

Mr. Henry Wilkie Project Manager New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Remedial Bureau A 625 Broadway Albany, New York 12233-7015

Mr. Steven Scharf, P.E.
Project Manager
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Remedial Bureau A
625 Broadway
Albany, New York 12233-7015

Subject:

Results of Third Quarter 2015 Groundwater Monitoring,
Operable Unit 2, Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation and Naval Weapons
Industrial Reserve Plant (NWIRP) Sites, Bethpage, New York.
(NYSDEC Site #s 1-30-003A and B)

Dear Mr. Scharf:

On behalf of Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation (Northrop Grumman), ARCADIS is providing the NYSDEC with the validated results of Operable Unit 2 (OU2) groundwater monitoring, performed in accordance with the approved Groundwater Monitoring Plan (ARCADIS of New York, Inc. 2012) and the Public Water Supply Contingency Plan (PWSCP) (ARCADIS G&M, Inc. 2003). Table 1 summarizes OU2 remedial system performance operational data and water balance. Tables 2 and 3 provide the validated analytical results of monitoring for this period. Table 4, 5 and 6 provide the validated analytical results for vapor samples collected from the system for this period. Figure 1 shows the site plan with well locations.

Please contact us if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Arcadis of New York, Inc.

David E. Stern Senior Hydrogeologist

Enclosures

Arcadis of New York, Inc.
Two Huntington Quadrangle

Suite 1S10 Melville New York 11747 Tel 631 249 7600 Fax 631 249 7610 www.arcadis.com

ENVIRONMENT

Date

November 30, 2015

Contact:

David Stern

Phone:

631.391.5284

Email:

david.stern@arcadis.com

Our ref:

NY001496. 314I.NAVI4

Mr. Henry Wilkie Mr. Steven Scharf, P.E. November 30, 2015

Copies:

Ed Hannon – Northrop Grumman Fred Weber – Northrop Grumman Walter Parish – NYSDEC Region 1

Steven Karpinski – New York State Department of Health Michael Alarcon – Nassau County Department of Health Joseph DeFranco – Nassau County Department of Health

Lora Fly – NAVFAC Midlant Environmental

David Brayack - TetraTech NUS, Inc.

Roger Smith – Glenn Springs Holdings, Inc.

Kevin Lumpe – Steel Equities

Thomas Taccone – USEPA

Robert Alvey - USEPA

Carol Stein-USEPA

Matthew Russo - Town of Oyster Bay

Stan Carey - Massapequa Water District

Matthew Snyder – New York American Water

Charles Prucha – South Farmingdale Water District

John Reinhardt - Town of Hempstead Water District

Michael Boufis - Bethpage Water District

Lois Lovisolo – Bethpage Public Library (Public Repository)

File

TABLES

Table 1
Operational Summary for the On-Site Portion of the Operable Unit 2 Groundwater Remedy
Third Quarter 2015
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2
Bethpage, New York



	Quarterly Flo	Quarterly Flow Rates (gpm)		Quarterly Flow Volumes (MG)			Concentrations (µg/L)	VOC Mass Removed (lbs) (7)
	Design (2)	Average (3,4,17)	Design (2)	Actual (3,4)	% of Design	TCE (5)	TVOC (5,6)	Quarterly
Influent Groundwater								
Well 1 (11,13)	800	803	104.8	101.0	96%	852	900	760
Well 3R (12,13)	700	916	91.7	118.9	130%	557	620	603
Well 17 (14,16)	1,000	998	131.0	126.9	97%	178	220	228
Well 18 ⁽¹⁶⁾	600	616	78.6	79.1	101%	61	83	54
Well 19 (15,16)	700	750	91.7	92.4	101%	153	180	136
Total	3,800	4,083	498	518	104%			1,781
Effluent Groundwater (8)								
Calpine	100 - 400	497		65.9				
OXY Biosparge (10)	2 - 42	3.8		0.5			-	
West Recharge Basins	1,112 - 1,455	852		111.6			0.90	
South Recharge Basins	2,231	2,597	292.4	340.3	116%		1.18	
Total Effluent Groundwater		3,950		518				
Additional Flow to South Recharge B	<u>asins</u>							
Storm Water Runoff Contributing to Sou		Volume (18)		20.7				
Total Flow Volume to South Recharge	e Basins ⁽¹⁹⁾		292.4	361.0	123%			
Treatment Efficiencies (9)								
Tower 96 System:	99.9%							
Tower 102 System:	>99.9%							

See notes on next page

Table 1 Operational Summary for the On-Site Portion of the Operable Unit 2 Groundwater Remedy Third Quarter 2015 Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2



Notes:

Bethpage, New York

- (1) Quarterly reporting period: July 06, 2015 through October 05, 2015
- (2) "Design" flow rates were determined for the five remedial wells and for the South Recharge Basins based on computer modeling (ARCADIS G&M, Inc. 2003c, modified in April 2005). Flow rates for Calpine, OXY Biosparge and West Recharge Basins are typical flow rates and are provided for reader information. "Design" flow volumes represent the volume of water that should be pumped/discharged during the reporting period and is calculated by multiplying the design rate by the reporting period duration.
- (3) "Average" flow rates for the remedial wells represent the average actual pumping rates when the pumps are operational and do not take into account the time that a well is not operational. During this reporting period, the remedial wells operated for the following percentage of the time: Well 1 (96%), Well 3R (99%), Well 17 (97%), Well 18 (98%), and Well 19 (94%). "Actual" volumes are determined via totalizing flow meters.
- (4) "Average" flow rates for the system discharges represent the average flow rate during the entire reporting period and are determined by dividing the total flow during the reporting period by the reporting period duration. The Calpine and South Recharge Basins flow volumes are determined via totalizing flow meters. The West Recharge Basin flow is calculated by subtracting the cumulative flow to the other discharges from the total influent flow. Actual flow to the recharge basins are greater than shown because storm water combines with the plant effluent prior to discharge to the recharge basins.
- (5) The TCE and TVOC concentrations for the remedial wells are from the quarterly sampling event performed during this reporting period on September 9, 2015 (Table 2).
- (6) The TVOC concentration for the two sets of recharge basins are their respective average monthly SPDES concentration for the current quarter.
- (7) TVOC mass removed for the reporting period is calculated by multiplying the TVOC concentration from the quarterly sampling event and the quantity of water pumped during the reporting period.
- (8) There are four discharges for the effluent groundwater: South Recharge Basins, West Recharge Basins, Calpine and OXY Biosparge system. Treated water is continuously discharged to the south and west recharge basins, and is available "on-demand" to both the Calpine Power Plant (Calpine) for use as make-up water, and the biosparge remediation system operated by Occidental Chemical (OXY Biosparge).
- (9) Treatment System Efficiencies are calculated by dividing the difference between the influent and effluent TVOC concentrations by the influent concentration.
- (10) The flow rate and volume for OXY Biosparge (Occidental Chemical) were estimated based on the average pumping rate calculated from data from April 2007 through March 2012.
- (11) Well 1 was shutdown from September 21 through 24, 2015 due to replacement of the existing drop pipe with stainless steel pipe.
- (12) A Well 3R pilot study was started on July 14, 2014 in an effort to increase the VOC mass removal through an increased pumping rate to approximately 1,000 gpm. The TVOC concentration and mass removal have increased since the initiation of the pilot study. On April 3, 2015 Well 3R flow rate was decreased to approximately 900 gpm to eliminate the increasing trend of TVOC concentration at Tower 96 effluent. Well 3R was brought online December 2013 to replace Well 3 due to decreasing specific capacity at Well 3 indicative of imminent well failure.
- (13) Well 1 and Well 3R were shutdown on August 26, 2015 due to cleaning of the distribution tray at the Tower 96 air stripper.
- (14) Well 17 was shut down due to pressure gauge issues and replacement, and installation of additional ball valve on the sampling port line.
- (15) Well 19 was shut down from August 21 through 25, 2015 due to flow meter calibration and repair.
- (16) Wells 17, 18 and 19 were shut down various times throughout the reporting period due to Tower 102 treatment system alarm testing, routine maintenance and well communication alarms.
- (17) Total pumpage/recharge rates are accurate to -/+ 15% due to limitations in metering. Flow meter calibration is scheduled.
- (18) Storm Water Runoff Volume is calculated by multiplying the adjusted tributary area and NOAA precipitation data for the reporting period. The adjusted tributary area is tributary area that is adjusted by the runoff coefficient to exclude the infiltration volume from the total rainfall volume. The tributary area, runoff coefficient, and adjusted tributary area are from Dvirka and Bartilucci Consulting Engineers' Storm Water Permit Evaluation Report (January, 28, 2010). The NOAA precipitation data are calculated as a sum of NOAA daily precipitation data for the reporting period. NOAA precipitation data are retrieved from Station GHCND:USW00054787 FARMINGDALE REPUBLIC AIRPORT, NY US.
- (19) Total Flow Volume to South Recharge Basins is estimated as a sum of flow volumes contributed from the Effluent Groundwater to South Recharge Basins and from Storm Water Runoff to South Recharge Basins.

Abbreviations:

	Not Available or Not Applicable	TCE	Trichloroethene
TVOC	Total Volatile Organic Compounds	lbs	pounds
μg/L	micrograms per liter	MG	Million Gallons
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds	NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
gpm	gallons per minute	SPDES	State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

Table 2
Water Sample Analytical Results for Groundwater
Remedial Wells and Treatment Systems, Third Quarter 2015
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2
Bethpage, New York



	Location:	WELL 1	WELL 3R	96 EFFLUENT
Constituent	Sample ID:	WELL 1	WELL 3R	T96 EFFLUENT (GW)
(Units in μg/L)	Date:	9/9/2015	9/9/2015	9/9/2015
Volatile Organic Compo	unds (VOCs) ⁽¹⁾			
1 1 1 Trichlereethene		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
1,1,1-Trichloroethane 1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethar	20	<5.0 <5.0	<5.0	<1.0
	ie	<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
1,1,2-Trichloroethane		<5.0 <5.0	1.3 J	<1.0
1,1-Dichloroethane		2.8 J	3.9 J	<1.0
1,1-Dichloroethene		2.6 J <5.0	3.9 3 <5.0	<1.0
1,2-Dichloroethane		5.0	<5.0 <5.0	<1.0 <1.0
1,2-Dichloropropane				<1.0 <10
2-Butanone (MEK)		<50	<50	
2-Hexanone (MBK)	A AU C	<25	<25	<5.0
4-methyl-2-pentanone (I	MIK)	<25	<25	<5.0
Acetone		<50	<50	<10
Benzene		<2.5	<2.5	<0.50
Bromodichloromethane		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Bromoform		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Bromomethane		<10	<10	<2.0
Carbon Disulfide		<10	<10	<2.0
Carbon tetrachloride		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Chlorobenzene		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Chloroethane		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Chloroform		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Chloromethane		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
cis-1,2-dichloroethene		4.6 J	6.4	<1.0
cis-1,3-dichloropropene		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Dibromochloromethane		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Ethylbenzene		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Methylene Chloride		<10	<10	<2.0
Styrene		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Tetrachloroethene		35.4	36.6	<1.0
Toluene		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
trans-1,2-dichloroethene	9	<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
trans-1,3-dichloroproper	ne	<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Trichloroethylene		852	557	0.66 J
Trichlorotrifluoroethane	(Freon 113)	4.3 J	4.8 J	<5.0
Vinyl Chloride	•	<5.0	12.7	<1.0
Xylene-o		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Xylenes-m,p		<5.0	<5.0	<1.0
Total VOCs (2)		900	620	0.66
1,4-Dioxane ⁽³⁾		3.4	8.5	6.8

Table 2
Water Sample Analytical Results for Groundwater
Remedial Wells and Treatment Systems, Third Quarter 2015
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2
Bethpage, New York



Constituent (Units in µg/L)	Location: Sample ID: Date:	WELL 17 WELL 17 9/9/2015	WELL 17-REP REP-090915-EE-1 9/9/2015	WELL 18 WELL 18 9/9/2015	WELL 19 WELL 19 9/9/2015	102 EFFLUENT T102 EFFLUENT (GW) 9/9/2015
Volatile Organic Compound	s (VOCs) ⁽¹⁾					
1,1,1-Trichloroethane		0.51 J	0.54 J	0.87 J	0.43 J	<1.0
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0 J
1,1,2-Trichloroethane		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
1,1-Dichloroethane		1.2	1.1	1.4	0.77 J	<1.0
1,1-Dichloroethene		1.9	2.0	<1.0	1.3	<1.0
1,2-Dichloroethane		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	0.46 J	<1.0
1,2-Dichloropropane		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
2-Butanone (MEK)		<10	<10	<10	<10	<10 J
2-Hexanone (MBK)		<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0 J
4-methyl-2-pentanone (MIK))	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0 J
Acetone		<10	<10	<10	<10	<10 J
Benzene		< 0.50	<0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	<0.50
Bromodichloromethane		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Bromoform		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Bromomethane		<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
Carbon Disulfide		<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
Carbon tetrachloride		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Chlorobenzene		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Chloroethane		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Chloroform		0.43 J	0.47 J	<1.0	0.44 J	<1.0
Chloromethane		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
cis-1,2-dichloroethene		3.8	3.7	2.0	18.3	<1.0
cis-1,3-dichloropropene		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Dibromochloromethane		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Ethylbenzene		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Methylene Chloride		<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
Styrene		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Tetrachloroethene		30	30.5	15.2	6.7	<1.0
Toluene		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
trans-1,2-dichloroethene		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
trans-1,3-dichloropropene		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Trichloroethylene		178	177	61.3	153	<1.0
Trichlorotrifluoroethane (Fre	on 113)	2.4 J	2.5 J	2.3 J	0.97 J	<5.0
Vinyl Chloride		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Xylene-o		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Xylenes-m,p		<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Total VOCs (2)		220	220	83	180	0
1,4-Dioxane ⁽³⁾		2.8	3.0	2.2	1.9	2.8

Table 2

Water Sample Analytical Results for Groundwater Remedial Wells and Treatment Systems, Third Quarter 2015 Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2 Bethpage, New York



Notes and Abbreviations:

- (1) VOC samples analyzed using Method 8260C.
- (2) Total VOC results rounded to two significant figures.
- (3) 1,4-Dioxane samples analyzed using Method 8270D SIM.

Results validated following protocols specified in OU2 Groundwater Monitoring Plan (ARCADIS 2014).

BoldConstituent detectedVOCsVolatile Organic Compoundsμg/LMicrograms per liter

J Constituent value is estimated

REP Field replicate
<5.0 Compound not detected above its laboratory quantification limit.

OU2 Operable Unit 2

Table 3
Concentrations of Site Related Volatile Organic Compunds and 1,4-Dioxane in Outpost Wells⁽¹⁾
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2
Bethpage, New York



Constituent (Units in µg/L)	Well: Sample ID: Date:	BPOW 1-1 BPOW 1-1 8/11/2015	BPOW 1-2 BPOW 1-2 8/11/2015	BPOW 1-3 BPOW 1-3 8/13/2015	BPOW 1-4 BPOW 1-4 8/18/2015	BPOW 1-5 BPOW 1-5 8/18/2015	BPOW 1-6 BPOW 1-6 8/17/2015	BPOW 2-1 BPOW 2-1 8/10/2015
Volatile Organic Comp	pounds (VOCs) (3)							
1,1,1-Trichloroethane		0.67	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroeth	ane	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	< 0.50	<0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
1,1,2-Trichloroethane		<0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
1,1-Dichloroethane		0.21J	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
1,1-Dichloroethene		0.6	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
1,2-Dichloroethane		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
Carbon Tetrachloride		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
Chlorobenzene		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
Chloroform		0.15J	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene)	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
Trichlorotrifluoroethan	e (Freon 113)	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0
Tetrachloroethene		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
trans-1,2-Dichloroethe	ne	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
Trichloroethene		1.1	0.30J	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	< 0.50
Total Site-Related VC	OCs ⁽⁴⁾ :	2.7	0.3	0	0	0	0	0
1,4-Dioxane ⁽⁵⁾		<0.20	<0.20	<0.21	<0.21	<0.20	<0.22	0.09J

Table 3
Concentrations of Site Related Volatile Organic Compunds and 1,4-Dioxane in Outpost Wells⁽¹⁾
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2
Bethpage, New York



Constituent (Units in µg/L)	Well: Sample ID: Date:	BPOW 2-2 BPOW 2-2 8/14/2015	BPOW 2-3 BPOW 2-3 8/14/2015	BPOW 3-1 BPOW 3-1 8/12/2015	BPOW 3-2 BPOW 3-2 9/17/2015	BPOW 3-3 BPOW 3-3 8/25/2015	BPOW 3-4 BPOW 3-4 8/25/2015	BPOW 3-4 REP082515BT1 8/25/2015
Volatile Organic Compo	ounds (VOCs) (3)							
1,1,1-Trichloroethane		<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroetha	ne	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
1,1,2-Trichloroethane		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	0.79J	0.74J
1,1-Dichloroethane		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
1,1-Dichloroethene		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	0.61	0.64
1,2-Dichloroethane		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
Carbon Tetrachloride		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	1	1.1
Chlorobenzene		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
Chloroform		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	1.3	1.4
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	1.1	1.1
Trichlorotrifluoroethane	(Freon 113)	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	0.75J	0.72J
Tetrachloroethene		< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
trans-1,2-Dichloroethen	е	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
Trichloroethene		<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	<0.50	60.9D	61D
Total Site-Related VOC	Os ⁽⁴⁾ :	0	0	0	0	0	66	67
1,4-Dioxane ⁽⁵⁾		<0.21	<0.21	0.28	1.1	0.6	0.77J	0.32J

Table 3
Concentrations of Site Related Volatile Organic Compunds and 1,4-Dioxane in Outpost Wells⁽¹⁾
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2
Bethpage, New York



1,4-Dioxane ⁽⁵⁾		0.58	0.41
Total Site-Related VOCs (4	·) :	17	16
Trichloroethene		0.92J	1.6
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene		<0.50	<0.50
Tetrachloroethene		<0.50	<0.50
Trichlorotrifluoroethane (Fre	eon 113)	14.7	12.9
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene		0.086J	0.18J
Chloroform		0.15J	0.090J
Chlorobenzene		<0.50	<0.50
Carbon Tetrachloride		0.21J	0.19J
1,2-Dichloroethane		0.13J	0.072J
1,1-Dichloroethene		0.38J	0.52
1,1-Dichloroethane		<0.50	<0.50
1,1,2-Trichloroethane		<0.50	<0.50
1,1,1-Trichloroethane 1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane		<0.50 <0.50	0.063J <0.50
Volatile Organic Compound	s (VOCs) (a)		
	(3)		
Constituent (Units in µg/L)	Sample ID: Date:	BPOW 4-1R 8/26/2015	BPOW 4-2R 8/26/2015
	Well:	BPOW 4-1R ⁽²⁾	BPOW 4-2R ⁽²⁾

Table 3

Concentrations of Site Related Volatile Organic Compunds and 1,4-Dioxane in Outpost Wells⁽¹⁾ Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2 Bethpage, New York



Notes and Abbreviations:

- These outpost wells have been recently repurposed for use as plume monitoring wells per the June 2015 Groundwater Monitoring Plan Addendum (ARCADIS of New York, Inc., 2015) as conditionally approved by the NYSDEC (August 25, 2015). Therefore, TVOC trigger levels that may have been previously established are no longer shown.
- The NAVY abandoned original Wells BPOW4-1 and BPOW4-2 and installed replacement Wells BPOW4-1R and BPOW4-2R between August, 2014 and October, 2014.
- (3) Samples analyzed for site related VOCs per the PWSCP (ARCADIS G&M, Inc. 2003) using USEPA Method 524.2
- Site-related VOCs were established for the wells identified above in the Public Water Supply Contingency Plan (PWSCP) (ARCADIS G&M, Inc. 2003). Total Site-Related VOCs rounded to two significant figures.
- (5) Samples analyzed for 1,4-Dioxane by USEPA Method 8270D SIM.

Bold Bold value indicates constituent detected.

J Constituent value is estimated

D Concentration is based on a diluted sample analysis

REP Replicate Sample

TVOCs Total Volatile Organic Compounds

USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency

VOC Volatile Organic Compounds

μg/L micrograms per liter

< 0.5 Compound not detected above its laboratory quantification limit.

Table 4
Vapor Sample Analytical Results for Treatment Systems
Third Quarter 2015
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2
Bethpage, New York



Constituent□ Sample ID: (Units in µg/m3) Date:	T96 Influent 9/9/2015	T96 Midtrain 9/9/2015	T96 Effluent 9/9/2015	T102 Influent 9/9/2015	T102 Effluent 9/9/2015
(Offits in µg/mo)	3/3/2013	9/9/2013	3/3/2013	3/3/2013	3/3/2013
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	<65	9.3	<0.55	10	<0.55
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	<82	<5.5	< 0.69	<5.5	< 0.69
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	<65	<4.4	< 0.55	<4.4	< 0.55
1,1-Dichloroethane	49.0 J	39	34	23	8.1
1,1-Dichloroethylene	148	142	60.7	52.7	35
1,2-Dichloroethane	<97	<6.5	<0.81	<6.5	<0.81
1,2-Dichloropropane	84.1 J	18	< 0.92	<7.4	< 0.92
Benzene	<77	<5.1	< 0.64	<5.1	0.51
Bromodichloromethane	<80	< 5.4	< 0.67	< 5.4	< 0.67
Bromoform	<49	< 3.3	< 0.41	< 3.3	< 0.41
Bromomethane	<93	< 6.2	<0.78	< 6.2	<0.78
Carbon disulfide	<75	< 5.0	< 0.62	< 5.0	< 0.62
Carbon tetrachloride	<30	<2.0	< 0.25	<2.0	< 0.25
Chlorobenzene	<110	<7.4	< 0.92	<7.4	< 0.92
Chloroethane	<63	11	13	<4.2	< 0.53
Chloroform	<120	6.8 J	2.5	8.8	1.6
Chloromethane	<50	<3.3	1.6	<3.3	1.3
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	<110	<7.3	< 0.91	<7.3	< 0.91
Dibromochloromethane	<100	<6.8	< 0.85	<6.8	< 0.85
Ethylbenzene	<100	<6.9	< 0.87	<6.9	0.69 J
Methylene chloride	154	<5.6	1.7	<5.6	1.5
Styrene	<100	<6.8	< 0.85	<6.8	< 0.85
Tetrachloroethylene	1,460	178	0.37	411	3.7
Toluene	<90	<6.0	< 0.75	< 6.0	21
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	<110	<7.3	< 0.91	<7.3	<0.91
Trichloroethylene	29,900	8,010	3.8	3,710	12
Trichlorotrifluoroethane (Freon 113)	189	109	2.6	52	7.7
Vinyl chloride	268	284	28.4	< 0.82	<0.10
Xylene-o	<100	<6.9	< 0.87	<6.9	0.56 J
Xylenes - m,p	<100	<6.9	<0.87	<6.9	1.9
Total VOCs (2)	32,104	8,617	54	4,182	96

Vapor Sample Analytical Results for Treatment Systems Third Quarter 2015



Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2 Bethpage, New York

Notes and Abbreviations:

- (1) Vapor samples collected by ARCADIS on the dates shown and submitted to a NYSDOH ELAP certified laboratory for VOC analyses per Modified USEPA Method TO-15.
- (2) "Total VOCs" represents the sum of individual concentrations of compounds detected rounded to the nearest whole number.

Acronyms\Key:

700 Bold data indicates that the analyte was detected at or above its reporting limit.

16 Data that is not bold indicates analyte detected but below its reporting limit; the value is estimated.

ELAP Environmental Laboratory Approval Program

NYSDO New York State Department of Health

USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency.

VOC Volatile organic compound.

μg/m³ Micrograms per cubic meter.

Table 5A
Summary of SCREEN3 Model Input and Outputs
Tower 96 Treatment System, Third Quarter 2015
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2
Bethpage, New York



Parameters	Date Sampled:	11/13/2014	3/16/2015	5/11/2015	9/9/2015
SCREEN3 Model Input					
Source Type		Point	Point	Point	Point
Emission Rate (g/s)		1	1	1	1
Stack Height (ft)		55	55	55	55
Stack Height (m)		16.8	16.8	16.8	16.8
Stack Inside Diameter (m)		0.508	0.508	0.508	0.508
Air Flow Rate (scfm@stack temp) ⁽¹⁾		4,606	4,627	4,688	4,581
Air Flow Rate (acfm) ^{(2), (3)}		4,780	4,810	4,936	4,840
Stack Gas Exit Temperature (K) ⁽²⁾		305	306	310	311
Ambient Air Temperature (K) ⁽⁴⁾		286	277	287	293
Receptor Height (m) ⁽⁵⁾		1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Urban/Rural		Urban	Urban	Urban	Urban
Building Height (m)		6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7
Min Horizontal Bldg Dim (m)		9.8	9.8	9.8	9.8
Max Horizontal Bldg Dim (m)		12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8
Consider Bldg Downwash?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Simple/Complex Terrain Above Stack		Simple	Simple	Simple	Simple
Simple/Complex Terrain Above Stack Base		Simple	Simple	Simple	Simple
Meteorology		Full	Full	Full	Full
Automated Distances Array		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Terrain Height Above Stack Base		0	0	0	0
SCREEN3 Model Output					
1-HR Max Concentration at Receptor Height (µg	g/m ³) ⁽⁶⁾	198	197	195	199
Annualization Factor ⁽⁷⁾		0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
Average Annual Concentration at Receptor Heig	ght (µg/m³) ⁽⁸⁾	15.8	15.8	15.6	15.9
Distance To Max Concentration (m) ⁽⁹⁾		110	110	110	109

Table 5A Summary of SCREEN3 Model Input and Outputs Tower 96 Treatment System, Third Quarter 2015 Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2 Bethpage, New York



Notes:

- (1) The stack air flow rate at the stack temperature (in scfm) was calculated by multiplying the stack air flow rate in acfm by the ratio of the standard temperature to the actual stack gas exit temperature in degrees Kelvin.
- (2) The stack air flow rate (in acfm) and temperature were measured using inline instrumentation. Values were measured at the blower effluent location.
- (3) The stack air flow rate is taken from the actual stack air flow rate on the day of sampling.
- (4) The ambient temperature was recorded from weather.newsday.com website for Islip, New York. The mean actual temperature from the website was used in the model calculation
- (5) The receptor height corresponds to the average inhalation level.
- (6) SCREEN3 calculated constituent concentration at listed conditions at the specified inhalation level.
- (7) A USEPA time averaging conversion factor of 1/0.08 was used to convert the 1-hour maximum concentration output to an annual average.
- (8) Average annual constituent concentration at the receptor height was calculated by multiplying the one hour maximum concentration by the annualization factor.
- (9) SCREEN3 calculated distance to the 1-hour maximum concentration.

Acronyms\Key:

μg/m³ Micrograms per cubic meter. acfm Actual cubic feet per minute.

ft Feet.

g/s Grams per second.

KKelvin.Meters.

scfm Standard cubic feet per minute.

USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Table 5B
Summary of Maximum Allowable Stack Concentration Calculations
Tower 96 Treatment System, Third Quarter 2015
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2
Bethpage, New York



4.96E+09

1.87E+03

Compound	SGC ⁽¹⁾		Actual Effluent Cond	centrations ⁽²⁾ (µg/m ³)	
Compound	(µg/m³)	11/13/2014	3/16/2015	5/11/2015	9/9/2015
1,1-Dichloroethane	95,000 ⁽³⁾	0	8.9	0.57	34
1,1-Dichloroethene	188,000 ⁽³⁾	3.7	138	2.3	60.7
Benzene	1,300	0.38	0	0	0
Chloroethane	619,000 ⁽³⁾	19	20	12	13
Chloroform	150	0	0.63	0	2.5
Chloromethane	22,000	1.2	3.7	3.5	1.6
Methylene Chloride	14,000	18	1.5	1.7	1.7
Tetrachloroethylene	1,000	1.4	14	2.7	0.37
Toluene	37,000	0.49	0	0	0
Trichloroethylene	14,000	2	203	32	3.8
Trichlorotrifluoroethane (Freon 113)	960,000	0	4.5	0	2.6
Vinyl chloride	180,000	99.9	281	1.0	28.4
Commonwed	AGC ⁽⁴⁾		Annual MAS	SC ⁽⁵⁾ (μg/m ³)	
Compound	(µg/m³)	11/13/2014	3/16/2015	5/11/2015	9/9/2015
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.63	1.77E+04	1.76E+04	1.73E+04	1.73E+04
1,1-Dichloroethene	200	5.61E+06	5.58E+06	5.50E+06	5.51E+06
Benzene	0.13	3.65E+03	3.62E+03	3.58E+03	3.58E+03
Chloroethane	10,000	2.81E+08	2.79E+08	2.75E+08	2.75E+08
Chloroform	14.700	4.12E+05	4.10E+05	4.05E+05	4.05E+05
Chloromethane	90	2.53E+06	2.51E+06	2.48E+06	2.48E+06
Methylene Chloride	60	1.68E+06	1.67E+06	1.65E+06	1.65E+06
Tetrachloroethylene	4.0	1.12E+05	1.12E+05	1.10E+05	1.10E+05
Toluene	5,000	1.40E+08	1.39E+08	1.38E+08	1.38E+08
Trichloroethylene	0.2	5.61E+03	5.58E+03	5.50E+03	5.51E+03

5.02E+09

1.90E+03

4.95E+09

1.87E+03

See notes on last page.

Vinyl chloride

Trichlorotrifluoroethane (Freon 113)

5.05E+09

1.91E+03

180,000

0.068





Compound	Percent of Annual MASC ⁽⁶⁾							
Compound	11/13/2014	3/16/2015	5/11/2015	9/9/2015	% MASC ⁽⁷⁾			
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.0%	0.05%	0.0%	0.20%	0.08%			
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Benzene	0.01%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Chloroethane	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Chloroform	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Chloromethane	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Methylene Chloride	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Tetrachloroethylene	0.0%	0.01%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Toluene	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Trichloroethylene	0.04%	3.64%	0.58%	0.07%	1.35%			
Trichlorotrifluoroethane (Freon 113)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Vinyl chloride	5.24%	14.82%	0.05%	1.52%	6.45%			

Notes:

- (1) Refers to the compound-specific SGC per the NYSDEC DAR-1 AGC/SGC tables revised February 28, 2014.
- (2) Only VOCs that were detected in the effluent vapor sample (T96 EFF) over the past year of system operation are included in this table.
- (3) An SGC was not provided in the DAR-1 AGC/SGC Tables, dated February 28, 2014. An interim SGC was developed based on guidelines provided in Section IV.A.2.b.1 of the NYSDEC DAR-1 Guidelines for the Control of Toxic Ambient Air Contaminants, 1991 edition.
- (4) AGC refers to the compound-specific annual guideline concentration per the NYSDEC DAR-1 AGC/SGC tables, revised February 28, 2014. NYSDEC DAR-1 AGCs were scaled using the results of a site-specific annual USEPA SCREEN 3 model to calculate the annual MASC per monitoring event.
- (5) Annual MASC was calculated by dividing the product of the AGC of a compound and the ratio of the SCREEN3 gas emission rate and the SCREEN 3 average annual concentration at receptor height by the air flow rate at the stack temperature and multiplying by the appropriate conversion factors.
- (6) Percent of MASC was calculated by dividing the actual effluent concentration by the MASC for the past four quarters of operation. Percentages have been rounded to two digits.
- (7) Cumulative percent of the MASC was calculated using a time-weighted average of the percent MASC per event. Percentages have been rounded to two digits.

Acronyms\Key:

μg/m³	Micrograms per cubic meter.
AGC	Annual guideline concentration.
SGC	Short-term guideline concentration
D 4 D 4	D: : : (A: D

DAR-1 Division of Air Resources-1

MASC Maximum allowable stack concentration.
NL Compound concentration is not listed

NYSDEC New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

Table 6A
Summary of SCREEN3 Model Input and Outputs
Tower 102 Treatment System, Third Quarter 2015
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2
Bethpage, New York



Parameters	Date Sampled:	11/13/14	3/16/15	5/11/15	9/9/15	
SCREEN3 Model Input						
Source Type		Point	Point	Point	Point	
Emission Rate (g/s)		1	1	1	1	
Stack Height (ft)		69.52	69.52	69.52	69.52	
Stack Height (m)		21.19	21.19	21.19	21.19	
Stack Inside Diameter (m)		0.61	0.61	0.61	0.61	
Air Flow Rate (scfm@stack temp) ⁽¹⁾		8,123	8,231	8,068	7,930	
Air Flow Rate (acfm) ^{(2), (3)}		8,320	8,420	8,220	8,080	
Stack Gas Exit Temperature (K) ⁽²⁾		301	301	300	300	
Ambient Air Temperature (K) ⁽⁴⁾		286	277	287	293	
Receptor Height (m) ⁽⁵⁾		1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	
Urban/Rural		Urban	Urban	Urban	Urban	
Building Height (m)		7.62	7.62	7.62	7.62	
Min Horizontal Bldg Dim (m)		12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	
Max Horizontal Bldg Dim (m)		15.54	15.54	15.54	15.54	
Consider Bldg Downwash?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Simple/Complex Terrain Above Stack		Simple	Simple	Simple	Simple	
Simple/Complex Terrain Above Stack Base		Simple	Simple	Simple	Simple	
Meteorology		Full	Full	Full	Full	
Automated Distances Array		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Terrain Height Above Stack Base		0	0	0	0	
SCREEN3 Model Output						
1-HR Max Concentration at Receptor Height (µg/	/m ³) ⁽⁶⁾	108.0	106.6	108.7	110.6	
Annualization Factor ⁽⁷⁾	,	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	
Average Annual Concentration at Receptor Heig	ht (µg/m³) ⁽⁸⁾	8.6	8.5	8.7	8.8	
Distance To Max Concentration (m) ⁽⁹⁾	(1 3°)	146	146	145	144	

Table 6A Summary of SCREEN3 Model Input and Outputs Tower 102 Treatment System, Third Quarter 2015 Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2 Bethpage, New York



Notes:

- (1) The stack air flow rate at the stack temperature (in scfm) was calculated by multiplying the stack air flow rate in acfm by the ratio of the standard temperature to the actual stack gas exit temperature in degrees Kelvin.
- (2) The stack air flow rate (in acfm) and temperature were measured using inline instrumentation. Values were measured at the blower effluent location.
- (3) The stack air flow rate is taken from the actual stack air flow rate on the day of sampling.
- (4) The ambient temperature was recorded from weather.newsday.com website for Islip, New York. The mean actual temperature from the website was used in the model calculation
- (5) The receptor height corresponds to the average inhalation level.
- (6) SCREEN3 calculated constituent concentration at listed conditions at the specified inhalation level.
- (7) A USEPA time averaging conversion factor of 1/0.08 was used to convert the 1-hour maximum concentration output to an annual average.
- (8) Average annual constituent concentration at the receptor height was calculated by multiplying the one hour maximum concentration by the annualization
- (9) SCREEN3 calculated distance to the 1-hour maximum concentration.

Acronyms\Key:

μg/m³ Micrograms per cubic meter. acfm Actual cubic feet per minute.

ft Feet.

g/s Grams per second.

K Kelvin. m Meters.

scfm Standard cubic feet per minute.

USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency.





Compared	SGC ⁽¹⁾ Actual Effluent Concentrations ⁽²⁾ (µg/m ³)						
Compound	(µg/m³)	11/13/2014	3/16/2015	5/11/2015	9/9/2015		
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	9,000	0	0	0.55	0		
1,1-Dichloroethane	95,000 ⁽³⁾	4.5	3.2	5.7	8.1		
1,1-Dichloroethene	188,000 ⁽³⁾	15	11	21	35		
Benzene	1,300	0	0	0	0.51		
Carbon Disulfide	6,200	0	1.6	0	0		
Chloroform	150	1.1	0.88	1.6	1.6		
Chloromethane	22,000	1.1	1.2	0.99	1.3		
Ethylbenzene	54,000	0	0	0	0.69		
Methylene Chloride	14,000	13	16	1.3	1.5		
Tetrachloroethene	1,000	7.5	5.2	1.6	3.7		
Toluene	37,000	0	0	0	21		
Trichloroethene	14,000	22	20	34	12		
Trichlorotrifluoroethane (Freon 113)	960,000	4.4	3.1	7.1	7.7		
Vinyl Chloride	180,000	0.41	0.31	0	0		
Xylene-m,p	4,300	0	0	0	1.9		
Xylene-o	4,300	0	0	0	0.56		





Compound	AGC ⁽⁴⁾	Annual MASC ⁽⁵⁾ (µg/m3)						
Compound	(µg/m³)	11/13/2014	3/16/2015	5/11/2015	9/9/2015			
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	5,000	1.48E+08	1.48E+08	1.48E+08	1.49E+08			
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.63	1.87E+04	1.87E+04	1.87E+04	1.88E+04			
1,1-Dichloroethene	200	5.92E+06	5.92E+06	5.93E+06	5.96E+06			
Benzene	0.13	3.85E+03	3.85E+03	3.85E+03	3.87E+03			
Carbon Disulfide	700	2.07E+07	2.07E+07	2.07E+07	2.09E+07			
Chloroform	14.700	4.35E+05	4.35E+05	4.36E+05	4.38E+05			
Chloromethane	90	2.67E+06	2.66E+06	2.67E+06	2.68E+06			
Ethylbenzene	1,000	2.96E+07	2.96E+07	2.96E+07	2.98E+07			
Methylene Chloride	60.0	1.78E+06	1.78E+06	1.78E+06	1.79E+06			
Tetrachloroethene	4	1.18E+05	1.18E+05	1.19E+05	1.19E+05			
Toluene	5,000	1.48E+08	1.48E+08	1.48E+08	1.49E+08			
Trichloroethene	0.2	5.92E+03	5.92E+03	5.93E+03	5.96E+03			
Trichlorotrifluoroethane (Freon 113)	180,000	5.33E+09	5.33E+09	5.33E+09	5.36E+09			
Vinyl Chloride	0.068	2.01E+03	2.01E+03	2.01E+03	2.03E+03			
Xylene-m,p	100	2.96E+06	2.96E+06	2.96E+06	2.98E+06			
Xylene-o	100	2.96E+06	2.96E+06	2.96E+06	2.98E+06			





Compound	Percent of Annual MASC ⁽⁶⁾				
Compound	11/13/14	03/16/15	5/11/2015	9/9/2015	% MASC ⁽⁷⁾
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.02%	0.02%	0.03%	0.04%	0.03%
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Benzene	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.01%	0.0%
Carbon Disulfide	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chloroform	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chloromethane	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ethylbenzene	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Methylene Chloride	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Tetrachloroethene	0.01%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Toluene	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Trichloroethene	0.37%	0.34%	0.57%	0.20%	0.33%
Trichlorotrifluoroethane (Freon 113)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Vinyl Chloride	0.02%	0.02%	0.0%	0.0%	0.01%
Xylene-m,p	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Xylene-o	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 6B Summary of Maximum Allowable Stack Concentration Calculations Tower 102 Treatment System, Third Quarter 2015 Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, Operable Unit 2



Notes:

Bethpage, New York

(1)	Refers to the compound-specific SGC per the NYSDEC DAR-1 AGC/SGC tables revised February 28, 2014.
-----	--

- (2) Only VOCs that were detected in the effluent vapor sample (T102 EFF) over the past year of system operation are included in this table.
- (3) An SGC was not provided in the DAR-1 AGC/SGC Tables, dated February 28, 2014. An interim SGC was developed based on guidelines provided in Section IV.A.2.b.1 of the NYSDEC DAR-1 Guidelines for the Control of Toxic Ambient Air Contaminants, 1991 edition.
- (4) AGC refers to the compound-specific annual guideline concentration per the NYSDEC DAR-1 AGC/SGC tables, revised February 28, 2014. NYSDEC DAR-1 AGCs were scaled using the results of a site-specific annual USEPA SCREEN 3 model to calculate the annual MASC per monitoring event.
- (5) Annual MASC was calculated by dividing the product of the AGC of a compound and the ratio of the SCREEN3 gas emission rate and the SCREEN 3 average annual concentration at receptor height by the air flow rate at the stack temperature and multiplying by the appropriate conversion factors.
- (6) Percent of MASC was calculated by dividing the actual effluent concentration by the MASC for the past four quarters of operation. Percentages have been rounded to two digits.
- (7) Cumulative percent of the MASC was calculated using a time-weighted average of the percent MASC per event. Percentages have been rounded to two digits.

Acronyms\Key:

Compound not reported, unable to compute MASC

AGC Annual guideline concentration.
NL Compound concentration not listed

DAR-1 Division of Air Resources-1

MASC Maximum allowable stack concentration.

μg/m³ Micrograms per cubic meter.

NYSDEC New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

FIGURES