

**From:** [Erickson, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Helton, Kelsey](#)  
**Cc:** [Miller.Scott@epamail.epa.gov](#); [Osteen.Bill@epamail.epa.gov](#); [Hutton, Richard H](#); [John Mousa](#); [Council, Greg](#); [Brouman, Mitch \(Pittsburgh\) NA](#)  
**Subject:** FW: UHB-4 Absence of NAPL  
**Date:** Monday, February 15, 2010 7:27:16 PM  
**Attachments:** [UHB4\\_Logs.pdf](#)

---

Kelsey, Zoe made the comment in our FS meeting 2 weeks ago that Figure 4-2 in the August 14, 2009 report entitled "Supplemental 2009 Hawthorn Group Investigation and Monitoring Well Installation Report" was incorrect in that DNAPL was observed in boring UHB-4. Zoe indicated that FDEPs review of the logs indicated that DNAPL was observed at a depth interval of 54.5-56 ft in this boring. I indicated that I would check on this and get back to her with our evaluation. This email is a summary of our evaluation.

I asked Brendan Shine who oversaw the installation of these borings to review our records and comment (see his email below). Appendix A in the August 14, 2009 report contains the form entitled "Soil Core Section Log, which is the field descriptions for the cores. The field form for UHB-4 is included with this email as an attachment and indicates Fe staining over the depth interval 54.5-56 ft. The well completion log in Appendix C is also included in this file and states "NAPL is not present" over this depth interval. It appears that the "staining" referenced in the well completion log was misinterpreted as "DNAPL staining". Hence, both of these documents state that DNAPL was not encountered in this boring.

I do not have Zoe's email and request that you please forward this email to her, so we can close the loop on this issue. Thanks Jim

**James R. Erickson, P.G.**  
Vice President | Principal Hydrogeologist  
Main: 303.665.4390 | Fax 303.665.4391

GeoTrans, Inc. | A Tetra Tech Company  
363 Centennial Parkway | Suite 210 | Louisville, CO 80027

---

**From:** Shine, Brendan  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 04, 2010 5:43 PM  
**To:** Erickson, Jim  
**Subject:** UHB-4 Absence of NAPL

Jim,

I looked at the cross sections in the Supplemental 2009 Hawthorn Group Investigation and Monitoring Well Installation Report, then compared them with the lithologic log, field form and the core photos for boring UHB-4. I couldn't find anything describing NAPL being present in this boring. There were PID detections and some staining at this location, but I don't recall encountering any NAPL, as supported by the field forms and the photos which were used to construct the log. The lith log consistently states that NAPL is not present in this boring. Please let me know if I misinterpreted the issue.

Thanks,

**Brendan Shine, P.E.** | Senior Engineer  
GeoTrans, Inc. | A Tetra Tech Company  
Main: 303.665.4390 | Cell: 303.808.6133  
363 Centennial Parkway, Suite 210 | Louisville, CO 80027 | [www.tetrattech.com](http://www.tetrattech.com)

PLEASE NOTE: This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you

are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.



Think Green - Not every email needs to be printed