CONSULTANTS' DAY 2015

V DNR's Remediation & Redevelopment Program

Site Investigations: Common Mistakes and Helpful Hints

Soil – Groundwater – NAPL / NR 716

Jennifer Borski, Hydrogeologist Wisconsin DNR







- Easier closure decisions for simple sites, including excavation remedies,
- Reduced long-term costs (delay/re-work),
- Improved site conceptual models, particularly for complex sites, and
- Reminder: absences on Closure Forms require meaningful explanations.

Subject Media





Part 2: Vadose Zone - vapor phase (Presentation B – Part 2)

Vadose Zone – Problems



- All potential sources not identified/sampled,
- All potential contaminants of concern not evaluated, including fill,
- Direct contact risk evaluations not complete,
- Extent incompletely defined, including offsite,

(continued next slide)

Vadose Zone – Problems



- Poorly constructed or incomplete cross sections,
- Less than clear post-excavation results, and
- Failure to identify structural impediments.

Vadose Zone – More Data



Benefits:

- Better fill characterization,
- Needed for background and statistical determinations,
- Better definition of VI risk, and
- Better definition of DC risk, particularly for contaminants w/o viable field indicators.

Vadose Zone Soils





Shallow Excavation: DC risk - no field indicators

Ο

 \mathbf{O}

С

Additional Grid of Sample Points

Post-Excavation Remaining DC risk (re-do, likely)

Boring w/no exceedance

- Boring w/exceedance
- **X** Confirmation Sidewalls

GW Aquifer – Problems



- Lateral/vertical extent of plume not defined,
- All contaminants of concern not evaluated,
- Range of lateral GW flow direction not illustrated,
- Vertical gradients not determined,
- Aquifer matrix sampling limited,

(continued next slide)

GW Aquifers - Problems



- Hydraulic conductivities (HC) not measured or improperly evaluated,
- Discounting data w/o adequate justification,
- Iso-concentration maps missing; relying on ES/PAL (closure) maps,
- Poor flow interpretations, and
- NA contaminant trends not adequately evaluated; variability needs to be qualified.

GW Aquifers - Piezometers



- Locate downgradient of source,
- Evaluate vertical gradients, including 3-D vector analysis, and
- HC needed considering limitations of aquifer matrix sampling - consider transducers/data loggers.

GW Aquifers









- Over reliance on measured well thicknesses,
- GWL vs. LNAPL thickness plots missing,
- Recognition of LNAPL below water table,
- Interim/remedial actions for historical sites: LNAPL bailing passive collectors vacuum truck extraction

(continued next slide)





- LNAPL transmissivity not measured, and
- Laser Induced Fluorescence (LIF) survey needed or inadequately evaluated,





Prior comments concerning improved aquifer matrix characterization and HC measures.

Why?

Downward flowing DNAPL will flow laterally along the top of low conductivity intervals.

LNAPL





LNAPL





Summary of Key Points



- Easier closure decisions for simple sites, including excavation remedies,
- Reduced Long-Term costs (delay/re-work),
- Improved site conceptual models, particularly for complex sites, and
- Reminder: absences on Closure Forms require meaningful explanations.

Questions & Contacts

South East Region: <u>Jim.Delwiche@Wisconsin.gov</u> (262) 574-2145 South Central Region: <u>Michael.Schmoller@Wisconsin.gov</u> (608) 275-3303 Northeast Region: <u>Keld.Lauridsen@Wisconsin.gov</u> (920) 662-5420 West Central Region: <u>David.Rozeboom@Wisconsin.gov</u> (715) 839-3710 Northern Region: <u>Christopher.Saari@Wisconsin.gov</u> (715) 685-2920 Central Office Policy & Technical Resources Section: <u>Judy.Fassbender@Wisconsin.gov</u> (608) 266-7278 or <u>David.Swimm@Wisconsin.gov</u> (608) 264-8766



Thank you for attending Consultants' Day

