL

Parameter	Units	Sample Date	ID	Depth Range (Ft BLS)	Result	Lab	Qualifiers Data	QA	Detection Limit	Uncertainty
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	7.58 - 12.58	1.18		F	#		
Oxidation Reduction Potential	mV	10/18/2011	N001	7.58 - 12.58	34.8		F	#		
pH	s.u.	10/18/2011	N001	7.58 - 12.58	6.33		F	#		
Specific Conductance	umhos /cm	10/18/2011	N001	7.58 - 12.58	1614		F	#		
Temperature	C	10/18/2011	N001	7.58 - 12.58	13.77		F	#		
Turbidity	NTU	10/18/2011	N001	7.58 - 12.58	9.7		F	#		
Uranium	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	7.58 - 12.58	0.00003	B	F	#	0.000029	

SAMPLE ID CODES: 000X = Filtered sample (0.45 µm). N00X = Unfiltered sample. X = replicate number.

LAB QUALIFIERS:

- * Replicate analysis not within control limits.
- > Result above upper detection limit.
- A TIC is a suspected aldol-condensation product.
- B Inorganic: Result is between the IDL and CRDL. Organic: Analyte also found in method blank.
- C Pesticide result confirmed by GC-MS.
- D Analyte determined in diluted sample.
- E Inorganic: Estimate value because of interference, see case narrative. Organic: Analyte exceeded calibration range of the GC-MS.
- H Holding time expired, value suspect.
- I Increased detection limit due to required dilution.
- J Estimated
- N Inorganic or radiochemical: Spike sample recovery not within control limits. Organic: Tentatively identified compound (TIC).
- P > 25% difference in detected pesticide or Aroclor concentrations between 2 columns.
- U Analytical result below detection limit.
- W Post-digestion spike outside control limits while sample absorbance < 50% of analytical spike absorbance.
- X,Y,Z Laboratory defined qualifier, see case narrative.

DATA QUALIFIERS:

- F Low flow sampling method used.
- L Less than 3 bore volumes purged prior to sampling.
- U Parameter analyzed for but was not detected.
- G Possible grout contamination, pH > 9.
- Q Qualitative result due to sampling technique.
- X Location is undefined.
- J Estimated value.
- R Unusable result.

QA QUALIFIER:

- # Validated according to quality assurance guidelines.

This page intentionally left blank

Surface Water Quality Data

This page intentionally left blank

Surface Water Quality Data by Location (USEE102) FOR SITE CAN01, Canonsburg Disposal Site

REPORT DATE: 1/13/2012

Location: 0602 SURFACE LOCATION RESERVED MGILBERT, WQD, 4/24/89

Parameter	Units	Sample Date	ID	Result	Lab	Qualifiers Data	QA	Detection Limit	Uncertainty
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	10.25			#		
Oxidation Reduction Potential	mV	10/18/2011	N001	44.4			#		
pH	s.u.	10/18/2011	N001	7.56			#		
Specific Conductance	umhos/cm	10/18/2011	N001	877			#		
Temperature	C	10/18/2011	N001	13.86			#		
Turbidity	NTU	10/18/2011	N001	18.6			#		
Uranium	mg/L	10/18/2011	N001	0.00056			#	0.000029	

SAMPLE ID CODES: 000X = Filtered sample (0.45 µm). N00X = Unfiltered sample. X = replicate number.

LAB QUALIFIERS:

* Replicate analysis not within control limits.
 > Result above upper detection limit.
 A TIC is a suspected aldol-condensation product.
 B Inorganic: Result is between the IDL and CRDL. Organic: Analyte also found in method blank.
 C Pesticide result confirmed by GC-MS.
 D Analyte determined in diluted sample.
 E Inorganic: Estimate value because of interference, see case narrative. Organic: Analyte exceeded calibration range of the GC-MS.
 H Holding time expired, value suspect.
 I Increased detection limit due to required dilution.
 J Estimated
 N Inorganic or radiochemical: Spike sample recovery not within control limits. Organic: Tentatively identified compound (TIC).
 P > 25% difference in detected pesticide or Aroclor concentrations between 2 columns.
 U Analytical result below detection limit.
 W Post-digestion spike outside control limits while sample absorbance < 50% of analytical spike absorbance.
 X,Y,Z Laboratory defined qualifier, see case narrative.

DATA QUALIFIERS:

F Low flow sampling method used. G Possible grout contamination, pH > 9. J Estimated value.
 L Less than 3 bore volumes purged prior to sampling. Q Qualitative result due to sampling technique. R Unusable result.
 U Parameter analyzed for but was not detected. X Location is undefined.

QA QUALIFIER:

Validated according to quality assurance guidelines.

This page intentionally left blank

Static Water Level Data

This page intentionally left blank

STATIC WATER LEVELS (USEE700) FOR SITE CAN01, Canonsburg Disposal Site
REPORT DATE: 1/13/2012

Location Code	Flow Code	Top of Casing Elevation (Ft)	Measurement Date	Time	Depth From Top of Casing (Ft)	Water Elevation (Ft)
0406A		941.26	10/18/2011	11:24:23	8.5	932.76
0412	O	949.7	10/18/2011	10:45:11	12.6	937.1
0413	O	940.36	10/18/2011	10:11:59	4.4	935.96
0414B		943.96	10/18/2011	09:28:41	8.9	935.06
0424	C	942.25	10/18/2011	08:43:59	14.35	927.9

FLOW CODES: B BACKGROUND
 N UNKNOWN

C CROSS GRADIENT
 O ON SITE

D DOWN GRADIENT
 U UPGRADIENT


F OFF SITE

This page intentionally left blank

Hydrograph

This page intentionally left blank

Canonsburg Disposal Site Hydrograph




This page intentionally left blank

Time-Concentration Graphs

This page intentionally left blank


**Canonsburg Disposal Site
Point of Compliance Wells
Uranium Concentration**

Alternate Concentration Limit = 1.0 mg/L



Canonsburg Disposal Site
Surface Location
Uranium Concentration

Alternate Concentration Limit = 0.01 mg/L



Attachment 3

Sampling and Analysis Work Order

This page intentionally left blank



established 1959

Task Order LM00-501
Control Number 11-1032

September 20, 2011

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Legacy Management
ATTN: Cliff Carpenter
Site Manager
99 Research Park Rd.
Morgantown, WV 26505

SUBJECT: Contract No. DE-AM01-07LM00060, S.M. Stoller Corporation (Stoller)
October 2011 Environmental Sampling at Canonsburg, Pennsylvania

REFERENCE: Task Order LM00-501-02-103-402, Canonsburg, PA, Disposal Site

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the upcoming sampling event at Canonsburg, PA. Enclosed are the map and tables specifying sample locations and analytes for monitoring at the Canonsburg Disposal Site. Water quality data will be collected from this site as part of the routine environmental sampling currently scheduled to begin the week of October 17, 2011.

The following lists show the monitoring wells (along with associated zone of completion) and surface locations scheduled for sampling during this event.

Monitoring Wells*

0406A Um 0412 Um 0413 Um 0414B Nr 0424 Um

*NOTE: Um = Unconsolidated materials; Nr = No recovery of data for classifying

Surface Locations*

0602

All samples will be collected as directed in the *Sampling and Analysis Plan for U.S. Department of Energy Office of Legacy Management Sites*. Access agreements are being reviewed and are expected to be complete by the beginning of fieldwork.

A draft of this letter is also being provided to DOE Support for distribution to stakeholders.

Cliff Carpenter
Control Number 11-1032
Page 2

Please contact me at (412) 818-7015 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Michele L. Miller
Project Manager, SM Stoller Corporation -
Contractor for Department of Energy Office of
Legacy Management
2011.09.20 09:05:48 -0400'

Michele Miller
Project Manager

MM/lcg/lb

Enclosures (3)

cc: (electronic)
Karl Stoeckle, DOE
Steve Donovan, Stoller
Bev Gallagher, Stoller
Lauren Goodknight, Stoller
Michele Miller, Stoller
EDD Delivery
rc-grand.junction
File: CAN 410.02(A)

Sampling Frequencies for Locations at Canonsburg, Pennsylvania

Location ID	Quarterly	Semiannually	Annually	Biennially	Not Sampled	Notes
Monitoring Wells						
0406A			X			
0412			X			
0413			X			
0414B			X			
0424			X			
Surface Locations						
0602			X			

Sampling conducted in October

Based on LTSP dated 2008

Constituent Sampling Breakdown

Site	Canonsburg		Required Detection Limit (mg/L)	Analytical Method	Line Item Code
Analyte	Groundwater	Surface Water			
Approx. No. Samples/yr	5	1			
Field Measurements					
Alkalinity					
Dissolved Oxygen	X	X			
Redox Potential	X	X			
pH	X	X			
Specific Conductance	X	X			
Turbidity	X	X			
Temperature	X	X			
Laboratory Measurements					
Aluminum					
Ammonia as N (NH ₃ -N)					
Calcium					
Chloride					
Chromium					
Gross Alpha					
Gross Beta					
Iron					
Lead					
Magnesium					
Manganese	0412 only	0602 only			
Molybdenum					
Nickel					
Nickel-63					
Nitrate + Nitrite as N (NO ₃ +NO ₂)-N					
Potassium					
Radium-226					
Radium-228					
Selenium					
Silica					
Sodium					
Strontium					
Sulfate					
Sulfide					
Total Dissolved Solids					
Total Organic Carbon					
Uranium	X	X	0.0001	SW-846 6020	LMM-02
Vanadium					
Zinc					
Total No. of Analytes	2	2			

Note: All private well samples are to be unfiltered. The total number of analytes does not include field parameters.

Attachment 4

Trip Report

This page intentionally left blank

Memorandum

DATE: December 20, 2011

TO: Michele Miller
Ken Broberg
Steve Donovan
Wanda Sumner
Karen Voisard
EDD Delivery

FROM: Mike Stott

SUBJECT: Trip Report for Canonsburg, Pennsylvania October 2011 Annual Sampling

Date of Sampling Event: October 18th, 2011

Team Members: Mike Stott, Jim Gore

Number of Locations Sampled: A total of six locations were sampled (five monitoring wells and one surface water location). One duplicate sample was collected from monitoring well 0412.

Locations Not Sampled/Reason: Well 0410; not scheduled for sampling.

Location Specific Information: The following table includes the established well type identified for each sampled well location.

Ticket Number	Location	Sample Date	Well Type	Comments	Water Levels
JLZ 328	0406A	10/18/11	CAT II	N/A	8.5
JLZ 332	0424	10/18/11	CAT I	N/A	14.35
JLZ 329	0412	10/18/11	CAT II	Duplicate Collected	12.6
JLZ 330	0413	10/18/11	CAT II	N/A	4.4
JLZ 331	0414B	10/18/11	CAT I	N/A	8.9
JLZ 334	0602	10/18/11	Surface water	N/A	N/A

N/A = not applicable

Water Level Measurements: Water levels were measured at all sampled wells. Water level data are provided in the table above and represent depth to water measurements measured from top of well.

Sample Shipment: Samples were shipped overnight by FedEx to ALS Laboratory Group, Fort Collins, CO, on October 24th, 2011.

Quality Control Sample Cross Reference: Following is the false identification assigned to the quality control sample:

False ID	True ID	Sample Type	Ticket Number
2817	0412	Duplicate	JLZ 333

Requisition Numbers Assigned: All samples were assigned to requisition identification number (RIN) 11104125.

Equipment: All monitoring wells are equipped with dedicated downhole and pumphead tubing. All wells were sampled using a peristaltic pump.

Institutional Controls: All gates were appropriately closed and locked during and after the sampling event.

R:\LM Sites\Canonsburg\2010\Canonsburg Trip Report Final 2011.doc