

DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2/5/99

RCRA Corrective Action
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control

Facility Name: Wyre Wynd Inc.
Facility Address: 77 Anthony Avenue Jewett City, CT
Facility EPA ID #: CTD002590461

1. Has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the groundwater media, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been considered in this EI determination?

If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.

If no - re-evaluate existing data, or

if data are not available, skip to #8 and enter "IN" (more information needed) status code.

BACKGROUND

Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

Definition of "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI

A positive "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater has stabilized, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the original "area of contaminated groundwater" (for all groundwater "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

Relationship of EI to Final Remedies

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI pertains ONLY to the physical migration (i.e., further spread) of contaminated ground water and contaminants within groundwater (e.g., non-aqueous phase liquids or NAPLs). Achieving this EI does not substitute for achieving other stabilization or final remedy requirements and expectations associated with sources of contamination and the need to restore, wherever practicable, contaminated groundwater to be suitable for its designated current and future uses.

Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database ONLY as long as they remain true (i.e., RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 2

2. Is groundwater known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated"¹ above appropriately protective "levels" (i.e., applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action, anywhere at, or from, the facility?

X If yes - continue after identifying key contaminants, citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation.

If no - skip to #8 and enter "YE" status code, after citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation to demonstrate that groundwater is not "contaminated."

If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): Wyre Wynd, a wire manufacturing company, began operating in 1961 as a tenant in the mill at 77 Anthony Street, Jewett City, CT, which was at the time owned by Aspinook Mills (a textile manufacturer). Wyre Wynd then purchased the property, which included the mill building, a hydroelectric plant and a non-RCRA landfill, on March 3, 1970. In 1971, Wyre Wynd was acquired by the Southwire Company. Southwire Company submitted its RCRA Part A application, which identified a greater than hazardous waste container storage area in the old boiler house, adjacent to the mill building, in November 1980. In 1996, Southwire sold the mill building parcel, which included the hazardous waste storage area, to Live Wire, Inc., but retained the landfill and the hydroelectric plant (Aaron Environmental 1998). This environmental indicator determination applies only to the mill building parcel (the "facility") consisting of approximately 16.5 acres, as that parcel is on the GPR list (facility map attached).

The Wyre Wynd facility manufactures wire, employing the following manufacturing processes: wire drawing, using copper, aluminum and animal and petroleum based lubricants; electroplating, using sulfuric acid, stannous sulfate, sulfuric acid, and defoaming agents; and wastewater treatment. In addition, small quantities of paint (for reel repair) and chlorinated solvents (1986 inventory indicates 1 liter of 1,1,1 trichloroethane and 1 gallon of carbon tetrachloride), petroleum naphtha parts cleaner and other materials were used at various locations for testing and maintenance. Halogenated solvent use was discontinued in 1992 (Aaron Environmental 1999).

Groundwater at the facility is classified as GB by the CTDEP. GB indicates groundwater within a highly urbanized area of intense industrial activity that may not be suitable for direct human consumption due to waste discharges, spills, or leaks of chemicals or land use impacts. For this class of groundwater, CTDEP has established a goal of preventing further degradation of groundwater and has established criteria for groundwater and soil (pollutant mobility criteria) for these groundwaters. However, CTDEP regulations indicate that groundwater standards for GA/GAA areas are used for GB groundwater. Therefore GA/GAA Groundwater Protection Criteria, Surface Water Protection Criteria, and Residential and Industrial/Commercial Volatilization Criteria were used as the "levels" to which groundwater data was compared. Based on information provided by the Jewett City Water Company, the area to the south and east of the facility has been serviced by public water since the late 19th and early 20th century. The only well the Jewett City Water Company identified was the production well at Wyre Wynd which is used for manufacturing purposes only. Investigation at the facility indicates that groundwater flows to the north,

Footnotes:

¹"Contamination" and "contaminated" describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriate "levels" (appropriate for the protection of the groundwater resource and its beneficial uses).

west, and south of the facility and discharges to the Quinebaug river, which forms a hydraulic barrier to the facility on these sides (Aaron Environmental 2000). Extensive surface and subsurface investigation has been performed. Investigation results have shown that arsenic is found in some soils, most likely as a result of coal ash from the former coal-fired boilers.

Ten monitoring wells were installed at the 16-acre factory parcel in 1995 and sampled as part of field investigations, reported in 1995 and 1999. Groundwater samples, for which results were reported in 1995, were analyzed for pH, VOCs, SVOCs, and metals (analysis performed on filtered samples). Results showed that all constituents detected were below the GA/GAA Groundwater Protection Criteria (GWPC) except for benzene which was detected in well SW-1 at 2 $\mu\text{g/l}$, above the GA/GAA GWPC of 1 $\mu\text{g/l}$ (Aaron Environmental 1995). Groundwater samples, for which results were reported in 1999, were analyzed for pH, VOCs, SVOCs, TPH, PCBs, and metals (analysis performed on filtered samples). Wells AW-3 and AW-4 contained trichloroethylene (14 $\mu\text{g/l}$) and TPH (3,300 $\mu\text{g/l}$), respectively, at levels above the GA/GAA GWPC (5 $\mu\text{g/l}$ and 500 $\mu\text{g/l}$, respectively). Well AW-3 is located in AOC 4, the former container storage area. Soils in that AOC contained arsenic at levels above regulatory criteria to depths of 8 feet bgs, but no VOCs were detected in soils at this AOC. Well AW-4 is located in AOC 9, the chemical and materials storage area. Soils in that AOC contained arsenic at levels above regulatory criteria. In addition, samples collected in 1999 from well SW-4, located in AOC 25, contained benzene (2 $\mu\text{g/l}$) at levels above the GA/GAA GWPC of 1 $\mu\text{g/l}$. Dissolved antimony (170 $\mu\text{g/l}$) was detected in well SW-1, located in AOC 12, at levels that exceeded GA/GAA GWPC (6 $\mu\text{g/l}$). However, all contaminant levels that exceeded GA/GAA criteria were below Connecticut DEP Remediation Standard Regulation default surface water protection criteria for groundwater (SWPC) and both residential and industrial volatilization criteria (VC) for groundwater. Furthermore, exceedances appeared to be isolated and did not appear to indicate the presence of a groundwater plume (Aaron Environmental 1999).

Additional groundwater monitoring wells were installed in 2001 and samples were collected in July 2001 from 17 wells, including new wells and previous wells, on the facility parcel (results presented in Table 1; well information presented in Table 2). These samples were collected in accordance with the EPA Region I Low Stress (low flow) Purging and Sampling Procedure for the Collection of Ground Water Samples from Monitoring Wells. Analysis for VOCs, PCBs, TPH, PAHs and metals was performed on unfiltered samples. Results from 8 of the 17 wells showed levels of arsenic that exceeded both the GA/GAA GWPC (50 $\mu\text{g/l}$) and the surface water protection criteria (4 $\mu\text{g/l}$). These elevated arsenic results ranged from 100 $\mu\text{g/l}$ to 440 $\mu\text{g/l}$ (results summarized in Table 3). However, results from the other 9 wells did not detect arsenic (at a detection limit of 4 $\mu\text{g/l}$). The result from well MW-378 did not detect arsenic, but showed levels of copper (3800 $\mu\text{g/l}$) and lead (730 $\mu\text{g/l}$) in excess of their respective GA/GAA GWPC (1300 $\mu\text{g/l}$ and 15 $\mu\text{g/l}$). No lead or copper was detected in a duplicate sample from well MW-378 that was filtered prior to analysis. The result from well SW-4 did not detect arsenic, but showed an elevated level of antimony (130 $\mu\text{g/l}$) in excess of the GA/GAA GWPC (6 $\mu\text{g/l}$).

As stated above, elevated levels of arsenic have been found in soils at the facility. In addition, the July 2001 groundwater monitoring is the only groundwater sampling to date at the facility that has been performed on unfiltered samples. Therefore, while arsenic was not detected in any of the groundwater samples for which results were reported in 1995 and 1999, it is possible that elevated levels of arsenic are present in the groundwater in a mobile, particulate form and that arsenic was not previously detected in groundwater because all previous groundwater samples were filtered. However, the quality of the data from the July 2001 sampling event is questionable based on the following factors:

- 5 of the 10 samples in which elevated levels of metals were detected had turbidity readings that exceeded the 5 NTU level recommended in the Region I low stress (low flow) procedure (EPA 1996);
- the duplicate samples which were collected (from well H-1) and analyzed to evaluate sample precision for the sampling event had analytical results for arsenic of 120 $\mu\text{g/l}$ and non-detect. These results have a relative percent difference of $\pm 187\%$ which greatly exceeds the acceptance criteria of $\pm 25\%$ typically applied to evaluation of duplicate sample results.

In addition, 2 of the 8 samples in which elevated levels of arsenic were detected were upgradient of the facility. One additional upgradient sample, outside of the facility parcel (AW-10), had the second highest level of arsenic (360 $\mu\text{g/l}$) detected in groundwater samples collected as part of the July 2001 sampling event.

An additional round of groundwater monitoring was performed in January 2002. Results for this monitoring are attached in Table 4. The groundwater sampling was performed using in accordance with the EPA Region I Low Stress (low flow) Purging and Sampling Procedure for the Collection of Ground Water Samples from Monitoring Wells. Laboratory analysis was performed for total and dissolved arsenic, aluminum, antimony, beryllium, copper, lead, and tin, VOCs (EPA Method 8260), PAHs (EPA Method 8270), PCBs (EPA Method 8082), and TPH. Five wells, of the seventeen on the manufacturing parcel, had either been destroyed or were inaccessible and could not be sampled. Results from the twelve wells sampled in January 2002 showed that neither dissolved nor total arsenic was detected in any of the samples. Two of the wells where arsenic had been detected in the July 2001 sampling event (AW-4 where 170 $\mu\text{g/L}$ arsenic was detected and AW-4D where 100 $\mu\text{g/L}$ was detected) could not be sampled in January 2002, as they were covered by stored equipment and material. However, no arsenic was detected in the January 2002 sampling event in wells located within approximately 100 feet of AW-4 and AW-4D. At MW-378 where 730 $\mu\text{g/L}$ lead and 3800 $\mu\text{g/L}$ copper were detected in July 2001, no dissolved or total lead was detected in January 2002 and while 12 $\mu\text{g/L}$ dissolved copper was detected (which is below applicable levels) no total copper was detected. At SW-4, where antimony was detected in July 2001 at 130 $\mu\text{g/L}$, in excess of the GA/GAA GWPC (6 $\mu\text{g/L}$), sampling could not be performed in January 2002, as the well was destroyed. However, antimony was detected at only one well in January 2002 (46 $\mu\text{g/L}$ total antimony at AW-1). In January 2002, 510 $\mu\text{g/L}$ total copper was detected at MW-379 and 16 $\mu\text{g/L}$ total lead was detected at MW-380. These concentrations exceed the Connecticut DEP default SWPC. However, the concentrations were well below site-specific SWPC calculated in accordance with Connecticut DEP requirements.

In summary, it appears that arsenic detected in the July 2001 sampling event may have been associated with a well development problem, as arsenic was not detected in previous or subsequent sampling events. All other exceedances of "appropriate levels" appear to be isolated and do not indicate the presence of a groundwater contaminant plume.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 3

3. Has the **migration of contaminated groundwater stabilized** (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater"² as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination)?

If yes - continue, after presenting or referencing the physical evidence (e.g., groundwater sampling/measurement/migration barrier data) and rationale why contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within the (horizontal or vertical) dimensions of the "existing area of groundwater contamination"².

If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the "existing area of groundwater contamination"²) - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after providing an explanation.

If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): A groundwater contaminant plume has not been identified at the site. Available data at the site indicated that groundwater contamination is aerially limited and that contaminant concentrations exceed appropriate levels at isolated locations only, including locations upgradient from the facility. These exceedances have not been observed consistently in any given location over the course of previous groundwater sampling events.

² "existing area of contaminated groundwater" is an area (with horizontal and vertical dimensions) that has been verifiably demonstrated to contain all relevant groundwater contamination for this determination, and is defined by designated (monitoring) locations proximate to the outer perimeter of "contamination" that can and will be sampled/tested in the future to physically verify that all "contaminated" groundwater remains within this area, and that the further migration of "contaminated" groundwater is not occurring. Reasonable allowances in the proximity of the monitoring locations are permissible to incorporate formal remedy decisions (i.e., including public participation) allowing a limited area for natural attenuation.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 4

4. Does "contaminated" groundwater discharge into surface water bodies?

If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.

If no - skip to #7 (and enter a "YE" status code in #8, if #7 = yes) after providing an explanation and/or referencing documentation supporting that groundwater "contamination" does not enter surface water bodies.

If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): Site investigation results indicate that groundwater from the facility likely discharges to the Quinebaug River.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 5

5. Is the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be "insignificant" (i.e., the maximum concentration³ of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their appropriate groundwater "level," and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of discharging contaminants, or environmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or eco-systems at these concentrations)?

 X If yes - skip to #7 (and enter "YE" status code in #8 if #7 = yes), after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration³ of key contaminants discharged above their groundwater "level," the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) provide a statement of professional judgement/explanation (or reference documentation) supporting that the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is not anticipated to have unacceptable impacts to the receiving surface water, sediments, or eco-system.

 If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water is potentially significant) - continue after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration³ of each contaminant discharged above its groundwater "level," the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) for any contaminants discharging into surface water in concentrations³ greater than 100 times their appropriate groundwater "levels," the estimated total amount (mass in kg/yr) of each of these contaminants that are being discharged (loaded) into the surface water body (at the time of the determination), and identify if there is evidence that the amount of discharging contaminants is increasing.

 If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.

Rationale and Reference(s): Due to the considerations described on Page 2 of this checklist, EPA concludes that levels of contaminants being discharged to surface water are likely to be insignificant.

³ As measured in groundwater prior to entry to the groundwater-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g., hyporheic) zone.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 6

6. Can the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" (i.e., not cause impacts to surface water, sediments or eco-systems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented⁴)?

Note: This item is not applicable based on the Answer to Item 5. Proceed to item 7.

_____ If yes - continue after either: 1) identifying the Final Remedy decision incorporating these conditions, or other site-specific criteria (developed for the protection of the site's surface water, sediments, and eco-systems), and referencing supporting documentation demonstrating that these criteria are not exceeded by the discharging groundwater; OR 2) providing or referencing an interim-assessment,⁵ appropriate to the potential for impact, that shows the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is (in the opinion of a trained specialists, including ecologist) adequately protective of receiving surface water, sediments, and eco-systems, until such time when a full assessment and final remedy decision can be made. Factors which should be considered in the interim-assessment (where appropriate to help identify the impact associated with discharging groundwater) include: surface water body size, flow, use/classification/habitats and contaminant loading limits, other sources of surface water/sediment contamination, surface water and sediment sample results and comparisons to available and appropriate surface water and sediment "levels," as well as any other factors, such as effects on ecological receptors (e.g., via bio-assays/benthic surveys or site-specific ecological Risk Assessments), that the overseeing regulatory agency would deem appropriate for making the EI determination.

_____ If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater can not be shown to be "currently acceptable") - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after documenting the currently unacceptable impacts to the surface water body, sediments, and/or eco-systems.

_____ If unknown - skip to 8 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s):

⁴ Note, because areas of inflowing groundwater can be critical habitats (e.g., nurseries or thermal refugia) for many species, appropriate specialist (e.g., ecologist) should be included in management decisions that could eliminate these areas by significantly altering or reversing groundwater flow pathways near surface water bodies.

⁵ The understanding of the impacts of contaminated groundwater discharges into surface water bodies is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration to be reasonably certain that discharges are not causing currently unacceptable impacts to the surface waters, sediments or eco-systems.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 7

7. Will groundwater monitoring / measurement data (and surface water/sediment/ecological data, as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated groundwater has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area of contaminated groundwater?"

If yes - continue after providing or citing documentation for planned activities or future sampling/measurement events. Specifically identify the well/measurement locations which will be tested in the future to verify the expectation (identified in #3) that groundwater contamination will not be migrating horizontally (or vertically, as necessary) beyond the "existing area of groundwater contamination."

If no - enter "NO" status code in #8.

If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.

Rationale and Reference(s): This environmental indicator determination is conditioned on the results of quarterly groundwater sampling which is planned for the next two years.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 8

8. Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control EI (event code CA750), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination below (attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility).

YE - Yes, "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" has been verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI determination, it has been determined that the "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater" is "Under Control" at the Wyre Wynd facility, EPA ID #CT002590461, located at 77 Anthony Street in Jewett City, CT. Specifically, this determination indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater is under control, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the "existing area of contaminated groundwater" This determination will be re-evaluated when the Agency becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.

NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater is observed or expected.

IN - More information is needed to make a determination.

Completed by (signature) Stephanie Carr
(print) Stephanie Carr
(title) RCRA Facility Manager

Date March 14, 2002

Supervisor (signature) Matthew R. Bayland
(print) Matthew R. Bayland
(title) Section Chief
(EPA Region or State) Reg. I.

Date 3/10/02

References:

- Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment for Wyre Wynd dated November 6, 1995, prepared by Aaron Environmental for Southwire Company;
- State of Connecticut Remediation Standard Regulations, January 30, 1996;
- EPA Region I Low Stress (low flow) Purging and Sampling Procedure for the Collection of Ground Water Samples from Monitoring Wells, Revision 2, July 30, 1996;
- Closure Plan Part 1: Facility Information & Site Characterization Work Plan for Wyre Wynd, dated December 28, 1998, prepared by Aaron Environmental for Southwire Company;
- RCRA Closure Plan Part 2: Results of Site Characterization for Wyre Wynd, dated June 16, 1999, prepared by Aaron Environmental for Southwire Company;
- Voluntary Corrective Action Work Plan Addendum #1 for Wyre Wynd, dated October 6, 2000, prepared by Aaron Environmental for Southwire Company;
- Groundwater Sampling Results - January 2002, dated March 7, 2002, prepared by Aaron Environmental for Southwire Company

Locations where References may be found: EPA Region I, One Congress Street, Boston, MA

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers

(name) Stephanie Carr
(phone #) 617-918-1363
(e-mail) carr.stephanie@epa.gov

Table 1

Concentrations in ug/l

Copper, Water

AW-1

AW-2

AW-4

AW-4D

AW-6

AW-7

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

Tin, Water

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

13 ND<10

12

Dissolved Metals

Lead-Low Level, Dissolved

Aluminum, Dissolved

Antimony, Dissolved

Arsenic, Dissolved

Beryllium-Dissolved

Copper, Dissolved

Tin, Dissolved

Concentrations in ug/l	AW-7D	SW-7	MW-380	MW-377	MW-378	MW-379
Copper, Water	ND<10	ND<10	ND<10	ND<10	3800	ND<10
Tin, Water	10	12	ND<10	24	53	ND<10
Dissolved Metals						
Lead-Low Level, Dissolved	ND<5.0				ND<5.0	
Aluminum, Dissolved	95				26	
Antimony, Dissolved	ND<100				ND<5	
Arsenic, Dissolved	ND<4				ND<4	
Beryllium-Dissolved	ND<2.5				ND<2.5	
Copper, Dissolved	ND<10				ND<10	
Tin, Dissolved	15				15	

Concntrations in ug/l

Copper, Water

Tin, Water

Dissolved Metals

Lead-Low Level, Dissolved

Aluminum, Dissolved

Antimony, Dissolved

Arsenic, Dissolved

Beryllium-Dissolved

Copper, Dissolved

Tin, Dissolved

MW-381

MW-382

SW-2

SW-4

H-1

H-1 DUP

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

ND<10

33

35

Table 2

Well I.D.	Screen Depth	Date	Inside Diameter	initial DTW	DTB	Pumping DTW
MW-376 (MW-7D)	d	7/12/01	2"	14.3	21.35	14.40
AW-7	s	7/12/01	2"	15.01	21.49	15.10
AW-6	s	7/12/01	2"	17.9	26.66	18.10
SW-7	d	7/12/01	2"	24.5	32.45	24.60
AW-2	s	7/12/01	2"	11.54	18.44	11.66
AW-4	s	7/12/01	2"	12.94	17.60	13.10
AW-4D	d	7/12/01	2"	12.7	22.32	12.80
MW-380	s	7/12/01	2"	16.34	18.64	16.45
MW-381	d	7/12/01	2"	16.09	22.94	16.15
MW-377	s	7/13/01	2"	13.92	18.30	13.99
MW-382	d	7/13/01	2"	13.56	22.10	13.65
SW-2	s	7/13/01	2"	13.87	19.93	13.91
SW-4	s	7/13/01	2"	11.9	12.64	12.10
AW-1	s	7/13/01	2"	15.99	24.20	16.04
MW-379	s	7/13/01	2"	15.01	18.65	15.20
MW-378	d	7/13/01	2"	14.92	17.69	15.20
H-1	s	7/16/01	2"	9.36	22.38	9.40

Well I.D.	Intake Depth	Turbidity(NTU)	Comments
MW-376 (MW-7D)	18'	3.98	~12 oz./min, sunny 80's
AW-7	18'	1.40	~8 oz/min
AW-6	21'	2.60	~12 oz/min
SW-7	27'	7.00	~6 oz/min
AW-2	13'	3.16	~4 oz/min
AW-4	16'	6.01	~4 oz/min
AW-4D	19.5'	9.10	~4 oz/min
MW-380	17.5'	3.00	~4 oz/min
MW-381	22.5'	6.00	~4 oz/min
MW-377	16'	4.00	~6oz./min, sunny, 80's
MW-382	20'	12.00	~6oz./min
SW-2	17'	3.92	~6oz./min
SW-4	12.25'	11.10	~6oz./min
AW-1	22'	3.62	~6oz./min
MW-379	16'	3.53	~6oz./min
MW-378	17'	15.00	~6oz./min, excessive silting
H-1	16'	2.20	~10 oz./min

Table 3: Summary of Analytical Results from Samples in which Elevated Concentrations of Metals were Detected

Wyre Wynd July 2001 Groundwater Sampling (results reported in draft, September 2001)

Well	Arsenic Conc.($\mu\text{g/l}$)	Turbidity (NTU)	Well Position	Previous Arsenic Results (1995 & 1999)
AW-2	440	3.16	downgradient	non detect
AW-4	170	6.01	downgradient	non detect
AW-4D	100	9.10	downgradient	new well
AW-6	150	2.60	upgradient	non detect
AW-7D	180 ¹	3.98	upgradient	new well
MW-380	110	3.00	downgradient	new well
MW-378	ND ²	15.00	downgradient	new well
MW-382	110	12.00	downgradient	new well
SW-4	ND ³	11.10	downgradient	non detect
H-1	120 ⁴	2.20	in hydroelectric plant	non detect

¹ A duplicate sample from AW-7D that was filtered prior to analysis did not detect arsenic at a detection limit of 4 $\mu\text{g/L}$.

² No arsenic was detected, but lead was detected at 730 $\mu\text{g/L}$ and copper was detected at 3800 $\mu\text{g/L}$. No lead or copper was detected in a filtered sample (respective detection limits: 5 $\mu\text{g/L}$ and 10 $\mu\text{g/L}$).

³ No arsenic was detected, but antimony was detected at 130 $\mu\text{g/L}$.

⁴Duplicate sample did not detect arsenic at a detection limit of 4 $\mu\text{g/L}$.

Table 4

US EPA New England
RCRA Document Management System (RDMS)
Image Target Sheet

RDMS Document ID# 981

Facility Name: <u>Wyre Wynd</u>	
Phase Classification: <u>R-13</u>	
Document Title: <u>Environmental Indicator (EI) Determination, Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control (CA750YE) - Wyre Wynd</u>	
Date of Document: <u>03-18-2002</u>	
Document Type: <u>EI Determination</u>	
Purpose of Target Sheet:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oversized	<input type="checkbox"/> Privileged
<input type="checkbox"/> Page(s) Missing	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please Provide Purpose Below)
<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	
Comments: <u>Map of Groundwater Sampling Wells</u>	

* Please Contact the EPA New England RCRA Records Center to View This Document *