# SCHEDULE 1 – SCOPE OF WORK
# SITE CHARACTERIZATION FOR LYNDON ROAD LANDFILL
# PERINTON, NY
# WA-D009810-30

## 1. Background

### 1.1 Location:

The Lyndon Road Landfill (formerly known as the Granger Landfill) is a 23.7-acre inactive landfill site located at 80 Lyndon Rd in the Town of Perinton, Monroe County. The site is bounded to the west by Lyndon Road and the Little League Landfill site (#828026A) and to the north by residential properties and wooded vacant land. Thomas Creek runs parallel to the eastern border and wraps around the southern portion of the site before trending west.

### 1.2 Site Features:

The western portion of the site features a parking lot and the Rochester Ice Center. The remainder of the site is mostly wooded. Thomas Creek is a Class B surface water body and flows south along the eastern border of the site and then west along the southern boundary. The topography of the site slopes down to the east, southeast, and south toward Thomas Creek. The maximum relief is 25 to 30-feet located in the northwest section of the site. The actual extents of fill placement at the site are unknown.

### 1.3 Current Zoning and Land Use:

The site is zoned commercial as an indoor rink (Code 542) and is the location of the Rochester Ice Center. The property owner is 80 Lyndon Road, LLC. The site and surrounding area are served by a public water supply.

The area immediately to the north, south, and west of the site is zoned residential. The Fairport Little League baseball fields are immediately west of the site and sit atop the historic Little League landfill. Residential neighborhoods lie to the north of the site on either side of Thomas Creek. The Erie Canal lies to the south of the site. To the east, the area is zoned industrial and hosts multiple businesses and industrial buildings.

### 1.4 Past Use of the Site:

The landfill was reported to have begun operation in 1971 and was owned by Granger Landscape Service, Inc. Mr. Allen Granger applied and received a permit to operate as a sanitary landfill, reportedly allowing the disposal of boards, wood debris, and rubble. The landfill operated until its closure in 1975. No final inspection for the site was completed.

### 1.5 Previous Investigations

A Phase II field investigation was conducted in 1991 by Ecology and Environment Engineering, P.C. in conjunction with the adjacent Little League Landfill site (E&E, 1991). This investigation included an initial site reconnaissance, an electromagnetic terrain conductivity (EM31) survey, and a portable proton magnetometer survey to define the site geological conditions, locate any buried metals, and assess groundwater quality. Four monitoring wells were installed at the Lyndon Road Landfill (identified as

Granger Landfill in the document). Groundwater, surface water and sediment samples were collected for analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), pesticides, PCBs metals and cyanide. The results found the presence of phenols in the surface water and low concentrations of metals in some of the sediment samples. No constituents of concern were identified in the groundwater samples.

A groundwater investigation was completed at this site in 2020 by Parsons Engineering (Parsons, 2020) as part of the NYSDEC Inactive landfill Initiative (ILI) The investigation included installation of four shallow groundwater monitoring wells and collection and analysis of groundwater samples. Soil borings used to install the wells documented that waste was present within 1-foot of grade and extended to between 7.5 and 27-feet below grade. Samples were analyzed for emerging contaminants and select landfill indicator parameters. The data revealed that per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) were present in concentrations as follows: PFOA (740 to 8,100 ppt), PFOS (62 to 290 ppt), and 1,4-Dioxane (2 to 43 ppb) (Parsons 2020). These concentrations are above the New York State Drinking Water (NYSDW) criteria.

### 1.6 Site Geology and Hydrogeology:

Monroe County lies within the Central Lowland physiographic province (Eastern Lake Section) of New York. The county is primarily mantled by glacial till and laminated lacustrine clay and silt deposits. The till consists of unconsolidated, poorly sorted clay, silt and/or sand deposits of relatively low permeability (loamy matrix).

Drilling logs provided in the 1991 Phase II report (E&E, 1991) and the ILI report (Parsons, 2020) indicate that between 7 and 27.5-feet of waste material consisting of wood, brick, municipal waste, and other debris is present at the site. The fill is underlain by a two to four feet thick clay layer followed by a mixture of sand, silt, and gravel. Bedrock was encountered during the Phase II investigation at depths ranging from 25 to 50-feet below grade. The underlying bedrock is the Vernon Shale which is weathered at the surface.

Review of the boring logs indicates that most of the waste material is unsaturated. At locations near the creek and where the layer of clay was present, the lower 0.5 to 1-foot of waste was reported to be wet. Groundwater generally occurs in the underlying overburden deposits. Water level elevations measured in November 1989 indicated groundwater flows radially towards Thomas Creek. Water level elevations measured in 2020 supported radial groundwater flows.

### 1.7 Preliminary Conceptual Site Model

The information summarized above was used to develop a preliminary conceptual site model for the Lyndon Road Landfill site. Previous sampling indicated contaminants of concern (PFOS, PFOA, and 1,4-dioxane) are present in site groundwater (Parsons 2020). Existing information suggests the landfill is unlined and covered by a thin layer of soil, which exposes fill materials to infiltration from precipitation and associated vertical migration through the fill into the groundwater. The fill material sits atop mixtures of clay, silt, and fine sand. The waste is generally unsaturated. Groundwater likely flows in a radial pattern to the stream that is present on the east and south sides of the landfill.

### 1.8 Project Objectives

The objective of this Site Characterization is to assess the potential for site-related constituents to migrate off-site above regulatory standards and guidance values. The Site Characterization will evaluate the presence of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), 1,4-dioxane, per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), inorganics, mercury, cyanide, and pesticides/herbicides in groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment, and fill material. Groundwater flow potential and on-site geology will also be evaluated.

## 2. Task 1: Preliminary Activities

Preliminary activities include the following:

- Review available site-related files provided by NYSDEC for the project
- Site visit to support planning of Site Characterization activities. The visit will assess the following:
  - Site accessibility and the need to clear trees or vegetation
  - Locations for proposed test trenches, monitoring wells, and surface water/sediment/soil samples
  - Whether monitoring wells installed during the Phase II investigation (E&E, 1991) are accessible for sampling
  - The presence of seeps
- Prepare this scope of work, schedule, costs (including subcontractor solicitations), and associated NYSDEC contract-related forms

## 3. Task 2/Task 3: Site Characterization

The objective of the Site Characterization is to document types of waste disposed at the landfill and identify whether PFAS, 1,4-dioxane, or other contaminants at the site pose a significant threat to public health or the environment. Site Characterization activities will consist of the following tasks:

- Seep survey
- Utility clearance
- Tree and brush clearing
- Soil sampling
- Test trench excavation and fill sampling and analysis
- Monitoring well installation and groundwater sampling and analysis
- Surface water/sediment sampling and staff gauge installation
- Survey
- Groundwater elevation study

These tasks are described in the sections below. **Figure 1** displays the location of existing monitoring wells and proposed locations for Site Characterization field activities. **Table 1** summarizes the analytical plan, including environmental media to be sampled, analytical methods, number of samples, and quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) samples.

Samples collected during Site Characterization will be shipped to an ELAP-certified laboratory subcontracted by Ramboll. Ramboll personnel will coordinate with the laboratory to arrange for the sample containers and associated shipping. The laboratory will provide an analytical data package that is consistent with the requirements of NYS ASP Category B. In addition, the laboratory will submit analytical data as an Electronic Data Deliverable (EDD) in the NYSDEC format.

Laboratory generated analytical data, except for waste characterization sample results, will be validated in accordance with the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). A Data Usability Summary Report (DUSR) conforming to Appendix 2B of DER-10 will be prepared.

Consistent with the Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP) provided in Appendix 1A of DER-10, air monitoring will be conducted during intrusive work (test trench excavation and advancement of soil borings and monitoring well installation). Accordingly, one upwind and one downwind station equipped with photoionization detector (PID) and particulate monitoring equipment will be housed in enclosures and mounted on tripods. The specific locations of the equipment will be based on wind direction and the excavation or drilling locations.

Samples for PFAS analysis will be collected consistent with the NYSDEC PFAS Guidance. PFAS samples will be collected before any other sample(s) at each location. Samples will be collected while wearing appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE).

### 3.1 Seep Survey and Sampling

A visual seep survey will be performed on the site to document and sample seep locations, if any are encountered. The on-site Thomas Creek shoreline will be surveyed, along with slopes and other areas on site where the topography suggests seeps could occur. For planning purposes, it is assumed this will require 1 full day for 1 Ramboll personnel and include sampling up to three seeps. Seep samples will be sent to the laboratory for analysis.

- Two samples will be analyzed for TCL VOCs plus tentatively identifiable compounds (TICs), TCL SVOCs plus TICs, TCL PCBs, TAL inorganics, mercury, pesticides/herbicides, cyanide, 1,4-dioxane, and PFAS.
- One sample will be analyzed for 1,4-dioxane and PFAS only.

### 3.2 Utility Clearance

A subsurface utility markout will be performed prior to intrusive activities to identify utilities and potential subsurface abnormalities in the vicinity of the drilling locations. UDig NY will be contacted by the subcontractor to locate utilities at the site prior to initiating intrusive activities. However, it should be noted that UDig NY will only coordinate utility location for those companies subscribing to the service. Furthermore, UDig NY will only identify the locations of subsurface lines on public property and rights-of-way. As a result, a private utility locator will be hired to identify and mark utilities and anomalies in the work area. The utility locator will utilize ground penetrating radar (GPR) and other appropriate technologies as needed to locate and mark the extents of subsurface utilities or anomalies in the vicinity of drilling locations. For planning purposes, this task is assumed to require 1.5 days with 2 Ramboll personnel to perform subcontractor oversight.

### 3.3 Tree and Brush Clearing

Targeted areas of trees and brush will be cleared to facilitate access for drilling and excavation activities. Monitoring well and test trench locations have been selected to minimize the need for tree and brush clearing while still achieving the Site Characterization objectives. For costing purposes, it is assumed that a lift will not be required, that no more than 5 trees will be felled, and that cut lumber and brush will be disposed of within the wooded portion of the site. For planning purposes, this task is assumed to require 1 day with 1 Ramboll personnel to perform subcontractor oversight.

### 3.4 Soil Sampling and Analysis

The fill material is reportedly covered with 12-inches of soil. Soil samples will be collected during monitoring well installation (**Section 3.5**) from four soil borings at three intervals (twelve samples total): 0–2-inch, 2–12-inch, and just above the air/water interface. Samples will be sent to the laboratory for analysis.

- Three samples will be analyzed for TCL VOCs plus TICs, TCL SVOCs plus TICs, TCL PCBs, TAL inorganics, pesticides/herbicides, cyanide, 1,4-dioxane, and PFAS.
- Nine samples will be analyzed for 1,4-dioxane and PFAS only.

### 3.5 Test Trench Excavation and Fill Sampling

Up to six test trenches will be excavated on the Site to document waste within the landfill. Proposed locations are shown on **Figure 1** but are subject to change based on field conditions and accessibility. It is assumed trenches will be up to 8 feet long and between 4 to 6 feet deep. To the extent practical, topsoil or cover material at each trench location will be segregated from landfill waste material. Excavated waste material will be staged on polyethylene sheets or a temporary spoils pad. Photographs will be taken to document the composition of the excavated materials and distribution within the trenches.

To assess the potential for leachate generation, one sample will be collected from each trench (six samples total) to represent the fill material present. Samples will be collected without entering the test trenches. These samples will be analyzed for leachability using the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) or Synthetic Precipitate Leaching Procedure (SPLP) with quantification of TCLP VOCs, TCLP SVOCs, TCLP Pesticides, TCLP chlorinated herbicides, TCLP inorganics. These samples will be collected from intervals where PFAS contamination appears most likely.

A companion sample from each trench (six samples total) will be collected in the 2–12-inch interval or where higher organic carbon is expected.

- One sample will be analyzed for TCL VOCs plus TICs, TCL SVOCs plus TICs, TCL PCBs, TAL inorganics, mercury, pesticides/herbicides, cyanide, 1,4-dioxane, PFAS, soil pH, total organic carbon, and leachability of PFAS using SPLP analyses.
- Five samples will be analyzed for PFAS, soil pH, total organic carbon, and leachability of PFAS using SPLP analyses.

An additional sample will be collected from each trench (six samples total) for PFAS and 1,4-dioxane analysis. Three of these samples will be collected from the 0–2-inch interval to address exposure concerns. The remaining three samples will be collected from intervals where contamination appears likely.

Following sample collection and waste documentation, each trench will be backfilled with excavated waste material followed by the excavated cover material. After backfilling, trench extents will be flagged for surveying.

For planning purposes, this task is assumed to require 2 days with 1 Ramboll personnel to perform subcontractor oversight, waste documentation, and sample collection.

### 3.6 Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling

Four monitoring wells will be installed as described in the following sections. For planning purposes, soil boring and monitoring well installation is assumed to require 7 days with 2 Ramboll personnel to perform subcontractor oversight, CAMP monitoring, geological documentation, and sample collection.

#### 3.6.1 Soil Boring

Soil borings will be completed to facilitate monitoring well installations. Drilling methods (hollow-stem auger or direct push) will be selected based on field conditions. Soil samples will be collected continuously at each boring location either using split-spoon or Macro-core® samplers (depending on the subsurface conditions). Upon retrieval, each soil sample will be described for: 1) percent recovery, 2) soil/material type, 3) color, 4) moisture content, 5) texture, 6) grain size and shape, 7) consistency, 8) evidence of staining or other chemical-related impacts, and 9) any other relevant observations. This descriptive information will be recorded on a soil boring log form. Soil samples will be collected as noted in **Section 3.4**. Air monitoring upwind, downwind, and within the work zone will be performed during drilling activities. Drilling spoils will not be containerized and will remain on site. If feasible, spoils will be incorporated into test trench excavations.

#### 3.6.2 Monitoring Well Details

Monitoring wells will be constructed of 2-inch polyvinyl chloride (PVC) casing flush-threaded to a 10-foot long, #10 slot PVC screen. The wells will be screened in native material either vertically or horizontally outside the fill material to assess potential for migration of contaminants. If fill material is encountered during soil boring, the well screen will be installed so that the top of the screen is at least 3-feet below the base of the fill material. If fill material is not encountered in the soil boring, the well screen will be installed at a depth straddling the shallow water table. Maximum well depth is assumed to be 40 feet below grade. The wells will be finished with final protective stick-up casing approximately 2 to 3 feet above grade.

#### 3.6.3 Monitoring Well Development

Each newly installed monitoring well will be developed no earlier than 24 hours following installation. Development will be performed to achieve visibly sediment-free groundwater discharge and stabilization (3 consecutive readings) of the water quality parameters (i.e., pH, temperature, specific conductivity, dissolved oxygen (DO), and turbidity) as outlined below, or until a volume of groundwater equivalent to 5 well volumes has been removed.

- Temperature (±10%)
- pH (±10%)
- Specific conductivity (±10%)
- DO (±10%)
- Turbidity (±)

Development will be completed by surging and purging the well using either a bailer or pump, as appropriate. Development is intended to remove the fine-grained material which may have settled within the well and to provide hydraulic communication with the surrounding formation. Groundwater parameters will be measured and recorded prior to development, after removal of each well volume during development, and at the conclusion of development. Parameters will include turbidity, pH, temperature, and specific conductance. Water levels will be measured prior to and at the conclusion of

development. Well development data will be recorded on a well development log. Purged groundwater will be discharged to ground surface downgradient of the well.

For planning purposes, monitoring well development for the 4 installed wells is assumed to require 2 days for 2 Ramboll personnel to complete.

### 3.6.4 Groundwater Sampling

One set of groundwater samples will be collected from the four newly installed monitoring wells (described in **Section 3.6**) and from the four existing on-site monitoring wells. For planning purposes, this task is assumed to require 2.5 days for 2 Ramboll personnel to complete. The groundwater samples will be collected using low-flow sampling techniques (submersible pump or peristaltic pump) to facilitate the collection of stabilized water quality parameters as outlined below:

- Temperature ± 3% of measurement
- pH ± 0.1 pH units
- Specific conductance ± 3% of measurement
- Redox ±10 mV
- DO ±10% of measurement
- Turbidity ± 10% of measurement

The well will be purged at a rate between 100 milliliters per minute (ml/min) and 500 ml/min. If a stable groundwater level cannot be achieved at a yield of at least 100 milliliters per minute (ml/min, the well will be dewatered to the intake of the pump (or tubing) and allowed to recover before the samples are collected. Purged groundwater will be collected in 5-gallon buckets and discharged to ground surface following sample collection. Groundwater samples will be sent to the laboratory for analysis.

- Four groundwater samples from the newly-installed monitoring wells will be analyzed for TCL VOCs plus TICs, TCL SVOCs plus TICs, TCL PCBs, TAL inorganics, mercury, pesticides/herbicides, cyanide, 1,4-dioxane, and PFAS.
- Four groundwater samples from the existing on-site monitoring wells will be analyzed for 1,4-dioxane and PFAS only.

Samples for PFAS analysis will be collected consistent with the NYSDEC PFAS Guidance. PFAS samples will be collected before any other sample(s) at each location. Samples will be collected while wearing appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE).

## 3.7 Surface Water/Sediment Sampling and Staff Gauge Installation

Up to eight co-located surface water/sediment samples will be collected along Thomas Creek. Six of the sample locations are shown on **Figure 1**, and two additional samples may be collected. For planning purposes, this task is assumed to require 2 days for 2 Ramboll personnel to complete. Samples will be sent to the laboratory for analysis.

- The two samples collected from the upstream/downstream site boundaries will be analyzed for TCL VOCs plus TICs, TCL SVOCs plus TICs, TCL PCBs, TAL inorganics, mercury, pesticides/herbicides, cyanide, 1,4-dioxane, and PFAS.
- Up to six samples will be analyzed for 1,4-dioxane and PFAS only.

Samples will be collected beginning from the most downstream location and moving progressively upstream. At each location, surface water samples will be collected first, followed by sediment samples.

Samples for PFAS analysis will be collected consistent with the NYSDEC PFAS Guidance. Samples for PFAS analysis will be collected before any other sample(s) at each location. Samples will be collected while wearing appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE).

After samples are collected, temporary staff gauges will be installed at four on-site locations along Thomas Creek. The staff gauges will be used to obtain surface water elevation for the water elevation study described in **Section 3.9**.

### 3.8 Survey

A survey will be performed after intrusive work and sample collection activities have been completed to document:

- Top of casing and ground elevation for the four newly installed monitoring wells
- Top of casing and ground elevation for the five existing monitoring wells located at the Fairport Little League baseball fields
- Top of casing and ground elevation for the four existing wells located on the Lyndon Rd Landfill
- Elevation of four temporary staff gauges installed in Thomas Creek
- Surface water/sediment sample locations
- Location and extent of the test trenches

The survey will be completed by a New York State-licensed surveyor. Horizontal datum will be referenced to North American Datum (NAD) 83 (2007) New York State Plane Eastern Zone, and vertical datum will be referenced to North American Vertical Datum (NAVD) 88. The surveyor will provide a survey drawing signed by a professional surveyor and a spreadsheet listing the locations, northings, eastings, and appropriate elevations.

For planning purposes, this task is assumed to require 1 Ramboll personnel 1 day to perform subcontractor oversight.

### 3.9 Water Elevations

Water levels will be measured in the four newly-installed wells, the four existing on-site wells, five off-site wells (located at the Fairport Little League baseball fields), and in Thomas Creek at up to four temporary staff gauges. The staff gauges will be installed along Thomas Creek during surface water and sediment sampling. These water level data will be used to evaluate the groundwater flow characteristics and relationship to Thomas Creek. For planning purposes, measuring water elevations is assumed to require 1 Ramboll personnel 1 day to complete.

## 4. Task 4: Report

A Site Characterization Report (SCR) will be prepared following completion of the field activities described in **Section 3** and receipt of the analytical results and DUSR. The SCR will discuss the field activities, results, and conclusions. It may include the following components based on the information generated:

- ***Site Description:*** This will include a discussion of current use of the site

- ***Site investigation Summary:*** This section will describe the activities completed as part of the Site Characterization and include deviations or modifications to the work scope defined in Schedule 1 (this document).
- ***Site Hydrogeology:*** A brief description of the subsurface soil characteristics and occurrence of groundwater will be provided. A groundwater flow map will be included.
- ***Nature of Contamination:*** This section will include a discussion of the presence of constituents detected and those that are detected at concentrations above regulatory criteria. The latter will be identified as constituents of potential concern (COPC).
    - ***Surface Soil:*** Detected constituents in surface soil samples will be compared to 6 NYCRR Part 375 Unrestricted Use Soil Cleanup Objectives (SCOs) and to Protection of Groundwater for compounds detected in groundwater. Detected PFAS constituents will be compared to the guidance values as presented in *Sampling, Analysis, and Assessment of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)* (NYSDEC, 2020) or the most recent document.
    - ***Groundwater:*** The detected constituents in groundwater will be compared to Class GA water quality standards and guidance values as compiled in *Technical and Operational Guidance Series 1.1.1* (NYSDEC, 1998) and associated addenda. Detected PFAS constituents will be compared to the screening levels as presented in *Sampling, Analysis, and Assessment of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)* (NYSDEC, 2020) or the most recent document.
    - ***Surface Water:*** The detected constituents in surface water will be compared to the appropriate class water quality standards and guidance values as compiled in *Technical and Operational Guidance Series 1.1.1* (NYSDEC, 1998) and associated addenda.
    - ***Seeps (if collected):*** The detected constituents in seep samples will be compared to the appropriate class water quality standards and guidance values as compiled in *Technical and Operational Guidance Series 1.1.1* (NYSDEC, 1998) and associated addenda.
    - ***Sediment:*** The detected constituents in sediment will be compared to freshwater sediment guidance values as compiled in *Screening and Assessment of Contaminated Sediment* (NYSDEC, June 2014).
- ***Data Presentations:*** The following data presentations will be included as appropriate based on the results:
    - Data tables for detected constituents compared to criteria as applicable for soil, groundwater, surface water and sediment
    - Figures showing constituents detected above criteria
    - Attachments including logs for soil borings, monitoring well construction, monitoring well development, and sampling.
    - EDDs of the analytical data will be provided separately as discussed in **Section 3**.
- ***Summary and Conclusions:*** This section will present a summary of the COPCs identified and their respective concentrations. Data gaps will be presented if identified.

For cost purposes, it is assumed that one round of consolidated comments will be received from NYSDEC upon review of a draft report for incorporation into a final SCR.

## 5. References

E&E, 1991. *Engineering Investigations at Inactive Hazardous Waste Sites in the State of New York - Phase II Investigations*. Ecology and Environment Engineering, p.c. 368 Pleasantview Drive, Lancaster, New York 14086.

NYSDEC, 1998. Division of Water Technical and Operational Guidance Series (TOGS) – *Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidance Values and Ground Water Effluent Guidelines* (TOGS 1.1.1). June 1998.

NYSDEC, 2014. *Screening and Assessment of Contaminated Sediment*. Division of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources Bureau of Habitat. June 24, 2014.

NYSDEC, 2020. *Sampling, Analysis, And Assessment of Per- And Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Under NYSDEC's Part 375 Remedial Programs*. October 2020.

Parsons, 2020. *Field Activities Summary Report*. Parsons. 301 Plainfield Road, Suite 350, Syracuse, New York, 13212

# TABLE 1 - SAMPLING SUMMARY
# SITE CHARACTERIZATION FOR LYNDON ROAD LANDFILL
# WA-D009810-30

| Sample Type | Analyses | Method | Number of Samples | Trip Blank | Equipment Blank | Field Duplicate | Field Reagant Blank | MS | MSD | Estimated Total Number of Samples | Unit Cost (Analytical) | Total Cost (Analytical) | Unit Cost (Data Validation) | Total Cost (Data Validation) | Deliverable | Validated (Y/N) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Test Trenches (Soil/Fill) | TCLP Method 1311 | USEPA Method 1311 | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | $ - | NA | $ - | Category A | N |
| | TCLP Method 1311 (VOCs/0 Headspace) | USEPA Method 1311 | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | $ - | NA | $ - | | |
| | TCLP VOCs | USEPA Method 8260D | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | $ - | NA | $ - | | |
| | TCLP SVOCs | USEPA Method 8270E | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | $ - | NA | $ - | | |
| | TCLP Herbicides | USEPA Method 8151 | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | $ - | NA | $ - | | |
| | TCLP Pesticides | USEPA Method 8081B | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | $ - | NA | $ - | | |
| | TCLP Inorganics | USEPA Method 6010D | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | $ - | NA | $ - | | |
| | SPLP Method 1312 | USEPA Method 1312 | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | $ - | NA | $ - | | |
| | SPLP PFAS | USEPA Method 537.1 (Modified) | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | $ - | NA | $ - | | |
| | SPLP PFAS | USEPA Method 1633 | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | $ - | NA | $ - | | |
| | Soil pH | USEPA Method 9045 | 6 | | | 1 | | | | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | Category B | Y |
| | Total Organic Carbon | Lloyd Kahn | 6 | | | 1 | | | | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 537.1 (Modified) | 12 | | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 18 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 1633 | 12 | | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 18 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | 1,4-Dioxane | USEPA Method 8270 | 7 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 10 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Volatiles + 10 | USEPA Method 8260D | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Semivolatiles + 20 | USEPA Method 8270E | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL PCBs | USEPA Method 8082A | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TAL Inorganics | USEPA Method 6010D | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Herbicides | USEPA Method 8151 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Pesticides | USEPA Method 8081B | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Cyanide | USEPA Method 9010B | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Mercury | USEPA Method 7471A | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| Soil | TCL Volatiles + 10 | USEPA Method 8260D | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | Category B | Y |
| | TCL Semivolatiles + 20 | USEPA Method 8270E | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL PCBs | USEPA Method 8082A | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TAL Inorganics | USEPA Method 6010D | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Herbicides | USEPA Method 8151 | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Pesticides | USEPA Method 8081B | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Cyanide | USEPA Method 9010B | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Mercury | USEPA Method 7471A | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | 1,4-Dioxane | USEPA Method 8270 | 12 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 15 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 537.1 (Modified) | 12 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 17 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 1633 | 12 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 17 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| Ground Water | TCL Volatiles + 10 | USEPA Method 8260D | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 8 | | $ - | | $ - | Category B | Y |
| | TCL Semivolatiles + 20 | USEPA Method 8270E | 4 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL PCBs | USEPA Method 8082A | 4 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TAL Inorganics | USEPA Method 6010D | 4 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Herbicides | USEPA Method 8151 | 4 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Pesticides | USEPA Method 8081B | 4 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Cyanide | USEPA Method 9010B | 4 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Mercury | USEPA Method 7470A | 4 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | 1,4-Dioxane | USEPA Method 8270 SIM | 8 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 11 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 537.1 (Modified) | 8 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 13 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 1633 | 8 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 13 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| Sediment | TCL Volatiles + 10 | USEPA Method 8260D | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | Category B | Y |
| | TCL Semivolatiles + 20 | USEPA Method 8270E | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL PCBs | USEPA Method 8082A | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TAL Inorganics | USEPA Method 6010D | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Herbicides | USEPA Method 8151 | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Pesticides | USEPA Method 8081B | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Cyanide | USEPA Method 9010B | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Mercury | USEPA Method 7471A | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Total Organic Carbon | Lloyd Kahn | 8 | | | 1 | | | | 9 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | 1,4-Dioxane | USEPA Method 8270 | 8 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 11 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 537.1 (Modified) | 8 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 11 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 1633 | 8 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 11 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| Suface Water | TCL Volatiles + 10 | USEPA Method 8260D | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | Category B | Y |
| | TCL Semivolatiles + 20 | USEPA Method 8270E | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL PCBs | USEPA Method 8082A | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TAL Inorganics | USEPA Method 6010D | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Herbicides | USEPA Method 8151 | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Pesticides | USEPA Method 8081B | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Cyanide | USEPA Method 9010B | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Mercury | USEPA Method 7470A | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | 1,4-Dioxane | USEPA Method 8270 SIM | 8 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 11 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 537.1 (Modified) | 8 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 12 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 1633 | 8 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 12 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| Seeps | TCL Volatiles + 10 | USEPA Method 8260D | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | Category B | Y |
| | TCL Semivolatiles + 20 | USEPA Method 8270E | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL PCBs | USEPA Method 8082A | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TAL Inorganics | USEPA Method 6010D | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Herbicides | USEPA Method 8151 | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | TCL Pesticides | USEPA Method 8081B | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Cyanide | USEPA Method 9010B | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | Mercury | USEPA Method 7470A | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | 1,4-Dioxane | USEPA Method 8270 SIM | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 537.1 (Modified) | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | | |
| | PFAS | USEPA Method 1633 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | | $ - | | $ - | | |

Notes:
- Validator and Laboratory to follow latest PFAS Guidance issued by NYSDEC.
- Total sample counts may increase or decrease depending on field observations and during finalization of the scope. Pricing will be applied on a per unit cost.
- Costs for PFAS analysis using both USEPA Methods 537.1 (Modified) and 1633 should be provided if possible. However, samples will only be analyzed using one of those methods.

K:\NYS-DEC.108781\5\194010291O.NYSDEC-Lyndon-Road-L\Docs\DWG\MXD\LyndonRd_Landfill_Rev.mxd


**LEGEND**

- EXISTING MONITORING WELL
- PROPOSED MONITORING WELL
- PROPOSED SURFACE WATER/SEDIMENT SAMPLE
- ESTIMATED FILL LIMITS
- WATER FEATURE
- PROPOSED TEST TRENCH
- TAX PARCEL BOUNDARY
- 80 LYNDON RD TAX PARCEL

**Notes**

1. Proposed test trench locations are subject to change based on field conditions and accessibility.

0 125 250 500 Feet

# LYNDON ROAD LANDFILL SITE

## SITE CHARACTERIZATION FIELD ACTIVITIES

FAIRPORT, NY

## FIGURE 1

RAMBOLL AMERICAS
INTEGRATED SOLUTIONS, INC.
A RAMBOLL COMPANY

RAMBOLL

PROJECT: 1690000XXXX | DATED: 11/11/2022 | DESIGNER: MCCOMBSI