FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility

County Case No. 93070

State Clearinghouse No. 93101036

December 1997

County of Los Angeles
Department of Regional Planning

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER EXPANSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
1.0 INTRODUCTION	**1-1**
1.1 Summary Project Description	1-1
1.2 Revised Project Description	1-1
1.2.1 Environmental Impacts of Revised Project	1-2
1.2.2 Summary of Environmental Impacts for Revised Project	1-13
1.3 Public Review of the Draft EIR	1-13
1.4 Final EIR Contents	1-14
2.0 GENERAL RESPONSES	**2-1**
2.1 Summary of Public Comments	2-1
2.2 General Responses	2-1
3.0 RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS	**3-1**
4.0 RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENTS	**4-1**
5.0 ADDITIONS, CLARIFICATION AND ERRATA	**5-1**

LIST OF TABLES

1-1 List of Agencies, Organizations and Citizens Commenting on the Draft EIR (Written Comments)

1-2 List of Persons Commenting on the Draft EIR (Oral Comments)

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER EXPANSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

1 Draft EIR Final Grades
2 Revised Final Grades
3 Revised Drainage Plan
4 Viewpoint 1 - Revised Grading Plan
5 Viewpoint 2 - Revised Grading Plan
6 Viewpoint 3 - Revised Grading Plan
7 Viewpoint 1 - Draft EIR Grading Plan
8 Viewpoint 2 - Draft EIR Grading Plan
9 Viewpoint 3 - Draft EIR Grading Plan

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Ground Water Remediation Program Description

SECTION 1.0
INTRODUCTION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center (LLRC) project consists of the expansion of an existing Class III Sanitary Landfill, located within unincorporated Los Angeles County, approximately two miles northeast of the City of Lancaster. The existing project site has a total area of 276 acres. The existing permitted landfill operates on 102 acres of this property. Ancillary facilities occupy an additional 20 acres.

The project applicant, Waste Management of Lancaster, is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and related operating permits to expand the landfill. Expansion is proposed in two areas-the Western Expansion Area (WEA) and the Eastern Expansion Area (EEA). The WEA is immediately west and adjacent to the existing disposal area and encompasses 62 acres now used as a borrow area. The EEA is comprised of 112 acres of presently undeveloped land to the east and is separated from the existing site by 10th Street East.

The project applicant proposes to increase the daily permitted disposal rate from the existing permitted rate of 1,000 tons per day (tpd) to 1,700 tpd. The expansion would add approximately 14.5 million cubic yards or 8.7 million tons of disposal capacity. The project proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) would result in the increase of the currently permitted elevation of 2,395 feet above mean sea level (msl) to 2,420 msl. The landfill would continue to be used for the disposal of dewatered sewage sludge (solid content greater than 50 percent). The applicant also proposes to dispose of asbestos and non-hazardous contaminated soil.

The project includes several recycling facilities including a redemption center, an area used for the storage of residential and commercial recyclables, and an existing composting operation which utilizes green waste and shredded wood waste as feedstocks.

1.2 REVISED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

At the September 24, 1997 hearing of the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission, the Commission tentatively approved the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility with a condition that modified the proposed grading plan for the project. The condition reduces the maximum elevation of the landfill proposed in the Draft EIR by

20 feet to 2,400 feet above mean sea level (MSL). To achieve a landform which better blends with the surrounding area, this condition would result in a less undulating landform than depicted and evaluated in the Draft EIR (See Figure 1). To comply with this condition, the applicant has prepared a revised final grading plan shown in Figure 2.

This modification to revise the grading plan would not result in further modifications to the project. The site life and incremental phasing proposed for the new grading plan is the same as that proposed for the grading plan in the Draft EIR. The maximum daily disposal rate (1,700 tons per day) also would not change if the site is developed in accordance with the revised grading plan.

1.2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF REVISED PROJECT

The following analysis compares the environmental impacts of the revised grading plan to the impacts of the grading plan in the Draft EIR.

1. Geotechnical Resources: The modification to the grading plan will not change the footprint to be developed. The project's susceptibility to impacts related to seismic events, the need for or the nature of proposed drainage improvements, or the effects of wind erosion would be substantially the same as documented in the Draft EIR.
2. Flood Hazard: Under peak runoff conditions, the revised grading plan will not measurably increase peak runoff flows or increase the need for drainage control facilities compared to flows generated by the grading plan evaluated in the Draft EIR. A revised drainage plan is presented in Figure 3.
3. Fire Hazard: The modified grading plan would not result in an increased potential for landfill fires or otherwise create a condition which would require additional fire protection staff or equipment at the project site.
4. Noise: Factors contributing to noise impacts for the project include trucks and other vehicles on adjacent roads and the mix of equipment used during construction and operations at the project site. Since the revised grading plan will not effect these factors, no additional noise impact is anticipated in conjunction with the revised grading plan.
5. Water Quality: The water quality section of the Draft EIR documents groundwater quality, groundwater recharge, and surface water impacts of the project. The proposed grading plan will result in the same impacts described in the Draft EIR.



LEGEND

- EXISTING CONTOURS
- SPOT ELEVATION
- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- H.P. — DRAINAGE HIGH POINT
- DRAINAGE COURSE
- ℄ — DRAINAGE FLOWLINE
- 2380 — FINAL GRADE
- SLOPE TO NATURAL GRADE

200 0 200 400

SCALE IN FEET

PROPRIETARY NOTE

THIS DRAWING AND ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY AND ALL DESIGNS AND SPECIFICATIONS (ALL THE FOREGOING BEING HEREIN AFTER COLLECTIVELY REFERRED TO AS "DRAWINGS") ARE PROPERTY OF WASTE MANAGEMENT OF CALIFORNIA, INC. (WMC). THE DRAWINGS ARE NOT TO BE USED EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY AUTHORIZED BY WMC. THE RECIPIENT OF THE DRAWINGS COVENANTS AND AGREES NOT TO REPRODUCE, FURTHER DISSEMINATE OR IN ANY WAY DISCLOSE THE CONTENT OF DRAWINGS TO ANY THIRD PARTY WITHOUT FIRST HAVING OBTAINED WMC'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT. RECIPIENT AGREES TO RETURN THE DRAWINGS AND ANY COPIES TO WMC IMMEDIATELY UPON WMC'S REQUEST

NOTES

1- AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY BY WALKER & ASSOCIATES OF SEATTLE, WASHINGTON; FLOWN FEBRUARY 27,1992 AT A SCALE OF 1"=100' AND 2' CONTOUR INTERVAL.

2- PROPERTY BOUNDARY WEST OF 10TH STREET EAST PREPARED BY J. LANCE HILL (CA. L.S. NO 4088), DATED 8-18-01.

3- PROPERTY BOUNDARY EAST OF 10TH STREET EAST PREPARED BY KEITH ENGINEERING, PALMDALE, CA. (1988).

4- ELEVATIONS ARE RELATIVE TO U.S.G.S. MEAN SEA LEVEL DATUM.

LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 1
DRAFT EIR FINAL GRADES

Source: Rust Environment & Infrastructure



LEGEND

- EXISTING CONTOURS
- SPOT ELEVATION
- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- LIMIT OF EXISTING REFUSE
- (2385) FINAL GRADE
- SLOPE TO NATURAL GRADE



NOTES

1- AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY BY WALKER & ASSOCIATES OF SEATTLE, WASHINGTON; FLOWN FEBRUARY 27,1992 AT A SCALE OF 1"=100' AND 2' INTERVAL CONTOUR.

2- PROPERTY BOUNDARY WEST OF 10TH STREET EAST PREPARED BY J. LANCE HILL (CA. L.S. NO 4089), DATED 8-18-81.

3- PROPERTY BOUNDARY EAST OF 10TH STREET EAST PREPARED BY KEITH ENGINEERING, PALMDALE, CA. (1988)

4- ELEVATIONS ARE RELATIVE TO U.S.G.S. MEAN SEA LEVEL DATUM.

PROPRIETARY NOTE

THIS DRAWING AND ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY AND ALL DESIGNS AND SPECIFICATIONS (ALL THE FOREGOING BEING HEREIN AFTER COLLECTIVELY REFERRED TO AS 'DRAWINGS') ARE PROPERTY OF WASTE MANAGEMENT OF CALIFORNIA, INC. (WMC). THE DRAWINGS ARE NOT TO BE USED EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY AUTHORIZED BY WMC. THE RECIPIENT OF THE DRAWINGS COVENANTS AND AGREES NOT TO REPRODUCE, FURTHER DISSEMINATE OR IN ANY WAY DISCLOSE THE CONTENT OF DRAWINGS TO ANY THIRD PARTY WITHOUT FIRST HAVING OBTAINED WMC'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT. RECIPIENT AGREES TO RETURN THE DRAWINGS AND ANY COPIES TO WMC IMMEDIATELY UPON WMC'S REQUEST

LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 2
REVISED FINAL GRADES

Source: Rust Environment & Infrastructure



LEGEND

- EXISTING CONTOURS
- SPOT ELEVATION
- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- H.P. — DRAINAGE HIGH POINT
- DRAINAGE COURSE
- ℄ — DRAINAGE FLOWLINE
- 2390 — FINAL GRADE
- SLOPE TO NATURAL GRADE

200 0 200 400

SCALE IN FEET

PROPRIETARY NOTE

THIS DRAWING AND ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY AND ALL DESIGNS AND SPECIFICATIONS (ALL THE FOREGOING BEING HEREIN AFTER COLLECTIVELY REFERRED TO AS 'DRAWINGS') ARE PROPERTY OF WASTE MANAGEMENT OF CALIFORNIA, INC. (WMC). THE DRAWINGS ARE NOT TO BE USED EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY AUTHORIZED BY WMC. THE RECIPIENT OF THE DRAWINGS COVENANTS AND AGREES NOT TO REPRODUCE, FURTHER DISSEMINATE OR IN ANY WAY DISCLOSE THE CONTENT OF DRAWINGS TO ANY THIRD PARTY WITHOUT FIRST HAVING OBTAINED WMC'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT. RECIPIENT AGREES TO RETURN THE DRAWINGS AND ANY COPIES TO WMC IMMEDIATELY UPON WMC'S REQUEST

NOTES

1- AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY BY WALKER & ASSOCIATES OF SEATTLE, WASHINGTON; FLOWN FEBRUARY 27,1992 AT A SCALE OF 1"=100' AND 2' CONTOUR INTERVAL.

2- PROPERTY BOUNDARY WEST OF 10TH STREET EAST PREPARED BY J. LANCE HILL (CA. L.S. NO 4089), DATED 8-18-81.

3- PROPERTY BOUNDARY EAST OF 10TH STREET EAST PREPARED BY KEITH ENGINEERING, PALMDALE, CA. (1988).

4- ELEVATIONS ARE RELATIVE TO U.S.G.S. MEAN SEA LEVEL DATUM.

LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 3
REVISED DRAINAGE PLAN

Source: Rust Environment & Infrastructure

6. Air Quality: The revised grading plan will not affect factors contributing to air emissions such as vehicular emissions from trucks and other vehicles accessing the site, vehicular emissions from on-site equipment, flare emissions, or odor from landfill gas and waste received at the project site.

7. Biota: The revised grading plan does not involve any modification to the proposed area to be developed. Accordingly, impacts to biotic resources will be the same as described in the Draft EIR.

8. Cultural and Paleontological Resources: The revised grading plan does not involve any modification to the proposed area to be developed. Accordingly, impacts to biotic resources will be the same as described in the Draft EIR.

9. Traffic: The revised grading plan will not result in additional traffic or pavement maintenance impacts at or near the landfill. Traffic impacts will be the same as described in the Draft EIR.

10. Environmental Safety: This section of the Draft EIR discusses environmental safety impacts related to methane gas emissions and the presence of small volumes of household hazardous waste in municipal solid waste. The revised grading plan will not result in a change to the impacts described in the draft EIR.

11. Visual Impacts: The project described in the DEIR assesses the impacts of increasing the maximum permitted elevation of the project from 2,395 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to 2,420 feet amsl, an increase of 25 feet. The revised grading plan increases the maximum permitted elevation to 2,400 feet amsl, an increase of 5 feet over the current permitted elevation. The project applicant has agreed to this height restriction and has developed the grading plan presented in Figure 2.

The revised grading plan will reduce the visual impact of the project because it will result in less incremental change to the visual environment than the project evaluated in the Draft EIR primarily due to the reduced height. In addition, the aesthetic form created by the revised grading plan which results in a flat upper deck will blend better with the aesthetic character of the natural, adjacent area which is flat, desert topography than the grading plan assessed in the Draft EIR which had an undulating deck. Figures 4 through 6 illustrate the viewpoints of the revised grading plan and Figures 7 through 9 illustrate the viewpoints of the DEIR grading plan.



LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 4

VIEWPOINT 1

REVISED GRADING PLAN



LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 5

VIEWPOINT 2

REVISED GRADING PLAN



LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 6

VIEWPOINT 3

REVISED GRADING PLAN



LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 7

VIEWPOINT 1

DRAFT EIR GRADING PLAN



LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 8

VIEWPOINT 2

DRAFT EIR GRADING PLAN



LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 9

VIEWPOINT 3

DRAFT EIR GRADING PLAN

The rationale for concluding that the visual impact of the revised grading plan is not significant is the same rationale as that for the alternative evaluated in the Draft EIR. There will be no increase in the visible size of the landfill from the east and west where the existing landfill either obstructs the view of the expansion area in the foreground or buffers the view of the expansion area behind the existing landfill. Views from the north and south will be adversely effected due to the increased landfill area visible but this impact is not considered significant because (1) the increased visible area is not great (2) unique environmental or manmade visual features are not obstructed, (3) the increase will not obstruct views from important public gathering places and (4) views from a County Scenic Highway are not obstructed. The same measures (landscaping, berms) will be implemented to mitigate visual impacts as with the previous grading plan.

1.2.2 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR REVISED PROJECT

The Draft EIR indicates that the project will result in a significant NO_x impact and a significant cumulative NO_x impact which cannot be mitigated to levels of non-significance. All other residual impacts of the project are less than significant. As discussed above, the revised grading plan will not result in any additional significant impacts.

1.3 PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIR

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Draft EIR was prepared by the County of Los Angeles to evaluate the environmental impacts of this project. The Draft EIR was published on May 5, 1997 and circulated through the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 93101036). All governmental agencies and interested parties known to have a direct interest in or review authority over all or portions of the proposed project were mailed copies or notified of the Draft EIR. The distribution list was circulated in the Draft EIR as part of the Notice of Completion. In addition, the availability of the Draft EIR was advertised in the Antelope Valley Press and La Opinion on May 13, 1997. Copies of the Draft EIR were also distributed to the Lancaster Public Library.

The public review period for the Draft EIR extended from May 5, 1997 to June 27, 1997 (45 days). The RPC held public hearings on this project in Room 150, Hall of Records, 320 Temple Street, Los Angeles on July 9, 1997 and September 24, 1997 and in the Ana B. Davis Room of the Lancaster Public Library at 601 West L Street, Lancaster on July 23, 1997. The RPC visited the site prior to the July 23, 1997 public hearing.

Oral testimony and written comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIR were received at the July 9 and 23, 1997 hearings. The applicant's rebuttal to comments was presented at the hearing of July 23 and September 24, 1997. The County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning (DRP) received fifteen comment letters on this project. Oral comments and testimony were received by several individuals at the public hearings. The DRP reviewed all letters and comments in the preparation of this Final EIR. The RPC must consider all public comments and responses included in the Final EIR prior to certifying the Final EIR and taking action to approve or deny the CUP. Implementation of all mitigation measures contained in this Final EIR will be required as a condition of the CUP.

1.4 FINAL EIR CONTENTS

This Final EIR incorporates by reference the contents of the Draft EIR, in compliance with Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and includes the following:

- A list of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;
- Written comments and hearing testimony received on the Draft EIR;
- The responses to comments regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR raised in written comments or at public hearings, and;
- Revisions to the Draft EIR.

Table 1-1 lists each of the comment letters received by agency, organization or individual, author and date. Table 1-2 lists those individuals who provided oral comments at the public hearings. Letters in support of the project were also received. However, since no response was required for the support letters they are not included in this Final EIR. The support letters are filed as part of the project record at the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning office.

TABLE 1-1

LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND CITIZENS COMMENTING ON THE DRAFT EIR (Written Comments)

Comment Letter ID No.	Affiliation	Name	Date of Written Response
1	County of Los Angeles, Transportation/Planning Division	Barry Witler, Transportation Planning/Assessments	May 12, 1997
2	California Historic Resources Inventory	Phyllisa Eisentraut, Coordinator	May 12, 1997
3	California Department of Transportation	Carl Shiigi, Associate Transportation Planner	May 13, 1997
4	City of Lancaster	Brian Hawley, Director of Community Development	May 20, 1997
5	City of Lancaster	Bob Weithofer, Traffic Engineering Manager	May 22, 1997
6	Southern California Gas Company	Jim Hammel, Technical Services, Northern Region	May 29, 1997
7	County of Los Angeles, Fire Department	David Leininger, Assistant Chief, Forestry Division, Prevention Bureau	May 29, 1997
8	California Department of Transportation	Stephen Buswell, IGR/CEQA Program Manager, Transportation Planning Office	June 2, 1997
9	County of Los Angeles, Building and Safety/Land Development Division	Randine Ruiz, Subdivision Mapping Section	June 5, 1997
10	County of Los Angeles, Traffic and Lighting Division	K.E. Weary	June 5, 1997
11	County of Los Angeles, Materials Engineering Division	Kenneth H. Erhard	June 11, 1997
12	Southern California Association of Governments	Viviane Douche-Boulos, Manager Intergovernmental Review	June 23, 1997
13	California Integrated Waste Management Board, Permitting and Enforcement Division	Jeannie Blakeslee, Environmental Review Section	June 24, 1997
14	High Desert Citizens Against Pollution	Lyle Talbot	June 29, 1997
15	County of Los Angeles, Department of Health Services	Richard Hanson, Chief, Solid Waste Management Program	July 17,1997
16	Department of the Air Force Headquarters Air Force Flight Test Center (AFMC), Edwards Air Force Base, California	Wendy L. Waiwood, Chief, Plans and Policies Division	June 27, 1997

TABLE 1-2

LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
LIST OF PERSONS COMMENTING ON THE DRAFT EIR
(Oral Comments)

Name	Address	Public Hearing Testimony 7-9-97	7-23-97
Lyle Talbott	633 West Avenue J-11 Lancaster, CA 93534	*	*
John Waters	2617 West F-2 Lancaster, CA 93534		*
Dean Webb	1000 East Caperton St. Lancaster, CA 93534		*
Lee Richardson	5112 West Avenue L-12 Quartz Hill, CA		*
Sharon Smock	45437 35th Street Lancaster, CA 93534		*

Section 2.0 includes general responses formulated for the main topics of concern expressed in the comment letters and at the public hearings. All letters have been reproduced in their entirety in Section 3.0 of this document. Section 3.0 includes responses to each substantive written comment received regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR during the public review process. Each individual comment is identified by a comment number with an identical number assigned to the corresponding response. Section 4.0 includes responses to oral comments not addressed in Sections 2.0 and 3.0.

Where written comments or hearing testimony led to additions, clarifications, errata and other changes in the Draft EIR, these revisions are listed by section, page and paragraph number in Section 5.0. Information regarding the ground water remediation program at the existing landfill is included in Appendix A.

SECTION 2.0
GENERAL RESPONSES

2.0 GENERAL RESPONSES

2.1 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

The County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning (DRP) reviewed all substantive written and oral comments received on the content and adequacy of the Draft EIR for the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility project and determined there were several main topics expressed in the comments. Those topics include:

- The need for the project,
- The visual impacts of the proposed grading plan,
- The relationship of the project to Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) order to cease disposal in unlined areas,
- Impacts related to the disposal of dewatered sewage sludge,
- The relationship of the project to the diversion requirements of AB 939, and
- Inconsistencies between the requested permit expiration date (2012) and portions of the Draft EIR

These topics were those raised which related to the content and adequacy of the EIR. Responses to these topical comments are provided below. In addition, many individual comments were received on the EIR. These comment letters are reproduced in Section 3.0 and are each followed by responses to substantive comments in each letter.

It should also be noted that many comments were received expressing opinions regarding the project, expressing policy preferences regarding the project or making comments unrelated to the adequacy of the EIR. State CEQA Guidelines do not require a response to these comments and, therefore, responses to these types of comments are not included herein.

2.2 GENERAL RESPONSES

General Response No. 1: Need for the Project

Several comments were received questioning the need for the project. Commentors questioned whether the proposed maximum disposal rate (1,700 tons per day) is appropriate given historical rates, which are much lower. They also asked whether the need was based on the assumption that waste would be imported from other areas and

whether providing this additional disposal capacity would impede efforts to achieve AB 939 diversion requirements. Comments such as these were received from the High Desert Citizens Against Pollution (HCAP) and Sharon Smock.

The need for this project is based on estimated waste generation rates, estimated diversion rates and disposal capacity needs which are quantified in the Los Angeles County, Countywide Siting Element, approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in June, 1997. These estimates assume that local governments throughout Los Angeles County will achieve the diversion requirements of AB 939 (25% diversion in 1995, 50% in the year 2000). These estimates also indicate that without new or expanded capacity of landfills within the county, a countywide disposal shortfall of 2,042 tpd will arise in the year 2000 increasing to 25,705 tons per day in the year 2010. This estimated future disposal capacity shortfall will be greater if local governments do not achieve the 50% diversion mandate of AB 939 because less diversion creates the need for more disposal capacity. Figure ES-1 of the Countywide Siting Element identifies the Lancaster Landfill as potential expansion of an existing Class III (municipal solid waste) landfill. In the July 9, 1997 public hearing, Mr. Michael Mohajer of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Waste Management Division, indicated that the project is one of a series of landfill expansions and proposed new landfills in the Siting Element that could meet a portion of the County's future disposal needs. The Siting Element does not evaluate the suitability of this or other designated sites for development. The suitability of the project, or any other proposed landfill project, is determined through compliance with land use and environmental review requirements and compliance with other applicable regulatory requirements.

As indicated in the Draft EIR (Page 3-16), the additional refuse capacity is expected to extend the life of the landfill beyond the year 2012. Since disposal in the WEA and EEA is not likely to occur prior to 1999, the time frame for the project is generally consistent with the anticipated countywide disposal capacity shortfall.

The commentors are correct that recent historical disposal rates in the Antelope Valley do not support the higher daily tonnage proposed for the project. Further, due to the expansion of the Palmdale Landfill there is no immediate disposal capacity shortfall in the Antelope Valley. However, during historic times of major development in the Antelope Valley, the site accepted up to 1,000 tpd. The need for the project is not premised on the need to import waste from other jurisdictions. As indicated above, the project may be needed to meet countywide disposal needs in the year 2000 even with expansion of the Palmdale Landfill. If AB 939 objectives are not achieved, disposal rates

will be higher and available countywide disposal capacity exhausted more rapidly. An upturn in the local economy may also reduce disposal capacity sooner than anticipated.

Written comments and hearing testimony was received regarding the Draft EIR not including the adopted SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments) population growth forecasts in determining the need for the project. Upon review of the adopted SCAG forecasts for Northern Los Angeles County (the SCAG subregion which includes the Antelope Valley), the forecasts are almost twice the forecasts shown on Page 3-10 of the Draft EIR and hence imply the need for more disposal capacity than the forecasts shown in the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR (Page 3-14) states that all estimates of disposal capacity and the need for the project can only be regarded as rough approximations due to the dynamic nature of solid waste management practices. These forecasts, like all forecasts, are based on historical trends and anticipated future behavior, which may or may not occur as predicted. However, the additional disposal capacity provided by this project is consistent with the need for additional disposal capacity indicated in the Countywide Siting Element, the current official County estimate of needed disposal capacity.

General Response No. 2: The Visual Impacts of the Grading Plan

Several comments were received questioning the EIR's assessment of visual impacts in view of the proposed increase in elevation and the contrast between the aesthetic form of the landfill and the aesthetic characteristics of the area in the vicinity of the project site. Comments questioned the lack of landscaping at the entrance to the facility, the density of landscaping around the perimeter of the site, and the use of native or climate adaptive plant species on exposed slopes. Comments of this nature were received from the City of Lancaster, HCAP and Sharon Smock.

The comments received question the conclusion drawn in the Draft EIR that impacts will be reduced to levels of non-significance through the implementation of the proposed landscaping plan, the use of visual berms and interim vegetative cover. These comments do not acknowledge that the existing landfill is already an element of the current environmental setting and that the project impact is limited to the incremental change resulting from the horizontal and lateral expansion of the facility.

The project described in the DEIR assesses the impacts of increasing the maximum permitted elevation of the project from 2,395 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to 2,420

feet amsl, an increase of 25 feet. In receiving hearing testimony, the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) has requested a revised plan to increase the maximum permitted elevation to 2,400 feet amsl, an increase of 5 feet over the current permitted elevation. The project applicant has agreed to this height restriction and has developed an alternative grading plan. A description of the revised grading plan and a visual analysis of its impacts was previously discussed in Section 1.2 of this document.

The revised final grading plan will reduce the visual impact of the project because it will result in less incremental change to the visual environment than the project evaluated in the Draft EIR. In addition, the aesthetic form created by the revised grading plan, which results in a flat deck, will blend better with the aesthetic character of the local area which is flat, desert topography rather than the grading plan assessed in the Draft EIR which had an undulating deck.

The rationale for concluding that the visual impact of either grading plan is not significant is provided on Page 5.11-8 of the Draft EIR. The same rationale applies to the revised grading plan. There will be no increase in the visible size of the landfill from the east and west where the existing landfill either obstructs the view of the expansion area in the foreground or buffers the view of the expansion area behind the existing landfill. Views from the north and south will be adversely effected due to the increased landfill area visible but this impact is not considered significant because (1) the increased area visible is not great (2) unique environmental or manmade visual features are not obstructed, (3) the increase will not obstruct views from important public gathering places and (4) views from a County Scenic Highway are not obstructed.

General Response No. 3: The Relationship of the Project to the RWQCB Order to Cease Disposal In Unlined Areas

A February 6, 1997 order of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) cites concerns about the existing (unlined) landfill creating methane and its effect on groundwater quality. This order indicates that it is not appropriate to permit long-term discharges to unlined disposal areas. The order requires that disposal to unlined areas cease by August 1, 2000. In view of the RWQCB order, written comments and hearing testimony questioned whether it was appropriate to increase the elevation of the existing disposal area and to develop the WEA adjacent to the existing disposal area in a manner where leachate or gas from the WEA could continue to migrate through the unlined disposal area and adversely impact groundwater quality. These types of comments were received from HCAP and Sharon Smock.

The design of the project, as proposed by the applicant, will include a liner and leachate collection and recovery system (LCRS) over the entirety of the existing as well as the expanded waste footprint. A cross-section of the liner system is presented in Figure 3-7 of the Draft EIR. This liner and LCRS are designed to direct the flow of leachate and gas condensate away from the unlined and native disposal areas. The system is designed in accordance with State and Federal requirements for a liner system. The RWQCB has direct permitting authority over the liner design in issuing amended Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) to allow for discharge into the expansion areas.

General Response No. 4: Disposal of Sewage Sludge

Several comments were received regarding the disposal of dewatered sewage sludge. These comments requested information on the type and source of sludge to be accepted and contended that the disposal of sludge may result in groundwater contamination. Concern was also expressed regarding analytical procedures used to test the chemical composition of the sludge and what assurances there were that sludge deemed hazardous would be disposed in an appropriate hazardous waste treatment or disposal facility. Comments of this nature were received from HCAP, Sharon Smock and other speakers at the July 23, 1997 Public Hearing in Lancaster.

The acceptance of sludge at the landfill is not new. The Lancaster Landfill is currently permitted to dispose of dewatered sewage sludge with a solids content of greater than 50%. Typically, dewatered sewage sludge has a solids content of 15 to 20 percent. After it is dried at the wastewater treatment plant, its solids content is increased to over 50%.

Sludge has been accepted at the landfill from the Avenue D Treatment Facility operated by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County since it opened. The DEIR indicates that sludge disposal needs may reach about 10 wet tons per day (Page 2-7).

Analytical tests which establish whether the sludge is suitable for disposal in a Class III municipal solid waste landfill are conducted by the wastewater treatment plant operator and are reviewed by the RWQCB and landfill operator. Test results are reviewed and approved prior to accepting this material at the landfill. If chemical composition of the sludge is not appropriate for disposal in a Class III (municipal solid waste) landfill, the wastewater treatment plant operator will be denied access to the landfill.

The disposal of dewatered sewage sludge occurs at a number of Southern California Landfills including Bradley West, Simi Valley, and Puente Hills. To protect against ground water contamination resulting from the acceptance of this material, the project is designed with a liner and LCRS to protect soils and groundwater from gas and leachate infiltration. Further, a network of groundwater monitoring wells will be installed in up-gradient and down-gradient locations to detect leakage from the landfill mass (See DEIR Page 3-38).

The comments received at the July 23, 1997 Public Hearing expressed general environmental concerns regarding the disposal of sewage sludge. They requested the information provided above but did not raise specific questions regarding the Draft EIR's assessment of impacts related to the disposal of sludge.

General Response No. 5: Disposal of Asbestos Waste

Several comments were received regarding the disposal of asbestos waste. These comments primarily requested information on the source and handling procedures for the waste. Comments were made by the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services (LACDHS) requesting that the Final EIR reflect current regulations and stipulate adherence to them.

Both friable and non-friable asbestos waste is proposed to be accepted at the LLRC from residential and commercial demolition contractors throughout the Antelope Valley and elsewhere.

The project applicant will comply with the most recent regulation promulgated for the handling and disposal of asbestos containing waste contained in CCR, Title 14, Chapter 3.5, Section 17897, et. seq. as well as other applicable local, state and federal regulations in force at the time asbestos containing waste will be accepted.

The following design and operating requirements of CCR, Title 14, Chapter 3.5, Section 17897.18 will replace the procedures described in the Draft EIR to be complied with by the landfill operator:

a) establish a designated asbestos containing waste disposal area for the disposal of asbestos containing waste as defined in Section 17897.10;
b) establish a site control program with work zones and control points at the designated asbestos containing waste disposal area. At a minimum, work zones should be established for the active face, designated disposal area, handling and support areas;

c) segregate asbestos containing waste from refuse. At no time shall asbestos containing waste be disposed with refuse;
d) establish a means to prevent any visible emissions outside the designated asbestos containing waste disposal area during handling and disposal operations;
e) maintain the integrity of leak-tight containers and/or packaging at all times during the handling and disposal operations;
f) minimize the release and exposure of asbestos containing waste after placement in the disposal area by not compacting the waste prior to application of cover, at no time shall compaction equipment come into contact with asbestos containing waste containers or packaging;
g) after deposit, the owner or operator shall cover the asbestos containing waste with sufficient cover material to ensure complete coverage of the disposed asbestos containing waste and prevent re-exposure during continuing disposal operations;
h) cover shall be applied to the asbestos containing waste at a frequency that minimizes releases to the environment and threats to human health, but at a minimum of once every operational hour. An alternative frequency may be prescribed if the Enforcement Agency deems if appropriate.

Section 17897.10 defines a "designated asbestos containing waste disposal area" as an area specifically designated for the disposal of asbestos containing waste at a solid waste facility. A specifically designated area is a dedicated disposal area. The area shall be identified on a survey plat containing the location and dimensions of the area with respect to permanently surveyed vertical and horizontal control monuments. This survey plat shall be prepared and certified by a professional land surveyor licensed in California or a civil engineer authorized to practice land surveying in California. The designated area shall be delineated with physical barriers, such as a fence and signs. The project applicant will comply with other requirements of CCR, Title 14, Chapter 3.5, as applicable

Other comments by the LACDHS and oral commentors on specific asbestos handling procedures are responded to in Sections 3 and 4.

General Response No. 6: The Relationship of the Project to the Diversion Requirements of AB 939.

Several questions were received from the RPC regarding the project's relationship to County programs to comply with the requirements of AB 939 to divert 25% of solid waste from landfills by 1995 and to divert 50% by the year 2000. These questions concerned whether the approval of this (or other) landfill projects may impede AB 939 compliance, the status of County programs to meet these requirements, and the programs being implemented by the project applicant to increase recycling and diversion.

As discussed under General Response No. 1, the Los Angeles Countywide Siting Element provides countywide estimates of disposal capacity which indicate that assuming local governments meet AB 939 diversion requirements, a capacity shortfall may arise in 2000 if no new or expanded disposal facilities are approved. If local jurisdictions do not meet AB 939 requirements, disposal capacity will be utilized more rapidly and the capacity shortfall will occur sooner. From this perspective, the Siting Element views the project as one of a number of proposed landfill expansions that could meet anticipated disposal capacity needs. Since quantification of these needs are consistent with the diversion requirements of AB 939, there is no basis to conclude that the additional capacity provided by this project would have a negative effect upon achieving AB 939 requirements.

As indicated in the public hearing testimony of Mr. Mike Mohajer of the Los Angeles County, Department of Public Works, Waste Management Division, the relationship of the project to AB 939 requirements is a question of what actions the project proponent is taking to assist the County in increasing diversion. In this case, Waste Management of Lancaster is implementing the following measures:

- Requesting permission from the State to utilize green waste as alternative daily cover (ADC) at the landfill.
- Providing a redemption center for recyclables at the landfill.
- Composting shredded wood waste and green waste at the landfill.
- Using a portion of the project site to transfer loads of commingled recyclables to sorting facilities.
- Recovering scrap metal from loads of waste received at the landfill.
- Recycling and reusing of construction and demolition materials received at the landfill for on-site access roads and other on-site uses.

General Response No. 7: Inconsistencies between Requested Permit Date (2012) and Portions of the Draft EIR

At the July 9, 1997 public hearing, there was discussion between a Planning Commissioner, County staff, and the project applicant regarding what date the proposed Conditional Use Permit would expire. All parties agreed that the proposed expiration date is August 1, 2012. However, one of the Planning Commissioners expressed confusion because portions of the EIR utilized analyses that were based on an expiration date in the year 2010.

The three portions of the analysis affected by the expiration date are the traffic, noise, and air quality impact assessments. The air quality and noise impact assessments are based on traffic volumes that will be greater in the year 2012 than in the year 2010. To update this analysis, the traffic consultant has prepared a series of new tables (Tables 6-11) and figures (Figures 7 to 12) to replace tables and figures with the same numbers in the traffic study (Draft EIR, Appendix G). The use of the year 2012 does not effect the results of the traffic analysis, i.e. impacts are considerably less than significant.

Changing the expiration date does not change the results of the air quality impact assessment. As shown in Table 5.6-10 of the Draft EIR (Page 5.6-18), the estimated emissions for carbon monoxide, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates are substantially less than the SCAQMD threshold criteria for determining the significance of air quality impacts. The minor increase in emissions due to increased traffic would not result in project emissions exceeding the SCAQMD significance thresholds.

The same is true for noise. As indicated in Table 5.4-7, noise increases on all but one traffic link are anticipated at less than 1 decibel. Increases on these links would also be less than 1 decibel using the year 2012 as an expiration date. Since noise increases of less than 1 decibel are not discernible to the human ear, these impacts are not significant. On the one link where projected noise would exceed 1 decibel (Avenue F east of Division Street), increased noise in the year 2012 would still be considerably be less than 65 CNEL and would therefore not be considered significant.

SECTION 3.0
RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

May 12, 1997

TO: Terri M. Grant
Environmental and Special Studies

FROM: Barry S. Witler Barry S. Witler
Transportation Planning/Assessments

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING FACILITY

1-1 [As requested, we have reviewed the subject document and have no comments.

If you have any questions, please contact Andy Narag at Extension 4356.

AHN
P-3:llrc2

cc: Planning (Witler)

Response to:

Barry S. Witler
Transportation Planning/Assessment
County of Los Angeles DPW, Transportation Planning

1-1 Comment noted, no response required.

California Historic Resources Inventory

Regional Information Center
Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura Counties

RECEIVED
MAY 19 1997
REGIONAL PLANNING
L.A. COUNTY

May 12, 1997

Kerwin Chih
Department of Regional Planning
Impact Analysis Section
Los Angeles County
320 W. Temple St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Draft EIR for the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility

Dear Mr. Chih:

2-1 Thank you for submitted the above identified Draft EIR to our office for review. Our records indicate the project area has been surveyed for cultural resources and no archaeological sites were identified. Our office concurs with your determination of no significant impact to known archaeological, and supports your halt-work condition for cultural resources encountered during any phase of the construction.

If you have any questions concerning our review, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Sincerely,

Phyllisa Eisentraut

Phyllisa J. Eisentraut
Coordinator

South Central Coastal Information Center • UCLA Institute of Archaeology • Fowler Museum of Cultural History • Los Angeles, California 90095
Telephone: (310) 825-1980 FAX: (310) 206-4723

Response to:

Phyllisa J. Eisentraut
Coordinator
Regional Information Center

2-1 Comment noted, no response required.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS AND TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

PETE WILSON, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7, 120 SO. SPRING ST.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-3606
TDD (213) 897-6610

May 13, 1997

IGR/CEQA cs/970521
Lancaster
Ave. F, 2.5 NE of Lancaster
Lancaster Landfill
Case No. 93070
Vic. LA-14-71.19
SCH# 93101036

Mr. Kerwin Chih
Los Angeles County Dept. of Regional Planning
Impact Analysis Section
320 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Chih:

3-1 Thank you for including Caltrans in the environmental review process for the above-mentioned project. Based on the information received and on our preliminary review, we have no comments at this time.

3-2 However, to reduce vehicular congestion and conflicts with commute traffic we recommend that trucks traveling on the CMP Roadway System be limited to off-peak commute periods

If you have any questions regarding our response, refer to Caltrans IGR/CEQA Record# 970521 and please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (213) 897-1726.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN BUSWELL
IGR/CEQA Program Manager

Carl Shiigi

CARL SHIIGI
Associate Transportation Planner

cc: Mr. Chris Belsky, State Clearinghouse

Response to:

Stephen Buswell
IGR/CEQA Program Manager
Department of Transportation, District 7

3-1 Comment noted, no response required.

3-2 The landfill does not and will not generate a substantial number of trips during peak commute periods. In fact, refuse collection trips are scheduled to avoid these periods to minimize costs. During peak commute hours, refuse collection vehicles are generally collecting refuse and recyclables from residential and commercial generators. Collection vehicles leave their routes and travel over the roadway system to the landfill during the late morning and early afternoon or during off-peak commute hours.

City of Lancaster
44933 North Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534-2461
805-723-6000

May 20, 1997

Frank C. Roberts
Mayor
Rev. Henry W. Hearns
Vice Mayor
Jim Jeffra
Council Member
Deborah A. Shelton
Council Member
Michael Singer
Council Member
James C. Gilley
City Manager

Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning
Impact Analysis Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attn: Mr. Kerwin Chih, Principal Regional Planning Assistant

RE: County Case No. 93070 - SCH No. 93101036

Dear Mr. Chih:

In response to above referenced Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), I wish to submit the following comments relative to the proposed expansion of the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center (LLRC). Although we acknowledge the need for expansion of this facility to serve the projected growth in the North County Subregion, we feel that the DEIR is deficient in the areas of concern addressed below.

4-1 1. The DEIR acknowledges impacts to the pavement structure of the adjacent streets namely Avenue F and 10th Street East (See Summary, Pg. 6). However, the mitigation measure proposed is to "contribute on a fair-share, pro rata basis to the City of Lancaster for reconstruction of the pavement and thickening of the base/subbase".

4-2 It is a commonly recognized and accepted principle that *the use which creates the impact (or need) must mitigate the impact (or need).* All new development must construct or pay for capital improvements necessitated by the new development. In this case, it is obvious (and so recognized in the DEIR) that the proposed expansion will create the need to make substantial improvements to the roads accessing the LLRC. The installation of these improvements, therefore, should be made a condition of approval of the permit to expand.

4-3 The mitigation measure proposed in the DEIR is inadequate and is not a viable proposal since the sections of Avenue F and 10th Street East identified are <u>not located within the City of Lancaster</u>. The City of Lancaster cannot legally expend monies for projects located outside of its corporate boundaries. Perhaps the County of Los Angeles should or will participate in the cost of upgrading these street sections since the project is located within County unincorporated territory and it is the County that is the permitting agency.

4-4 2. The DEIR identifies a service area which includes communities beyond the Antelope Valley (Action, Wrightwood, Gorman, etc.) and yet there is no analysis of potential environmental impacts or hazards associated with this transfer. How many vehicle trips are involved? What are the impacts of this traffic vis-a-vis noise and air quality? What are the consequences of potential accidents especially with trucks carrying such special wastes as sewage sludge, asbestos, or contaminated soil? Accidents along Highway 138 and Freeway 14 have a major impact on vehicular traffic movements and patterns. This matter should be addressed before any action is taken to certify the Final EIR.

4-5 3. To minimize impacts associated with transfers, the use permit for this expansion should be conditioned to allow the LLRC to accept only waste material generated in Los Angeles County - preferably, only that generated in the Antelope Valley.

4-6 4. Since the LLRC is the highest and most expansive man-made feature proposed for the Antelope Valley, it will be highly visible from properties many miles removed. It would seem that landscaping should be given some serious consideration to mitigate the lasting visual impact that this project will create on the community. The paucity of landscaping depicted in Figure 3-3b for the new entrance is pathetic. If this is an example of screen-type mitigation to be employed on the remainder of the project, then the visual impact of this project must be identified as significant. Landscaping should be increased in intensity, particularly along the adjacent streets with the density of trees being increased to at least one tree for each 20 feet of lineal distance. Native or climate adaptive plant species also should be mandated on all exposed slopes. For the DEIR to conclude a landfill operation of this magnitude to be part of a community's natural man-made environment or urban expansion and, therefore, not a significant impact (pp. 6-10, 6-13) is an insult to the entire north county population.

5. Attached to this transmittal is a copy of the comments prepared by the City's Traffic Engineering Manager in response to his analysis of the traffic section of the DEIR relating to existing conditions, thresholds of significance, impacts, mitigation measures, and the traffic impact study contained in the Appendices Document.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this proposal.

Sincerely,

Brian N. Hawley

Brian N. Hawley
Director of Community Development

BNH:jh

Response to:

Brain N. Hawley
Director of Community Development
City of Lancaster, Department of Community Development

4-1 The impacted roadway segments are located in unincorporated Los Angeles County, not within the City of Lancaster. The Draft EIR (Table 2-2, Page 6 of 6) erroneously indicates that the segments are located within the City of Lancaster. This statement has been revised in Section 4 of this document to substitute "unincorporated Los Angeles County" for the "City of Lancaster".

4-2 The analysis indicates that the impacts will be limited to the identified roadway segments in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Whether the installation of these improvements is made a condition of approval will be determined by the lead agency, the County of Los Angeles Regional Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

4-3 The mitigation measure is a viable proposal to be implemented by the County of Los Angeles. Please see response to Comment No. 4-1.

4-4 For the past several years, the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center has accepted random loads of solid waste from these three communities. It is estimated that the landfill currently receives one to two truckloads per month from Acton and Wrightwood where Waste Management Inc. has a collection contract with a State agency. Even if the frequency of trips from these communities increased to several per day, it would not be possible to estimate a discernible difference in traffic, traffic safety, noise, and air quality impacts from those estimated in the Draft EIR.

Similarly, the impacts associated with the transportation of special wastes along Highway 138 and Freeway 14 are not anticipated to be significant. Under worst-case conditions, potentially one or two vehicles per day carrying sludge may come to the landfill. Irrespective of its point of origin, this amount of traffic is not likely to result in a significant impact. It is unlikely that very much traffic with asbestos or contaminated soil would come from outside the Antelope Valley because of the availability of facilities that accept these materials elsewhere in the County. It would be entirely speculative to attempt to quantify or estimate the origin of trips bringing these special wastes to the landfill from outside the Antelope Valley.

4-5 Because a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision limits the ability of local governments to restrict or regulate the flow of solid waste in this manner, the County does not have the authority to condition the permit as suggested in this comment.

4-6 Please see response to General Response No. 2.

The landscaping presented in Figure 3-3b is for the entrance only. Section 5.11.3.2 of the Draft EIR discusses interim visual mitigation measures which include berms to buffer views of the operation and landscaping with an interim vegetative cover. This vegetative cover would be suited to the climate of the area consistent with the final landscaping discussed in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR.

City of Lancaster
44933 North Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534-2461
805-723-6000

Frank C. Roberts
Mayor

Rev. Henry W. Hearns
Vice Mayor

Jim Jeffra
Council Member

Deborah A. Shelton
Council Member

Michael Singer
Council Member

James C. Gilley
City Manager

May 22, 1997

Kerwin Chih
Principal Regional Planning Assistant
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report
Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility
Project No. 93070
Sch. No. 93101036

Dear Mr. Chih:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above captioned document. The City of Lancaster Traffic Division offers the following comments regarding this document. There may be additional comments from other City Departments and Divisions:

Section 5.9.1.1

5-1 The description of Avenue H is incorrect. The flyover is complete, and is designed for eight lanes, but is currently striped for six lanes. There is no intersection of Avenue H and Sierra Highway. The analysis should be modified to remove the intersection of Avenue H and Sierra Highway.

The speed limit on Division is 55 MPH north of Avenue H and 50 MPH south of Avenue H.

Section 5.9.1.3

5-2 Since 10th Street East (Challenger Way) provides the primary access to this site, and since the Avenue H overpass is the only route that cannot be interrupted by train traffic in the vicinity of the site, the intersection of Avenue H and 10th Street East (Challenger Way) should be studied.

Section 5.9.1.5

5-3 The use of the ICU method of analysis is inappropriate for a stop sign controlled intersection. This method assumes that the intersection is signalized and that the signals are optimized. Thus, it over states the capacity if it is used for a stop controlled intersection and will not identify the need for additional lanes or other mitigation. Section 5.9.3.5 states that none of the intersections analyzed will warrant the installation of traffic signals, therefore, a different method of analyzing capacity is necessary in order to accurately measure the impacts of the proposed project. We recommend the use of the Highway Capacity Manual Unsignalized Intersection methodology. This will allow a proper determination of LOS and determination of the impacts and mitigation. The impact analysis must be repeated using this methodology in order to determine the impacts and mitigations that may actually be required.

Section 5.9.3.1.1

5-4 The traffic generation does not appear appropriate for this project. It does not appear to include an adequate number of employees to operate this facility, it does not appear to include drop off by local contractors or citizens, on site recycling, and also local refuse collection operated by Waste Management or other companies. Thus, the impacts are under estimated throughout the report.

Section 5.9.3.6

5-5 This analysis is limited to the pavement sections adjacent to the site rather than those roadway segments that are impacted by the proposal. This does not present a valid analysis of the impacts of this proposal. The trip distributions previously presented in this document indicate that Avenue G between Division and SR 14, and SR 14 and Division between Avenue F and Avenue G should be analyzed in order to determine the impacts of this project. The importance of SR 14 and the roadways connecting it to the landfill was previously acknowledged in the report and thus the impacts on these roadways of the project must be recognized, analyzed and mitigated.

Table 5.9-8

5-6 This table does not correspond to any scenario previously presented. The distribution data previously presented shows that there are a negligible number of trips on Avenue G east of Division.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding these comments, please contact me at (805) 723-6048.

Sincerely,

Bob Weithofer

Bob Weithofer
Traffic Engineering Manager

BW:ww

cc: Jeff Long, Director of Public Works
Brian Hawley, Director of Community Development

Response to:

Bob Weithofer
Traffic Engineering Manager
City of Lancaster, Traffic Engineering

5-1 The Draft EIR has been modified to indicate that the Avenue H flyover is complete (See Section 4 of the Final EIR). This facility was under construction when the traffic study was first completed. Please note, however, that all future scenarios in the Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix G) assumed the construction of the flyover. Section 4 also includes a modification of the Draft EIR to indicate the speed limit on Division Street.

5-2 All of the analyzed intersections and roadway segments currently operate at LOS A, and are projected to operate at LOS A under future conditions. The traffic volumes and operating conditions at the Avenue H/10th Street intersection would most likely be similar to the adjacent intersections that were analyzed in the Draft EIR. Please note that the list of intersections to be analyzed, project trip distribution and generation, and information regarding cumulative impacts were facsimiled to the City of Lancaster on November 18, 1996. All of the City's comments, as presented in their letter of November 21, 1996 were incorporated into the traffic analysis.

5-3 In the absence of traffic study guidelines for the City of Lancaster, the Los Angeles County traffic study guidelines were used for all locations analyzed in the traffic study. Pursuant to instructions from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works staff, the ICU methodology was used in the level of service of all 13 intersections. It should also be noted that the County's criteria for a significant impact is based on V/C ratio, not on average delay (the measure used to determine significance using the HCM methodology).

Based upon other traffic studies conducted by DKS Consultants, the results from the use of ICU and HCM methodologies tend to be similar at intersections operating at very good levels of service. In order to prove this correlation for this project, an evaluation of the intersection that is projected to operate under the worst future conditions was done which is the intersection of Avenue G and Sierra Highway under cumulative (year 2012) + project (w/o Avenue F extension) PM peak hour conditions, using the HCM methodology. The results indicated that the intersection is projected to operate at a borderline LOS A/LOS B (5.5 seconds of average delay) which is very similar to the LOS A resulting from the application

of the ICU methodology. Using both the ICU and HCM methodologies at this intersection, where future conditions are worst, the impacts are not significant. Accordingly, use of HCM at the other intersections analyzed in the traffic study would also result in less than significant impacts.

5-4 The City of Lancaster received information regarding the scope of the traffic study, including information regarding trip generation, in a facsimile dated November 18, 1996. The City's comments on the traffic study, as provided in their letter of November 21, 1996, were incorporated into the traffic study. The trip generation characteristics of the project are described on Page 3 of Appendix G of the Draft EIR. Although this comment does not specifically identify which trip generation categories may have been underestimated, it is estimated that if project-generated traffic doubled, project and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

5-5 These three roadway segments were evaluated for the project's potential impact on pavement structure. Revised Table 5.9-8 (Table 11 of the Traffic Study) presents the results of this analysis. As indicated in this table, the project will not cause a significant impact on any of these roadway segments.

5-6 The distribution pattern used in the assignment of trips assumes that 30 percent of the project-generated trips travel along Avenue G to/from the east. The traffic volume figures illustrate negligible trips during the morning or afternoon peak hour. Table 5.9-8 of the Draft EIR (Table 11) presents the project trips on a daily basis, not during the morning or afternoon peak hour.

The Gas Company®

May 29, 1997

Paul McCarthy / Kerwin Chih
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Regional Planning-Impact Analysis
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Southern California
Gas Company
9400 Oakdale Avenue
Chatsworth, CA
91313-2300

Mailing Address:
Box 2300
Chatsworth, CA
91313-2300

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report-Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility. County Case No. 93070. (Gas Atlas # OBA 74)

Dear Mr. McCarthy:

This letter is not to be interpreted as a contractual commitment to serve this proposed project, but only as an information service. Its intent is to notify you that Southern California Gas Company has facilities in the area where this project is proposed. Gas service can be provided without significant impact on the environment from a **2" medium pressure main in Avenue F-10 at Division.** 6-1

Service would be in accordance with our policies and extension rules on file with the California Public Utilities Commission at the time contractual arrangements are made. The availability of natural gas service, as set forth in this letter, is based on present conditions of gas supply and regulatory policies. As a public utility, Southern California Gas Company is under the jurisdiction of the California Public Utilities Commission. We can also be affected by actions of federal regulatory agencies. Should these agencies take any action which affects gas supply or the condition under which service is available, gas service will be provided in accordance with the revised conditions.

To assist in developing natural gas fired mitigating applications or a refueling facility, please call Mary Cornell at **209-739-2240**.

Sincerely,

Jim Hammel
Technical Services, Northern Region
818-701-3324

c: P. Fitzgerald, Lancaster District
M. Cornell, Mktg. (ML # 9393)
City Correspondence File

laco_com.doc

Response to:

Jim Hammel
Technical Services, Northern Region
The Gas Company

6-1 Comment noted, no response required.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

FIRE DEPARTMENT

1320 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-3294

(213) 881-2481

P. MICHAEL FREEMAN
FIRE CHIEF
FORESTER & FIRE WARDEN

RECEIVED
JUN 5 1997
REGIONAL PLANNING
L.A. COUNTY

May 29, 1997

Mr. Kerwin Chih
Principal Regional Planning Assistant
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Chih:

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT – (CITY OF, LANCASTER) LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING FACILITY, PROJECT #93-070 STATE CLEARING HOUSE #93101036 – (EIR #442/1997)

This document has be reviewed by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department's Planning, Engineering, and Forestry Divisions. The following are their comments:

7-1

The development of this project must comply with all applicable code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire flows, and fire hydrants. Commercial, multiple-residential fire flows shall be 5,000 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for a five-hour duration.

This property is located within the area described by the Forester and Fire Warden as Fire Zone 3, and must comply with all applicable code and ordinance requirements for construction access, water mains, fire hydrants, fire flows and brush clearance. Specific fire and life safety requirements for the construction phases will be addressed at the plan check stage.

All on-site driveways shall provide a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet clear to the sky to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of any building.

The minimum width of 26 feet shall be increased when any of the following conditions exist for Commercial/Industrial developments:

- *28 feet - When buildings are more than three stories in height or 35 feet in height above ground level. The centerline of the access roadway shall be located parallel to and within 30 feet of the exterior wall on one side of the proposed structure.*

High density residential (apartments, condominiums, etc.) shall provide a minimum clear width of 26 feet which allows no parking and shall be designated as a fire lane with appropriate signage.

- ***34 feet - Allows parallel parking on one side of the access way.***
- ***36 feet - Allows parallel parking on both sides of the access way, except in front of fire hydrants.***

All driveways shall be labeled as "Fire Lane" on the final building plans. Labeling is necessary to ensure access for Fire Department use.

Additional fire life safety requirements will be addressed at building plan check. Fire Department requirements for access, fire flow and hydrants are addressed at the Los Angeles County Subdivision committee meeting when approval for tentative subdivision maps are considered.

A. *Class II Standpipe System: Shall be provided and located within 200 feet of dumping operations and shall have sufficient 1-1/2 inch hose with a variable-fog nozzle to reach all portions of such operations.*

7-1 *In lieu of a Class II standpipe system, the use of water tender trucks may be permitted, provided each is equipped with 2-1/2 inch outlets for Fire Department use.*

Access Roads: Approved access roads shall be provided and maintained at all times around the dumping areas to provide assess for firefighting equipment. Weeds, grass and combustible vegetation shall be removed for a distance of ten feet on both sides of all access roads used by rubbish trucks or the public.

Firebreaks:
A firebreak consisting of the clearance of all dry weeds and grass shall be provided around the dumping areas. Secondary firebreaks, as required by the Fire Department, shall be provided and maintained in order to prevent the spread of fire beyond the dump facility. Such secondary firebreaks shall be not less than 60 feet in width.

Fencing:
The property shall be adequately fenced to prevent entry of unauthorized persons and the gates shall be locked at all times when the facility is not supervised. An attendant shall be on duty when the site is open to the public.

Smoking Restrictions:
"NO SMOKING" signs shall be posted on the facility and at all entrances to the facility. Smoking regulations, as required by this Department, will be strictly enforced.

7-1

Fires in Dumping Operations:
Dumping operations shall be carried on in such a manner as to minimize the possibility of fires occurring in the waste material. Waste material dumped on the premises shall be immediately mixed with earth, and under no circumstances shall any exposed surface of face of combustible materials be left uncovered at the close of daily operations.

Reporting of Fires:
Any fire which occurs on the premises shall be reported immediately to the Fire Department and it shall be the responsibility of the operator to immediately extinguish any such fire. A telephone shall be installed for the purpose of notifying the Fire Department in case of fire.

Should you have any further questions, please contact this office at (213) 881-2481.

Very truly yours,

DAVID R. LEININGER, ASSISTANT CHIEF
FORESTRY DIVISION, PREVENTION BUREAU

DRL:jmb

Response to:

David R. Leininger
Assistant Chief, Forestry Division, Prevention Bureau
County of Los Angeles, Fire Department

7-1 This comment letter lists the permit requirements of the County of Los Angeles, Fire Department. The final design of the project will meet these requirements. No further response is required.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS AND TRANSPORTATION AGENCY PETE WILSON, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7, 120 SO. SPRING ST.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-3606

To: Chris Belsky
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Date: June 2, 1997

File No.: IGR/CEQA #970546
DEIR
Lancaster Landfill &
Recycling Facility Project
Vic. LA-014-71.99

From: Stephen J. Buswell
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Subject: Project Review Comments: SCH NO. 93101036

Caltrans had received and reviewed the draft environmental impact report for the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility expansion project. The project proposes expanding the existing 102-acre landfill by 174 acres and increasing the currently permitted elevation of 2,395 feet mean sea level (msl) to 2,420 feet msl. The project also plans to add asbestos waste for acceptance at the landfill.

8-1 Based on the existing traffic, and the projected traffic as shown in the EIR, the Level of Service (LOS) "A" remains unchanged on SR14 at Avenues F, G, and H Interchange. Therefore, we have no comment at the present time. However, we may contact you again should we identify any matter that should be brought to your attention.

8-2 We would like to remind you, any transportation of heavy construction equipment which requires the use of oversized transport vehicle on State highways will require a Caltrans transportation permit. We recommend that large-sized trucks be limited to off-peak commute periods.

Thank you for including Caltrans in the environmental review of the project. If you have any questions, please call Nora Piring at (213) 897-0486 or the undersigned at (213) 897-4429 and refer to our IGR/CEQA number above.

Original Signed By
STEPHEN J. BUSWELL
IGR/CEQA Program Manager
Transportation Planning Office

cc: Paul McCarthy
L.A. County Regional Planning
320 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RECEIVED
JUN 4 1997
REGIONAL PLANNING
L.A. COUNTY

Response to:

Stephen J. Buswell
IGR/CEQA Program Manager
Department of Transportation, District 7

8-1 Comment noted, no response is required.

8-2 Comment noted. It is not anticipated that large-sized trucks will be used in conjunction with the project. However, if large-sized trucks are needed for construction, they will be limited to off-peak commute periods.

June 5, 1997

TO: Terri Grant
Environmental and Special Studies Section
Planning Division

Attention Vik Bapna

FROM: Randine M. Ruiz HW/for
Subdivision Mapping Section
Building and Safety/Land Development Division

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING FACILITY
COUNTY CASE NUMBER 93070

As requested, we reviewed the subject report. The following comments are provided for inclusion in your response to the Department of Regional Planning.

9-1

- Make an irrevocable offer of future right of way 32 feet from centerline on 5th Street East (the most westerly boundary), Avenue F-8 (the most southerly boundary), and along the most easterly boundary of the easterly expansion area.

- Make an irrevocable offer of future right of way 30 feet along the most southerly boundary of the easterly expansion area.

- Make an irrevocable offer of future right-of-way for a 13-foot property line return radius at the corners of Avenue F/5th Street East, 5th Street East/Avenue F-8, 10th Street East/ Avenue F-8, and 10th Street East/the most southerly boundary of the easterly expansion area.

- Dedicate the right to restrict vehicular access on Avenue F and 10th Street East.

- Dedicate vehicular access rights on Avenue F-8, 5th Street East, the most southerly and easterly boundaries of the easterly expansion area, unless the Department of Regional Planning requires the construction of a wall. In such cases, complete access rights shall be dedicated.

- Construct base and pavement for two travel lanes (one lane in each direction) on Avenue F fronting the easterly expansion area to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

- Construct additional base and pavement for left-turn and right-turn lanes and transitions on 10th Street East and Avenue F (west of 10th Street East) at the project entrances to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

9-1

- Construct additional base and pavement to provide a left-turn lane and transitions on all approaches at the intersection of Avenue F and 10th Street East to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

- Reconstruct damaged pavement on Avenue F to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

- Prepare signing and striping plans for Avenue F and 10th Street East to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

- Comply with the traffic mitigation measures, if any, as recommended by our Traffic and Lighting Division.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Henry Wong at (818) 458-4915.

HW:file\CUP93070.eir

cc: Design
Traffic and Lighting

Response to:

Randine M. Ruiz
Building and Safety/Land Development Division
County of Los Angeles, DPW Subdivision Mapping Section

9-1 Comments noted. The recommendations will be incorporated into the final design of the project which include vehicular accessways and adjacent roadways.

June 5, 1997

TO: Dave Yamahara
Planning Division

FROM: K. E. Weary
Traffic and Lighting Division

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (DECEMBER 1996)
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
LANCASTER AREA

As requested, we have reviewed the subject document. The document contains a previously reviewed traffic study dated December 23, 1996. Our March 10, 1997 comments (copy attached) are still valid and applicable to this project.

If you have any questions, please contact Suen Fei Lau of our Traffic Studies Section at Extension 5909.

SFL:lg
T-2/LANCLND1

Attach.

cc: Ronald J. Ornee

March 10, 1997

TO: David Yamahara
Planning Division

FROM: K. E. Weary
Traffic and Lighting Division

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (DECEMBER 1996)
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
LANCASTER AREA

We have reviewed the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center Traffic Impact Study prepared and submitted by DKS Associates, the Traffic Consultant for the subject project. The proposed project is for the expansion of the existing landfill operation area. The project will be located in the southwest and southeast quadrants of Avenue F and 10th Street East.

The proposed project consists of the expansion of the existing 102 acres to 276 acres by expanding 62 acres west of the existing site designated as the western expansion area and another 112 acres to the east of the existing site designated as the eastern expansion area. The proposed expansion will increase the current daily refuse disposal operation from 650 tons per day (tpd) to 1,700 tpd at its ultimate capacity in the Year 2010. The proposed expansion is estimated to generate approximately 400 additional passenger car equivalent trips per day.

The study is based on two transportation system scenarios with and without the extension of Avenue F west of Division Street. The extension of Avenue F west of Division Street is included in the City of Lancaster's long range circulation plan. We agree with
10-1 the study that the project will not have a significant impact on any of the 23 intersections/roadways analyzed whether or not Avenue F is extended.

We also agree with the study that the additional truck traffic that the project will generate <u>will</u> have a significant impact on the
10-2 existing pavement structure for the following roadway segments. The project should be solely responsible for upgrading the pavement section for these roadway segments to provide for a 20-year traffic index of 8.5.

- Avenue F between Division Street and 10th Street East
- 10th Street East between Avenue F and Avenue G

10-3 In addition, the developer should dedicate adequate road right of way and construct project frontage street improvements along Avenue F and 10th Street East satisfactory to this Department. Detailed striping plans for these roadway improvements should be submitted to this Department for review and approval.

We recommend the State of California Department of Transportation and the City of Lancaster review this project for impacts/mitigations within their jurisdictions.

If you have any questions, please contact Suen Fei Lau of our Traffic Investigations and Studies Section at Extension 5909.

SFL:lg
T-2/LANCLAND

cc: Ronald J. Ornee
Materials Engineering (Lancaster)

Response to:

K. E. Weary
Traffic and Lighting Division
County of Los Angeles, DPW, Traffic and Lighting

10-1 Comment noted, no response required.

10-2 Please see response to Comment No. 4-2.

10-3 Comment noted. The development of geometric roadway design plans will be coordinated with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

June 11, 1997

TO: Dave Yamahara
Planning Division

Attention Vikram Bapna

FROM: Kenneth H. Erhard KE
Materials Engineering Division

REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

The attached documents for the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility project, No. 93070, have been reviewed by the Materials Engineering Division.

Comments are attached.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Fred Gharib at (818) 458-4925.

sm
ME-0/EIR:93070.eir

Attach.

GEOTECHNICAL REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
MATERIALS ENGINEERING DIVISION

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION 93070 LOCATION Lancaster

DATE RECEIVED 5/7/97 DEADLINE 6/12/97 DATE REVIEW COMPLETED 6/12/97

DATA REVIEWED DEIR dated April 1997

11-1 [X] **The proposed project has no significant effects from a geology and soils standpoint, provided the appropriate ordinances and codes are followed.**

[ ] **Review of the initial study/geotechnical report indicates that the proposed project will not have significant effects on the checked environmental factor(s) from a geology and/or soils standpoint. See discussion.**

[ ] **The environmental document is inadequate from a geology and soils standpoint. See discussion.**

DISCUSSION OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND/OR REPORT INADEQUACIES

Geotechnical Engineer

Engineering Geologist

Original to: Planning Division or
LDMA/Processing Center Section

cc: Development Review Section File

Rev. 02/15/96
F-RS:FORM.9

Response to:

Kenneth H. Erhard
Materials Engineering Division
County of Los Angeles, DPW, Materials Engineering Division

11-1 Comment noted, no response is required.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street

12th Floor

Los Angeles, California

90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers: • President: Supervisor Judy Mikels, Ventura County • First Vice President: Mayor Bob Bartlett, City of Monrovia • Second Vice President: Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Los Angeles County • Immediate Past President: Mayor Dick Kelly, Palm Desert

County of Imperial: Sam Sharp, Imperial County • David Dhillon, El Centro

County of Los Angeles: Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Los Angeles County • Richard Alarcon, Los Angeles • Richard Alatorre, Los Angeles • Eileen Ansari, Diamond Bar • Bob Bartlett, Monrovia • George Bass, Bell • Sue Bauer, Glendora • Hal Bernson, Los Angeles • Marvin Braude, Los Angeles • Robert Bruesch, Rosemead • Laura Chick, Los Angeles • John Crawley, Cerritos • Hector De La Torre, South Gate • Doug Drummond, Long Beach • John Ferraro, Los Angeles • Michael Feuer, Los Angeles • Ruth Galanter, Los Angeles • Eileen Givens, Glendale • Jackie Goldberg, Los Angeles • Garland Hardeman, Inglewood • Mike Hernandez, Los Angeles • Nate Holden, Los Angeles • Barbara Messina, Alhambra • David Myers, Palmdale • George Nakano, Torrance • Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica • Jenny Oropeza, Long Beach • Beatrice Proo, Pico Rivera • Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles • Richard Riordan, Los Angeles • Marcine Shaw, Compton • Ray Smith, Bellflower • Rudy Svorinich, Los Angeles • Joel Wachs, Los Angeles • Rita Walters, Los Angeles • Paul Zee, South Pasadena

County of Orange: William Steiner, Orange County • Steve Apodaca, San Clemente • Ron Bates, Los Alamitos • Art Brown, Buena Park • Jan Debay, Newport Beach • Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Charlene Hatakeyama, La Palma • Bev Perry, Brea

County of Riverside: James Venable, Riverside County • Dennis Draeger, Calimesa • Dick Kelly, Palm Desert • Ron Loveridge, Riverside • Andrea Puga, Corona • Ron Roberts, Temecula

County of San Bernardino: Larry Walker, San Bernardino County • Bill Alexander, Rancho Cucamonga • Jim Bagley, Twentynine Palms • Deirdre Bennett, Colton • David Eshleman, Fontana • Norine Miller, San Bernardino • Gwenn Norton-Perry, Chino Hills

County of Ventura: Judy Mikels, Ventura County • Andrew Fox, Thousand Oaks • John Melton, Santa Paula • Toni Young, Port Hueneme

Printed on Recycled Paper 4/15/97

June 23, 1997

Kerwin Chih, Principal Regional Planning Assistant
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: **Comments on the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility - SCAG No. I 9700218**

Dear Mr. Chih:

Thank you for submitting the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility to SCAG for review and comment. As areawide clearing-house for regionally significant projects, SCAG assists cities, counties and other agencies in reviewing projects and plans for consistency with regional plans.

The attached comments are meant to provide guidance for considering the proposed project within the context of our regional goals and policies. If you have any questions regarding the attached comments, please contact Bill Boyd at (213) 236-1960.

Sincerely,

VIVIANE DOCHE-BOULOS
Manager, Intergovernmental Review

RECEIVED
JUN 25 1997
REGIONAL PLANNING
L.A. COUNTY

COMMENTS ON COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR
LANCASTER LANDFILL & RECYCLING FACILITY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project proposes the expansion of the existing 102-acre Lancaster Landfill by 174 acres and increasing the currently permitted elevation of 2,395 feet mean sea level (msl) to 2,420 feet msl. The 274 acre site is located in an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County approximately two miles northeast of the City of Lancaster. The proposed expansion is estimated to provide from 15 to 35 years of additional site life depending on the disposal rate and assuming a 4 percent annual rate of increase. Refuse capacity of the existing site is 690,000 cubic yards (470,000 tons). The proposed expansion would accommodate an additional 14,534,000 cubic yards (8,720,400 tons) of refuse. The applicant is currently permitted to accept up to 1,000 tons per day of municipal solid waste and is proposing to accept up to 1,7000 tons per day by the year 2010. The site is owned and operated by Waste Management, Inc.. The Project also plans to add asbestos and non-hazardous contaminated soil waste for acceptance at the landfill. It currently received dewatered sewage sludge providing that it contains 50 percent or more of solids.

INTRODUCTION TO SCAG REVIEW PROCESS

The document that provides the primary reference for SCAG's project review activity is the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG). The RCPG chapters fall into three categories: core, ancillary, and bridge. The Growth Management (adopted June 1994), Regional Mobility (adopted June 1994), Air Quality (adopted October 1995), Hazardous Waste Management (adopted November 1994), and Water Quality (adopted January 1995) chapters constitute the core chapters. These core chapters respond directly to federal and state planning requirements. The core chapters constitute the base on which local governments ensure consistency of their plans with applicable regional plans under CEQA. The Air Quality and Growth Management chapters contain both core and ancillary policies, which are differentiated in the comment portion of this letter. The Regional Mobility Element (RME) constitutes the region's Transportation Plan. The RME policies are incorporated into the RCPG.

Ancillary chapters are those on the Economy, Housing, Human Resources and Services, Finance, Open Space and Conservation, Water Resources, Energy, and Integrated Solid Waste Management. These chapters address important issues facing the region and may reflect other regional plans. Ancillary chapters, however, do not contain actions or policies required of local government. Hence, they are entirely advisory and establish no new mandates or policies for the region.

Bridge chapters include the Strategy and Implementation chapters, functioning as links between the Core and Ancillary chapters of the RCPG.

Each of the applicable policies related to the proposed project are identified by number and reproduced below in italics followed by SCAG staff comments regarding the consistency of the project with those policies.

Consistency With Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide Policies

1. The Growth Management Chapter (GMC) of the Regional Comprehensive Plan contains a number of policies that are particularly applicable to this Project.

a. *Core Growth Management Policies*

3.01 The population, housing, and jobs forecasts, which are adopted by SCAG's Regional Council and that reflect local plans and policies, shall be used by SCAG in all phases of implementation and review.

12-1 SCAG staff comments. As SCAG has designated subregions, the Project is situated in the North Los Angeles County subregion. The Draft EIR, on Table 3-1 only identifies projected population growth in the Antelope Valley through the year 2000. These projections are based on out of date 1986 numbers. No comparisons are provided in the document to currently adopted (1994) SCAG population, housing and employment forecasts. Therefore, it is not possible to ascertain the degree to which the proposed Project in consistent with this SCAG policy.

3.03 The timing, financing and location of public facilities, utility systems, and transportation systems shall be used by SCAG to implement the region's growth policies.

SCAG staff comments. The proposed project involves the continued use of an existing sanitary landfill. The Draft EA identifies the timetable for landfill expansion, closure and transition to post-closure land use for the site as open space and wildlife habitat. The project is consistent with this RCPG policy.

b. *Ancillary Growth Management Policies*

3.18 Encourage planned development in locations least likely to cause adverse environmental impact.

SCAG staff comments. The proposed Project is designed in a manner which will minimize adverse environmental impacts. Appropriate mitigation measures have been developed to address environmental considerations, including: air quality, geotechnical, flooding, fire

hazards, noise, water quality, biota, cultural and paleontological resources, traffic/access and environmental safety. The project is supportive of this RCPG policy.

3.19 Support policies and actions that preserve open space areas identified in local, state, and federal plans.

SCAG staff comments. The proposed project is located within designated non-urban lands which include mountain, foothill and high desert areas of the County not currently planned for urban use or scheduled to receive an urban level of service. Edwards Air Force Base's southern boundary is located about a mile north of the landfill. The site is located within the City of Lancaster's sphere of influence, and is designated as Medium Industry on the city's General Plan. Adjacent areas are designated Heavy Industry or Non-Urban on the city's plan. As noted in the discussion of policy 3.03 , the long range use of the site is for open space and habitat use. The project is supportive of this RCPG policy.

SCAG's *Open Space and Conservation* chapter of the *Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide* identifies as a goal to "Provide adequate land resources to meet the outdoor recreation needs of the present and future residents in the region and to promote tourism in the region." Furthermore, appropriate sub-goals include: 1) Increase the accessibility to open space lands for outdoor recreation. 2) Promote self-sustaining regional recreation resources and facilities. Long term use of the project site for open space and recreational use will support the open space goal and sub-goals. The project is also supportive of this RCPG goal and sub-goals.

3.21Encourage the implementation of measures aimed at the preservation and protection of recorded and unrecorded cultural resources and archaeological sites.

SCAG staff comments. The Draft EIR addresses cultural and archeological resources. Mitigation measures are developed to preserve cultural and archeological sites. Impacts would not be significant after mitigation. The project is supportive of this RCPG policy.

3.23 Encourage mitigation measures that reduce noise in certain locations, measures aimed at preservation of biological and ecological resources, measures that would reduce exposure to seismic hazards, minimize earthquake damage, and to develop emergency response and recovery plans.

SCAG staff comments. Discussion of mitigation measures for any significant environmental factor is addressed in the Draft EIR. The Project is supportive of this RCPG policy.

2. The Air Quality Chapter (AQC) core actions that are generally applicable to the Project are as follows:

5.11 Through the environmental document review process, ensure that plans at all levels of government (regional, air basin, county, subregional and local) consider air quality, land use, transportation and economic relationships to ensure consistency and minimize conflicts.

SCAG staff comments: **The Draft EIR (Table 2.2 and Sections 5.6 and 6.7) addresses various actions that will be taken to address air quality questions pertaining to the Project. Mitigation measures are proposed to mitigate impacts to a level less than significance. The Project is consistent with this RCPG policy.**

3. The Water Quality Chapter (WQC) core recommendations and policy options relate to the two water quality goals: to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the nation's water; and, to achieve and maintain water quality objectives that are necessary to protect all beneficial uses of all waters. The core recommendations and policy options that are particularly applicable to the Project, include the following:

11.02 Encourage "watershed management" programs and strategies, recognizing the primary role of local governments in such efforts.

SCAG staff comments: The Draft EIR references a number of "watershed management" strategies and mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the Project to address surface and ground water management problems. Specific design features are addressed fir groundwater, leachate and surface water monitoring. Mitigation measures are addressed for flood hazards in Section 5.2 and 6.3. and for water quality in Sections 5.5 and 6.6. The Project is consistent with this RCPG policy.

4. The Integrated Solid Waste Management Chapter (ISWM) is non mandated; it is provided for information and advisory purposes. The recommendations in the chapter fulfill the chapter's objectives and do not create new legal mandates for local governments or other regional governmental organizations, like sanitation or waste management districts. The chapter includes the following goals, objectives and policy recommendations are included in the ISWM:

Solid Waste Goals

- *Promote the following waste management practices in order of priority:*

  1. *Waste Prevention.*
  2. *Recycling and Composting.*

3. *Safe Disposal or Transformation.*

SCAG staff comments: The proposed project is an integral part of the county's integrated waste management system. Actions to address waste prevention are included in the various local jurisdiction's and the County of Los Angeles's *Source Reduction and Recycling Elements*, the *Draft Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (Summary Plan and Siting Element)*. Safe disposal of waste through landfilling is an action consistent with this goal. The Draft EIR also notes actions that are currently being used at the landfill site to reduce at volume of waste being landfilled. The Project is supportive of this RCPG goal.

- *Minimize unnecessary duplication of effort in the solid waste programs carried out by local governments.*

SCAG staff comments: The proposed project will facilitate the orderly implementation of city and county waste management plans in the Lancaster landfill wasteshed area (primarily the Antelope Valley). Continued use of this landfill throughout its planned life, will meet the spirit of this goal. The Project is supportive of this RCPG goal.

Regional Solid Waste Objectives

- *Divert at least 25 percent of all waste from landfills by the year 1995 and divert at least 50 percent by the year 2000.*

SCAG staff comments: The proposed project includes activities on site that will facilitate the diversion of materials from the landfill, specifically newsprint, commingled recyclables, green waste, tire, appliance and construction/demolition material recovery programs. The Project is supportive of this RCPG objective.

- *Ensure that there is adequate, environmentally safe disposal capacity for the remaining waste.*

SCAG staff comments: The proposed project identifies actions and mitigation measures (including special use permit conditions) which will help ensure adequate, environmentally safe disposal capacity for the Lancaster Landfill wasteshed through at least year 2010. The Project is supportive of this RCPG objective.

Solid Waste Policy Recommendations

- *Minimize economic impacts of increased waste management costs.*

  SCAG staff comments: The proposed project will result in a minimization of increased waste management costs in the Lancaster Landfill wasteshed, and extend the time when costlier solutions will be necessary. The Draft EIR on page 4-21 notes that current site has a tipping fee of $32.50 per ton whereas costlier waste-by-rail projects would have tipping fees of $50 to $55 per ton. The Project is supportive of this RCPG policy recommendation.

- *Facilitate regional dialogue on intercounty waste disposal projects.*

  SCAG staff comments: The proposed project will facilitate the regional dialog on intercounty waste disposal projects (see discussion on waste-by-rail on page 4-21 of Draft EIR). The Project is supportive of this RCPG policy recommendation.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

(1) As noted in the staff comments, the Project is consistent with or supportive of most of the aforementioned policies of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, with the exception of policy 3.01 where consistency could not be determined..

(2) All mitigation measures associated with the project should be monitored in accordance with AB 3180 requirements and reported to SCAG through the Annual Reasonable Further Progress Reports.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Roles and Authorities

THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS is a *Joint Powers Agency* established under California Government Code Section 6502 et seq. Under federal and state law, the Association is designated as a Council of Governments (COG), a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), and a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Among its other mandated roles and responsibilities, the Association is:

- Designated by the federal government as the Region's ***Metropolitan Planning Organization*** and mandated to maintain a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process resulting in a Regional Transportation Plan and a Regional Transportation Improvement Program pursuant to 23 U.S.C. §134(g)-(h), 49 U.S.C. §1607(f)-(g) et seq., 23 C.F.R. §450, and 49 C.F.R. §613. The Association is also the designated ***Regional Transportation Planning Agency***, and as such is responsible for both preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) under California Government Code Section 65080.

- Responsible for developing the demographic projections and the integrated land use, housing, employment, and transportation programs, measures, and strategies portions of the ***South Coast Air Quality Management Plan***, pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 40460(b)-(c). The Association is also designated under 42 U.S.C. §7504(a) as a ***Co-Lead Agency*** for air quality planning for the Central Coast and Southeast Desert Air Basin District.

- Responsible under the Federal Clean Air Act for determining ***Conformity*** of Projects, Plans and Programs to the State Implementation Plan, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §7506.

- Responsible, pursuant to California Government Code Section 65089.2, for ***reviewing all Congestion Management Plans (CMPs) for consistency with regional transportation plans*** required by Section 65080 of the Government Code. The Association must also evaluate the consistency and compatibility of such programs within the region.

- The authorized regional agency for ***Inter-Governmental Review*** of Programs proposed for federal financial assistance and direct development activities, pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12,372 (replacing A-95 Review).

- Responsible for reviewing, pursuant to Sections 15125(b) and 15206 of the CEQA Guidelines, ***Environmental Impact Reports*** of projects of regional significance for consistency with regional plans.

- The authorized ***Areawide Waste Treatment Management Planning Agency***, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. §1288(a)(2) (Section 208 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act)

- Responsible for preparation of the ***Regional Housing Needs Assessment***, pursuant to California Government Code Section 65584(a).

- Responsible (along with the San Diego Association of Governments and the Santa Barbara County/Cities Area Planning Council) for preparing the ***Southern California Hazardous Waste Management Plan*** pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25135.3.

Response to:

Viviane Douche-Boulos
Manager, Intergovernmental Review
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

12-1 The SCAG North Los Angeles County is comprised of all of Los Angeles County north of the Angeles National Forest. SCAG's adopted population projections for the subregion are considerably greater and, therefore, imply the need for more landfill capacity than the forecasts shown in Table 3-1 of the Draft EIR. SCAG's base-year (1990) population estimate for the subregion is 283,035. The subregional projections are 571,939 for the year 2000, 916,915 for the year 2010, and 1,297,353 for the year 2015.

State of California

California Environmental
Protection Agency

MEMORANDUM

To: Chris Belsky
State Clearinghouse
1400 10th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Date: June 24, 1997

Kerwin Chih
Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

From: Jeannie H. Blakeslee
Environmental Review Section
Permitting and Enforcement Division
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

FILED
JUN 24 1997
STATE
CLEARINGHOUSE

Subject: SCH# 93101036 - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING FACILITY, LOS ANGELES COUNTY (SWIS# 19-AA-0050)

California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) staff have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility. The proposed project consists of the following changes in the design and operation of the landfill:

1. A lateral expansion of approximately 62 acres to the west of the existing 102 acre landfill, and another 112 acre area to the east;

2. A vertical expansion from 2,395 feet mean sea level (MSL) to 2,420 MSL;

3. An increase in daily tonnage from 1,000 to 1,700 tons per day;

4. A change in operating hours from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m. to 5 a.m. to 8 p.m.;

5. Acceptance of approximately 10 tons per day of sewage sludge; and

6. Acceptance of asbestos and non-hazardous contaminated soils.

Staff offers the following comments:

13-1 1. The facility is apparently open to the general public for drop off of recyclable materials and waste to be landfilled. Are there separate entrances for public and commercial vehicles? It would be helpful if the FEIR included an schematic of ingress and egress for commercial, private and public haulers.

13-2 2. Is there an airplane field adjacent to the eastern parcel? The document mentions that a model airplane field exists within a three-mile radius of the east expansion area, however, the plates included in the Technical Appendices indicate that an airstrip is near the expansion area. Staff suggests that the FEIR provide some clarification this particular surrounding land use. Is there an airstrip within a 5-mile radius of the proposed expansion area? If there is an airstrip how will birds be controlled so that there is no interference with airplane safety?

13-3 3. The Technical Appendices provide a brief description of a recycling program. How and where are recyclable materials to be sorted and stored? How often are the recovered materials to be removed from the site?

13-4 4. The Technical Appendices briefly mention that a compost operation processing green and wood waste is part of the operation. Where on the facility site is the composting operation? The facility apparently composts about 60 cubic yards of wood and green waste. Is this the maximum amount of material onsite at any given time, or does the facility accept 60 cubic yards per day of green and wood waste? Although the document states that no manure or sludge is added to the these materials, the proposed project includes the acceptance of sewage sludge; are there plans for including sludge as feedstock for the compost operation?

13-5 5. How much asbestos is to be received at this site?

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document. Please call me at (916) 255-4708 if you have any questions.

Cc: Connie Rocke, LA Co LEA

Response to:

Jeannie H. Blakeslee
Environmental Review Section, Permitting and Enforcement Division
California Integrated Waste Management Board

13-1 Currently, commercial vehicles and self-haul vehicles share the same entrance to the landfill. These vehicles share the same access route to the working face of the landfill but are directed to separate tipping areas, approximately 100 feet apart, to discharge their loads. Self-haul vehicles with recyclables share the same access route between the entrance and scale house as all vehicles which enter the landfill. These vehicles share the same access route to the fleet parking area (where recyclables are transferred) as commercial vehicles carrying curbside recyclables.

13-2 The Draft EIR indicates the presence of a *model* airplane field in proximity to the project site. There is not an air safety issue related to the use of model planes. Please note that there is also an old abandoned private airstrip approximately one mile south of the project site (confirm). Since the airstrip is abandoned, there is no relationship of the landfill project to the use of the airstrip.

13-3 Recyclable materials are received on an asphalt pad south of the entrance in the fleet parking area. Curbside materials enter the facility through the main gate, are weighed at the scales, and proceed to the recycling area in the fleet parking area where loads are discharged, loaded into transfer trailers and transported to off-site processing facilities where materials are sorted.

13-4 The compost area is approximately 100 to 150 feet north of the northern portion of the existing borrow pit. The composting facility is permitted to process up to 1000 cubic yards at any one time. In the past, the most material on the site at any one time has been 60 cubic yards.

13-5 It is anticipated that asbestos will be received from demolition contractors throughout the Antelope Valley. The quantity received will vary based on the amount of development activity which occurs in the area. The project applicant has not estimated a specific quantity to be received.

High desert Citizens Against Pollution
633 West J-11
LANCASTER, CA. 93534
Phone/Fax (805) 942-4209

June 29, 1997

Kerwin Chih
Regional Planning Dept.

Subject: Comments on DEIR Lancaster Landfill

Dear Sir,

Having had very little time in our busy schedule to conduct our review of the said DEIR due to a host of other pressing environmental projects and the critical illness of one of the key members of our review team, we are asking for a 60 day extension of the public comment period. Also there are some disjointed pages in the copy of the DEIR provided which were assembled incorrectly, causing us some confusion.

Based on a cursory review we have seen more than a few"red flags"raised that warrant further, detailed research.

Some of those are related to ground emissions of mercury and air emissions of dioxin from the flaring system of which we find no mention.

More specifically:

14-1 3.4.4 The need for the vast increase TPD figures from 1,000 to 1,700 TPD does not appear to be justified with data supplied. Does this reflect expectation of imported waste coming to the facility? Also the term "mixed waste" is incorrectly defined here (usually refers to nuclear waste).

14-2 3.4.4.1.1 "SEWAGE SLUDGE is now accepted"; does this indicate a new waste stream and if so how much, what type, what source?

14-3 3.4.4.1.2 ASBESTOS (Friable and non friable); from what source?

14-4 3.4.4.1.3 NON HAZARDOUS CONTAMINATED SOILS: imported or local?

14-5 3.4.4.1.5 SHREDDED TIRES: limitations on tonnage accepted?

Clearly, we need the requested extension of 60 days for further review. Can we anticipate a new hearing date beyond July 9th? Your early response would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Lyle Talbot

Lyle Talbot
for the members

Response to:

Lyle Talbot
High Desert Citizens Against Pollution

14-1 Please see General Response No. 1.

14-2 Please see General Response No. 4.

14-3 It is anticipated that asbestos will be received from residential and commercial demolition contractors throughout the Antelope Valley.

14-4 There is no proposed limitation on the source of non-hazardous contaminated soils.

14-5 There are no proposed limits on the tonnage of shredded tires to be accepted.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES • DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
2525 Corporate Place, Monterey Park, California 91754 (213) 881-4151

DHS

July 17, 1997

Kerwin Chih
Assistant Section Head, Impact Analysis Section
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: Lancaster Landfill & Recycling Facility, SWFP #19-AA-0050
Draft EIR, SCH No. 93101036

Dear Mr. Chih:

The Los Angeles County Environmental Health Services Solid Waste Management Program (SWMP) as the Local Enforcement Agency will be responsible for issuance of the Solid Waste Facility Permit for this project. After another detailed review, we determined that the issues previously described in our letter dated June 26, 1997, had been adequately addressed, except for the following two items:

1. Page 3-18, section 3.4.4.1.2

15-1 The DEIR says that "All applicable local, state and federal regulations regarding the disposal of asbestos and asbestos-containing waste will be complied with." However, procedures described in the DEIR for handling asbestos containing waste do not meet current regulations. California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, Chapter 3.5, Article 1, Section 17897, et seq. pertains to the disposal of asbestos containing waste. A major omission in the operational procedure in the DEIR is that the requirement for a designated asbestos containing waste disposal area for the disposal of asbestos containing waste is not described. The Final EIR should reflect current regulations and stipulate adherence to them.

2. Page 3-19, Disposal of Asbestos Waste

15-2 The DEIR states that the operator could still accept asbestos wastes even if not properly containerized, by thoroughly soaking the asbestos before unloading, and then immediately covering the waste with soil or other approved alternative daily cover material. The employees who do the soaking of the asbestos could contact asbestos fibers if the asbestos should become disturbed before or while they are being wetted. Describe how employees, the public, and the environment, would be protected during this procedure.

15-3 Also, would this procedure be done while the asbestos is in a truck, and would any run off result from this soaking? If run off does occur, how would it be dealt with?

If you have any questions or concerns, you can call me at (213) 881-4151.

Sincerely,

Richard Hanson, Chief
Solid Waste Management Program
RH:cr
P:\USERS\CMASTRO\LANCAST\REVLEIR.DRF

Response to:

Richard Hanson
Chief, Solid Waste Management Program
County of Los Angeles, Department of Health Services

15-1 The landfill operator will adhere to regulations recently promulgated (effective date of February 13, 1997) for the handling and disposal of asbestos containing waste contained in CCR, Title 14, Chapter 3.5, Section 17897, et. seq. as well as all other applicable local, state and federal regulations in force at the time asbestos containing waste is proposed to be accepted.

The following design and operating requirements of CCR, Title 14, Chapter 3.5, Section 17897.18 will replace the procedures described in the Draft EIR and will be complied with by the landfill operator:

a) establish a designated asbestos containing waste disposal area for the disposal of asbestos containing waste as defined in Section 17897.10;
b) establish a site control program with work zones and control points at the designated asbestos containing waste disposal area. At a minimum, work zones should be established for the active face, designated disposal area, handling and support areas;
c) segregate asbestos containing waste from refuse. At no time shall asbestos containing waste be disposed with refuse;
d) establish a means to prevent any visible emissions outside the designated asbestos containing waste disposal area during handling and disposal operations;
e) maintain the integrity of leak-tight containers and/or packaging at all times during the handling and disposal operations;
f) minimize the release and exposure of asbestos containing waste after placement in the disposal area by not compacting the waste prior to application of cover, at no time shall compaction equipment come into contact with asbestos containing waste containers or packaging;
g) after deposit, the owner or operator shall cover the asbestos containing waste with sufficient cover material to ensure complete coverage of the disposed asbestos containing waste and prevent re-exposure during continuing disposal operations;
h) cover shall be applied to the asbestos containing waste at a frequency that minimizes releases to the environment and threats to human health, but at a

minimum of once every operational hour. An alternative frequency may be prescribed if the Enforcement Agency deems if appropriate.

Section 17897.10 defines a "designated asbestos containing waste disposal area" as an area specifically designated for the disposal of asbestos containing waste at a solid waste facility. A specifically designated area is a dedicated disposal area. The area shall be identified on a survey plat containing the location and dimensions of the area with respect to permanently surveyed vertical and horizontal control monuments. This survey plat shall be prepared and certified by a professional land surveyor licensed in California or a civil engineer authorized to practice land surveying in California. The designated area shall be delineated with physical barriers, such as a fence and signs. The landfill operator will comply with other requirements of CCR, Title 14, Chapter 3.5, where applicable.

15-2 In addition to the requirements for a designated disposal area described above, procedures outlined in CCR Title 8 and Title 14, Chapter 3.5, Section 17897.19 dealing with site security will be followed to provide for protection of employees and the public. The asbestos disposal area will be limited to authorized personnel with appropriate personal protective equipment. The employees assigned to work in this area will be protected through the following programs:

Exposure Monitoring - Determination of employee exposures to asbestos at the landfill working face will be conducted initially and periodically. If exposure limits established by OSHA are exceeded, LLRC will take corrective action (i.e., regulated work areas, engineering controls and work practices) to reduce exposure to or below threshold levels.

Respiratory Program - An existing Respiratory Program will be used to supply respirators, and ensure they are used, as required by Cal-OSHA.

Protective Work Clothing and Equipment - Employees who may be exposed to airborne concentrations of asbestos will be provided at no cost to the employee, appropriate protective clothing and equipment such as, coveralls, gloves and foot coverings.

Employee Training Program - A training program will be instituted for all employees engaged in asbestos-related work. The program will be conducted at the time of initial assignment and at least annually thereafter.

15-3 This procedure will be conducted while the asbestos is in the truck with the objective of minimizing airborne asbestos by binding dust with water. Run off will be minimized by not saturating the asbestos.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE FLIGHT TEST CENTER (AFMC)
EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA

U.S. AIR FORCE
1947 - 1997

RECEIVED
JUL 2 1997
REGIONAL PLANNING
L.A. COUNTY

27 JUN 1997

AFFTC/XPX
One South Rosamond Blvd
Edwards AFB CA 93524-1036

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles CA 90012

Dear Sir/Madam:

16-1 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Conditional Use Permit No. 93-070-(5). The Air Force Flight Test Center (AFFTC) is concerned with the potential impacts of the proposed project on the air visibility. Air visibility is critical to the testing activity performed at the AFFTC. Highly sensitive, land based photo optical equipment is used to record all aspects of flight testing. Any activity which contributes to decreased visibility in the vicinity of the base may adversely impact Edward's test mission.

The AFFTC appreciates the continued efforts of your department in assuring compatible land use in the Los Angeles County area. If my office can be of any assistance to you in the future, please contact me at (805) 277-3837.

Sincerely

Wendy L Waiwood

WENDY L. WAIWOOD
Chief, Plans and Policies Division

Response to:

Wendy L. Waiwood
Chief, Plans and Policies Division
Department of the Air Force
Headquarters Air Force Flight Test Center (AFMC)
Edwards Air Force Base, California

16-1 Particulate emissions from the project will occur only at or near the ground surface and will not be visible from or interfere with operations at the air force base.

SECTION 4.0
RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENTS

4.0 RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENTS

The first Los Angeles County Planning Commission Hearing was held on July 9, 1997. County of Regional Planning staff, Paul McCarthy, briefly described the proposed project. A presentation was then made by the applicant and his consultant (Doug Corcoran, Waste Management of Lancaster and Bryan Stirrat, Bryan A. Stirrat & Associates, Inc.). Michael Mohajer, Assistant Division Engineer, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, then provided information on the status of disposal capacity in the County of Los Angeles. Testifiers at the July 9 and 23, 1997 hearings are listed in Table 1-2. The applicant's rebuttal was presented at the July 23, and September 24, 1997 public hearings and testimony was given by Michael Mohajer at the September 24, 1997 hearing on the County status of AB939 compliance.

Several individuals who provided testimony also submitted written comments which are included in Section 3.0 of this FEIR. General responses to main topics raised in written comments or oral testimony are provided in Section 2.0 of this FEIR. Other issues raised during oral testimony which are not addressed in Sections 2.0 and 3.0, herein, are provided below.

- Public Hearing Testimony
  County of Los Angeles
  320 West Temple Street, Room 150
  Los Angeles, CA. 90012

  Lyle Talbott

  Issue: I have not seen any public notice of the July 23rd hearing in Lancaster. I would like to see proof of the public notice.

  Response: Notification of the July 9th and 23rd public hearings was published in the Antelope Valley Press and La Opinion on May 13, 1997. A courtesy list of certain organizations were notified, as well as property owners within a 500 foot radius of the subject property. A sign indicating the hearing dates was posted at the project site 30 days prior to the hearings. In addition, two copies of the DEIR were sent to the local library which received the documents on May 13, 1997.

  Issue: The extended hours of operation are not needed to dispose of local trash. Refuse collection usually ends by 4:30 or 5:00 p.m. I think they expect more trash from outside the area.

Response: The extended hours of operation are necessary to dispose of the increased amount of waste handled on a daily basis, up to 1,700 tons per day. The Draft EIR evaluates impacts and proposes mitigation measures related to this disposal rate. Regarding the acceptance of waste from outside the area, see General Response No. 1 in Section 2.0.

- Public Hearing Testimony
  Lancaster Public Library
  Ana B. Davis Room
  601 West Lancaster Boulevard
  Lancaster, CA. 93534

Sharon Smock, 45437 35th Street, East Lancaster, CA

Issue: The Draft EIR should specify the source of special wastes.

Response: Dewatered sewage sludge will come from wastewater treatment plant operators. Friable and non-friable asbestos will be received from residential and commercial demolition contractors throughout the Antelope Valley. Non-contaminated hazardous soil may be received from site cleanups throughout the Antelope Valley and elsewhere. There is no proposed geographical limitation on the source of these materials.

Issue: There should be a further evaluation of the impacts associated with non-hazardous contaminated soil, asbestos and sludge.

Response: Regarding potential groundwater impacts, see General Response No. 3 (description of liner, leachate control and removal system, and groundwater monitoring system) in Section 2.0. Comment is not specific regarding how Draft EIR should be modified to further discuss impacts of special wastes.

Lyle Talbott, 633 West Avenue J-11, Lancaster, CA 93534

Issue: The project involves increased operating hours. Why are more hours necessary? For trucking in waste from other areas?

Response: Increased hours of operation are being requested to process the increased daily tonnage to be disposed and processed at the landfill.

Issue: Water - the (groundwater) monitoring reports referred to should be attached to the final EIR.

Response: These reports are included in Appendix B, of this EIR.

Issue: Air Quality - I'd like to see all references to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) changed to the Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District which was formed on July 1, 1997. The Antelope Valley APCD should be asked to review and comment on the draft EIR.

Response: The Draft EIR uses the significance criteria of the SCAQMD to measure the significance of air quality impacts. These criteria are believed to be the most stringent in the state. The Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District was sent a copy of the Draft EIR and asked to comment. In a phone conversation, the APCD representative indicated that the Antelope Valley APCD was new and had no specific standards to assess the EIR and that evaluation in terms of SCAQMD guidelines was appropriate.

Issue: As for the chlorinating system. You have chlorinating products in the trash refuse and when you burn chlorinated products you create dioxin. There are no scrubbers and no way to capture dioxin which is a carcinogen.

Response: The project will not modify the landfill flare system currently used to combust landfill gas. Landfill flares are not a source of dioxin emissions.

John Waters, 2617 West F-2, Lancaster, CA 93534

Issue: Doesn't want landfill to be any taller. Doesn't want landfill to be highest thing in the Antelope Valley. Height getting to the point so that you can actually see it from the Antelope Valley Freeway.

Response: See General Response No. 2 in Section 2.0.

Dean Webb, 1000 East Caperton St., Lancaster, CA 93534

Issue: Has questions about sludge, Is it Type A, Type B or just raw sludge?

Response: See General Response No. 4 in Section 2.0.

Issue: Will there be monitoring to measure any leakage of sludge under the new landfill?

Response: See General Response No. 4 in Section 2.0.

Lee Richardson, 5112 West Avenue L-12, Quartz Hill

Issue: Questions procedures for accepting sludge or asbestos. There needs to be advance notice before material is accepted at the landfill.

Response: Regarding sludge, see General Response No. 4 in Section 2.0.
Regarding asbestos, see General Response No. 5 in Section 2.0.

SECTION 5.0
ADDITIONS, CLARIFICATION AND ERRATA

5.0 ADDITIONS, CLARIFICATION AND ERRATA

Section 2.0, Table 2-2, Page 6-6, Mitigation Measure

Contribute on a fair-share, pro-rata basis to the ~~City of Lancaster~~ County of Los Angeles for the reconstruction of the pavement and thickening of the base/subbase.

Section 5.0, Page 5.9-2, Description of Avenue H

~~Avenue H is a discontinuous roadway that, currently, has no connection between Sierra Highway and Division Street. However, an Avenue H flyover is presently being constructed over Sierra Highway providing a connection between Division Street and just west of Sierra Highway. This future overcrossing will provide four travel lanes.~~ **Avenue H** is a four lane arterial road between Sierra Highway and Division Street. A flyover was recently constructed to provide continuous access on Avenue H between these streets.

Section 5.0, Page 5.9-3, Description of Avenue H (last sentence)

~~From Division Street, Avenue H is a two-lane roadway with unpaved shoulders and a 55 mph speed limit.~~ North of Division Street, Avenue H is a two-lane roadway with unpaved shoulders and a 55 mph speed limit. South of Division Street, Avenue H is a two-lane roadway with unpaved shoulders and a 50 mph speed limit.

Section 5.0, Page 5.9-12, Table 5.9-3

Delete this figure and replace with the following new figure.

Section 5.0, Figures 5.9-5 through Figure 5.9-7

Delete these figures and replace with the following new figures.

Section 5.0, Tables 5.9-5 and 5.9-6

Delete these tables and replace with the following revised tables.

Section 5.0, Table 5.9-8

Delete this table and replace with the following revised table.

Section 6.0, Table 6-2 and Table 6-3

Delete these tables and replace with the following revised tables.

Appendix G

Replace Tables 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11 and Figures 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 with the following revised tables and figures with corresponding numbers.

DRAFT EIR: SECTION 5.0 REVISED TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 5.9-3
EXISTING ROADWAY LEVELS OF SERVICE

	Roadway Segment	ADT	V/C [a]	LOS
1	Avenue F east of SR-14 NB Ramps	1,700	0.14	A
2	Avenue F east of Division Street	338	0.03	A
3	Avenue G east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,243	0.19	A
4	Avenue G east of Division Street	1,143	0.10	A
5	Avenue H east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,060	0.17	A
6	Avenue H east of Division Street	667	0.06	A
7	Sierra Highway north of Avenue G	4,718	0.39	A
8	Sierra Highway south of Avenue G	4,655	0.39	A
9	Division Street north of Avenue G	1,967	0.16	A
10	Division Street south of Avenue G	2,038	0.17	A
11	10th Street East north of Avenue F	1,163	0.10	A
12	10th Street East south of Avenue F	1,588	0.13	A

Note:
[a] Roadway Capacity = 12,000 vehicles per segment

TABLE 5.9-5
INTERSECTION PEAK HOUR LEVELS OF SERVICE
EXISTING + AMBIENT GROWTH (YEAR 2012) + PROJECT

Intersection [a]	Peak Hour	Existing + Ambient Growth (Year 2012) V/C	LOS	Existing + Ambient + Project (w/ Avenue F Ext.) V/C	LOS	Project Increase in V/C	Significant Project Impact	Existing + Ambient + Project (w/o Avenue F Ext.) V/C	LOS	Project Increase in V/C	Significant Project Impact
1. Avenue F &	AM	0.11	A	0.12	A	0.01	NO	0.11	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.14	A	0.14	A	0.00	NO	0.14	A	0.00	NO
2. Avenue F &	AM	0.14	A	0.14	A	0.00	NO	0.14	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.21	A	0.21	A	0.00	NO	0.21	A	0.00	NO
3. Avenue F &	AM	0.20	A	0.21	A	0.01	NO	0.21	A	0.01	NO
Division Street	PM	0.20	A	0.22	A	0.02	NO	0.22	A	0.02	NO
4. Avenue F &	AM	0.18	A	0.19	A	0.01	NO	0.19	A	0.01	NO
10th Street East	PM	0.20	A	0.22	A	0.02	NO	0.22	A	0.02	NO
5. Avenue G &	AM	0.16	A	0.16	A	0.00	NO	0.16	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.18	A	0.18	A	0.00	NO	0.18	A	0.00	NO
6. Avenue G &	AM	0.16	A	0.16	A	0.00	NO	0.16	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.17	A	0.17	A	0.00	NO	0.17	A	0.00	NO
7. Avenue G &	AM	0.36	A	0.36	A	0.00	NO	0.36	A	0.00	NO
Sierra Highway	PM	0.48	A	0.48	A	0.00	NO	0.49	A	0.01	NO
8. Avenue G &	AM	0.31	A	0.31	A	0.00	NO	0.32	A	0.01	NO
Division Street	PM	0.30	A	0.30	A	0.00	NO	0.31	A	0.01	NO
9. Avenue G &	AM	0.21	A	0.22	A	0.01	NO	0.22	A	0.01	NO
10th Street East	PM	0.29	A	0.30	A	0.01	NO	0.30	A	0.01	NO
10. Avenue H &	AM	0.20	A	0.20	A	0.00	NO	0.20	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.22	A	0.22	A	0.00	NO	0.22	A	0.00	NO
11. Avenue H &	AM	0.19	A	0.19	A	0.00	NO	0.19	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.22	A	0.22	A	0.00	NO	0.22	A	0.00	NO
12. Avenue H &	AM	[b]		[b]		-	-	[b]		-	-
Sierra Highway	PM	[b]		[b]		-	-	[b]		-	-
13. Avenue H &	AM	0.26	A	0.27	A	0.01	NO	0.27	A	0.01	NO
Division Street	PM	0.27	A	0.28	A	0.01	NO	0.28	A	0.01	NO

Notes:

[a] All analyzed intersections are currently stop-controlled. Based upon County of Los Angeles traffic study guidelines, these intersections were analyzed as if they were signalized.

[b] Grade-separated under future conditions.

TABLE 5.9-6
ROADWAY LEVELS OF SERVICE
EXISTING + AMBIENT GROWTH (YEAR 2012) + PROJECT

Roadway Segment	Existing + Ambient Growth (2012)			Project Only (w/ Ave F Ext.) ADT	Existing + Ambient Growth + Project (w/ Ave F Ext.)				Project Only (w/o Ave F Ext.) ADT	Existing + Ambient Growth + Project (w/o Ave F Ext.)			
	ADT	V/C [a]	LOS		ADT	V/C [a]	LOS	V/C Inc		ADT	V/C [a]	LOS	V/C Inc
1 Avenue F east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,244	0.19	A	80	2,324	0.19	A	0.01	0	2,244	0.19	A	0.00
2 Avenue F east of Division Street	446	0.04	A	200	646	0.05	A	0.02	200	646	0.05	A	0.02
3 Avenue G east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,961	0.25	A	40	3,001	0.25	A	0.00	80	3,041	0.25	A	0.01
4 Avenue G east of Division Street	1,509	0.13	A	0	1,509	0.13	A	0.00	0	1,509	0.13	A	0.00
5 Avenue H east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,719	0.23	A	20	2,739	0.23	A	0.00	40	2,759	0.23	A	0.00
6 Avenue H east of Division Street	880	0.07	A	0	880	0.07	A	0.00	0	880	0.07	A	0.00
7 Sierra Highway north of Avenue G	6,228	0.52	A	60	6,288	0.52	A	0.01	0	6,228	0.52	A	0.00
8 Sierra Highway south of Avenue G	6,144	0.51	A	60	6,204	0.52	A	0.01	40	6,184	0.52	A	0.00
9 Division Street north of Avenue G	2,596	0.22	A	100	2,696	0.22	A	0.01	160	2,756	0.23	A	0.01
10 Division Street south of Avenue G	2,690	0.22	A	60	2,750	0.23	A	0.01	80	2,770	0.23	A	0.01
11 10th Street East north of Avenue F	1,535	0.13	A	20	1,555	0.13	A	0.00	20	1,555	0.13	A	0.00
12 10th Street East south of Avenue F	2,096	0.17	A	180	2,276	0.19	A	0.02	180	2,276	0.19	A	0.02

Note:
[a] Roadway Capacity = 12,000 vehicles per segment

TABLE 5.9-8
PAVEMENT ANALYSIS

Roadway Segment	Existing (Year 1996)			Existing + Ambient Growth (Year 2012)			Existing + Ambient + Project (w/ Ave F)			Existing + Ambient + Project (w/o Ave F)			Cumulative Base (Year 2012)			Cumulative + Project (w/ Ave F)			Cumulative + Project (w/o Ave F)		
	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI
1 Avenue F East of Division St.	81	299,000	8.0	107	394,680	8.0	207	762,680	8.5	207	762,680	8.5	107	394,680	8.0	207	762,680	8.5	207.25	762,880	8.5
2 Avenue G East of Division St.	57	210,275	7.5	75	277,563	7.5	75	277,563	7.5	75	277,563	7.5	75	277,563	7.5	75	277,563	7.5	75	277,563	7.5
3 10th Street East North of Avenue F	0	-	na	0	-	na	10	36,800	6.0	10	36,800	6.0	0	-	na	10	36,800	6.0	10	36,800	6.0
4 10th Street East South of Avenue F	50	184,000	7.5	66	242,880	7.5	156	574,080	8.5	156	574,080	8.5	66	242,880	7.5	156	574,080	8.5	156	574,080	8.5
5 Avenue G East of SR-14	131	482,080	8.0	173	636,346	8.5	193	709,946	8.5	213	783,546	8.5	173	636,346	8.5	193	709,946	8.5	213	783,546	8.5
6 Sierra Hwy (SR-14) North of Avenue G	377	1,387,360	9.5	498	1,831,315	9.5	528	1,941,715	9.5	498	1,831,315	9.5	498	1,831,315	9.5	528	1,941,715	9.5	498	1,831,315	9.5
7 Division St North of Avenue G	103	379,040	8.0	136	500,333	8.5	186	684,333	8.5	216	794,733	8.5	136	500,333	8.5	186	684,333	8.5	216	794,733	8.5

Notes:
[a] As contained in the Caltrans, ***Highway Design Manual*** July (1990), the ESAL 20-year Constant used was 3.680 (corresponding to 3-axle trucks).

Significant Impact



LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 5.9-5

EXISTING + AMBIENT GROWTH (2012) PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES

SOURCE: DKS ASSOCIATES TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY REVISIONS – OCTOBER, 1997



LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 5.9-6

EXISTING + AMBIENT GROWTH (2012) PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES (WITH AVENUE F EXTENSION)

SOURCE: DKS ASSOCIATES TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY REVISIONS – OCTOBER, 1997



LEGEND

- Existing Facility
- Proposed Expansion
- Analyzed Intersection

XX (XX) AM (PM) Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
Volumes Rounded to the Nearest Five Vehicles
* Negligible Number of Trips

LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FIGURE 5.9-7

EXISTING + AMBIENT GROWTH (2012) PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES (WITHOUT AVENUE F EXTENSION)

SOURCE: DKS ASSOCIATES TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY REVISIONS – OCTOBER, 1997

DRAFT EIR: SECTION 6.0 REVISED TABLES

TABLE 6-2
INTERSECTION PEAK HOUR LEVELS OF SERVICE
CUMULATIVE (YEAR 2012) + PROJECT

Intersection [a]	Peak Hour	Cumulative Base (Year 2012) V/C	Cumulative Base (Year 2012) LOS	Cumulative + Project (w/ Avenue F Ext.) V/C	Cumulative + Project (w/ Avenue F Ext.) LOS	Project Increase in V/C	Significant Project Impact	Cumulative + Project (w/o Avenue F Ext.) V/C	Cumulative + Project (w/o Avenue F Ext.) LOS	Project Increase in V/C	Significant Project Impact
1. Avenue F &	AM	0.11	A	0.12	A	0.01	NO	0.11	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.14	A	0.14	A	0.00	NO	0.14	A	0.00	NO
2. Avenue F &	AM	0.14	A	0.14	A	0.00	NO	0.14	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.21	A	0.21	A	0.00	NO	0.21	A	0.00	NO
3. Avenue F &	AM	0.20	A	0.21	A	0.01	NO	0.21	A	0.01	NO
Division Street	PM	0.21	A	0.22	A	0.01	NO	0.22	A	0.01	NO
4. Avenue F &	AM	0.18	A	0.19	A	0.01	NO	0.19	A	0.01	NO
10th Street East	PM	0.20	A	0.22	A	0.02	NO	0.22	A	0.02	NO
5. Avenue G &	AM	0.16	A	0.16	A	0.00	NO	0.16	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.18	A	0.18	A	0.00	NO	0.18	A	0.00	NO
6. Avenue G &	AM	0.16	A	0.16	A	0.00	NO	0.16	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.17	A	0.17	A	0.00	NO	0.17	A	0.00	NO
7. Avenue G &	AM	0.36	A	0.36	A	0.00	NO	0.37	A	0.01	NO
Sierra Highway	PM	0.48	A	0.48	A	0.00	NO	0.49	A	0.01	NO
8. Avenue G &	AM	0.32	A	0.32	A	0.00	NO	0.32	A	0.00	NO
Division Street	PM	0.30	A	0.31	A	0.01	NO	0.31	A	0.01	NO
9. Avenue G &	AM	0.21	A	0.22	A	0.01	NO	0.22	A	0.01	NO
10th Street East	PM	0.29	A	0.30	A	0.01	NO	0.30	A	0.01	NO
10. Avenue H &	AM	0.20	A	0.20	A	0.00	NO	0.20	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.22	A	0.22	A	0.00	NO	0.22	A	0.00	NO
11. Avenue H &	AM	0.19	A	0.19	A	0.00	NO	0.19	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.22	A	0.22	A	0.00	NO	0.22	A	0.00	NO
12. Avenue H &	AM	[b]		[b]		-	-	[b]		-	-
Sierra Highway	PM	[b]		[b]		-	-	[b]		-	-
13. Avenue H &	AM	0.27	A	0.27	A	0.00	NO	0.27	A	0.00	NO
Division Street	PM	0.28	A	0.28	A	0.00	NO	0.29	A	0.01	NO

Notes:

[a] All analyzed intersections are currently stop-controlled. Based upon County of Los Angeles traffic study guidelines, these intersections were analyzed as if they were signalized.

[b] Grade-separated under future conditions.

TABLE 6-3
ROADWAY LEVELS OF SERVICE
CUMULATIVE (YEAR 2012) + PROJECT

Roadway Segment	Cumulative Base (Year 2012)			Project Only (w/ Ave F Ext.) ADT	Existing + Ambient Growth + Project (w/ Ave F Ext.)				Project Only (w/o Ave F Ext.) ADT	Existing + Ambient Growth + Project (w/o Ave F Ext.)			
	ADT	V/C [a]	LOS		ADT	V/C [a]	LOS	V/C Inc		ADT	V/C [a]	LOS	V/C Inc
1 Avenue F east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,244	0.19	A	80	2,324	0.19	A	0.01	0	2,244	0.19	A	0.00
2 Avenue F east of Division Street	446	0.04	A	200	646	0.05	A	0.02	200	646	0.05	A	0.02
3 Avenue G east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,961	0.25	A	40	3,001	0.25	A	0.00	80	3,041	0.25	A	0.01
4 Avenue G east of Division Street	1,509	0.13	A	0	1,509	0.13	A	0.00	0	1,509	0.13	A	0.00
5 Avenue H east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,719	0.23	A	20	2,739	0.23	A	0.00	40	2,759	0.23	A	0.00
6 Avenue H east of Division Street	880	0.07	A	0	880	0.07	A	0.00	0	880	0.07	A	0.00
7 Sierra Highway north of Avenue G	6,308	0.53	A	60	6,368	0.53	A	0.01	0	6,308	0.53	A	0.00
8 Sierra Highway south of Avenue G	6,224	0.52	A	60	6,284	0.52	A	0.01	40	6,264	0.52	A	0.00
9 Division Street north of Avenue G	2,676	0.22	A	100	2,776	0.23	A	0.01	160	2,836	0.24	A	0.01
10 Division Street south of Avenue G	2,770	0.23	A	60	2,830	0.24	A	0.01	80	2,850	0.24	A	0.01
11 10th Street East north of Avenue F	1,535	0.13	A	20	1,555	0.13	A	0.00	20	1,555	0.13	A	0.00
12 10th Street East south of Avenue F	2,096	0.17	A	180	2,276	0.19	A	0.02	180	2,276	0.19	A	0.02

Note:
[a] Roadway Capacity = 12,000 vehicles per segment

DRAFT EIR: APPENDIX G REVISED TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 3
EXISTING ROADWAY LEVELS OF SERVICE

Roadway Segment	ADT	V/C [a]	LOS
1 Avenue F east of SR-14 NB Ramps	1,700	0.14	A
2 Avenue F east of Division Street	338	0.03	A
3 Avenue G east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,243	0.19	A
4 Avenue G east of Division Street	1,143	0.10	A
5 Avenue H east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,060	0.17	A
6 Avenue H east of Division Street	667	0.06	A
7 Sierra Highway north of Avenue G	4,718	0.39	A
8 Sierra Highway south of Avenue G	4,655	0.39	A
9 Division Street north of Avenue G	1,967	0.16	A
10 Division Street south of Avenue G	2,038	0.17	A
11 10th Street East north of Avenue F	1,163	0.10	A
12 10th Street East south of Avenue F	1,588	0.13	A

Note:
[a] Roadway Capacity = 12,000 vehicles per segment

TABLE 6
INTERSECTION PEAK HOUR LEVELS OF SERVICE
EXISTING + AMBIENT GROWTH (YEAR 2012) + PROJECT

Intersection [a]	Peak Hour	Existing + Ambient Growth (Year 2012) V/C	LOS	Existing + Ambient + Project (w/ Avenue F Ext.) V/C	LOS	Project Increase in V/C	Significant Project Impact	Existing + Ambient + Project (w/o Avenue F Ext.) V/C	LOS	Project Increase in V/C	Significant Project Impact
1. Avenue F &	AM	0.11	A	0.12	A	0.01	NO	0.11	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.14	A	0.14	A	0.00	NO	0.14	A	0.00	NO
2. Avenue F &	AM	0.14	A	0.14	A	0.00	NO	0.14	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.21	A	0.21	A	0.00	NO	0.21	A	0.00	NO
3. Avenue F &	AM	0.20	A	0.21	A	0.01	NO	0.21	A	0.01	NO
Division Sttreet	PM	0.20	A	0.22	A	0.02	NO	0.22	A	0.02	NO
4. Avenue F &	AM	0.18	A	0.19	A	0.01	NO	0.19	A	0.01	NO
10th Street East	PM	0.20	A	0.22	A	0.02	NO	0.22	A	0.02	NO
5. Avenue G &	AM	0.16	A	0.16	A	0.00	NO	0.16	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.18	A	0.18	A	0.00	NO	0.18	A	0.00	NO
6. Avenue G &	AM	0.16	A	0.16	A	0.00	NO	0.16	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.17	A	0.17	A	0.00	NO	0.17	A	0.00	NO
7. Avenue G &	AM	0.36	A	0.36	A	0.00	NO	0.36	A	0.00	NO
Sierra Highway	PM	0.48	A	0.48	A	0.00	NO	0.49	A	0.01	NO
8. Avenue G &	AM	0.31	A	0.31	A	0.00	NO	0.32	A	0.01	NO
Division Street	PM	0.30	A	0.30	A	0.00	NO	0.31	A	0.01	NO
9. Avenue G &	AM	0.21	A	0.22	A	0.01	NO	0.22	A	0.01	NO
10th Street East	PM	0.29	A	0.30	A	0.01	NO	0.30	A	0.01	NO
10. Avenue H &	AM	0.20	A	0.20	A	0.00	NO	0.20	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.22	A	0.22	A	0.00	NO	0.22	A	0.00	NO
11. Avenue H &	AM	0.19	A	0.19	A	0.00	NO	0.19	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.22	A	0.22	A	0.00	NO	0.22	A	0.00	NO
12. Avenue H &	AM	[b]		[b]		-	-	[b]		-	-
Sierra Highway	PM	[b]		[b]		-	-	[b]		-	-
13. Avenue H &	AM	0.26	A	0.27	A	0.01	NO	0.27	A	0.01	NO
Division Street	PM	0.27	A	0.28	A	0.01	NO	0.28	A	0.01	NO

Notes:

[a] All analyzed intersections are currently stop-controlled. Based upon County of Los Angeles traffic study guidelines, these intersections were analyzed as if they were signalized.

[b] Grade-separated under future conditions.

TABLE 7
ROADWAY LEVELS OF SERVICE
EXISTING + AMBIENT GROWTH (YEAR 2012) + PROJECT

Roadway Segment	Existing + Ambient Growth (2012)			Project Only (w/ Ave F Ext.) ADT	Existing + Ambient Growth + Project (w/ Ave F Ext.)				Project Only (w/o Ave F Ext.) ADT	Existing + Ambient Growth + Project (w/o Ave F Ext.)			
	ADT	V/C [a]	LOS		ADT	V/C [a]	LOS	V/C Inc		ADT	V/C [a]	LOS	V/C Inc
1 Avenue F east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,244	0.19	A	80	2,324	0.19	A	0.01	0	2,244	0.19	A	0.00
2 Avenue F east of Division Street	446	0.04	A	200	646	0.05	A	0.02	200	646	0.05	A	0.02
3 Avenue G east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,961	0.25	A	40	3,001	0.25	A	0.00	80	3,041	0.25	A	0.01
4 Avenue G east of Division Street	1,509	0.13	A	0	1,509	0.13	A	0.00	0	1,509	0.13	A	0.00
5 Avenue H east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,719	0.23	A	20	2,739	0.23	A	0.00	40	2,759	0.23	A	0.00
6 Avenue H east of Division Street	880	0.07	A	0	880	0.07	A	0.00	0	880	0.07	A	0.00
7 Sierra Highway north of Avenue G	6,228	0.52	A	60	6,288	0.52	A	0.01	0	6,228	0.52	A	0.00
8 Sierra Highway south of Avenue G	6,144	0.51	A	60	6,204	0.52	A	0.01	40	6,184	0.52	A	0.00
9 Division Street north of Avenue G	2,596	0.22	A	100	2,696	0.22	A	0.01	160	2,756	0.23	A	0.01
10 Division Street south of Avenue G	2,690	0.22	A	60	2,750	0.23	A	0.01	80	2,770	0.23	A	0.01
11 10th Street East north of Avenue F	1,535	0.13	A	20	1,555	0.13	A	0.00	20	1,555	0.13	A	0.00
12 10th Street East south of Avenue F	2,096	0.17	A	180	2,276	0.19	A	0.02	180	2,276	0.19	A	0.02

Note:
[a] Roadway Capacity = 12,000 vehicles per segment

TABLE 8
INTERSECTION PEAK HOUR LEVELS OF SERVICE
CUMULATIVE (YEAR 2012) + PROJECT

Intersection [a]	Peak Hour	Cumulative Base (Year 2012) V/C	Cumulative Base (Year 2012) LOS	Cumulative + Project (w/ Avenue F Ext.) V/C	Cumulative + Project (w/ Avenue F Ext.) LOS	Project Increase in V/C	Significant Project Impact	Cumulative + Project (w/o Avenue F Ext.) V/C	Cumulative + Project (w/o Avenue F Ext.) LOS	Project Increase in V/C	Significant Project Impact
1. Avenue F &	AM	0.11	A	0.12	A	0.01	NO	0.11	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.14	A	0.14	A	0.00	NO	0.14	A	0.00	NO
2. Avenue F &	AM	0.14	A	0.14	A	0.00	NO	0.14	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.21	A	0.21	A	0.00	NO	0.21	A	0.00	NO
3. Avenue F &	AM	0.20	A	0.21	A	0.01	NO	0.21	A	0.01	NO
Division Sttreet	PM	0.21	A	0.22	A	0.01	NO	0.22	A	0.01	NO
4. Avenue F &	AM	0.18	A	0.19	A	0.01	NO	0.19	A	0.01	NO
10th Street East	PM	0.20	A	0.22	A	0.02	NO	0.22	A	0.02	NO
5. Avenue G &	AM	0.16	A	0.16	A	0.00	NO	0.16	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.18	A	0.18	A	0.00	NO	0.18	A	0.00	NO
6. Avenue G &	AM	0.16	A	0.16	A	0.00	NO	0.16	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.17	A	0.17	A	0.00	NO	0.17	A	0.00	NO
7. Avenue G &	AM	0.36	A	0.36	A	0.00	NO	0.37	A	0.01	NO
Sierra Highway	PM	0.48	A	0.48	A	0.00	NO	0.49	A	0.01	NO
8. Avenue G &	AM	0.32	A	0.32	A	0.00	NO	0.32	A	0.00	NO
Division Street	PM	0.30	A	0.31	A	0.01	NO	0.31	A	0.01	NO
9. Avenue G &	AM	0.21	A	0.22	A	0.01	NO	0.22	A	0.01	NO
10th Street East	PM	0.29	A	0.30	A	0.01	NO	0.30	A	0.01	NO
10. Avenue H &	AM	0.20	A	0.20	A	0.00	NO	0.20	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 SB Ramps	PM	0.22	A	0.22	A	0.00	NO	0.22	A	0.00	NO
11. Avenue H &	AM	0.19	A	0.19	A	0.00	NO	0.19	A	0.00	NO
SR-14 NB Ramps	PM	0.22	A	0.22	A	0.00	NO	0.22	A	0.00	NO
12. Avenue H &	AM	[b]		[b]		-	-	[b]		-	-
Sierra Highway	PM	[b]		[b]		-	-	[b]		-	-
13. Avenue H &	AM	0.27	A	0.27	A	0.00	NO	0.27	A	0.00	NO
Division Street	PM	0.28	A	0.28	A	0.00	NO	0.29	A	0.01	NO

Notes:

[a] All analyzed intersections are currently stop-controlled. Based upon County of Los Angeles traffic study guidelines, these intersections were analyzed as if they were signalized.

[b] Grade-separated under future conditions.

TABLE 9
ROADWAY LEVELS OF SERVICE
CUMULATIVE (YEAR 2012) + PROJECT

Roadway Segment	Cumulative Base (Year 2012)			Project Only (w/ Ave F Ext.) ADT	Existing + Ambient Growth + Project (w/ Ave F Ext.)				Project Only (w/o Ave F Ext.) ADT	Existing + Ambient Growth + Project (w/o Ave F Ext.)			
	ADT	V/C [a]	LOS		ADT	V/C [a]	LOS	V/C Inc		ADT	V/C [a]	LOS	V/C Inc
1 Avenue F east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,244	0.19	A	80	2,324	0.19	A	0.01	0	2,244	0.19	A	0.00
2 Avenue F east of Division Street	446	0.04	A	200	646	0.05	A	0.02	200	646	0.05	A	0.02
3 Avenue G east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,961	0.25	A	40	3,001	0.25	A	0.00	80	3,041	0.25	A	0.01
4 Avenue G east of Division Street	1,509	0.13	A	0	1,509	0.13	A	0.00	0	1,509	0.13	A	0.00
5 Avenue H east of SR-14 NB Ramps	2,719	0.23	A	20	2,739	0.23	A	0.00	40	2,759	0.23	A	0.00
6 Avenue H east of Division Street	880	0.07	A	0	880	0.07	A	0.00	0	880	0.07	A	0.00
7 Sierra Highway north of Avenue G	6,308	0.53	A	60	6,368	0.53	A	0.01	0	6,308	0.53	A	0.00
8 Sierra Highway south of Avenue G	6,224	0.52	A	60	6,284	0.52	A	0.01	40	6,264	0.52	A	0.00
9 Division Street north of Avenue G	2,676	0.22	A	100	2,776	0.23	A	0.01	160	2,836	0.24	A	0.01
10 Division Street south of Avenue G	2,770	0.23	A	60	2,830	0.24	A	0.01	80	2,850	0.24	A	0.01
11 10th Street East north of Avenue F	1,535	0.13	A	20	1,555	0.13	A	0.00	20	1,555	0.13	A	0.00
12 10th Street East south of Avenue F	2,096	0.17	A	180	2,276	0.19	A	0.02	180	2,276	0.19	A	0.02

Note:
[a] Roadway Capacity = 12,000 vehicles per segment

TABLE 11
PAVEMENT ANALYSIS

Roadway Segment	Existing (Year 1996)			Existing + Ambient Growth (Year 2012)			Existing + Ambient + Project (w/ Ave F)			Existing + Ambient + Project (w/o Ave F)			Cumulative Base (Year 2012)			Cumulative + Project (w/ Ave F)			Cumulative + Project (w/o Ave F)		
	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI	Daily # of Trucks	20 yr Total ESAL [a]	TI
1 Avenue F East of Division St.	81	299,000	8.0	107	394,680	8.0	207	762,680	8.5	207	762,680	8.5	107	394,680	8.0	207	762,680	8.5	207.25	762,680	8.5
2 Avenue G East of Division St.	57	210,275	7.5	75	277,563	7.5	75	277,563	7.5	75	277,563	7.5	75	277,563	7.5	75	277,563	7.5	75	277,563	7.5
3 10th Street East North of Avenue F	0	-	na	0	-	na	10	36,800	6.0	10	36,800	6.0	0	-	na	10	36,800	6.0	10	36,800	6.0
4 10th Street East South of Avenue F	50	184,000	7.5	66	242,880	7.5	156	574,080	8.5	156	574,080	8.5	66	242,880	7.5	156	574,080	8.5	156	574,080	8.5
5 Avenue G East of SR-14	131	482,080	8.0	173	636,346	8.5	193	709,946	8.5	213	783,546	8.5	173	636,346	8.5	193	709,946	8.5	213	783,546	8.5
6 Sierra Hwy (SR-14) North of Avenue G	377	1,387,360	9.5	498	1,831,315	9.5	528	1,941,715	9.5	498	1,831,315	9.5	498	1,831,315	9.5	528	1,941,715	9.5	498	1,831,315	9.5
7 Division St North of Avenue G	103	379,040	8.0	136	500,333	8.5	186	684,333	8.5	216	794,733	8.5	136	500,333	8.5	186	684,333	8.5	216	794,733	8.5

Notes:

[a] As contained in the Caltrans, ***Highway Design Manual*** July (1990), the ESAL 20-year Constant used was 3.680 (corresponding to 3-axle trucks).

Significant Impact



Figure 7: EXISTING + AMBIENT GROWTH (2012) PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES



Figure 8: EXISTING + AMBIENT GROWTH (2012) + PROJECT PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES (WITH AVENUE F EXTENSION)



Figure 9: EXISTING + AMBIENT GROWTH (2012) + PROJECT PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES (WITHOUT AVENUE F EXTENSION)



Figure 10: CUMULATIVE BASE (2012) PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES



Figure 11: CUMULATIVE + PROJECT PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES
(WITH AVENUE F EXTENSION)



Figure 12: CUMULATIVE + PROJECT PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES (WITHOUT AVENUE F EXTENSION)

APPENDIX A
GROUND WATER REMEDIATION PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Waste Management of Lancaster
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster, California 93535
(805) 945-5944 Fax (805) 945-2269

A Waste Management Company

July 21, 1997

Attn: Mr. Paul McCarthy
Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subject: **Ground Water Remediation System Reports - Conditional Use Permit No. 93-070-(5)**

Dear Mr. McCarthy,

As requested in your in the July 9, 1997 Regional Planning Commission meeting, Waste Management of Lancaster submits the enclosed monitoring reports. In addition, please find attached a synopsis of the remediation systems operational history.

If you should have any questions or require additional information on this matter, please contact me at (805) 945-5944.

Sincerely,

Rod Collins
Environmental Health & Safety Manger

Enclosure

cc: file

remed_cir.doc

Printed on Recycled Paper

Enclosure

GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION HISTORICAL SUMMARY

RUST Rust Environment & Infrastructure Inc.

A Rust International Company
18401 Von Karman Avenue
Suite 560 - 5th Floor
Irvine, CA 92715

Phone 714.251.8400
Fax 714.251.8444

July 21, 1997

Mr. Rod Collins
Waste Management of Lancaster
600 E. Avenue F
Lancaster, CA 93535

RE: Ground Water Remediation System Synopsis

Mr. Collins:

As requested, Rust Environment and Infrastructure (REI) has prepared the following synopsis which provides a brief history and current status of the groundwater remediation system at the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center (LLRC).

The first Groundwater Monitoring Program (GMP) at LLRC began in 1987. Results of this GMP indicated elevated concentrations of VOC's beneath the site (EMCON, 1987). In response, LLRC conducted additional groundwater monitoring which began in 1990 (HydroSearch, 1990). Results of these investigations determined that two main VOC-impacted (northern and southern) plumes existed at LLRC.

In December 1991, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was submitted to the RWQCB. This CAP included a series of extraction, injection and monitoring wells, and a groundwater remediation system designed to address VOC impacted groundwater from the northern and southern plumes. In February 1992, the RWQCB approved the CAP, and in February 1994, the wells and groundwater remediation system was in place and started. The basic design of the groundwater remediation system is to extract VOC impacted groundwater from a series of groundwater extraction wells, remove the VOC's through an granular activated carbon treatment system, and reinject the treated water back into the groundwater aquifer and use it for dust suppression at LLRC. The treatment system was designed to operate at between approximately 110 and 180 g pm total inflow and outflow.

On June 1, 1995 REI submitted an annual CAP effectiveness evaluation. Based on the results of the evaluation, four new wells (EX-8 through EX-11) were recommended to be added to the remediation system, and three wells (EX-1, EX-2 and EX-4) removed from the system.

September 30, 1996, REI submitted the second CAP effectiveness evaluation. Results of this CAP concluded the VOC plume boundaries were reduced from previous investigations and the new extraction wells (EX-8 through EX-10) were effectively capturing VOC's along the southern and

southeastern boundary of LLRC, preventing additional VOC's to migrate off-site. Based on the results the CAP effectiveness evaluation, it was recommended to continue operating extraction wells EX-7 through EX-11 and take well EX-3 off line. If future monitoring events show an increase in the VOC concentrations in the vicinity of EX-3, then well EX-3 should be restarted. It was also recommended to install a new permanent monitoring well near TC-3 to evaluate the VOC's, SVOC's and inorganic concentrations detected in the TC wells.

In December 1996, REI prepared a new CAP Monitoring Plan and Amended Report Of Waste Discharge, based on data generated since the 1991 CAP. This report evaluated the location and frequency of monitoring wells and chemical parameters of constituents monitored. Recommendations made in this report were approved by the RWQCB in their letter dated February 25, 1997.

As always, REI appreciates the opportunity to work with WMI, and will support WMI needs in any way possible. If there are any questions or comments please, feel free to contact me at (714)251-6448.

Sincerely;

Steve Williams
Hydrogeologist

G:\GEO\LANCASTE\ROD8.LTR



CORRECTIVE ACTION PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT

FOR:

LANCASTER LANDFILL
AND RECYCLING
CENTER
600 E. AVE. F
LANCASTER,
CALIFORNIA 93535

PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

18401 Von Karman
Avenue, Suite 550
Irvine, California 92715

Project # 69234.100

September 30, 1996

CERTIFICATION

CORRECTIVE ACTION PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT, LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER, LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA.

This report, including all related activities, was prepared by Steve Williams and conducted under the supervision of Susan F. Goss, Rust Environment & Infrastructure (Rust E&I). Our professional services have been performed using that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised under similar circumstances by other geologists and engineers practicing in this field. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice in this report.

_____ _____

Steve Williams
Project Hydrogeologist

Date

_____ _____

Susan F. Goss
Project Manager

Date

California Registered Geologist, License Number: 5639

Stamp of Registered Geologist:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1-1
1.1 SITE DESCRIPTION 1-1

2.0 BACKGROUND 2-1

3.0 GEOLOGY / HYDROGEOLOGY 3-1
3.1 REGIONAL GEOLOGY 3-1
3.2 SITE TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY 3-1
3.3 SITE HYDROGEOLOGY 3-2
3.3.1 Aquifer Testing Summary 3-2

4.0 CAP EFFECTIVENESS 4-1
4.1 GROUNDWATER FLOW 4-1
4.2 GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION SYSTEM (CAP) OPERATION 4-2
4.3 TEMPORARY CASED WELLS AND LABORATORY RESULTS 4-2
4.3.1 Semi-VOCs 4-3
4.3.2 VOCs 4-3
4.3.3 Inorganics 4-3
4.4 GROUNDWATER QUALITY BASELINE CONDITIONS 4-3
4.5 ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOUR MAPS 4-4
4.5.1 VOC and Inorganic Constituent Plume Boundaries 4-4
4.6 TIME SERIES PLOTS 4-5
4.6.1 Well MW-2 4-5
4.6.2 Well MW-3 and MW-5 4-6
4.6.3 Wells MW-10, MW-11, and MW-17 4-6
4.6.4 Extraction Wells 4-6

5.0 CONCLUSIONS OF CAP EFFECTIVENESS 5-1

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 6-1

7.0 REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY 7-1

Tables

Table 1 Well Construction Details
Table 2 Summary of Pumping Test Data
Table 3 Extraction Well Pumping Rates
Table 4 TC Well VOC and SVOC Results Summary

Figures

Figure 1	Site Vicinity/Location Map
Figure 2	Well Location Map
Figure 3	Hydraulic Conductivity Contour Map
Figure 4	Groundwater Contour Map - February 1995
Figure 5	Groundwater Contour Map - December 1995
Figure 6	Piezometric Contours-May 28, 1996
Figure 7	Piezometric Contours-August 6, 1996
Figure 8	1/94 to 2/94 Estimated Baseline Concentrations
Figure 9	February 1995 Groundwater VOC Concentrations

Appendices

Appendix A	Temporary Cased Wells TC-1, TC-2, TC-3 and TC-4 Installation and Abandonment Report
Appendix B	Isoconcentration Contour Maps
Appendix C	Time Series Graphs

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the Corrective Action Program (CAP) Effectiveness Evaluation for the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center (LLRC). The report was prepared by RUST Environment and Infrastructure (RUST E&I) for Waste Management of Lancaster (WML) and was conducted in accordance with RUST E&I's proposal and service agreement dated September 1, 1996.

The purpose of this report is to provide an annual CAP evaluation, more specifically, to evaluate the effectiveness of the groundwater remediation system currently operating at the LLRC. An annual evaluation of the CAP is requested by the Regional Water Quality Control Board - Lahontan Region (RWQCB) in the Revised Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR's) Board Order No. 6-95-103 dated October 5, 1995 and as required by Title 23, Chapter 15, Article 5, Section 2550.10(h). Based on the findings of this evaluation, recommendations will be provided to improve the effectiveness of the existing CAP.

1.1 SITE DESCRIPTION

The LLRC is located at 600 East Avenue F, in Lancaster, California (Figure 1). It is an unlined Class III landfill and has been in operation since 1954. The facility is roughly L-shaped and the actual waste footprint covers the central and eastern portions of the facility. The administrative offices and maintenance facilities (i.e., truck fueling, repair and washout facilities) are at the northwest end of the facility (Figure 2).

2.0 BACKGROUND

The first Groundwater Monitoring Program at LLRC began in 1987 in response to RWQCB Order 6-87-11. During the initial monitoring events, elevated concentrations of VOCs were detected in three downgradient wells (EMCON, 1989). In response to these detections a Verification Monitoring Program (VMP) was voluntarily initiated by LLRC in 1988, in conjunction with the Solid Waste Assessment Test (SWAT) investigation required for the facility. The results of the VMP indicated additional VOC's in groundwater beneath the site prompting additional Verification Monitoring Activities which began in 1990 (HydroSearch, 1990). Based on these investigations it was determined that two main plumes of VOC-impacted groundwater existed: a northern plume near the current location of EX-11 and a southern plume along the southern and southeastern property line which extended off site.

In December 1991, a corrective action plan (CAP) was submitted to the RWQCB in accordance with Chapter 15 requirements. The proposed CAP included a series of extraction and monitoring wells designed to address elevated VOC concentrations within the northern and southern plumes only. On February 13, 1992, the RWQCB adopted Order 6-92-07, formally approving LLRC's proposed CAP. The groundwater extraction system was started up in February 1994 and with the exception of minor maintenance downtime, has been operating continuously since that time.

In mid 1995, the annual CAP evaluation was conducted (Rust E&I, June 1, 1995) in response to the RWQCB's letter dated January 18, 1995. Based on the results of this investigation recommendations were made to add extraction wells EX-8 through EX-11 and remove extraction wells EX-1, EX-2 and EX-4 from the system. Based on the distribution of VOC's it was determined that extraction well EX-3 captured the majority of VOC's which migrated off site and that additional wells, EX-8, EX-9, and EX-10 along the southern and eastern property boundary, would prevent additional migration of contaminants off site. Extraction well EX-3 remained on the system to collect remaining VOC's south of the property, but has been pumped at a lower rate to minimize migration of the plume off site and prevent possible degradation of offsite water quality. Extraction well EX-11 is located in the northern portion of the landfill just downgradient of the old truckwash, the presumed source of VOC's in the northern plume. The modifications to the remediation system were made in late 1995 and early 1996. The remediation system was restarted in May, 1996. Details for the new extraction wells are presented in a report by Rust E&I, dated May 20, 1996..

As recommended in the "Corrective Action Effectiveness Evaluation and Proposed Monitoring Plan" (Rust E&I, June 1, 1995), four temporary cased wells (TC-1, TC-2, TC-3, and TC-4) were installed east of the LLRC as shown in Figure 2. Permission was not granted to leave permanent wells in place; therefore the wells were installed, sampled and removed over a period of a few days. Refer to the "Temporary Well Construction Report" in Appendix A for well installation, sampling, laboratory results, and removal details. The Corrective Action Effectiveness Evaluation and Proposed Monitoring Plan Submittal (Rust E&I, June 1, 1995) contains a more detailed description of previous investigations conducted on the site.

3.0 GEOLOGY / HYDROGEOLOGY

3.1 REGIONAL GEOLOGY

The LLRC is located in the western Mojave Desert in the topographic Antelope Valley Basin. The Antelope Valley basin is a downfaulted structural depression bounded on the north by the Rosamond and Bissel Hills, on the northwest by the Garlock Fault and Tehachapi Mountains, on the south and southwest by the San Andreas Fault Zone and the San Gabriel Mountains, and on the east by a series of small hills which separate the Antelope Valley from the Mojave and Fremont Valleys (Durbin, 1978).

The subject area is located within the Lancaster subunit of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. The groundwater basin consists of two main aquifers; the upper predominately unconfined Principal Aquifer and the lower predominately confined Deep Aquifer. The Principal and Deep Aquifers are separated by a lacustrine clay deposit which is approximately 100 to 300 feet below ground surface (bgs) (Duell, 1987). Regional recharge to the groundwater basin occurs mainly from surface run-off or rainfall in the local mountains and imported water for irrigation.

3.2 SITE TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

The land surface is characterized as relatively flat and gently sloping at 15 to 20 feet per mile, to the northwest. Ground surface elevations range from 2,325 feet above mean sea level (MSL) along the southern boundary to 2,310 feet MSL along the northern boundary.

Information provided in lithologic logs of borings drilled in the vicinity of the site is consistent with the regional geology and indicate the upper alluvium consists of interlayered, intermixed, and unconsolidated clays, silts, sands and gravels to a depth of approximately 105 feet bgs. The boring logs are provided in the Rust E&I (June 1, 1995) Effectiveness Evaluation report. Beneath this sequence of alluvium, at approximately 105 feet bgs, is a continuous clay deposit. This clay is believed to be the regional lacustrine deposits which separate the upper and lower alluvium.

Based on previous investigations, the upper alluvium is laterally divided into two areas; a finer-grained sediment sequence in the southeastern portion of the site vicinity consisting predominately of clays and silts with intermixed sands; and a coarser sediment sequence in the northwestern portion of the site. The upper alluvium consists of interlayered and intermixed clayey silts, sandy silts, silty sands and gravelly sands. Within the upper alluvium there exists a continuous sand unit which ranges in thickness from approximately 10 feet to 70 feet in thickness and is observed in borings throughout the study area. This "primary" sand unit follows the northwestern to southeastern change between the finer to coarser sediments. The thickest and most continuous sand is seen in the western portion of the site. In the center and eastern portion of the site the sand unit becomes thinner, less continuous and intermixed with finer sediments.

3.3 SITE HYDROGEOLOGY

Hydrogeologically, the upper alluvium consists of one continuous aquifer known as the Principle Aquifer (the uppermost water bearing unit) which is located in the primary sand unit. Regionally, the Principal Aquifer is reported to be predominately unconfined (Duell, 1987). In the area of the LLRC, the Principle Aquifer is assumed to be semi-confined to confined in the northern and eastern portion of the site due to the overlying fine-grained sediments. These fine-grained sediments are not present or are very thin and discontinuous in the western and southern portion of the site, where the Principle Aquifer is predominantly unconfined. The base of the Principle Aquifer is at approximately 105 feet bgs at the surface of the lacustrine clay deposit and ranges from approximately 20 to 60 feet in saturated thickness (Rust E&I, 1995) averaging 40 feet across the site. Based on pre-pumping groundwater contour maps, the static groundwater direction is to the southeast. The transient flow characteristics are discussed in Section 4.1.

3.3.1 Aquifer Testing Summary

Aquifer pumping tests conducted during previous investigations and the distribution of the Principle Aquifer hydrogeologic parameters were evaluated. Table 2 summarizes available data reported from pumping tests conducted at the site. A wide range of values for aquifer characteristics such as hydraulic conductivity, transmissivity, and storativity were reported. The range of reported values can be attributed to several factors which were noted in the pump test discussions presented in investigative reports (Emcon 1989, Hydro-Search 1990, GeoSyntec 1992, Rust E&I, 1995). These factors included: high well losses or inefficient pumping wells; short-term pumping; insufficient aquifer stabilization; delayed yield from surrounding sources; the absence of observation wells or observation wells placed too distant from the pumping well (no measurable drawdown). In general, pumping tests which were run for a longer period of time and tests which involved the use of observation wells are considered the most reliable.

Based on available data and the above mentioned factors the following are estimated hydrogeologic parameters that are believed to exist beneath the site.

Hydraulic Conductivity	50 to 2,112 gpd/ft^2
Transmissivity	3,000 to 90,000 gpd/ft
Storativity	0.000001 to 0.0001
Porosity	0.2
Velocity	105 ft/yr
Aquifer Thickness	20 to 60 ft, average 40 ft

where: gpd/ft^2 = gallons per day per foot squared
gpd/ft = gallons per day per foot
ft/yr = feet per year

The range in hydraulic conductivity, transmissivity, storativity and aquifer thickness is due to the lateral variation in aquifer material as discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. The western and southern portion of the site, where the aquifer is thicker and sediments are much coarser-grained, has a much higher hydraulic conductivity than the eastern and northern areas. Durbin's mathematical flow model of the Antelope Valley (Durbin, 1978) supports a change from lower to higher transmissivities from the north to south. Although Durbin's model estimates higher transmissivities and aquifer thickness in the area, the relative change is similar. Figure 3 illustrates the estimated change in hydraulic conductivity across the site.

4.0 CAP EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION

This section of the report presents an evaluation of the CAP effectiveness over the past year. Special attention, however, is given to the past two quarters, during which time recent modifications to the CAP groundwater extraction system have been in place and operating. The evaluation focuses primarily on the performance of the existing CAP with respect to the specific VOC plumes. In evaluating the CAP, the following approach was used: review baseline and previous conditions; evaluate and discuss isoconcentration contour maps (Appendix B) and time series plots (Appendix C) of selected VOC's and inorganics; evaluate and discuss piezometric contours maps and calculated capture zones of extraction wells; evaluate the relationships between VOC and inorganic concentrations, piezometric contour maps and relative changes in concentrations. Based on the results, recommendations are provided for modifications to the system to maximize pumping effectiveness, plume remediation and CAP monitoring.

4.1 GROUNDWATER FLOW

Groundwater contour maps from February 1995 and December 1995 are provided in Figures 4 and 5, to illustrate general groundwater flow conditions prior to completion of the recent system modification in early 1996. Groundwater flow conditions existing after the completion of the modifications are presented in Figure 6 (May 28, 1996, Piezometric Contours) and Figure 7 (August 6, 1996 Piezometric Contours). A comparison of the various maps illustrates the relative changes in the groundwater flow patterns with respect to the different pumping scenarios. Table 3 summarizes the available data concerning pumping rates in effect at the time each map was created. The pumping rates of EX-3 and EX-7 were decreased after the CAP modifications.

The February 1995 Groundwater Contour Map (approximately one year after system start up) shows little hydraulic influence from the existing system except near well EX-7 (Table 3 shows EX well pumping rates). The December 1995 shows the groundwater elevations approximately two years after system start up. This map shows two main areas of groundwater depressions. One in the northern area is a result of pumping from Extraction Wells EX-1, EX-2 and EX-7. The depression is centered around EX-7, as Well EX-2 was not pumping at the time of groundwater measurements. The southern depression is centered around Well EX-3. Well EX-4 was also not pumping at the time groundwater levels were collected. As shown on this figure, Well EX-3 has a large radius of influence and captures the majority of the groundwater just south of the landfill.

The piezometric contour maps from May 28 and August 8, 1996 show the current pumping scenario at the site with the new extraction wells online (the system was restated at the beginning of May 1996). During the May 28 measurements, EX-9 was not pumping; consequently a depression is not seen around EX-9. However, the August 6, 1996 piezometric contour map shows all wells pumping and the corresponding cones of depression and areas of influence. The pumping rates of EX-9 and EX-10 have since been increased to approximately 20 gpm each. Wells EX-7 and EX-11 in the northern area both have separate cones of depression and areas of influence that cover the areas of historical elevated VOC's. Wells EX-8 through EX-10 cover the southern and southeastern portion of the site. Based on the contours presented in the August 6, 1996 map, the cones of depression have intercepted one another at the southeastern boundary of the landfill. Ideally the capture zones of EX-8, EX-9 and EX-10 will completely overlap which will prevent any contamination from migrating off-site. Increasing, wells EX-9 and EX-10 to approximately 20 gpm each should give the desired

drawdown and radii of influence. EX-3, located south of EX-8 is creating a third main area of influence which has been capturing VOC's that migrated off site prior to the CAP installation.

4.2 GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION SYSTEM (CAP) OPERATION

As discussed in Section 2.0 the CAP was modified during at the beginning of 1996. The modification involved the installation of wells EX-8 through EX-11 and connecting them to the groundwater remediation system, removing wells EX-1, EX-2, and EX-4 from the system, reducing flow rates in EX-3 and EX-7, and adjusting the flow rates of the new wells. As with any new well installation, the start up period involved numerous adjustments to the flow rates to establish the desired drawdown in each extraction well. Table 3 summarizes available data concerning flow rates from each extraction well. Currently, the goal of the CAP is to capture VOCs from the southeastern property boundary in wells EX-8, EX-9, and EX-10 and to capture VOCs from the northern area near EX-7 and EX-11. Well EX-3 has remained in operation to capture any remaining VOCs which moved off site prior to the CAP or CAP modifications. The VOC concentrations in EX-3 have decreased and are below the MCL's, and all the surrounding wells are ND, or have trace levels of VOC indicating that a minimal amount of VOCs exists south of the site.

The total volume of VOC removed this year is approximately 3 kg. The volume was calculated from the following equation:

(Conc. VOC (ppb)/kg) x (3.7852 kg/1gal) x total gal treated = total VOC removed

Where: Conc. VOC = concentration of each VOC detected quaterly.
Total gal treated = the total volume of water treated each semester

The First and Second Semester CAP Monitoring Reports prepared by WMI were used to obtain; the VOC concentrations detected in the CAP influent water; and for the total gallons of water treated each semester. The total volume of each VOC detected was calculated for each semester then the total volume of VOC extracted was added to get the total volume of VOC's removed this year.

Based on information collected during the CAP modifications, the influent operating parameters of the current remediation system have been established to be between approximately 110 gpm to 160 gpm. If the total influent does not fall within these parameters the system will still run but will shut down after a period of time due to either the influent or effluent holding tanks reaching either their maximum or minimum capacity.

4.3 TEMPORARY CASED WELLS AND LABORATORY RESULTS

As discussed in previous sections, four temporary cased (TC) wells were installed and sampled to collect groundwater chemical data east of the site. Results of the analytical results show several unusual or anomalous conditions which are discussed here in further detail. For details on the TC well installation, sampling and removal activities refer to Appendix A. Table 4 summmarizes the VOC and SVOCs detected in the TC wells.

4.3.1 Semi-VOCs

Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate and Di-N-Butylphthalate were both detected at elevated levels in one or more of the TC well samples. Both of these compounds are used as plasticizer's in polyvinyl chloride (PVC). Due to the nature of the TC well installation and minimal time frame between casing installation and sampling, these compounds are believed to have leached from the PVC casing. These two compounds are not seen in any of the other monitoring wells across the site and at this time are not believed to be representative of groundwater at the site. WMI is currently testing and analyzing water placed in new PVC casing, identical to the casing used for the TC wells. The test results will be forwarded to the RWQCB as soon as they are available.

4.3.2 VOCs

Results of the TC well analyses indicate the presence of several VOCs, including PCE, Toluene, DCDFM, and Cis-1,2-DCE. All of these VOCs, except 2-Butanone, are present at concentrations below the Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs). The presence of these VOCs in the TC wells may reflect the eastern most edge of the current VOC plume.

The VOC 2-Butanone was detected at elevated levels in TC-1 (130 ppb) and TC-3 (33 ppb). This compound is used in teflon tubing. New teflon tubing was used in sampling of the TC wells. One section of tubing was used for all four wells and sampled in the following order TC-1, TC-3, TC-4 and TC-2. The tubing was decontaminated prior to use and between each well according to WMI well sampling procedures (WMI, 1989). It is believed that 2-Butanone leached out of the teflon tubing during sampling and is not representative of groundwater at the site. WMI is currently also testing and analyzing clean water placed in similar teflon tubing. 2-Butanone has been detected on site at low levels in EX-8(13 and 5 ppb) and one time in March 1996 in EX-11 at 210 ppb subsequent samples were non-detect for 2-Butanone in EX-11.

4.3.3 Inorganics

The inorganic constituents (specifically Chloride, Sulfate and Barium) all show anomalously elevated levels in some or all of the TC wells compared to all wells sampled and analyzed over the last two semesters at LLFRC. Figures B-11 and B-12 in Appendix B show the isoconcentration contours of Chloride. As shown, the chloride in TC-4 (110 mg/l) is about two orders of magnitude higher MW-2 and MW-5. Sulfate is significantly higher, especially in TC-4 (30.6 mg/l), and Barium is one order of magnitude higher in TC-1(1.42 mg/l) and TC-3 (1.69 mg/l). The distribution of high concentrations of inorganics does not coincide with a plume moving off site. For example, wells MW-2 and MW-15, which are upgradient from the TC wells, are significantly lower and consistent with all existing wells on site. These anomalously high inorganics cannot be fully explained with the available data but are not believed to be landfill related. The elevated levels may be due to the local lithology, which is known to contain evaporites (Duell, 1987), or due to the well installation and sampling procedures, which did not allow for thorough well development.

4.4 GROUNDWATER QUALITY BASELINE CONDITIONS

As discussed in Section 2.0 the design of the CAP was originally based on the detection and location of VOC's in the groundwater beneath and adjacent to the site. Specifically, Figures 8 and 9 show the

estimated distribution of PCE and TCE concentrations in excess of the MCLs. Figure 8 shows the pre-pumping VOC concentrations and Figure 9 showsVOC concentrations after one year of pumping.

4.5 ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOUR MAPS

Isoconcentration contour maps from the Second Semester 1996 for selected analytes are included in Appendix B. Under the current WDR's, sampling was conducted with a different set of wells for the second and third quarter, 1996. The second quarter (sampled at the end of May and beginning of June 1996), consisted of Wells MW-2, MW-3, MW-5, MW-10, MW-11, MW-12, MW-13, MW-15, MW-17, CAP-5, EX-3, and EX-7, through EX-11. The third quarter sampling, conducted in July 1996, includes Wells MW-15, EX-3, and EX-7 through EX-11. Wells MW-6 and MW-7 were also included in the third quarter sampling event for additional upgradient water quality data.

The analytical results were evaluated for VOCs and Semi-VOCs known to exist in previous sampling events and for any new or elevated VOCs or Semi-VOCs. The detectable VOCs or VOCs of concern include; 1,1-Dichloroethane (1,1-DCA), 1,2-Dichloroethene (1,2-DCE), 1,4-Dichlorobenzene (1,4-DCB), Cis-1,2-Dichloroethene and Trans-1-2-Dichloroethene (Cis and Trans-1,2-DCE), Dichlorodifluoromethane (DCDFM), Tetrachloroethene (PCE), Trichloroethene (TCE), and Vinyl Chloride. There were no significant detections of Semi-VOC's. Isoconcentration contour or concentration maps from both sampling events (May and June, 1996 and July, 1996) were prepared for most of the VOC's listed above and are included in Appendix B. Isoconcentration contours for 1,1-DCA, 1,2-DCE and 1,4-DCB were not prepared as the distribution and or quantity of these constituents was minimal and does not show significant changes at the plume boundaries. The analytical results were also evaluated for inorganics and general chemistry and isoconcentration contour maps were prepared for Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), Sulfate, and Chloride.

4.5.1 VOC and Inorganic Constituent Plume Boundaries

Figures B-1 through B-10 in Appendix B shows the estimated current distribution of VOCs and Figures B-11 through B-16 show the estimated current distribution of TDS, Chloride, and Sulfate based on the most recent sampling events in June and July 1996. It should be noted that the plume margins are based on a limited number of data points, and in some areas are estimated or inferred.

Based on a comparison of the current VOC isoconcentration maps with the isoconcentration maps presented in the "Groundwater Remediation System Monitoring Report, First Semester 1996" (WMI, April 30, 1996), VOC concentrations appear to have slightly decreased across the site, with the exception of PCE which has decreased significantly along the leading edge (Wells MW-2 and MW-5). All off-site wells, including EX-3, are well below MCLs for all VOCs analyzed. Well CAP-5, which had detectable concentrations of PCE and DCE in March 1996, is now non-detect for all VOC's. Data collected from the newly installed TC wells shows a maximum detection of PCE and DCDFM at 1 ppb in TC-3. Based on this new data it is believed that some trace levels of VOC's have migrated off-site prior to the installation of the CAP or modified CAP. In most cases, the distribution of VOCs is highest along the southeastern site boundary, however, VOCs also extend in lesser amounts south of the landfill toward EX-3 and TC-3.

Because of the layout of the site, and the lack of data from the covered landfill (interior), it is uncertain if there are two distinct (northern and southern plumes) as previously believed. Therefore

the current isoconcentration maps show only one plume extending beneath most of the site. However, in comparing the recent plume boundaries with pre-pumping plume boundaries the level of VOCs in the northern portion of the site (EX-11) has decreased, in most cases, to non-detect levels.

The distribution of TDS, Chloride and Sulfate is relatively consistent with the First Semester data, however there is an overall slight decrease in levels with the exception of Sulfate and Chloride in the new TC wells. As seen on Figures B-11 through B-14 the TC wells show anomalously high inorganic data compared with any other well on site, even wells known to be affected by leachate. The isoconcentration contour maps show the dramatic increase of the selected inorganics but do not indicate that these are leading edges of an inorganic plume, or are related to landfill leachate. Since these concentrations are so dramatically different than landfill wells or all other offsite wells for Chloride and Sulfate and VOC concentrations do not show a similar increase, the high inorganic levels are believed to be anomalous and may be due to the chemistry of soil, or well installation and sampling methods.

Selected chemicals from both quarters in the second semester were contoured and are provided in Appendix B. However, the May/June 1996 sampling event, where both the extraction wells and monitoring wells were monitored shows more complete and reliable isoconcentration figures. The isoconcentration contours which show only the extraction well data are not as reliable and are considered inconclusive. As shown in the May/June 1996 TCE, PCE, and DCDFM isoconcentration contour maps there is a relatively large difference between the concentrations detected in EX-8 and EX-9 and the adjacent monitoring wells MW-3 and MW-5. In each case the concentration is greater in the monitoring well, indicating that although the extraction well contains VOCs the result is partially diluted due to the volume of water extracted and the larger screened area. The concentrations of VOCs detected in the extraction wells can be used to show the relative difference from quarter to quarter in each extraction well, however, semiannual sampling appears to be sufficient to monitor the fluctuation in VOC concentrations beneath the site. Based on this observation and discussion, sampling the extraction wells semiannually should be adequately to monitor the VOC concentrations beneath the site.

4.6 TIME SERIES PLOTS

Time series plots of selected VOCs, inorganics, and general water quality from extraction wells EX-3, EX-7 through EX-11, MW-2 through MW-5, MW-10, MW-11 and MW-17 are presented as Figures 1 through 16 in Appendix C. The same chemical constituents selected for the isoconcentration and concentration maps were used for the time series plots. Time series plots were created for all active extraction wells and monitoring wells which either have detectable concentrations or have historically contained significant detectable concentrations of the selected VOC and inorganic constituents. Figures 1 through 16 (Appendix C) show time series plots of the selected VOCs and inorganics from wells in the southern and eastern portion of the site.

4.6.1 Well MW-2

In MW-2, the detectable concentrations of TCE, PCE and DCDFM show a general decrease in concentration with time. As can be seen, the highest concentrations were detected prior to the Iistallation of the CAP, however they were decreasing prior to the CAP start up. After the CAP was

installed there was a slight increase in detected VOC's, then the levels decreased again. Similarly, the detected concentrations of Chloride and Sulfate have decreased over time and were decreasing prior to the installation of the CAP. The TDS values have remained relatively constant through time. Compared with the first semester 1996 WMI report the concentrations have mostly decreased and in some cases remained relatively unchange in MW-2. Further, MW-2 is below the MCLs for all the selected VOC and inorganics analyzed.

4.6.2 Well MW-3 and MW-5

In contrast, the detected concentrations of PCE, and TCE in MW-3 and MW-5 and DCDFM and Cis-1,2-DCE in MW-3 show an overall increase over time. In general, they also show a relative greater change immediately after CAP pumping began and then relative decrease to the current levels. The detected concentrations of DCDFM in MW-5, however, are similar to MW-2 in that they have decreased over time and were decreasing prior to the installation of the CAP. Similarly with MW-2 the Chloride concentrations in MW-3 and MW-5 and the Sulfate concentrations in MW-5 have decreased over time and were decreasing prior to the CAP, however the Sulfate concentration in MW-3 has increased with time. MW-3 is below the MCL for all selected VOCs evaluated except PCE (5 ppb), Vinyl Chloride (6 ppb), and TCE (17 ppb). MW-5 is below the MCL for all selected chemicals evaluated except PCE (100 ppb).

4.6.3 Wells MW-10, MW-11, and MW-17

Figures 1-16 in Appendix C show the VOC and inorganic concentrations over time in MW-10, MW-11 and MW-17. All three of these wells show relatively consistent fluctuations with respect to the VOC's (TCE, PCE, Cis-1,2-DCE, and DCDFM) and inorganics. In general, all the constituents show a slight increase followed by a decrease to the current levels. MW-10, MW-11, and MW-17 are below the MCL except for PCE in MW-10 which is at 17 ppb.

4.6.4 Extraction Wells

In extraction wells EX-3 and EX-7, the concentrations of the selected VOCs show a general decreasing trend over time. Both wells show that after the start of the CAP the VOC concentrations decresed rapidly, then show a relative stable condition. Based on the trends shown in these time series plots, extraction wells EX-3 and EX-7 have captured VOCs in their local area and decreased the VOC concentrations. As shown on Figures 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16 in Appendix C, there is a relatively larger fluctuation in some of VOCs for EX-7 than in EX-3. This may be attributed to the relative location of EX-3 and EX-7 to a source. Where EX-7 is closer to the source the relative concentrations show a greater variance than in EX-3. Th inorganic trends for Chloride and TDS show a relative stable trend over time, however Sulfate shows a noticable increase in early 1996 in both EX-3 and EX-7. This increase may be a result of leachate but because the actual concentrations are so low (a few mg/l) it does not appear that a new source or discharge of leachate has occured.

The amount of data available for the new extraction wells EX-8 through EX-11, and the amount of adjustments conducted on the pumping rates in the past year makes the time series plots inconclusive in evaluating a trend in chemical concentrations. Time series plots should be evaluated in the next annual evaluation.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS OF CAP EFFECTIVENESS

Based on the information and discussions presented in Section 4.0 through 4.5 the following conclusions are made:

- The isoconcentration contour and concentration maps presented in Appendix B show the existence of VOC impacted groundwater beneath the site, with concentrations below the current MCLs extending southeast of the site toward EX-3 and TC-3. Comparing concentrations of VOCs with the first semester 1996 VOC concentrations and isoconcentration maps (WMI, April 30, 1996), there is a general decrease in VOC levels and decrease in the size of the estimated VOC plume boundaries.

- Similar to the VOCs, there is a general decrease in inorganic concentrations from last semester, with the exception of the TC wells. The inorganic isoconcentration maps show a slight increase in concentration around extraction wells EX-8 and EX-7 relative to the other wells. This is believed to be due to landfill leachate which is drawn into the extraction wells.

- The value of sampling all the extraction wells and well MW-15 each quarter does not appear to be justified. Isoconcentration contour maps generated from extraction well and MW-15 data only is inconclusive and relies on inferred or estimated contours. The Isoconcentration contour maps which include the larger set of wells are more reliable as the contours have values on each side enabling contouring calculations. As shown on the four sets of isoconcentration maps from the two semesters this year there is relatively little change between each quarter, especially in the extraction wells. Further, quarterly sampling of the influent will indicate if there has been a substantial increase of VOCs.

- The time series plots (Appendix C) indicate that for the selected VOC and Inorganics, relatively consistent concentrations are recordered for most of the wells. In some cases, however, the concentrations have gone up slightly and in some wells the concentrations dropped fairly dramatically. The time series plots also show that in many cases, (MW-2 and MW-5) the VOC and inorganic concentrations were decreasing over time even prior to the CAP installation. This may be due to natural degradation or dilution. The time series plots show VOC and inorganic concentrations in EX-3 have decreased with time after the CAP installation and all constituents are below the MCLs.

- The piezometric contour maps show the groundwater flow and capture zones of the extraction wells. The current extraction system is effectively capturing groundwater along the majority of the southeastern property boundary. In addition, the extraction system is capturing VOCs in the northern portion of the site near EX-7 and EX-11 and south of the site in near EX-3. Based on the available data Well EX-3 has decreased in VOC and inorganic concentrations, indicating that concentrations have been reduced enough to remove EX-3 from the CAP. The surrounding Wells MW-12, MW-13 and CAP-5 should continue to be monitored, and if VOC concentrations begin to rise again EX-3 should be reactivated.

- The CAP system is effectively capturing VOCs in groundwater beneath the site. The estimated total volume of VOCs extracted this year is 3 kg.

- The TC wells showed that trace amounts of VOCs have migrated off-site, probably prior to the installation of the CAP and CAP modifications. These concentrations are well below all MCLs. The elevated SVOCs and inorganics detected in the TC wells are believed to be due to sampling methods, equipment or local lithology. Due to the existence of VOCs and SVOCs in the TC wells and if permission can be obtained Rust E&I recommends the additional CAP monitoring well should be installed near TC-3. If permission is not granted an additional CAP well should be installed approximately 800 feet east of TC-4 in the public dirt road. This well should be added to the CAP monitoring well network and sampled on a semi-annual basis.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this investigation the following recommendations are made to improve the effectiveness of the CAP system.

- Continue operating extraction Wells EX-7 through EX-11 at the current pumping rates and take Well EX-3 off line. If VOCs increase in subsequent monitoring events south of the landfill turn EX-3 back on.

- Continue to conduct semi-annual sampling with the existing suite of wells MW-3, MW-5, MW-10, MW-11, MW-12, MW-13, MW-15, MW-17, CAP-5, EX-3, and EX-7 through EX-11.

- Continue to conduct quarterly sampling on the CAP influent and effluent and discontinue quarterly sampling on all the extraction wells and well MW-15.

- Install a permanent monitoring well near TC-3. If permission cannot be obtained, move the well location to the public access road approximately 800 feet to the east of TC-4. Include this well in the semiannual monitoring well network.

- Collect quarterly groundwater elevations on all monitoring, cap, injection and extraction wells during a maximum 24-hour time period, to obtain consistent groundwater elevation data.

7.0 REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Lahontan Region (CRWQCB), "Waste Discharge Requirements for Waste Management of California, Inc., Groundwater Remediation Project, Lancaster Sanitary Landfill, Los Angeles County," Board Order No. 6-92-20, WDID No. 6B199201001.

Duell, Lowell F. W., Jr., 1987, "Geohydrology of the Antelope Valley Area California and Design for A Ground-Water-Quality Monitoring Network". U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigations Report 84-4081.

Durbin, Timothy J., 1978, "Calibration of a Mathematical Model of the Antelope Valley Ground-Water Basin, California". Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 2046.

EMCON, July 1986, "Groundwater Monitoring System; Lancaster Landfill, Los Angeles County, California," prepared for Waste Management of Lancaster.

EMCON, January 1989, "Verification Monitoring Program Report Lancaster Landfill," prepared for Waste Management of North America, Inc.

GeoSyntec Consultants (GeoSyntec), December 24, 1991, "Remedial Action Plan, Ground-Water Remediation Project, Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center, Los Angeles County, California," December 24, 1991.

GeoSyntec Consultants, February 20, 1992, "Draft Report, Ground-Water Remediation System, Lancaster Landfill, Los Angeles County, California."

GeoSyntec Consultants, June 11, 1992, "Draft Design, Ground-Water Remediation System, Lancaster Landfill, Los Angeles County, California."

GeoSyntec Consultants, July 15, 1994, "Report, First Quarter Monitoring of Ground-Water Remediation System, Ground-Water Remediation Project, Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center, Lancaster California," prepared for Waste Management of California.

GeoSyntec Consultants, October 14, 1994, "Report, Second Quarter Monitoring of Ground-Water Remediation System, Ground-Water Remediation Project, Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center, Lancaster, California," prepared for Waste Management of California.

GeoSyntec Consultants, January 15, 1995, "Report, Third Quarter Monitoring of Ground-Water Remediation System, Ground-Water Remediation Project, Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center, Lancaster, California," prepared for Waste Management of California.

GeoSyntec Consultants, March 30, 1995, "Annual Report of Groundwater Remediation System, 1994 Groundwater Remediation Project," Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center, Lancaster, California.

GeoSyntec Consultants, April 14, 1995, "Report, Fourth Quarter Monitoring of Ground-Water Remediation System, Ground-Water Remediation Project, Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center, Lancaster, California" prepared for Waste Management of California.

Hydro-Search, Inc., December 27, 1990, "Phase II Hydrogeologic Investigation, Lancaster Landfill, Lancaster California," prepared for Waste Management of California.

McDonald, Michael G. and Arlen W. Harbough, 1987, "A Modular Three-Dimensional-Finite Difference Groundwater Flow Model" Chapter A1, Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations of the United States Geological Survey.

Regional Water Quality Control Board-Lahontan Region, November 9, 1994, "Correspondence to Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center."

Regional Water Quality Control Board-Lahontan Region, January 18, 1995, "Correspondence to Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center."

RUST Environment & Infrastructure, Inc., August 5, 1994, "Addendum to Proposed Monitoring and Reporting Program," Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center, California, prepared for Waste Management.

SEC Donohue, June 1990, "Proposed Monitoring and Reporting Program, Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center, Lancaster, California."

USEPA, June 1994, "Methods for Monitoring Pump-and-Treat Performance," EPA/600/R-94/123.
Waste Management of North America, Inc., June 1991, (WMNA), "Groundwater Flow and Contaminant Transport Modeling, Lancaster Landfill, California," WMNA Environmental Studies Groundwater Modeling Section.

RUST Environment & Infrastructure, May 20, 1996, "Extraction Wells EX-8, EX-9, EX-10 and EX-11 Installation Report," prepared for Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center.

RUST Environment & Infrastructure, June 1, 1995, "Corrective Action Effectivenes Evaluation and Proposed Monitoring Plan," prepared for Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center.

Waste Management, Inc., April 30, 1996, "Groundwater Remediation System Monitoring Report, First Semester 1996," prepared for Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center.

Zheng, C., October 17, 1990, MT#D A Modular Three-Dimensional Transport Model of Simulation of Advection, Dispersion and Chemical Reactions of Contaminants in Groundwater Systems.

TABLE 1
WELL CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

Well I.D.	Reference	Date Installed	Well Type	Well Diameter (Inches)	Ground Surface (ft msl)	Total Depth (ft bgs)	Screened Interval (ft bgs)	Drill Method	Lithologic Log	Northing	Easting	TOC Elevation (ft msl)
MW-1	Emcon 1986	May 1986	D. Monitor	4.5	2312.2	69.5	36.5-65.5	HS Auger	YES	4384670	4252118	2313.25
MW-2	Emcon 1986	May 1986	D. Monitor	4.5	2317.1	79.5	34.5-74.5	HS Auger	YES	4383398	4253080	2318.00
MW-3	Emcon 1986	May 1986	D. Monitor	4.5	2317.8	79.5	35.5-74.5	HS Auger	YES	4382127	4252173	2318.70
MW-4	Emcon 1989	May 1986	D. Monitor	4.5	2313.8	69.5	34-63	HS Auger	YES	4383378	4251755	2314.81
MW-5	Emcon 1989	Oct 1988	D. Monitor	2.0	2319.2	80.0	58.8-78.4	HS Auger	YES	4382159	4253104	2320.45
MW-6	Emcon	July 1988	D. Monitor	2.0	2307+-	75.0	43-73.5	HS Auger	YES	4384752	4249953	2308.72
MW-7	Emcon	July 1988	D. Monitor	2.0	2313+-	75.0	44.3-74	HS Auger	YES	4384681	4253567	2312.07
MW-8	Hydro-Search	Oct 1988	D. Monitor	2.0	2318.3	77.2	44.98-75	HS Auger	YES	4382125	4250872	2321.00
MW-9	Hydro-Search	Oct 1988	D. Monitor	2.0	2317.9	75.6	45.01-75	HS Auger	YES	4382127	4251543	2320.48
MW-10	GeoSyntec	Jan 1993	C.A. Monitor	4.5	2315.1	112.0	30-110	RC Water	NO	4383082	4251770	2318.23
MW-11	GeoSyntec	Oct 1992	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2317.3	116.5	30-115	NA	YES	4382494	4251786	2318.84
MW-12(CAP-4)	GeoSyntec	Oct 1992	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2324.4	80.5	30-80	NA	YES	4380890	4252514	2325.92
MW-13(CAP-6)	GeoSyntec	Oct 1992	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2323.0	80.0	30-80	NA	YES	4381307	4253057	2324.35
MW-14	GeoSyntec	Dec 1993	C.A. Monitor	4.5	NA	115.0	30-110	RC Water	YES	4379931	4253155	2327.30
MW-15	GeoSyntec	Oct 1992	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2320.1	115.0	30-115	NA	YES	4383364	4254734	2320.10
MW-16(EW-2)	Hydro-Search	Nov 1990	C.A. Monitor	6.0	2322.2	116.0	50-110	HS Auger	NO	NA	NA	2324.16
MW-17	GeoSyntec	Oct 1992	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2315.7	116.5	30-115	NA	YES	4384087	4251601	2316.26
EX-1	GeoSyntec 1992	Oct 1991	Extraction	4.0	2297.2	99.7	20-90	Mud Rotary	YES	4383927	4251771	2294.74
EX-2	GeoSyntec 1992	Oct 1991	Extraction	4.0	2314.9	116.8	40-110	Mud Rotary	YES	4383300	4251770	2313.50
EX-3(EW-3)	Hydro-Search	Nov 1990	Extraction	6.0	NA	NA	NA	Mud Rotary	NO	4381354	4252611	2320.11
EX-4	GeoSyntec 1992	Oct 1991	Extraction	4.0	2323.7	117.1	40-110	Mud Rotary	YES	4381064	4253033	2320.95
EX-7	GeoSyntec	Dec 1992	Extraction	4.5	2316.0	113.0	30-112	RC Water	NO	4383597	4251779	2314.90
EX-8	RUST E&I	Dec 1995	Extraction	6.0	NA	113.0	50-105	Air Hammer	YES	4382132	4252285	2318.37
EX-9	RUST E&I	Dec 1995	Extraction	6.0	NA	110.0	48-103	Air Hammer	YES	4382130	4252990	2319.50
EX-10	RUST E&I	Dec 1995	Extraction	6.0	NA	106.0	50-100	Air Hammer	YES	4382794	4253.92.12	2319.33
EX-11	RUST E&I	Dec 1995	Extraction	6.0	NA	97.0	50-90	Air Hammer	YES	4384336	4251057	2312.67
IW-1	GeoSyntec	July 1992	Injection	6.0	NA	120.0	16.5-116.5	Mud Rotary	NO	NA	NA	NA
IW-2	GeoSyntec	Nov 1992	Injection	6.0	2318.8	122.0	20-120	RC Water	NO	4383651	4254674	2315.60
IW-3	GeoSyntec	Dec 1992	Injection	6.0	2321.1	122.0	20-120	RC Water	NO	4383638	4254872	2318.20
IW-4	GeoSyntec	Dec 1992	Injection	6.0	2319.6	123.0	20-120	RC Water	NO	4383629	4255071	2316.50
IW-5	GeoSyntec	Dec 1992	Injection	6.0	2321.5	123.5	20-120	RC Water	NO	4383619	4255269	2318.80
IW-6	GeoSyntec	Dec 1992	Injection	6.0	2321.0	122.0	18-78	RC Water	NO	4383610	4255468	2318.00
CAP-1	GeoSyntec	Oct 1992	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2314.6	80.0	30-80	NA	YES	4383810	4251134	2315.79

TABLE 1
WELL CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

Well I.D.	Reference	Date Installed	Well Type	Well Diameter (Inches)	Ground Surface (ft msl)	Total Depth (ft bgs)	Screened Interval (ft bgs)	Drill Method	Lithologic Log	Northing	Easting	TOC Elevation (ft msl)
CAP-2	GeoSyntec	Nov 1992	C.A. Monitor	2.0	NA	38.5	8-38	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA
CAP-3	GeoSyntec	Oct 1992	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2317.5	80.5	30-80	NA	YES	4383827	4251801	2319.03
CAP-5	GeoSyntec	Oct 1992	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2325.3	89.5	30-85	NA	YES	4380785	4253105	2326.32
TW-1(B-10)*	Emcon 1989	Sep 1988	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2318.2	78.0	55-74.35	HS AUGER	YES	4382125	4252181	2320.20
TW-2(B-17)*	Emcon 1989	Oct 1988	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2318.3	96.0	86.05-95.5	HS AUGER	YES	4382125	4252192	2319.20
TC-1	RUST E&I	July 1996	C.A. Monitor	2.0	23179.9	85.0	75-85	HS AUGER	YES	4382811	4253928	2318.73
TC-2	RUST E&I	July 1996	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2321.4	85.0	75-85	HS AUGER	YES	4381928	4253954	2322.34
TC-3	RUST E&I	July 1996	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2324.0	83.0	73-83	HS AUGER	YES	4381216	4253945	2324.80
TC-4	RUST E&I	July 1996	C.A. Monitor	2.0	2326.6	85.0	75-85	HS AUGER	YES	4280308	4253977	2327.62

Notes:

* = Abandonned well

HS Auger = Hollow Stem Auger

R.C. Water = Reverse Circulation with water

Air Hammer = Dual-wall reverse circulation, air hammer

C.A. Monitor = Corrective Action Monitoring Well

D. Monitor = Detection monitoring well

Emcon 1986 = Installed by Emcon included in Emcon Report 1986 see reference section

Emcon = Installed by Emcon, report not available

NA =not available

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF PUMPING TEST DATA

Well	Date	Contractor	Type of Test	Analysis Method	Transmissivity T (gpd/ft)	Hydr Cond K (gpd/ft2)	Storage Coeff	ump/Obs Well	Aquifer Thicknes (ft)	Hydraulic Gradient (ft/ft)	G W Velocity (ft/day)	Porosity
MW-1	1986	EMCON	Constant Rate	Theis	508t *	12.7	NR	pump	NR	0.001	0.002-0.02	0.2-0.4
MW-2	1986	EMCON	Constant Rate	Theis	96t *	2.4	NR	pump	NR	0.001	0.002-0.02	0.2-0.4
MW-3	1986	EMCON	Constant Rate	Bolton	200 *	5.0	NR	pump	NR	0.001	0.002-0.02	0.2-0.4
MW-4	1986	EMCON	Constant Rate	Theis	260t *	6.5	NR	pump	NR	0.001	0.002-0.02	0.2-0.4
MW3	01/10/89	EMCON	Constant Rate	Boulton	68.6	4.9	NR	pump	14	8.3 x10-4	0.3	0.20
MW-3	01/10/89	EMCON	Constant Rate	Coop/Jac	119	8.5	NR	pump	14	8.3 x10-4	0.3	0.20
MW-3	01/10/89	EMCON	Recovery	Coop/Jac	113	8.1	NR	pump	14	8.3 x10-4	0.3	0.20
TW-1	01/10/89	EMCON	Constant Rate	Theis	6,812.4	487.6	NR	obs	14	8.3 x10-4	0.3	0.20
TW-1	01/10/89	EMCON	Constant Rate	Coop/Jac	7,420	530	NR	obs	14	8.3 x10-4	0.3	0.20
TW-1	01/10/89	EMCON	Recovery	Coop/Jac	8,013	572.4	NR	obs	14	8.3 x10-4	0.3	0.20
TW-2	01/10/89	EMCON	Constant	Coop/Jac	4,685.2	275.6	NR	obs	17	8.3 x10-4	0.3	0.20
EW-1	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Jacob Dd	19,800.0	495.0	4.8x10-4	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
EW-2	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Jacob Dd	17,600.0	440.0	3.7x10-3	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
EW-3	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Jacob Dd	22,000.0	550.0	NR	pmp	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
P-3	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Jacob Dd	44,000.0	1,100.0	1.02x10-	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
P-4	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Jacob Dd	44,000.0	1,100.0	2.2x10-6	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
P-5	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Jacob Dd	34,434.0	860.9	1.37x10-	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
EW-1	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Theis Dd	31,265.0	781.6	9.8x10-5	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
EW-2	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Theis Dd	22,926.0	573.2	9.3x10-4	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
P-3	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Theis Dd	33,390.0	834.8	1.03x10-	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
P-4	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Theis Dd	31,268.0	781.7	1.36x10-	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
P-5	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Theis Dd	20,232.0	505.8	4.9x10-5	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
EW-3	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Coop/Jac(46)	26,800.0	670.0	NR	pmp	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
P-4	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Coop/Jac(46)	31,680.0	792.0	NR	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
P-5	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	Coop/Jac(46)	31,680.0	792.0	NR	obs	40	9.1x10-4	0.39	0.20
avg	1990	HydroSearch	Constant Rate	all	29,362.0	734.1	4.9x10-5	NA	40	0.00	0.39	0.20
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 1 ET	Coop/Jac	837.7	18.7	NR	pump	44.80	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 1 IT	Coop/Jac	2,154.2	48.8	NR	pump	44.14	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 2 ET	Coop/Jac	8,706.7	192.9	NR	pump	45.14	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 3 ET	Coop/Jac	673.2	15.1	NR	pump	44.58	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 3 IT	Coop/Jac	3,336.1	74.2	NR	pump	44.96	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 4 ET	Coop/Jac	2,401.1	53.0	NR	pump	45.30	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 5 ET	Coop/Jac	5,161.2	114.5	NR	pump	45.08	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 5 IT	Coop/Jac	1,496.0	33.9	NR	pump	44.13	NR	NR	NR

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF PUMPING TEST DATA

Well	Date	Contractor	Type of Test	Analysis Method	Transmissivity T (gpd/ft)	Hydr Cond K (gpd/ft2)	Storage Coeff	ump/Obs Well	Aquifer Thicknes (ft)	Hydraulic Gradient (ft/ft)	G W Velocity (ft/day)	Porosity
EX-2	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 1 ET	Coop/Jac	231.8	5.1	NR	pump	45.45	NR	NR	NR
EX-2	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 1 IT	Coop/Jac	994.8	21.2	NR	pump	46.92	NR	NR	NR
EX-2	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 2 ET	Coop/Jac	964.0	21.2	NR	pump	45.47	NR	NR	NR
EX-2	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 2 IT	Coop/Jac	1,974.7	55.1	NR	pump	35.84	NR	NR	NR
EX-2	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 3 ET	Coop/Jac	231.9	5.1	NR	pump	45.47	NR	NR	NR
EX-2	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 3 IT	Coop/Jac	231.9	13.8	NR	pump	16.80	NR	NR	NR
EX-2	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 3 LT	Coop/Jac	4,607.7	108.1	NR	pump	42.62	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 1 ET	Coop/Jac	1,122.0	25.4	NR	pump	44.17	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 1 IT	Coop/Jac	68,741.2	1,526.4	NR	pump	45.03	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 2 ET	Coop/Jac	3,874.7	86.9	NR	pump	44.59	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 2 IT	Coop/Jac	34,841.9	784.4	NR	pump	44.42	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 3 ET	Coop/Jac	1,166.9	25.4	NR	pump	45.94	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 3 IT	Coop/Jac	6,821.8	152.6	NR	pump	44.70	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 4 ET	Coop/Jac	14,518.7	318.0	NR	pump	45.66	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 4 IT	Coop/Jac	9,679.1	212.0	NR	pump	45.66	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 5 ET	Coop/Jac	12,903.0	296.8	NR	pump	43.47	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 1	Boulton	583.4	14.6	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 2	Boulton	7,233.2	180.8	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 4	Boulton	1,084.6	27.1	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 5	Boulton	2,042.0	51.1	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-1	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 6	Boulton	4,181.3	104.5	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-2	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 1	Boulton	29.9	0.7	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-2	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 2	Boulton	1,211.8	30.3	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-2	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 4	Boulton	628.3	15.7	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 1	Boulton	418.9	10.5	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 2	Boulton	2,752.6	68.8	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 4	Boulton	546.0	13.7	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 5	Boulton	7,098.5	177.5	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-4	1992	GeoSyntec	Step 6	Boulton	14,354.1	358.9	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	NR
EX-8	1996	Rust E&I	Step	Coop/Jac	84,480.0	2,112.0	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	0.20
EX-9	1996	Rust E&I	Step	Coop/Jac	89,760.0	1,994.0	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	0.20
EX-10	1996	Rust E&I	Step	Coop/Jac	52,800.0	1,508.0	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	0.20
EX-11	1996	Rust E&I	Step	Coop/Jac	3,168.0	105.0	NR	pump	40.0	NR	NR	0.20

NOTE: Hydr Cond. = Hydraulic conductivity
G.W. = Groundwater
N.R. = Not reported
Coop/Jac = Cooper - Jacob Method

Aquiifer Thickness of EX-1 through EX-4 - Coop Jacob Method were calculated by K=T/b
Aquiifer Thickness of EX-1 through EX-4 -Boulton Method was averaged at 40'

Step 1 ET = Step drawdown test early time (Step 1)
Step 1 IT = Step drawdown test Intermediate time (Step I)
Step 3 LT = Step drawdown test Step 1 through step 6

Step 1-6 = Step drawdown test Step 1 through Step 6
Boulton = (Boulton, 1963)
Theis = (theis, 1935)
Jacob Dd = Jacob drawdown (Cooper and Jacob, 1946)
Jacob rec = Jacob recovery method (Cooper and Jacob, 1964)

G:\geo\lancaster\pmptstsm.wk4

TABLE 3 Extraction Well Pumping Rates					
Well ID	2/95	12/1/95	5/28/96	8/6/96	Current
	gpm	gpm	gpm	gpm	gpm
EX-1	10	0	0	0	0
EX-2	0	12	0	0	0
EX-3	55	55	30	30	30
EX-4	0	20	0	0	0
EX-7	0	30	0	22	20
EX-8	0	0	50	50	50
EX-9	0	0	0	12	20
EX-10	0	0	10	10	20
EX-11	0	0	25	25	25

TABLE 4 TC Well VOC and SVOC Results					
Constituant	TC-1	TC-2	TC-3	TC-4	MCL
	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb
Bis(2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	16	3	22	3	4
Di-N-Butylphthalate	34	13	52	28	na
2-Butanone	130	ND<0.80	33	ND<8	na
PCE	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.9	5
Toluene	3	0.6	ND<0.5	0.8	1000
DCDFM	ND<0.60	ND<0.60	1	0.6	na
Cis-1,2-DCE	ND<0.40	ND<0.40	ND<0.40	0.6	6

FIGURES

12/89



VICINITY



SOURCE: USGS MAP, NW/4 LANCASTER 15' QUADRANGLE, 1958, PHOTOREVISED 1974

LOCATION

PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

LANCASTER LANDFILL
AND RECYCLING CENTER

SITE VICINITY/LOCATION

FIGURE
1

40107



SURVEY DATA

WELL	EASTING	NORTHING	TOC ELEV	WELL	EASTING	NORTHING	TOC ELEV
MW-1	4252118	4384670	2313.25	EX-1	4251771	4383972	2294.74
MW-2	4283080	4383398	2318.00	EX-2	4251770	4383300	2313.50
MW-3	4252173	4382127	2318.70	EX-3	4252611	4381354	2320.11
MW-4	4251755	4383378	2314.81	EX-4	4253033	4381084	2320.95
MW-5	4253104	4382159	2320.45	EX-7	4251779	4383597	2314.90
MW-6	4249953	4384752	2308.72	EX-8	4252285	4382132	2318.37
MW-7	4253567	4384681	2312.07	EX-9	4252990	4384130	2319.50
MW-8	4250872	4382125	2321.00	EX-10	4253092	4382794	2319.33
MW-9	4251543	4382127	2320.48	EX-11	4251057	4384336	2312.67
MW-10	4251770	4383082	2318.23	IW-2	4254674	4383651	2315.60
MW-11	4251786	4382494	2318.84	IW-3	4254872	4383638	2318.20
MW-12	4252514 (CAP 4)	4380890	2325.92	IW-4	4255071	4383629	2316.50
MW-13	4253047 (CAP 6)	4381307	2324.35	IW-5	4255269	4383819	2318.60
MW-14	4253155	4379931	2327.30	IW-6	4255468	4383610	2318.00
MW-15	4254734	4383364	2320.10	CAP-1	4251134	4383810	2315.79
MW-17	4251601	4384087	2316.26	CAP-3	4251801	4383827	2319.03
TC-01	4253928	4382811	2318.73	CAP-5	4253105	4380785	2326.32
TC-02	4253954	4381928	2322.34	TW-1 (B-10)	4252181	4382125	2320.20
TC-03	4253945	4381216	2324.80	TW-2 (B-17)	4252192	4382125	2319.20
TC-04	4253977	4380308	2327.62				

LEGEND

EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL

MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL

TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL

PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

LANCASTER LANDFILL
AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.

WELL LOCATION MAP

FIGURE 2

G:\GEO\LANCSTE\LAIS0896.DWG

40107



WELL NO.	NORTHING	EASTING	ELEVATION
MW-1	4,384,670	4,252,118	2313.25
MW-2	4,383,398	4,253,080	2318.00
MW-3	4,382,127	4,252,173	2318.70
MW-4	4,383,378	4,251,755	2314.81
MW-5	4,382,159	4,253,104	2320.45
MW-6	4,384,752	4,249,953	2308.72
MW-7	4,384,681	4,253,567	2312.07
MW-8	4,382,125	4,250,872	2321.00
MW-9	4,382,127	4,251,543	2320.48
MW-10	4,383,082	4,251,770	2318.23
MW-11	4,382,494	4,251,786	2318-84
MW-12	4,380,890	4,252,514	2325.92
MW-13	4,381,307	4,253,057	2324.35
MW-14	4,379,931	4,253,155	2327.30
MW-15	4,383,364	4,254,734	2320.10
MW-16	NA	NA	NA
MW-17	4,384,087	4,251,601	2316.26
EX-1	4,383,927	4,251,711	2294.74
EX-2	4,383,300	4,251,770	2313.50
EX-3	4,381,354	4,252,611	2320.11
EX-4	4,381,064	4,253,033	2320.95
EX-7	4,383,597	4,251,779	2314.90
IW-2	4,383,651	4,254,674	2315.60
IW-3	4,383,638	4,254,872	2318.20
IW-4	4,383,629	4,255,071	2316.50
IW-5	4,383,619	4,255,269	2318.60
IW-6	4,383,610	4,255,468	2318.00
CAP-1	4,383,811.71	4,251,135.73	2315.79
CAP-2	NA	NA	NA
CAP-3	4,383,821.86	4,251,801	2319.03
CAP-5	4,380,786.66	4,253,106.57	2326.32

The drawings, specifications and other documents prepared by the Engineer for this project are instruments of the Engineer's service for use solely with respect to this project and,



GROUNDWATER WELLS

WELL NO.	NORTHING	EASTING	ELEVATION
MW-1	4,384,670	4,252,118	2313.25
MW-2	4,383,398	4,253,080	2318.00
MW-3	4,382,127	4,252,173	2316.70
MW-4	4,383,378	4,251,755	2314.81
MW-5	4,382,159	4,253,104	2320.45
MW-6	4,384,752	4,249,953	2308.72
MW-7	4,384,681	4,253,567	2312.07
MW-8	4,382,125	4,250,872	2321.00
MW-9	4,382,127	4,251,543	2320.48
MW-10	4,383,082	4,251,770	2318.23
MW-11	4,382,494	4,251,786	2318-84
MW-12	4,380,890	4,252,514	2325.92
MW-13	4,381,307	4,253,057	2324.35
MW-14	4,379,931	4,253,155	2327.30
MW-15	4,383,364	4,254,734	2320.10
MW-16	NA	NA	NA
MW-17	4,384,087	4,251,601	2316.26
EX-1	4,383,927	4,251,711	2294.74
EX-2	4,383,300	4,251,770	2313.50
EX-3	4,381,354	4,252,611	2320.11
EX-4	4,381,064	4,253,033	2320.95
EX-7	4,383,597	4,251,779	2314.90
IW-2	4,383,651	4,254,674	2315.60
IW-3	4,383,638	4,254,872	2318.20
IW-4	4,383,629	4,255,071	2316.50
IW-5	4,383,619	4,255,269	2318.80
IW-6	4,383,610	4,255,468	2318.00
CAP-1	4,383,811.70	4,251,135.73	2315.79
CAP-2	NA	NA	NA
CAP-3	4,383,827.66	4,251,801.30	2319.03
CAP-5	4,380,785.58	4,253,105.57	2326.32

LANCASTER LANDFILL
AND RECYCLING CENTER

GROUNDWATER CONTOUR MAP
FEBRUARY 1995

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

PROJECT NUMBER	DATE 5/5/95
RUST DWG NUMBER LA40101X8.DGN	FILE NUMBER 40101
CLIENT DWG NUMBER	FIGURE 4

© DES. FILE /USR/PROJECT/LANCSTR/LA40101x8.DGN

The drawings, specifications and other documents prepared by the Engineer for this project are instruments of the Engineer's service for use solely with respect to this project and



SURVEY DATA

WELL	EASTING	NORTHING	TOC ELEV	WELL	EASTING	NORTHING	TOC ELEV
MW-1	4252118	4384670	2313.25	EX-1	4251771	4383972	2294.74
MW-2	4283080	4383398	2318.00	EX-2	4251770	4383300	2313.50
MW-3	4252173	4382127	2314.81	EX-3	4252611	4381354	2320.11
MW-4	4251755	4383378	2314.81	EX-4	4253033	4381084	2320.95
MW-5	4253104	4382159	2320.45	EX-7	4251779	4383597	2314.90
MW-6	4249953	4384752	2308.72	EX-8	4252285	4382132	2318.37
MW-7	4253567	4384681	2312.07	EX-9	4252990	4384130	2319.50
MW-8	4250872	4382125	2321.00	EX-10	4253092	4382794	2319.33
MW-9	4251543	4382127	2320.48	EX-11	4251057	4384336	2312.67
MW-10	4251770	4383082	2318.23	IW-2	4254674	4383651	2315.60
MW-11	4251786	4382494	2318.84	IW-3	4254872	4383638	2318.20
MW-12	4252514 (CAP 4)	4380890	2325.92	IW-4	4255071	4383629	2316.50
				IW-5	4255269	4383819	2318.60
MW-13	4253047 (CAP 6)	4381307	2324.35	IW-6	4255468	4383610	2318.00
				CAP-1	4251134	4383810	2315.79
MW-14	4253155	4379931	2327.30	CAP-3	4251801	4383827	2319.03
MW-15	4254734	4383364	2320.10	CAP-5	4253105	4380785	2326.32
MW-17	4251601	4384087	2316.26	TW-1 (B-10)	4252181	4382125	2320.20
				TW-2 (B-17)	4252192	4382125	2319.20

GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTIONS AND GRADIENTS

MW-6 TO MW-7: SOUTHEAST (0.0018 FEET/FEET)
EX-2 TO EX-3: SOUTH (0.0045 FEET/FEET)
MW-15 TO MW-14: SOUTHWEST (0.0013 FEET/FEET)

PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.

GROUNDWATER CONTOURS
12/11/95

FIGURE 5

40107


MW-6
(2255.94)
2256.00
2255.00
2254.00
MW-1
(2255.55)
MW-7
(2255.63)
EX-11
(2253.37)
MW-17
(2256.09)
EX-1
(NA)
CAP-1
(NA)
CAP-3
(NA)
EX-7
(2255.31) Not Pumping
MW-4
(NA)
EX-2
MW-10
(2255.35)
MW-2
(2254.50)
IW-2
(NA)
IW-3
(NA)
IW-4
(NA)
IW-5
(NA)
IW-6
(NA)
MW-15
(2255.79)
2256.00
EX-10
(2252.23)
TC-01
(NA)
2253.00
2254.00
MW-11
(2255.14)
2253.00
2252.00
MW-8
(NA)
MW-9
(2320.48)
MW-3
(2253.33)
EX-8
(2250.82)
MW-5
(2253.30)
EX-9
(2253.18) Not Pumping
TW-1
(NA)
TW-2
(NA)
2251.00
2255.00
2254.00
TC-02
(NA)
MW-16
(NA)
(APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
(2250.64)
EX-3
MW-13
(2253.85)
2251.00
2253.00
EX-4
(NA)
MW-12
(2253.92)
CAP-5
(2253.67)
TC-03
(NA)
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
2253.00
TC-04
(NA)
MW-14
(NA)
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(2255.79) PIEZOMETRIC ELEVATION (ft/msl) MEASURED 5/28/96
—2251.00— PIEZOMETER CONTOUR DASHED WHERE INFERRED NA= Not Available EXTRACTION WELL EX-7 AND EX-9 WERE NOT PUMPING AT TIME OF MEASUREMENT
NOTE: GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FROM TC-1, TC-2, TC-3, AND TC-4 WERE NOT USED IN CONTOURS
FLOW DIRECTION
GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTION, GRADIENT AND VELOCITY
MW-1 TO EX-10; SOUTHEAST 0.0012 ft/ft; 193 ft/yr.
MW-11 TO EX-8; SOUTHEAST; 0.072 ft/ft; 880 ft/yr.
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.
PIEZOMETER CONTOURS
5/28/96
FIGURE
6
G:\GEO\LANCSTE\LAIS0996.DWG
40107


MW-6 (2255.82)
2254.00
2248.00
MW-1 (2255.35)
MW-7 (2255.57)
EX-11 (2247.03)
MW-17 (2255.71)
2255.00
?
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
2254.00
2256.00
IW-4
IW-2
IW-3
IW-5
IW-6
EX-7 (2252.95)
2254.00
2253.00
MW-4 (NA)
MW-2 (2254.12)
MW-15 (2256.22)
?
2255.00
EX-2 (NA)
2255.00
MW-10 (2254.91)
2255.00
EX-10 (2250.33)
TC-01 (2253.63)
MW-11 (2254.80)
2253.00
2248.00
2253.00
2248.00
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (2253.48)
MW-3
EX-8 (2247.02)
MW-5 (2252.65)
(22528.80)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
EX-9 (2250.86)
TC-02 (2251.84)
2253.00
2250.00
2254.00
MW-16 (NA)
EX-3 (2249.66)
(APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
MW-13 (2253.35)
TC-03 (2252.70)
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (2253.54)
CAP-5 (2253.31)
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
2253.00
TC-04 (2251.84)
MW-14 (NA)
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(2251.84) PIEZOMETRIC ELEVATION (ft/msl) MEASURED 5/28/96
-2253.0- PIEZOMETER CONTOUR DASHED WHERE INFERRED NA= Not Available EXTRACTION WELL EX-7 AND EX-9 WERE NOT PUMPING AT TIME OF MEASUREMENT
NOTE: GROUNDWATER ELEVATION FROM TC-1, TC-2, TC-3, AND TC-4 WERE NOT USED IN CONTOURS
FLOW DIRECTION
GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTION, GRADIENT AND VELOCITY
MW-1 TO EX-10; SOUTHEAST 0.002 ft/ft; 292 ft/yr.
MW-10 TO EX-8; SOUTHEAST; 0.013 ft/ft; 1585 ft/yr.
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.
PIEZOMETRIC CONTOURS
8/6/96
FIGURE
7
G:\CEO\LANCSTE\LAIS0896.DWG
40107



VC-VINYL CHLORIDE
DCE-CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE
PCE-TETRACHLOROETHENE
TCE-TRICHLOROETHENE
1,1-DCA-1,1-DICHLOROETHENE
DCDFM-DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE
B-BENZENE

ALL CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN UG/L

LEGEND

EX-1	INJECTION EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7	DECTECTION MONITORING WELL
CAP-3	CORRECTIVE ACTION MONITORING WELL (2")
MW-10	CORRECTIVE ACTION MONITORING WELL
?—	APPROXIMATE BOUNDRY OF HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY
TC-7	TEMPORARY CASED WELL

GROUNDWATER WELLS

WELL NO.	NORTHING	EASTING	ELEVATION
MW-1	4,384,670	4,252,118	2313.25
MW-2	4,383,398	4,253,080	2318.00
MW-3	4,382,127	4,252,173	2318.70
MW-4	4,383,378	4,251,755	2314.81
MW-5	4,382,159	4,253,104	2320.45
MW-6	4,384,752	4,249,953	2308.72
MW-7	4,384,681	4,253,567	2312.07
MW-8	4,382,125	4,250,872	2321.00
MW-9	4,382,127	4,251,543	2320.48
MW-10	4,383,082	4,251,770	2318.23
MW-11	4,382,494	4,251,786	2318.84
MW-12	4,380,890	4,252,514	2325.92
MW-13	4,381,307	4,253,057	2324.35
MW-14	4,379,931	4,253,155	2327.30
MW-15	4,383,364	4,254,734	2320.10
MW-16	NA	NA	NA
MW-17	4,384,087	4,251,601	2316.26
EX-1	4,383,927	4,251,711	2294.74
EX-2	4,383,300	4,251,770	2313.50
EX-3	4,381,354	4,252,611	2320.11
EX-4	4,381,064	4,253,033	2320.95
EX-7	4,383,597	4,251,779	2314.90
IW-2	4,383,651	4,254,674	2315.60
IW-3	4,383,638	4,254,872	2318.20
IW-4	4,383,629	4,255,071	2316.50
IW-5	4,383,619	4,255,269	2318.80
IW-6	4,383,610	4,255,468	2318.00
CAP-1	4,383,810.70	4,251,134.72	2315.79
CAP-2	NA	NA	NA
CAP-3	4,383,827.85	4,251,801.29	2319.03
CAP-5	4,380,785.57	4,253,105.56	2326.32

LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

1/94 TO 2/94 ESTIMATED BASELINE CONCENTRATIONS

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

PROJECT NUMBER		DATE 5/5/95
RUST DWG NUMBER	LA40101X3.DGN	FILE NUMBER 40101
CLIENT DWG NUMBER		FIGURE 8

The drawings, specifications and other documents prepared by the Engineer for this project are instruments of the Engineer's service for use solely with respect to this project and,



LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER

FEBRUARY 1995 GROUNDWATER VOC CONCENTRATIONS

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

PROJECT NUMBER		DATE 5/25/95
RUST DWG NUMBER	LA40101X4.DGN	FILE NUMBER 40101
CLIENT DWG NUMBER		FIGURE 9

The drawings, specifications and other documents prepared by the Engineer for this project are instruments of the Engineer's service for use solely with respect to this project and

Quality • Integrity • Creativity • Responsiveness



TEMPORARY CASED WELLS TC-1, TC-2, TC-3, AND TC-4 INSTALLATION AND ABANDONMENT REPORT

FOR:

LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVE. F
LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA 93535

PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

18401 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 550
Irvine, California 92715

Quality through teamwork

Project # 69076.100

September 25, 1996

CERTIFICATION

TEMPORARY CASED WELLS TC-1, TC-2, TC-3, AND TC-4 INSTALLATION AND ABANDONMENT REPORT, LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER, LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA.

This report, including all related activities, was prepared and conducted under the supervision of Sue Goss, Rust Environment & Infrastructure (Rust E&I). Our professional services have been performed using that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised under similar circumstances by other geologists and engineers practicing in this field. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice in this report.

_____ _____

Steve Williams Date
Project Hydrogeologist

_____ _____

Susan F. Goss Date
Project Manager

California Registered Geologist, License Number: 5639

Stamp of Registered Geologist:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION Page

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

2.0 PERMITTING 1

3.0 DRILLING AND WELL INSTALLATION ACTIVITIES 1
- 3.1 Temporary Cased Well TC-1 2
- 3.2 Temporary Cased Well TC-2 2
- 3.3 Temporary Cased Well TC-3 3
- 3.4 Temporary Cased Well TC-4 3

4.0 WELL SAMPLING ACTIVITIES 3

5.0 WELL ABANDONMENT ACTIVITIES 4

6.0 WELL SURVEY 4

7.0 SUMMARY 4

FIGURES

1 SITE VICINITY/LOCATION MAP
2 WELL LOCATION MAP

APPENDICES

A SOIL BOREHOLE LOGS
B WELL CONSTRUCTION SUMMARIES
C LABORATORY ANALYTICAL RESULTS
D WELL SURVEY DATA

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report documents the permitting, drilling activities, well installation, well sampling, and survey activities for the installation of temporary cased wells TC-1, TC-2, TC-3, and TC-4 at the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center (LLRC), located in Lancaster, California (Figure 1). The locations of the four Temporary Cased (TC) wells and existing wells are shown on Figure 2. The work was performed at the request of Waste Management of Lancaster (WML) and under the authorization of Rust Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.'s (Rust E&I) Service Agreement, dated June 17, 1996. The primary purpose of the project was to install four temporary cased wells, collect groundwater samples and abandon the wells. The data collected in this project is to be used in the annual groundwater remediation system effectiveness investigation. The installation of the temporary cased wells was proposed in the Groundwater Remediation System Effectiveness Evaluation Report (Rust E&I, 1995). Permanent wells were not installed because permission from the off-site property owners could not be obtained.

Layne Environmental Drilling Services, Fontana, California conducted all drilling well installation and abandonment services. WML personnel conducted all well purging and sampling activities. After the samples were collected they were delivered to WMX Environmental Monitoring Laboratories, Inc. for analysis. All field activities were conducted between July 19 and 23, 1996. Drilling, well installation, and well abandonment was performed under the direct supervision of Rust E&I and in accordance with Waste Management Inc.'s protocols (Waste Management of North America, Inc., 1989), as well as local and State of California regulations pertaining to well construction.

2.0 DRILLING AND WELL INSTALLATION ACTIVITIES

Layne Environmental Drilling Services, Fontana, California conducted all drilling and well installation activities under the direct supervision of Rust E&I. Prior to drilling, a health and safety meeting was conducted with Rust E&I and Layne Environmental Drilling Services employees. All boreholes were drilled utilizing a CME 75 Hollow Stem Auger drilling system and a 8-inch diameter drill bit. All wells were constructed with 2-inch PVC casing and screen with 0.02 inch slot. The casing and screen were installed through the center of the hollow stem auger drill pipe. During placement of the casing and screen RMC 2x12 silica sand was installed for the well screen filter material in the annulus between the casing and drill pipe while the drill pipe was slowly raised. A minimum of approximately one to two feet of filter sand remained in the drill pipe to ensure native material did not come in contact with the casing screen. The filter material was placed a minimum of 10 feet above the top of the screened interval. Because the well was going to be removed immediately after sampling (a few days) the drill pipe was left in the ground to help prevent sloughing and the need to overdrill the casing during removal.

Each borehole was advanced until a minimum of 15 feet of groundwater was encountered. Based on available data from groundwater elevations measured at nearby groundwater monitoring wells,

groundwater was expected to be encountered at approximately 60 to 65 feet below ground surface (bgs) and the wells were installed at 85-90 feet bgs. Detailed soil borehole logs were constructed by a Rust E&I geologist working under the direct supervision of a California Registered Geologist. The soil borehole logs are included in Appendix A. Lithologies were described according to the United Soils Classification System (USCS) and Munsell Color Chart. Drill cuttings were also examined for unusual odor, refuse, and organic vapor. Organic vapor was tested by collecting soil samples in one gallon plastic baggies and measuring head space vapor with a Photovac Microtip HL200 photo-ionization detector (PID). The PID was calibrated daily. Well construction activities are described below and the Well Construction Summaries are provided in Appendix B.

2.1 Temporary Cased Well TC-1

The borehole for Temporary Cased Well TC-1 was drilled to a total depth of 85 feet bgs. The well casing and screen was installed from 85 feet to ground surface on July 15, 1996. No problems were encountered during casing installation. TC-1 is located approximately 800 feet east of extraction well EX-10 in a vacant field. Lithologies encountered during drilling consisted primarily poorly graded sand from ground surface to 25 feet bgs, sandy silt from 25 to 60 feet bgs, and poorly graded sand from 60 to 85 feet bgs. There was no odor or refuse encountered during drilling and no headspace readings detected on the PID. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 60 feet bgs.

2.2 Temporary Cased Well TC-2

The first borehole for Temporary Cased Well TC-2 was drilled on July 15, 1996 to a total depth of 85 feet bgs. Problems were encountered while attempting to install the casing and screen. Ultimately the casing was removed and the borehole redrilled to a total depth of 85 feet bgs. The well casing and screen installed on July 18, 1996. No problems were encountered during the second casing installation effort. TC-2 is located approximately 850 feet south of TC-1. Lithologies encountered during drilling consisted primarily poorly graded sand from ground surface to 25 feet bgs, silty sand from 25 to 50 feet bgs, and poorly graded sand from 50 to 85 feet bgs. There was no odor or refuse encountered during drilling and no headspace readings detected on the PID. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 60 feet bgs.

2.3 Temporary Cased Well TC-3

The borehole for Temporary Cased Well TC-3 was drilled to a total depth of 85 feet bgs. The well casing and screen installed from 83 feet to ground surface on July 16, 1996. No problems were encountered during casing installation. TC-2 is located approximately 850 feet south of TC-2. Lithologies encountered during drilling consisted primarily of poorly graded sand from ground surface to 25 feet bgs, silty sand from 25 to 40 feet bgs, and poorly graded sand from 40 to 85 feet bgs. There was no odor or refuse encountered during drilling and no headspace readings detected on the PID. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 60 feet bgs.

2.4 Temporary Cased Well TC-4

The borehole for Temporary Cased Well TC-4 was drilled to a total depth of 90 feet bgs. The well casing and screen installed from 85 feet to ground surface on July 17 and 18, 1996. No problems were encountered during casing installation. TC-1 is located approximately 850 south of TC-3. Lithologies encountered during drilling consisted primarily poorly graded sand from ground surface to 25 feet bgs, silty sand from 25 to 50 feet bgs, and poorly graded sand from 50 to 90 feet bgs. There was no odor or refuse encountered during drilling and no headspace readings detected on the PID. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 60 feet bgs.

3.0 WELL SAMPLING ACTIVITIES

After the TC wells were installed, WML personnel sampled each well utilizing a submersible pump, portable generator and power supply, and new teflon tubing. All sampling equipment was decontaminated according to Waste Management Inc.'s protocols (Waste Management of North America, Inc., 1989), as well as all local and State of California regulations pertaining to well construction. The wells were sampled in the following order:

1. TC-1 July 16, 1996
2. TC-3 July 16, 1996
3. TC-4 July 18, 1996
4. TC-2 July 19, 1996

The samples were collected in laboratory supplied and packaged containers, immediately placed on ice and promptly delivered to WMX Environmental Monitoring Laboratories, Inc. for analysis. The laboratory analytical results are included in Appendix C. A discussion of the results is presented in the Corrective Action Program Effectiveness Evaluation Report (Rust E&I, Sept 1996). This installation report in included as an appendix tothe above-referenced report.

5.0 WELL ABANDONMENT ACTIVITIES

Following completion of well sampling activities, each well was abandoned by removing the casing from the borehole and pressure grouting the borehole to five feet bgs in accordance with the permit requirements. The top five feet of the borehole was backfilled with native soil. Well abandonment activities were conducted on July 20 and 21, 1996.

6.0 WELL SURVEY

The well locations, ground surface elevations, and top of casing (TOC) elevations for TC-1, TC-2, TC-3, and TC-4 were surveyed on July 19, 1996. The measurements were collected to within one-hundredth of a foot with respect to Mean Sea Level (MSL) by Arrow Engineering, Lancaster, California. The well survey report is included in Appendix D.

7.0 SUMMARY

The following is a brief summary of the topics covered in this report.

- Four Temporary Cased Wells (TC-1, TC-2, TC-3, and TC-4) were installed to approximately 85-90 feet bgs. Each well was completed with 20" diameter schedule 40 PVC with 10 feet of screen on the bottom.
- Each well was sampled for water quality utilizing a clean submersible pump.
- Each well abandoned following completion of sampling and the borehole backfilled with cement grout.
- Each well was surveyed with respect to MSL prior to abandonment.

8.0 REFERENCES

California Department of Water Resources, January 1990 "California Water Well Standards - Bulletin 74-90."

Rust E&I, June 1, 1995, "Corrective Action Effectiveness Evaluation and Proposed Monitoring Plan Submittal," Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Facility, Lancaster, California.

Waste Management of North America, Inc., 1989, "Well Construction and Development Procedures," internal guidance document prepared by WMX Technologies, Inc.

FIGURES

12/89



VICINITY



SOURCE: USGS MAP, NW/4 LANCASTER 15' QUADRANGLE, 1958, PHOTOREVISED 1974

LOCATION

PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

LANCASTER LANDFILL
AND RECYCLING CENTER

SITE VICINITY/LOCATION

FIGURE
1



SURVEY DATA

WELL	EASTING	NORTHING	TOC ELEV	WELL	EASTING	NORTHING	TOC ELEV
MW-1	4252118	4384670	2313.25	EX-1	4251771	4383972	2294.74
MW-2	4283080	4383398	2318.00	EX-2	4251770	4383300	2313.50
MW-3	4252173	4382127	2318.70	EX-3	4252611	4381354	2320.11
MW-4	4251755	4383378	2314.81	EX-4	4253033	4381084	2320.95
MW-5	4253104	4382159	2320.45	EX-7	4251779	4383597	2314.90
MW-6	4249953	4384752	2308.72	EX-8	4252285	4382132	2318.37
MW-7	4253567	4384681	2312.07	EX-9	4252990	4384130	2319.50
MW-8	4250872	4382125	2321.00	EX-10	4253092	4382794	2319.33
MW-9	4251543	4382127	2320.48	EX-11	4251057	4384336	2312.67
MW-10	4251770	4383082	2318.23	IW-2	4254674	4383651	2315.60
MW-11	4251786	4382494	2318.84	IW-3	4254872	4383638	2318.20
MW-12	4252514 (CAP 4)	4380890	2325.92	IW-4	4255071	4383629	2316.50
				IW-5	4255269	4383819	2318.60
MW-13	4253047 (CAP 6)	4381307	2324.35	IW-6	4255468	4383610	2318.00
				CAP-1	4251134	4383810	2315.79
MW-14	4253155	4379931	2327.30	CAP-3	4251801	4383827	2319.03
MW-15	4254734	4383364	2320.10	CAP-5	4253105	4380785	2326.32
MW-17	4251601	4384087	2316.26	TW-1 (B-10)	4252181	4382125	2320.20
TC-01	4253928	4382811	2318.73				
TC-02	4253954	4381928	2322.34	TW-2 (B-17)	4252192	4382125	2319.20
TC-03	4253945	4381216	2324.80				
TC-04	4253977	4380308	2327.62				

PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

LANCASTER LANDFILL
AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.

WELL LOCATION MAP

FIGURE 2

C:\CEO\LANCSTE\LAIS0996.DWG

APPENDIX A

SOIL BOREHOLE LOGS

ROCK BOREHOLE LOG

SITE NAME AND LOCATION:
ıncaster Landfill and Recycling Center
ıncaster, California



DRILLING METHOD:	Hollow Stem Auger			BORING/WELL# TC-1
DRILL RIG:	CME 75			SHEET 1 OF 1
SAMPLING METHOD:	Continuous Grab samples			
	Collected in 5-foot interval.			DRILLING
				START / FINISH
WATER LEVEL				TIME / TIME
TIME				1030 / 1300
DATE				DATE / DATE
CASING/BORING DEPTH	85 feet			7/15/96 / 7/15/96

Project # 69076.100
ATUM:Top of Casing ELEVATION: ft msl
NGLE: Verticle BEARING:N/A

SURFACE CONDITIONS: Open Field,Headspace readings with a Photovac Microtip HL200

DEPTH FEET BGS	DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS	SYMBOL	LITHOLOGY	MOISTURE CONTENT	ODOR	PID FIELD SCREENING (ppm)	COLOR-MUNSELL CHART	COMMENTS
	0 - 25 ft POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 6/3	Light yellowish brown
10'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 6/3	Light yellowish brown
20'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive brown
	25 - 60 ft SANDY SILT: approx. 70% low plastic fines (silt and clay); 30% fine sand, soft.	ML		DRY				
30'					NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
40'	SANDY SILT: approx. 70% low plastic fines (silt and clay); 30% fine sand, soft.	ML		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive brown
50'	SANDY SILT: approx. 70% low plastic fines (silt and clay); 30% fine sand, soft.	ML		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
60'	60 - 85 ft POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		DAMP	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/1	Dark gray
70'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		DAMP	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/1	Dark gray
80'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel. increse in sand and fine gravel at 80 ft.	SP		WET	NO	0	2.5 yr 5/1	Gary
90	Total Depth 85 feet bgs							

REGISTERED GEOLOGIST
SUSAN F. GOSS
exp 10/31/97
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

LOGGED BY: Steve Williams, Rust E&I
DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Layne Environmental Drilling Services, Fontana, Callifornia
ATE: 08/20/96 CHK'D BY: Sue Goss
geo/lancaster/LLRCTC1.wk4

ROCK BOREHOLE LOG

SITE NAME AND LOCATION:
ncaster Landfill and Recycling Center
ncaster, California



DRILLING METHOD:	Hollow Stem Auger			BORING/WELL#	
				TC-2	
DRILL RIG:	CME 75			SHEET	
SAMPLING METHOD:	Continuous Grab samples			1 OF 1	
	Collected in 5-foot interval.			DRILLING	
				START	FINISH
WATER LEVEL				TIME	TIME
TIME				1000	1230
DATE				DATE	DATE
CASING/BORING DEPTH	85 feet			7/18/96	7/18/96
SURFACE CONDITIONS:	Open Field,Headspace readings with a Photovac Microtip HL200				

Project # 69076.100
TUM:Top of Casing ELEVATION: ft msl
IGLE: Verticle BEARING:N/A

DEPTH FEET BGS	DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS	SYMBOL	LITHOLOGY	MOISTURE CONTENT	ODOR	PID FIELD SCREENING (ppm)	COLOR-MUNSELL CHART	COMMENTS
	0 - 25 ft POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 6/3	Light yellowish brown
10'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 6/3	Light yellowish brown
20'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive brown
	25 - 50 ft SILTY SAND: approx. 80% fine to coarse sand, subrounded; 20% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SM		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
30'	SILTY SAND: approx. 80% fine to coarse sand, subrounded; 20% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SM		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive brown
40'	50 - 85 ft POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
50'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		DAMP	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
60'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, subrounded; 10% grav trace silt.	SP		WET	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
70'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, subrounded; 10% grav trace silt.	SP		WET	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
80'	Total Depth 85 feet bgs							
90								

LOGGED BY: Steve Williams, Rust E&I
DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Layne Environmental Drilling Services, Fontana, California
TE: 08/20/96 CHK'D BY: Sue Goss
eo/lancaster/LLRCTC2.wk4

REGISTERED GEOLOGIST
SUE GOSS
exp 10/31/97
No. 5639
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ROCK BOREHOLE LOG

SITE NAME AND LOCATION:
ncaster Landfill and Recycling Center
ncaster, California



DRILLING METHOD:	Hollow Stem Auger			BORING/WELL#	
				TC-3	
DRILL RIG:	CME 75			SHEET	
SAMPLING METHOD:	Continuous Grab samples			1 OF 1	
	Collected in 5-foot interval.			DRILLING	
				START	FINISH
WATER LEVEL				TIME	TIME
TIME				0730	1130
DATE				DATE	DATE
CASING/BORING DEPTH	85 feet			7/16/96	7/16/96

Project # 69076.100
SURFACE CONDITIONS: Open Field,Headspace readings with a Photovac Microtip HL200
TUM:Top of Casing ELEVATION: ft msl
GLE: Verticle BEARING:N/A

DEPTH FEET BGS	DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS	SYMBOL	LITHOLOGY	MOISTURE CONTENT	ODOR	PID FIELD SCREENING (ppm)	COLOR-MUNSELL CHART	COMMENTS
	0 - 25 ft POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 6/3	Light yellowish brown
10'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 6/3	Light yellowish brown
20'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive brown
30'	25 - 40 ft SILTY SAND: approx. 80% fine to coarse sand, subrounded; 20% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SM		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
40'	40 - 85 ft POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive brown
50'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
60'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 95% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, more coarse sand than above, subrounded; 5% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		DRY/ DAMP	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
70'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 95% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, more coarse sand than above, subrounded; 5% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		WET	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
80'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 95% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, more coarse sand than above, subrounded; 5% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		WET	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
90	Total Depth 85 feet bgs							

REGISTERED GEOLOGIST
N F. GOSS
10/31/97
No. 5639
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

LOGGED BY: Steve Williams, Rust E&I
DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Layne Environmental Drilling Services, Fontana, Callifomia
TE: 08/20/96 CHK'D BY: Sue Goss
eo/lancaster/LLRCTC3.wk4

ROCK BOREHOLE LOG

SITE NAME AND LOCATION:

l ıcaster Landfill and Recycling Center

l ıcaster, California



DRILLING METHOD:	Hollow Stem Auger			BORING/WELL#	
				TC-4	
DRILL RIG:	CME 75			SHEET	
SAMPLING METHOD:	Continuous Grab samples			1 OF 1	
	Collected in 5-foot interval.			DRILLING	
				START	FINISH
WATER LEVEL				TIME	TIME
TIME				1300	9030
DATE				DATE	DATE
CASING/BORING DEPTH	90 feet			7/17/96	7/18/96

Project # 69076.100

SURFACE CONDITIONS: Open Field,Headspace readings with a Photovac Microtip HL200

l TUM:Top of Casing ELEVATION: ft msl

/ GLE: Verticle BEARING:N/A

DEPTH IN FEET BGS	DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS	SYMBOL	LITHOLOGY	MOISTURE CONTENT	ODOR	PID FIELD SCREENING (ppm)	COLOR-MUNSELL CHART	COMMENTS
	0 - 25 ft POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 80% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 20% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 6/3	Light yellowish brown
10'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 80% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 20% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 6/3	Light yellowish brown
20'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 80% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 20% non-plastic fines; trace gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive brown
	25 - 50 ft SILTY SAND: approx. 80% fine to coarse sand, subrounded; 20% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SM		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
30'	SILTY SAND: approx. 80% fine to coarse sand, subrounded; 20% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SM		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive brown
	50 - 90 POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 95% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 5% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		DRY	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
60'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 95% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 5% non-plastic fines; trace fine gravel.	SP		DRY/ DAMP	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
70'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% fine gravel.	SP		DAMP	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
80'	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% fine gravel.	SP		WET	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
90	POORLY GRADED SAND: approx. 90% fine to coarse sand, mostly fine to medium, subrounded; 10% fine gravel.	SP		WET	NO	0	2.5 yr 4/3	Olive Brown
	Total Depth 90 feet bgs							

REGISTERED GEOLOGIST SUSAN F. GOSS 10/31/97 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

LOGGED BY: Steve Williams, Rust E&I DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Layne Environmental Drilling Services, Fontana, Callifornia

l TE: 08/20/96 CHK'D BY: Sue Goss

(eo/lancaster/LLRCTC4.wk4

APPENDIX B

WELL CONSTRUCTION SUMMARIES

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Well No's.: TC-1, TC-2, TC-3, TC-4
Boring No's. X-Ref: TC-1, TC-2, TC-3, TC-4

WELL CONSTRUCTION SUMMARIES



Drilling Summary:

Borehole Diameter: 8-inch
Casing Stick-up Height 2-feet
Driller: Layne Environmental Drilling Services
Drilling Method: Hallow stem auger
Rig: CME-75
Datum: Ground Surface

Construction Time Log:

TASK	Start		Finish	
Drilling:	DATE	TIME	DATE	TIME
TC-1	07/15/96	1300	07/15/96	1400
TC-2	07/18/96	1200	07/18/96	1300
TC-3	07/16/96	0900	07/16/96	1100
TC-4	07/18/96	0800	07/18/96	1000

Well Design & Specifications: WELL No.: TC-1

SURVEY COORDS: N. 4382811 E. 4253928
TOP OF CASING: 2,318.73 feet above mean sea level

Casing String(s): C=Casing S=Screen E=End Cap

Depth	String(s)	Elevations
0 - 75 feet	C1	2,318.73 - 2,241.7 ft. bgs
75 - 85 feet	S1	2,241.7 - 2,231.7 ft. bgs

Casing: (C1) 2-inch diameter schedule 40 PVC
Screen: (S1) 2-inch schedule 40 PVC, 0.02-inch slot
Filter Pack: (F1) # 2/12 RMC Lonestar sand
70 - 85 feet bgs
Grout Seal: (G1) NA
Native Soil Backfill: NA

Well Design & Specifications: WELL No.: TC-3

SURVEY COORDS: N. 4381216 E. 4253945
TOP OF CASING: 2,324.80 feet above mean sea level

Casing String(s): C=Casing S=Screen E=End Cap

Depth	String(s)	Elevations
0 - 73 feet	C1	2,324.80 - 2,249.8 ft. bgs
73 - 83 feet	S1	2,249.8 - 2,239.8 ft. bgs

Casing: (C1) 2-inch diameter schedule 40 PVC
Screen: (S1) 2-inch schedule 40 PVC, 0.02-inch slot
Filter Pack: (F1) # 2/12 RMC Lonestar sand
68 - 85 feet bgs
Grout Seal: (G1) NA
Native Soil Backfill: NA

Well Design & Specifications: WELL No.: TC-2

SURVEY COORDS: N. 4381928 E. 4253954
TOP OF CASING: 2,322.34 feet above mean sea level

Casing String(s): C=Casing S=Screen E=End Cap

Depth	String(s)	Elevations
0 - 75 feet	C1	2,322.34 - 2,245.3 ft. bgs
75 - 85 feet	S1	2,245.3 - 2,235.3 ft. bgs

Casing: (C1) 2-inch diameter schedule 40 PVC
Screen: (S1) 2-inch schedule 40 PVC, 0.02-inch slot
Filter Pack: (F1) # 2/12 RMC Lonestar sand
70 - 85 feet bgs
Grout Seal: (G1) NA
Native Soil Backfill: NA

Well Design & Specifications: WELL No.: TC-4

SURVEY COORDS: N. 4380308 E. 4253977
TOP OF CASING: 2,327.62 feet above mean sea level

Casing String(s): C=Casing S=Screen E=End Cap

Depth	String(s)	Elevations
0 - 75 feet	C1	2,327.62 - 2,250.6 ft. bgs
75 - 85 feet	S1	2,250.6 - 2,240.6 ft. bgs

Casing: (C1) 2-inch diameter schedule 40 PVC
Screen: (S1) 2-inch schedule 40 PVC, 0.02-inch slot
Filter Pack: (F1) # 2/12 RMC Lonestar sand
70 - 85 feet bgs
Grout Seal: (G1) NA
Native Soil Backfill: NA

Comments: These were all temporary groundwater monitoring wells and therefore did not require a bentonite seal due to there temporary status.

Supervised By: Steve Williams
Date: 07/18/96

REGISTERED GEOLOGIST
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
No. 5539
10/31/97

Site Name: Lancaster Landfill & Recycling Center
Location: Lancaster, California

g:\geo\lancaster\lrtcwcs.wk4

APPENDIX C

LABORATORY ANALYTICAL RESULTS

WMX Technology Center, Inc.

A WMX Technologies Company

2100 Cleanwater Drive
Geneva, Illinois 60134
Phone 630.208.3100
Fax 630.208.9064

1950 S. Batavia Avenue
Geneva, Illinois 60134
Phone 630.513.4500
Fax 630.513.4888

Date: 16-September-1996

TO: Ernie Dragan BH

FROM: Barbara Hill

Dept: Administration

Subject: RE: DQR 950-96-12752-OR-090696-1/2

Thank you for your inquiry concerning the recently completed sampling event at Lancaster Landfill. A review of the data associated with the following samples revealed no errors with the results reported:

Sample Point	Sample ID	Analyte
TC-1	AP6030	Aldrin
		Dieldrin
		Endosulfan I
		Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate
		Di-n-butylphthalate
TC-2	AP6032	Heptachlor
		Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate
		Di-n-butylphthalate
TC-3	AP6031	Beta-BHC
		Endosulfan I
		Acetophenone
TC-4	AP6029	4,4'-DDT
		Acetophenone
		Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate
		Di-n-butylphthalate

The analyses met all of the quality control requirements of the reference methods. No problems were noted which would have caused the reported results to be erroneously high.

Please note that the pesticides results for these samples were all at, or just above the method detection level. Results reported at these low levels will have greater variability than results of a greater magnitude.

Also, phthalates are common contaminants originating from

plastics from either field or laboratory sources. Therefore, a positive result of phthalates may be a field or laboratory artifact, and not necessarily representative of the sample source.

If you have any further questions, please contact your Account Representative at (630) 208-3117.

Distribution:

CC: Joe Rentz
CC: 96-12752 (file)

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

DATA QUALIFIER REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill

ENS: 96-12752

Report Date: 16-SEP-1996

Sample Pt	Samp Date	Analyte	Method	Comment	Additional Comments Explanations (NQ/DL)
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	EVERY ANALYTE FOR THIS METHOD	8080	DL	Dilution factor 1.0870 applied.
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	ALDRIN	8080	NQ,P	Estimated concentration 0.02 UG/L.
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	DIELDRIN	8080	NQ,P	Estimated concentration 0.02 UG/L.
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	ENDOSULFAN I	8080	NQ,P	Estimated concentration 0.006 UG/L.
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID	8150	NQ	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	3-METHYLPHENOL	8270	MP	
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	4-METHYLPHENOL	8270	MP	
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	8270	NQ,P,PL	Estimated concentration 16 UG/L.
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	DIPHENYLAMINE	8270	NN	
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	8270	NN	
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	ACROLEIN	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	ACRYLONITRILE	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TC-1	16-JUL-1996	EVERY ANALYTE FOR THIS METHOD	376.1	NQ,SB	SEQUOIA
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	CADMIUM-TOTAL	200.7	MX	
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	VANADIUM-TOTAL	200.7	BL	
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	ARSENIC-TOTAL	200.7	BL	
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	HEPTACHLOR	8080	NQ,P	Estimated concentration 0.01 UG/L.
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	EVERY ANALYTE FOR THIS METHOD	8150	DL	Dilution factor 1.0204 applied.
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID	8150	NQ	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	3-METHYLPHENOL	8270	MP	
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	4-METHYLPHENOL	8270	MP	
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	8270	NQ,P,PL	Estimated concentration 3 UG/L.
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	DIPHENYLAMINE	8270	NN	
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	8270	NN	
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	ACROLEIN	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	ACRYLONITRILE	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TC-2	19-JUL-1996	EVERY ANALYTE FOR THIS METHOD	376.1	NQ,SB	SEQUOIA
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	BETA-BHC	8080	NQ,P	Estimated concentration 0.03 UG/L.
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	DIELDRIN	8080	NQ,P	Estimated concentration 0.004 UG/L.
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	ENDOSULFAN I	8080	NQ,P	Estimated concentration 0.008 UG/L.
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID	8150	NQ	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	3-METHYLPHENOL	8270	MP	
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	4-METHYLPHENOL	8270	MP	
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	ACETOPHENONE	8270	NQ,P	Estimated concentration 6 UG/L.
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	8270	NQ,P,PL	Estimated concentration 22 UG/L.
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	DIPHENYLAMINE	8270	NN	
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	8270	NN	
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	ACROLEIN	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

DATA QUALIFIER REPORT

Site: 950 — Lancaster Landfill

ENS: 96-12752

Report Date: 16-SEP-1996

Sample Pt	Samp Date	Analyte	Method	Comment	Additional Comments Explanations (NQ/DL)
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	ACRYLONITRILE	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TC-3	16-JUL-1996	EVERY ANALYTE FOR THIS METHOD	376.1	NQ,SB	SEQUOIA
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	VANADIUM-TOTAL	200.7	BL	
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	ARSENIC-TOTAL	200.7	BL	
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	4,4'-DDT	8080	NQ,P	Estimated concentration 0.004 UG/L.
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	8150	NQ	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	2,4-DICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	8150	NQ	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID	8150	NQ	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	3-METHYLPHENOL	8270	MP	
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	4-METHYLPHENOL	8270	MP	
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	ACETOPHENONE	8270	NQ,P	Estimated concentration 2 UG/L.
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	8270	NQ,P,PL	Estimated concentration 3 UG/L.
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	DIPHENYLAMINE	8270	NN	
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	8270	NN	
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	ACROLEIN	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	ACRYLONITRILE	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TC-4	18-JUL-1996	EVERY ANALYTE FOR THIS METHOD	376.1	NQ,SB	SEQUOIA
TBK-TC-1	16-JUL-1996	ACROLEIN	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TBK-TC-1	16-JUL-1996	ACRYLONITRILE	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TBK-TC-2	19-JUL-1996	ACROLEIN	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TBK-TC-2	19-JUL-1996	ACRYLONITRILE	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TBK-TC-4	18-JUL-1996	ACROLEIN	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
TBK-TC-4	18-JUL-1996	ACRYLONITRILE	8240	NQ	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

DATA QUALIFIER REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill

ENS: 96-12752

Report Date: 16-SEP-1996

Code	Data Qualifier Comment Code Definition
BL	The method blank concentrations associated with this analyte did not meet the acceptance criteria of the method.
DL	Sample diluted; reporting limits have been adjusted where necessary.
MP	3-methylphenol and 4-methylphenol co-elute under the analytical conditions of the method, and cannot be differentiated solely on the basis of their mass spectra. The concentrations reported may be either or both isomers.
MX	This sample was used as a matrix spike. The percent recovery did not meet the acceptance criteria of the method. The analysis of a quality control sample showed the analytical system was in control. The result reported may therefore be affected by matrix interferences.
NN	N-nitrosodiphenylamine cannot be distinguished from diphenylamine using gas chromatography. The concentration reported may be either or both compounds.
NQ	No standard qualifier code is in use for this qualification. See the associated comment.
P	Concentration found between the method detection limit and the reporting limit indicates the possible presence of a compound.
PL	This result may be a product of contamination from phthalate plasticizers, which are a common lab contaminant.
SB	The analysis of this sample was performed by an approved subcontract laboratory.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-1
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6030

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
FIELD DATA:					
ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED	NA		GALLONS		FDWPURINFO
ELAPSED HOURS	NA		HRS		FDWPURINFO
GROUNDWATER ELEV.	NA		FT MSL		FDWGWELWDT
PH FIELD	6.26		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	6.22		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	6.20		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	6.15		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PURGE DATE (YY/MM/DD)	96-07-16		YY/MM/DD		FDWPURINFO
PURGING DEVICE	C				FDWPURSAMP
PURGING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N				FDWPURSAMP
PURGING MATERIAL	A				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING DEVICE	C				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING MATERIAL	A				FDWPURSAMP
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	645		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	645		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	640		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	640		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
TUBING-PURGING	G				FDWPURSAMP
TUBING-SAMPLING	G				FDWPURSAMP
WATER TEMPERATURE IN DEG. CELSIUS FIELD	22.1		DEGREES C		FDXTEMPC01
WELL DEPTH TOTAL	NA		FT		FDWGWELWDT
CHEMICAL METHODS & ROBOTICS:					
CYANIDE, TOTAL	ND	0.010	MG/L		335.3
INORGANICS:					
ALKALINITY, BICARBONATE (AS CACO3)	133	5.00	MG/L		310.1
ANTIMONY-TOTAL	0.0075	0.00200	MG/L		200.7
ARSENIC-TOTAL	0.0553	0.00300	MG/L		200.7
BARIUM-TOTAL	1.42	0.00100	MG/L		200.7
BERYLLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.000400	MG/L		200.7
CADMIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00440	MG/L		200.7
CALCIUM-DISSOLVED	31.2	0.140	MG/L		200.7
CHLORIDE	110.	0.300	MG/L		325.2
CHROMIUM-TOTAL	0.163	0.00400	MG/L		200.7
COBALT-TOTAL	0.118	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
COPPER-TOTAL	0.297	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
LEAD-TOTAL	0.0274	0.00100	MG/L		200.7
MAGNESIUM-DISSOLVED	4.62	0.240	MG/L		200.7
MERCURY-TOTAL	0.00017	0.000050	MG/L		245.2
NICKEL-TOTAL	0.144	0.0190	MG/L		200.7
POTASSIUM-DISSOLVED	2.78	0.100	MG/L		258.1
SELENIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00300	MG/L		200.7
SILVER-TOTAL	ND	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
SODIUM-DISSOLVED	79.9	0.400	MG/L		200.7
SULFATE	30.6	1.00	MG/L		375.2
THALLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00200	MG/L		200.7
TIN-TOTAL	ND	0.0500	MG/L		200.7
VANADIUM-TOTAL	0.394	0.00670	MG/L		200.7
ZINC-TOTAL	0.577	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
SUB-CONTRACT DATA:					
SULFIDE	3.8	0.100	MG/L	NQ,SB	376.1
SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,2,4,5-TETRACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1,3-DINITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

em	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
376.1 0	SEQUOIA Dilution factor 1.0870 applied.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 — Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-1
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6030

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
1,4-NAPHTHOQUINONE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,3,4,6-TETRACHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L		8150
2,4,6-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L		8150
2,4-DIMETHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DINITROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DINITROTOLUENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,6-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,6-DINITROTOLUENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L	NQ	8150
2-ACETYLAMINOFLUORENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-CHLORONAPHTHALENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-CHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2-NITROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3,3'-DICHLOROBENZIDINE	ND	20.	UG/L		8270
3,3'-DIMETHYLBENZIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3-METHYLCHOLANTHRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L	MP	8270
3-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4,4'-DDD	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL	8080
4,4'-DDE	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL	8080
4,4'-DDT	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL	8080
4,6-DINITRO-2-METHYLPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4-AMINOBIPHENYL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-BROMOPHENYL-PHENYL ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLORO-3-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLOROANILINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLOROPHENYL PHENYL ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L	MP	8270
4-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4-NITROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
5-NITRO-O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
7,12-DIMETHYLBENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACENAPHTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACENAPHTHYLENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACETOPHENONE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ALDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL,NQ,P	8080
ALPHA-BHC	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL	8080
ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
AROCLOR 1016	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8080
AROCLOR 1221	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8080
AROCLOR 1232	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8080
AROCLOR 1242	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8080
AROCLOR 1248	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8080
AROCLOR 1254	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8080
AROCLOR 1260	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8080
BENZO[A]PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[B]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[G,H,I]PERYLENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONI	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
RIN	Estimated concentration 0.02 UG/L.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-1
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6030

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
BENZO[K]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZYL ALCOHOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BETA-BHC	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL	8080
BIS(2-CHLOROETHOXY)METHANE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-CHLOROETHYL)ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-CHLOROISOPROPYL)ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	ND	50.	UG/L	NQ,P,PL	8270
BUTYLBENZYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
CHLORDANE	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8080
CHLOROBENZILATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
CHRYSENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DELTA-BHC	ND	0.05	UG/L	DL	8080
DI-N-BUTYLPHTHALATE	34	10.	UG/L		8270
DI-N-OCTYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIALLATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIBENZOFURAN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIBENZ[A,H]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIELDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL,NQ,P	8080
DIETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIMETHOATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIMETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DINOSEB	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L	NN	8270
DISULFOTON	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ENDOSULFAN I	ND	0.05	UG/L	DL,NQ,P	8080
ENDOSULFAN II	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL	8080
ENDOSULFAN SULFATE	ND	0.5	UG/L	DL	8080
ENDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL	8080
ENDRIN ALDEHYDE	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL	8080
ETHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FAMPHUR	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FLUORENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEPTACHLOR	ND	0.05	UG/L	DL	8080
HEPTACHLOR EPOXIDE	ND	0.5	UG/L	DL	8080
HEXACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROCYCLOPENTADIENE	ND	100	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROETHANE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROPROPENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
INDENO[1,2,3-CD]PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISODRIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISOPHORONE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISOSAFROLE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
KEPONE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
LINDANE (GAMMA-BHC)	ND	0.1	UG/L	DL	8080
METHAPYRILENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
METHOXYCHLOR	ND	0.5	UG/L	DL	8080
METHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
METHYL PARATHION	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODI-N-BUTYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODI-N-PROPYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIMETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L	NN	8270
N-NITROSOMETHYLETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSOPIPERIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSOPYRROLIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
NITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

em	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	Estimated concentration 16 UG/L.
DIELDRIN	Estimated concentration 0.02 UG/L.
OSULFAN I	Estimated concentration 0.006 UG/L.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 — Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-1
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6030

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
O,O,O-TRIETHYL PHOSPHOROTHIOATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
P-(DIMETHYLAMINO)AZOBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
P-PHENYLENEDIAMINE	ND	100	UG/L		8270
PARATHION	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLORONITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLOROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
PHENACETIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHENANTHRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHORATE	ND	20.	UG/L		8270
PRONAMIDE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
SAFROLE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
SYM-TRINITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
THIONAZIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
TOXAPHENE	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8080
VOLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DIBROMO-3-CHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.008	UG/L		504.1
1,2-DIBROMOETHANE	ND	0.020	UG/L		504.1
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-BUTANONE	130	8.00	UG/L		8240
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00	UG/L		8240
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONE	ND	9.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONITRILE	0		UG/L		8240
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
BENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
OLEIN	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
ACRYLONITRILE	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-1
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6030

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
IODOMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL	0		UG/L		8240
METHACRYLONITRILE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
NAPHTHALENE	ND	0.900	UG/L		8240
PROPIONITRILE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
STYRENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.7	0.300	UG/L		8240
TOLUENE	3	0.500	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
VINYL ACETATE	ND	2.00	UG/L		8240
VINYL CHLORIDE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
XYLENE (TOTAL)	ND	1.40	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-2
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6032

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 19-JUL-1996
Received: 20-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
FIELD DATA:					
ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED	NA		GALLONS		FDWPURINFO
ELAPSED HOURS	NA		HRS		FDWPURINFO
GROUNDWATER ELEV.	NA		FT MSL		FDWGWELWDT
PH FIELD	7.72		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	7.72		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	7.71		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	7.68		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PURGE DATE (YY/MM/DD)	96-07-19		YY/MM/DD		FDWPURINFO
PURGING DEVICE	C				FDWPURSAMP
PURGING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N				FDWPURSAMP
PURGING MATERIAL	A				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING DEVICE	C				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING MATERIAL	A				FDWPURSAMP
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	467		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	470		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	462		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	464		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
TUBING-PURGING	G				FDWPURSAMP
TUBING-SAMPLING	G				FDWPURSAMP
WATER TEMPERATURE IN DEG. CELSIUS FIELD	20.4		DEGREES C		FDXTEMPC01
WELL DEPTH TOTAL	81.		FT		FDWGWELWDT
CHEMICAL METHODS & ROBOTICS:					
CYANIDE, TOTAL	ND	0.010	MG/L		335.3
INORGANICS:					
ALKALINITY, BICARBONATE (AS CACO3)	98	5.00	MG/L		310.1
ANTIMONY-TOTAL	ND	0.00200	MG/L		200.7
ARSENIC-TOTAL	0.0068	0.00300	MG/L	BL	200.7
BARIUM-TOTAL	0.0376	0.00100	MG/L		200.7
BERYLLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.000400	MG/L		200.7
CADMIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00440	MG/L	MX	200.7
CALCIUM-DISSOLVED	17.9	0.140	MG/L		200.7
CHLORIDE	42.1	0.300	MG/L		325.2
CHROMIUM-TOTAL	0.0186	0.00400	MG/L		200.7
COBALT-TOTAL	ND	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
COPPER-TOTAL	0.0136	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
LEAD-TOTAL	ND	0.00100	MG/L		200.7
MAGNESIUM-DISSOLVED	3.91	0.240	MG/L		200.7
MERCURY-TOTAL	ND	0.000050	MG/L		245.2
NICKEL-TOTAL	ND	0.0190	MG/L		200.7
POTASSIUM-DISSOLVED	3.56	0.100	MG/L		258.1
SELENIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00300	MG/L		200.7
SILVER-TOTAL	ND	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
SODIUM-DISSOLVED	50.3	0.400	MG/L		200.7
SULFATE	19.2	1.00	MG/L		375.2
THALLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00200	MG/L		200.7
TIN-TOTAL	ND	0.0500	MG/L		200.7
VANADIUM-TOTAL	0.0260	0.00670	MG/L	BL	200.7
ZINC-TOTAL	0.0279	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
SUB-CONTRACT DATA:					
SULFIDE	3.8	0.100	MG/L	NQ,SB	376.1
SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,2,4,5-TETRACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1,3-DINITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

.em	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
376.1 50	SEQUOIA Dilution factor 1.0204 applied.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 — Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-2
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6032

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 19-JUL-1996
Received: 20-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
1,4-NAPHTHOQUINONE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,3,4,6-TETRACHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8150
2,4,6-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L	DL	8150
2,4-DIMETHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DINITROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DINITROTOLUENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,6-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,6-DINITROTOLUENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L	DL,NQ	8150
2-ACETYLAMINOFLUORENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-CHLORONAPHTHALENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-CHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2-NITROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3,3'-DICHLOROBENZIDINE	ND	20.	UG/L		8270
3,3'-DIMETHYLBENZIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3-METHYLCHOLANTHRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L	MP	8270
3-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4,4'-DDD	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
4,4'-DDE	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
4,4'-DDT	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
4,6-DINITRO-2-METHYLPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4-AMINOBIPHENYL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-BROMOPHENYL-PHENYL ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLORO-3-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLOROANILINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLOROPHENYL PHENYL ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L	MP	8270
4-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4-NITROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
5-NITRO-O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
7,12-DIMETHYLBENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACENAPHTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACENAPHTHYLENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACETOPHENONE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ALDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ALPHA-BHC	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
AROCLOR 1016	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1221	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1232	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1242	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1248	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1254	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1260	ND	1	UG/L		8080
BENZO[A]PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[B]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[G,H,I]PERYLENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[K]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONI	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-2
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6032

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 19-JUL-1996
Received: 20-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
BENZYL ALCOHOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BETA-BHC	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
BIS(2-CHLOROETHOXY)METHANE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-CHLOROETHYL)ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-CHLOROISOPROPYL)ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	ND	50.	UG/L	NQ,P,PL	8270
BUTYLBENZYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
CHLORDANE	ND	1	UG/L		8080
CHLOROBENZILATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
CHRYSENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DELTA-BHC	ND	0.05	UG/L		8080
DI-N-BUTYLPHTHALATE	13	10.	UG/L		8270
DI-N-OCTYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIALLATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIBENZOFURAN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIBENZ[A,H]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIELDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
DIETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIMETHOATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIMETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DINOSEB	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L	NN	8270
DISULFOTON	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ENDOSULFAN I	ND	0.05	UG/L		8080
ENDOSULFAN II	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ENDOSULFAN SULFATE	ND	0.5	UG/L		8080
ENDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ENDRIN ALDEHYDE	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ETHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FAMPHUR	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FLUORENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEPTACHLOR	ND	0.05	UG/L	NQ,P	8080
HEPTACHLOR EPOXIDE	ND	0.5	UG/L		8080
HEXACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROCYCLOPENTADIENE	ND	100	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROETHANE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROPROPENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
INDENO[1,2,3-CD]PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISODRIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISOPHORONE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISOSAFROLE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
KEPONE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
LINDANE (GAMMA-BHC)	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
METHAPYRILENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
METHOXYCHLOR	ND	0.5	UG/L		8080
METHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
METHYL PARATHION	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODI-N-BUTYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODI-N-PROPYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIMETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L	NN	8270
N-NITROSOMETHYLETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSOPIPERIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSOPYRROLIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
NITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
O,O,O-TRIETHYL PHOSPHOROTHIOATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

em	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	Estimated concentration 3 UG/L.
HEPTACHLOR	Estimated concentration 0.01 UG/L.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-2
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6032

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 19-JUL-1996
Received: 20-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
P-(DIMETHYLAMINO)AZOBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
P-PHENYLENEDIAMINE	ND	100	UG/L		8270
PARATHION	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLORONITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLOROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
PHENACETIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHENANTHRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHORATE	ND	20.	UG/L		8270
PRONAMIDE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
SAFROLE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
SYM-TRINITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
THIONAZIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
TOXAPHENE	ND	1	UG/L		8080
VOLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DIBROMO-3-CHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.008	UG/L		504.1
1,2-DIBROMOETHANE	ND	0.020	UG/L		504.1
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-BUTANONE	ND	8.00	UG/L		8240
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00	UG/L		8240
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONE	ND	9.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONITRILE	0		UG/L		8240
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
BENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
OLEIN	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
ACRYLONITRILE	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-2
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6032

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 19-JUL-1996
Received: 20-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
IODOMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL	0		UG/L		8240
METHACRYLONITRILE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
NAPHTHALENE	ND	0.900	UG/L		8240
PROPIONITRILE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
STYRENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.6	0.300	UG/L		8240
TOLUENE	0.6	0.500	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
VINYL ACETATE	ND	2.00	UG/L		8240
VINYL CHLORIDE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
XYLENE(TOTAL)	ND	1.40	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-3
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6031

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
FIELD DATA:					
ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED	NA		GALLONS		FDWPURINFO
ELAPSED HOURS	NA		HRS		FDWPURINFO
GROUNDWATER ELEV.	NA		FT MSL		FDWGWELWDT
PH FIELD	6.94		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	6.91		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	6.91		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	6.90		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PURGE DATE (YY/MM/DD)	96-07-16		YY/MM/DD		FDWPURINFO
PURGING DEVICE	C				FDWPURSAMP
PURGING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N				FDWPURSAMP
PURGING MATERIAL	A				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING DEVICE	C				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING MATERIAL	A				FDWPURSAMP
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	645		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	648		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	648		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	651		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
TUBING-PURGING	G				FDWPURSAMP
TUBING-SAMPLING	G				FDWPURSAMP
WATER TEMPERATURE IN DEG. CELSIUS FIELD	23.8		DEGREES C		FDXTEMPC01
WELL DEPTH TOTAL	NA		FT		FDWGWELWDT
CHEMICAL METHODS & ROBOTICS:					
CYANIDE, TOTAL	ND	0.010	MG/L		335.3
INORGANICS:					
ALKALINITY, BICARBONATE (AS CACO3)	173	5.00	MG/L		310.1
ANTIMONY-TOTAL	0.0086	0.00200	MG/L		200.7
ARSENIC-TOTAL	0.0416	0.00300	MG/L		200.7
BARIUM-TOTAL	1.69	0.00100	MG/L		200.7
BERYLLIUM-TOTAL	0.0014	0.000400	MG/L		200.7
CADMIUM-TOTAL	0.0086	0.00440	MG/L		200.7
CALCIUM-DISSOLVED	21.7	0.140	MG/L		200.7
CHLORIDE	44.7	0.300	MG/L		325.2
CHROMIUM-TOTAL	0.204	0.00400	MG/L		200.7
COBALT-TOTAL	0.139	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
COPPER-TOTAL	0.385	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
LEAD-TOTAL	0.0351	0.00100	MG/L		200.7
MAGNESIUM-DISSOLVED	4.08	0.240	MG/L		200.7
MERCURY-TOTAL	0.00029	0.000050	MG/L		245.2
NICKEL-TOTAL	0.169	0.0190	MG/L		200.7
POTASSIUM-DISSOLVED	3.17	0.100	MG/L		258.1
SELENIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00300	MG/L		200.7
SILVER-TOTAL	ND	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
SODIUM-DISSOLVED	53.4	0.400	MG/L		200.7
SULFATE	19.9	1.00	MG/L		375.2
THALLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00200	MG/L		200.7
TIN-TOTAL	ND	0.0500	MG/L		200.7
VANADIUM-TOTAL	0.438	0.00670	MG/L		200.7
ZINC-TOTAL	0.638	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
SUB-CONTRACT DATA:					
SULFIDE	ND	0.100	MG/L	NQ,SB	376.1
SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,2,4,5-TETRACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1,3-DINITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1,4-NAPHTHOQUINONE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
376.1	SEQUOIA

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-3
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6031

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
1-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,3,4,6-TETRACHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L		8150
2,4,6-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L		8150
2,4-DIMETHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DINITROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DINITROTOLUENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,6-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,6-DINITROTOLUENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L	NQ	8150
2-ACETYLAMINOFLUORENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-CHLORONAPHTHALENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-CHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2-NITROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3,3'-DICHLOROBENZIDINE	ND	20.	UG/L		8270
3,3'-DIMETHYLBENZIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3-METHYLCHOLANTHRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L	MP	8270
3-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4,4'-DDD	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
4,4'-DDE	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
4,4'-DDT	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
4,6-DINITRO-2-METHYLPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4-AMINOBIPHENYL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-BROMOPHENYL-PHENYL ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLORO-3-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLOROANILINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLOROPHENYL PHENYL ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L	MP	8270
4-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4-NITROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
5-NITRO-O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
7,12-DIMETHYLBENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACENAPHTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACENAPHTHYLENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACETOPHENONE	ND	10.	UG/L	NQ,P	8270
ALDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ALPHA-BHC	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
AROCLOR 1016	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1221	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1232	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1242	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1248	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1254	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1260	ND	1	UG/L		8080
BENZO[A]PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[B]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[G,H,I]PERYLENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[K]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONI	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
TOPHENONE	Estimated concentration 6 UG/L.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-3
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6031

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
BENZYL ALCOHOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BETA-BHC	ND	0.1	UG/L	NQ,P	8080
BIS(2-CHLOROETHOXY)METHANE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-CHLOROETHYL)ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-CHLOROISOPROPYL)ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	ND	50.	UG/L	NQ,P,PL	8270
BUTYLBENZYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
CHLORDANE	ND	1	UG/L		8080
CHLOROBENZILATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
CHRYSENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DELTA-BHC	ND	0.05	UG/L		8080
DI-N-BUTYLPHTHALATE	52	10.	UG/L		8270
DI-N-OCTYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIALLATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIBENZOFURAN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIBENZ[A,H]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIELDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L	NQ,P	8080
DIETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIMETHOATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIMETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DINOSEB	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L	NN	8270
DISULFOTON	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ENDOSULFAN I	ND	0.05	UG/L	NQ,P	8080
ENDOSULFAN II	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ENDOSULFAN SULFATE	ND	0.5	UG/L		8080
ENDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ENDRIN ALDEHYDE	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ETHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FAMPHUR	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FLUORENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEPTACHLOR	ND	0.05	UG/L		8080
HEPTACHLOR EPOXIDE	ND	0.5	UG/L		8080
HEXACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROCYCLOPENTADIENE	ND	100	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROETHANE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROPROPENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
INDENO[1,2,3-CD]PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISODRIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISOPHORONE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISOSAFROLE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
KEPONE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
LINDANE (GAMMA-BHC)	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
METHAPYRILENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
METHOXYCHLOR	ND	0.5	UG/L		8080
METHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
METHYL PARATHION	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODI-N-BUTYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODI-N-PROPYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIMETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L	NN	8270
N-NITROSOMETHYLETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSOPIPERIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSOPYRROLIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
NITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
'A-BHC	Estimated concentration 0.03 UG/L.
3IS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	Estimated concentration 22 UG/L.
)IELDRIN	Estimated concentration 0.004 UG/L.
''DOSULFAN I	Estimated concentration 0.008 UG/L.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-3
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6031

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
O,O,O-TRIETHYL PHOSPHOROTHIOATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
P-(DIMETHYLAMINO)AZOBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
P-PHENYLENEDIAMINE	ND	100	UG/L		8270
PARATHION	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLORONITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLOROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
PHENACETIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHENANTHRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHORATE	ND	20.	UG/L		8270
PRONAMIDE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
SAFROLE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
SYM-TRINITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
THIONAZIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
TOXAPHENE	ND	1	UG/L		8080
VOLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DIBROMO-3-CHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.008	UG/L		504.1
1,2-DIBROMOETHANE	ND	0.020	UG/L		504.1
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-BUTANONE	33	8.00	UG/L		8240
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00	UG/L		8240
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONE	ND	9.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONITRILE	0		UG/L		8240
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
BENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
OLEIN	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
ACRYLONITRILE	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-3
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6031

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	1	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
IODOMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL	0		UG/L		8240
METHACRYLONITRILE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
NAPHTHALENE	ND	0.900	UG/L		8240
PROPIONITRILE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
STYRENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TETRACHLOROETHENE	1	0.300	UG/L		8240
TOLUENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
VINYL ACETATE	ND	2.00	UG/L		8240
VINYL CHLORIDE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
XYLENE(TOTAL)	ND	1.40	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-4
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6029

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 18-JUL-1996
Received: 19-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
FIELD DATA:					
ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED	NA		GALLONS		FDWPURINFO
ELAPSED HOURS	NA		HRS		FDWPURINFO
GROUNDWATER ELEV.	NA		FT MSL		FDWGWELWDT
PH FIELD	6.17		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	6.17		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	6.15		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PH FIELD	6.14		PH UNITS		FDPHQUAD01
PURGE DATE (YY/MM/DD)	96-07-18		YY/MM/DD		FDWPURINFO
PURGING DEVICE	C				FDWPURSAMP
PURGING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N				FDWPURSAMP
PURGING MATERIAL	A				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING DEVICE	C				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N				FDWPURSAMP
SAMPLING MATERIAL	A				FDWPURSAMP
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	509		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	509		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	509		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	510		UMHOS/CM		FDSPCOND04
TUBING-PURGING	G				FDWPURSAMP
TUBING-SAMPLING	G				FDWPURSAMP
WATER TEMPERATURE IN DEG. CELSIUS FIELD	23		DEGREES C		FDXTEMPC01
WELL DEPTH TOTAL	91		FT		FDWGWELWDT
CHEMICAL METHODS & ROBOTICS:					
CYANIDE, TOTAL	ND	0.010	MG/L		335.3
INORGANICS:					
ALKALINITY, BICARBONATE (AS CACO3)	102	5.00	MG/L		310.1
ANTIMONY-TOTAL	ND	0.00200	MG/L		200.7
ARSENIC-TOTAL	0.0081	0.00300	MG/L	BL	200.7
BARIUM-TOTAL	0.0487	0.00100	MG/L		200.7
BERYLLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.000400	MG/L		200.7
CADMIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00440	MG/L		200.7
CALCIUM-DISSOLVED	16.1	0.140	MG/L		200.7
CHLORIDE	76.8	0.300	MG/L		325.2
CHROMIUM-TOTAL	0.0121	0.00400	MG/L		200.7
COBALT-TOTAL	ND	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
COPPER-TOTAL	0.0148	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
LEAD-TOTAL	ND	0.00100	MG/L		200.7
MAGNESIUM-DISSOLVED	5.07	0.240	MG/L		200.7
MERCURY-TOTAL	ND	0.000050	MG/L		245.2
NICKEL-TOTAL	ND	0.0190	MG/L		200.7
POTASSIUM-DISSOLVED	5.51	0.100	MG/L		258.1
SELENIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00300	MG/L		200.7
SILVER-TOTAL	ND	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
SODIUM-DISSOLVED	71.6	0.400	MG/L		200.7
SULFATE	22.7	1.00	MG/L		375.2
THALLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00200	MG/L		200.7
TIN-TOTAL	ND	0.0500	MG/L		200.7
VANADIUM-TOTAL	0.0314	0.00670	MG/L	BL	200.7
ZINC-TOTAL	0.0164	0.0100	MG/L		200.7
SUB-CONTRACT DATA:					
SULFIDE	ND	0.100	MG/L	NQ,SB	376.1
SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,2,4,5-TETRACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1,3-DINITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
1,4-NAPHTHOQUINONE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
376.1	SEQUOIA

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

:ite: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-4
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6029

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 18-JUL-1996
Received: 19-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
1-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,3,4,6-TETRACHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L	NQ	8150
2,4,6-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L	NQ	8150
2,4-DIMETHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DINITROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2,4-DINITROTOLUENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,6-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2,6-DINITROTOLUENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID	ND	1	UG/L	NQ	8150
2-ACETYLAMINOFLUORENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-CHLORONAPHTHALENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-CHLOROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
2-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
2-NITROPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3,3'-DICHLOROBENZIDINE	ND	20.	UG/L		8270
3,3'-DIMETHYLBENZIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3-METHYLCHOLANTHRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
3-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L	MP	8270
3-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4,4'-DDD	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
4,4'-DDE	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
4,4'-DDT	ND	0.1	UG/L	NQ,P	8080
4,6-DINITRO-2-METHYLPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4-AMINOBIPHENYL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-BROMOPHENYL-PHENYL ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLORO-3-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLOROANILINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-CHLOROPHENYL PHENYL ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
4-METHYLPHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L	MP	8270
4-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
4-NITROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
5-NITRO-O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
7,12-DIMETHYLBENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACENAPHTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACENAPHTHYLENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ACETOPHENONE	ND	10.	UG/L	NQ,P	8270
ALDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ALPHA-BHC	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
AROCLOR 1016	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1221	ND	1	UG/L		8080

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
-DICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
)-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONI	For Herbicides: Analyte recovery for the quality control sample analyzed with this sample was outside the method limits but was within the laboratory historical limits. Note: The method limits were derived from a single operator accuracy and precision study.
1,4'-DDT	Estimated concentration 0.004 UG/L.
TOPHENONE	Estimated concentration 2 UG/L.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-4
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6029

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 18-JUL-1996
Received: 19-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
AROCLOR 1232	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1242	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1248	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1254	ND	1	UG/L		8080
AROCLOR 1260	ND	1	UG/L		8080
BENZO[A]PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[B]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[G,H,I]PERYLENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZO[K]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZYL ALCOHOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BETA-BHC	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
BIS(2-CHLOROETHOXY)METHANE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-CHLOROETHYL)ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-CHLOROISOPROPYL)ETHER	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	ND	50.	UG/L	NQ,P,PL	8270
BUTYLBENZYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
CHLORDANE	ND	1	UG/L		8080
CHLOROBENZILATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
CHRYSENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DELTA-BHC	ND	0.05	UG/L		8080
DI-N-BUTYLPHTHALATE	28	10.	UG/L		8270
DI-N-OCTYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIALLATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIBENZOFURAN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIBENZ[A,H]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIELDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
DIETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIMETHOATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIMETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DINOSEB	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
DIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L	NN	8270
DISULFOTON	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ENDOSULFAN I	ND	0.05	UG/L		8080
ENDOSULFAN II	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ENDOSULFAN SULFATE	ND	0.5	UG/L		8080
ENDRIN	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ENDRIN ALDEHYDE	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
ETHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FAMPHUR	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
FLUORENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEPTACHLOR	ND	0.05	UG/L		8080
HEPTACHLOR EPOXIDE	ND	0.5	UG/L		8080
HEXACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROCYCLOPENTADIENE	ND	100	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROETHANE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
HEXACHLOROPROPENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
INDENO[1,2,3-CD]PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISODRIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISOPHORONE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
ISOSAFROLE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
KEPONE	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
LINDANE (GAMMA-BHC)	ND	0.1	UG/L		8080
METHAPYRILENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
METHOXYCHLOR	ND	0.5	UG/L		8080
METHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
METHYL PARATHION	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODI-N-BUTYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODI-N-PROPYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	Estimated concentration 3 UG/L.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-4
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6029

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 18-JUL-1996
Received: 19-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
N-NITROSODIMETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L	NN	8270
N-NITROSOMETHYLETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSOPIPERIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
N-NITROSOPYRROLIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
NITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
O,O,O-TRIETHYL PHOSPHOROTHIOATE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
P-(DIMETHYLAMINO)AZOBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
P-PHENYLENEDIAMINE	ND	100	UG/L		8270
PARATHION	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLORONITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PENTACHLOROPHENOL	ND	50.	UG/L		8270
PHENACETIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHENANTHRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHENOL	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PHORATE	ND	20.	UG/L		8270
PRONAMIDE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
PYRENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
SAFROLE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
SYM-TRINITROBENZENE	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
THIONAZIN	ND	10.	UG/L		8270
TOXAPHENE	ND	1	UG/L		8080
VOLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DIBROMO-3-CHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.008	UG/L		504.1
1,2-DIBROMOETHANE	ND	0.020	UG/L		504.1
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-BUTANONE	ND	8.00	UG/L		8240
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00	UG/L		8240
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONE	ND	9.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONITRILE	0		UG/L		8240
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
BENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
ROLEIN	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
ACRYLONITRILE	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-4
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6029

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 18-JUL-1996
Received: 19-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	0.6	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	0.6	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
IODOMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL	0		UG/L		8240
METHACRYLONITRILE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
NAPHTHALENE	ND	0.900	UG/L		8240
PROPIONITRILE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
STYRENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.9	0.300	UG/L		8240
TOLUENE	0.8	0.500	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
VINYL ACETATE	ND	2.00	UG/L		8240
VINYL CHLORIDE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
XYLENE(TOTAL)	ND	1.40	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 — Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TC-4
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6029

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 18-JUL-1996
Received: 19-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	0.6	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	0.6	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
IODOMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL	0		UG/L		8240
METHACRYLONITRILE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
NAPHTHALENE	ND	0.900	UG/L		8240
PROPIONITRILE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
STYRENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.9	0.300	UG/L		8240
TOLUENE	0.8	0.500	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
VINYL ACETATE	ND	2.00	UG/L		8240
VINYL CHLORIDE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
XYLENE(TOTAL)	ND	1.40	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TBK-TC-1
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6030

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
VOLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-BUTANONE	ND	8.00	UG/L		8240
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00	UG/L		8240
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONE	ND	9.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONITRILE	0		UG/L		8240
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
BENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
IODOMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL	0		UG/L		8240
METHACRYLONITRILE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
NAPHTHALENE	ND	0.900	UG/L		8240
PROPIONITRILE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
STYRENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TETRACHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TOLUENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
OLEIN	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
ACRYLONITRILE	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 — Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TBK-TC-1
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6030

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 16-JUL-1996
Received: 17-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
VINYL ACETATE	ND	2.00	UG/L		8240
VINYL CHLORIDE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
XYLENE(TOTAL)	ND	1.40	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

ite: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TBK-TC-2
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6032

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 19-JUL-1996
Received: 20-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
OLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-BUTANONE	ND	8.00	UG/L		8240
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00	UG/L		8240
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONE	ND	9.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONITRILE	0		UG/L		8240
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
BENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
IODOMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL	0		UG/L		8240
METHACRYLONITRILE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
NAPHTHALENE	ND	0.900	UG/L		8240
PROPIONITRILE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
STYRENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TETRACHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TOLUENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
OLEIN	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
CRYLONITRILE	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

C L I E N T R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TBK-TC-2
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6032

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 19-JUL-1996
Received: 20-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
VINYL ACETATE	ND	2.00	UG/L		8240
VINYL CHLORIDE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
XYLENE(TOTAL)	ND	1.40	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

CLIENT REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TBK-TC-4
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6029

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 18-JUL-1996
Received: 19-JUL-1996
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
VOLATILE ORGANICS:					
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-BUTANONE	ND	8.00	UG/L		8240
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700	UG/L		8240
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00	UG/L		8240
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONE	ND	9.00	UG/L		8240
ACETONITRILE	0		UG/L		8240
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00	UG/L	NQ	8240
BENZENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200	UG/L		8240
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
IODOMETHANE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL	0		UG/L		8240
METHACRYLONITRILE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
NAPHTHALENE	ND	0.900	UG/L		8240
PROPIONITRILE	ND	1.00	UG/L		8240
STYRENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TETRACHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TOLUENE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.300	UG/L		8240
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE	ND	0.600	UG/L		8240
TRICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

Item	Additional Comment Explanations (NQ/DL)
ROLEIN	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.
ACRYLONITRILE	Analyzed by approved screen methodology per EPA Method 624 or analyzed quantitatively per SW-846 methods.

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte / Sample Point: / Sample Number: / Sampled:	950-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	950-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	950-TC-3 AP6031 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
FIELD DATA:							
ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED	NA		NA		NA		GALLONS
ELAPSED HOURS	NA		NA		NA		HRS
GROUNDWATER ELEV.	NA		NA		NA		FT MSL
PH FIELD	6.26		7.72		6.94		PH UNITS
PH FIELD	6.22		7.72		6.91		PH UNITS
PH FIELD	6.20		7.71		6.91		PH UNITS
PH FIELD	6.15		7.68		6.90		PH UNITS
PURGE DATE (YY/MM/DD)	96-07-16		96-07-19		96-07-16		YY/MM/DD
PURGING DEVICE	C		C		C		
PURGING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N		N		N		
PURGING MATERIAL	A		A		A		
SAMPLING DEVICE	C		C		C		
SAMPLING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N		N		N		
SAMPLING MATERIAL	A		A		A		
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	645		467		645		UMHOS/CM
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	645		470		648		UMHOS/CM
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	640		462		648		UMHOS/CM
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	640		464		651		UMHOS/CM
TUBING-PURGING	G		G		G		
TUBING-SAMPLING	G		G		G		
WATER TEMPERATURE IN DEG. CELSIUS FIELD	22.1		20.4		23.8		DEGREES C
WELL DEPTH TOTAL	NA		81.		NA		FT
CHEMICAL METHODS & ROBOTICS:							
CYANIDE, TOTAL	ND	0.010	ND	0.010	ND	0.010	MG/L
INORGANICS:							
ALKALINITY, BICARBONATE (AS CACO3)	133	5.00	98	5.00	173	5.00	MG/L
ANTIMONY-TOTAL	0.0075	0.00200	ND	0.00200	0.0086	0.00200	MG/L
ARSENIC-TOTAL	0.0553	0.00300	0.0068	0.00300	0.0416	0.00300	MG/L
BARIUM-TOTAL	1.42	0.00100	0.0376	0.00100	1.69	0.00100	MG/L
BERYLLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.000400	ND	0.000400	0.0014	0.000400	MG/L
CADMIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00440	ND	0.00440	0.0086	0.00440	MG/L
CALCIUM-DISSOLVED	31.2	0.140	17.9	0.140	21.7	0.140	MG/L
CHLORIDE	110.	0.300	42.1	0.300	44.7	0.300	MG/L
CHROMIUM-TOTAL	0.163	0.00400	0.0186	0.00400	0.204	0.00400	MG/L
COBALT-TOTAL	0.118	0.0100	ND	0.0100	0.139	0.0100	MG/L
COPPER-TOTAL	0.297	0.0100	0.0136	0.0100	0.385	0.0100	MG/L
LEAD-TOTAL	0.0274	0.00100	ND	0.00100	0.0351	0.00100	MG/L
MAGNESIUM-DISSOLVED	4.62	0.240	3.91	0.240	4.08	0.240	MG/L
MERCURY-TOTAL	0.00017	0.000050	ND	0.000050	0.00029	0.000050	MG/L
NICKEL-TOTAL	0.144	0.0190	ND	0.0190	0.169	0.0190	MG/L
POTASSIUM-DISSOLVED	2.78	0.100	3.56	0.100	3.17	0.100	MG/L
SELENIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00300	ND	0.00300	ND	0.00300	MG/L
SILVER-TOTAL	ND	0.0100	ND	0.0100	ND	0.0100	MG/L
SODIUM-DISSOLVED	79.9	0.400	50.3	0.400	53.4	0.400	MG/L
SULFATE	30.6	1.00	19.2	1.00	19.9	1.00	MG/L
THALLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00200	ND	0.00200	ND	0.00200	MG/L

NA - Not Analyzed ND - Not Detected

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte / Sample Point: / Sample Number: / Sampled:	950-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996		P Q L	950-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996		P Q L	950-TC-3 AP6031 16-JUL-1996		P Q L	Units
TIN-TOTAL	ND		0.0500	ND		0.0500	ND		0.0500	MG/L
VANADIUM-TOTAL	0.394		0.00670	0.0260		0.00670	0.438		0.00670	MG/L
ZINC-TOTAL	0.577		0.0100	0.0279		0.0100	0.638		0.0100	MG/L
SUB-CONTRACT DATA:										
SULFIDE	3.8	s	0.100	3.8	s	0.100	ND	s	0.100	MG/L
SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANICS:										
1,2,4,5-TETRACHLOROBENZENE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
1,3-DINITROBENZENE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
1,4-NAPHTHOQUINONE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
1-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2,3,4,6-TETRACHLOROPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND		50.	ND		50.	ND		50.	UG/L
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND		1	ND		1	ND		1	UG/L
2,4,6-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND		1	ND		1	ND		1	UG/L
2,4-DIMETHYLPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2,4-DINITROPHENOL	ND		50.	ND		50.	ND		50.	UG/L
2,4-DINITROTOLUENE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2,6-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2,6-DINITROTOLUENE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID	ND		1	ND		1	ND		1	UG/L
2-ACETYLAMINOFLUORENE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2-CHLORONAPHTHALENE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2-CHLOROPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2-METHYLPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
2-NITROANILINE	ND		50.	ND		50.	ND		50.	UG/L
2-NITROPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
3,3'-DICHLOROBENZIDINE	ND		20.	ND		20.	ND		20.	UG/L
3,3'-DIMETHYLBENZIDINE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
3-METHYLCHOLANTHRENE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
3-METHYLPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
3-NITROANILINE	ND		50.	ND		50.	ND		50.	UG/L
4,4'-DDD	ND		0.1	ND		0.1	ND		0.1	UG/L
4,4'-DDE	ND		0.1	ND		0.1	ND		0.1	UG/L
4,4'-DDT	ND		0.1	ND		0.1	ND		0.1	UG/L
4,6-DINITRO-2-METHYLPHENOL	ND		50.	ND		50.	ND		50.	UG/L
4-AMINOBIPHENYL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
4-BROMOPHENYL-PHENYL ETHER	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
4-CHLORO-3-METHYLPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
4-CHLOROANILINE	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
4-CHLOROPHENYL PHENYL ETHER	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L
4-METHYLPHENOL	ND		10.	ND		10.	ND		10.	UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank s = EML Subcontract Data

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte / Sample Point: / Sample Number: / Sampled:	950-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	950-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	950-TC-3 AP6031 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
4-NITROANILINE	ND	50.	ND	50.	ND	50.	UG/L
4-NITROPHENOL	ND	50.	ND	50.	ND	50.	UG/L
5-NITRO-O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
7,12-DIMETHYLBENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
ACENAPHTHENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
ACENAPHTHYLENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
ACETOPHENONE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
ALDRIN	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	UG/L
ALPHA-BHC	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	UG/L
ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
AROCLOR 1016	ND	1	ND	1	ND	1	UG/L
AROCLOR 1221	ND	1	ND	1	ND	1	UG/L
AROCLOR 1232	ND	1	ND	1	ND	1	UG/L
AROCLOR 1242	ND	1	ND	1	ND	1	UG/L
AROCLOR 1248	ND	1	ND	1	ND	1	UG/L
AROCLOR 1254	ND	1	ND	1	ND	1	UG/L
AROCLOR 1260	ND	1	ND	1	ND	1	UG/L
BENZO[A]PYRENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
BENZO[B]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
BENZO[G,H,I]PERYLENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
BENZO[K]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
BENZYL ALCOHOL	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
BENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
BETA-BHC	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	UG/L
BIS(2-CHLOROETHOXY)METHANE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
BIS(2-CHLOROETHYL)ETHER	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
BIS(2-CHLOROISOPROPYL)ETHER	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	ND	50.	ND	50.	ND	50.	UG/L
BUTYLBENZYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
CHLORDANE	ND	1	ND	1	ND	1	UG/L
CHLOROBENZILATE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
CHRYSENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
DELTA-BHC	ND	0.05	ND	0.05	ND	0.05	UG/L
DI-N-BUTYLPHTHALATE	34	10.	13	10.	52	10.	UG/L
DI-N-OCTYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
DIALLATE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
DIBENZOFURAN	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
DIBENZ[A,H]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
DIELDRIN	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	UG/L
DIETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
DIMETHOATE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
DIMETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
DINOSEB	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
DIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
DISULFOTON	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
ENDOSULFAN I	ND	0.05	ND	0.05	ND	0.05	UG/L
ENDOSULFAN II	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	UG/L
ENDOSULFAN SULFATE	ND	0.5	ND	0.5	ND	0.5	UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBX = Tab Block

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte / Sample Point: / Sample Number: / Sampled:	950-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	950-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	950-TC-3 AP6031 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
ENDRIN	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	UG/L
ENDRIN ALDEHYDE	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	UG/L
ETHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
FAMPHUR	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
FLUORENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
HEPTACHLOR	ND	0.05	ND	0.05	ND	0.05	UG/L
HEPTACHLOR EPOXIDE	ND	0.5	ND	0.5	ND	0.5	UG/L
HEXACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
HEXACHLOROCYCLOPENTADIENE	ND	100	ND	100	ND	100	UG/L
HEXACHLOROETHANE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
HEXACHLOROPROPENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
INDENO[1,2,3-CD]PYRENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
ISODRIN	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
ISOPHORONE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
ISOSAFROLE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
KEPONE	ND	50.	ND	50.	ND	50.	UG/L
LINDANE (GAMMA-BHC)	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	ND	0.1	UG/L
METHAPYRILENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
METHOXYCHLOR	ND	0.5	ND	0.5	ND	0.5	UG/L
METHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
METHYL PARATHION	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
N-NITROSODI-N-BUTYLAMINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
N-NITROSODI-N-PROPYLAMINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
N-NITROSODIETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
N-NITROSODIMETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
N-NITROSOMETHYLETHYLAMINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
N-NITROSOPIPERIDINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
N-NITROSOPYRROLIDINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
NITROBENZENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
O,O,O-TRIETHYL PHOSPHOROTHIOATE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
P-(DIMETHYLAMINO)AZOBENZENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
P-PHENYLENEDIAMINE	ND	100	ND	100	ND	100	UG/L
PARATHION	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
PENTACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
PENTACHLORONITROBENZENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
PENTACHLOROPHENOL	ND	50.	ND	50.	ND	50.	UG/L
PHENACETIN	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
PHENANTHRENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
PHENOL	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
PHORATE	ND	20.	ND	20.	ND	20.	UG/L
PRONAMIDE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
PYRENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
SAFROLE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
SYM-TRINITROBENZENE	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L
THIONAZIN	ND	10.	ND	10.	ND	10.	UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: 950-TC-1 Sample Number: AP6030 Sampled: 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	950-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	950-TC-3 AP6031 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
TOXAPHENE	ND	1	ND	1	ND	1	UG/L
VOLATILE ORGANICS:							
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200	ND	0.200	ND	0.200	UG/L
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,2-DIBROMO-3-CHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.008	ND	0.008	ND	0.008	UG/L
1,2-DIBROMOETHANE	ND	0.020	ND	0.020	ND	0.020	UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700	ND	0.700	ND	0.700	UG/L
2-BUTANONE	130	8.00	ND	8.00	33	8.00	UG/L
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700	ND	0.700	ND	0.700	UG/L
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00	ND	3.00	ND	3.00	UG/L
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	UG/L
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	UG/L
ACETONE	ND	9.00	ND	9.00	ND	9.00	UG/L
ACETONITRILE	0		0		0		UG/L
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	UG/L
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	UG/L
BENZENE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200	ND	0.200	ND	0.200	UG/L
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	UG/L
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	UG/L
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	1	0.600	UG/L
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	UG/L
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: / Sample Number: / Sampled:	950-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	950-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	950-TC-3 AP6031 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
IODOMETHANE		ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL		0		0		0		UG/L
METHACRYLONITRILE		ND	0.800	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	UG/L
METHYL METHACRYLATE		ND	0.800	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	UG/L
METHYLENE CHLORIDE		ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
NAPHTHALENE		ND	0.900	ND	0.900	ND	0.900	UG/L
PROPIONITRILE		ND	1.00	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	UG/L
STYRENE		ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
TETRACHLOROETHENE		0.7	0.300	0.6	0.300	1	0.300	UG/L
TOLUENE		3	0.500	0.6	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE		ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE		ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE		ND	0.600	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	UG/L
TRICHLOROETHENE		ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE		ND	0.800	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	UG/L
VINYL ACETATE		ND	2.00	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	UG/L
VINYL CHLORIDE		ND	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
XYLENE(TOTAL)		ND	1.40	ND	1.40	ND	1.40	UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank s = EML Subcontract Data

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02 ,
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte / Sample Point: / Sample Number: / Sampled:	950-TC-4 AP6029 18-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
FIELD DATA:							
ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED	NA						GALLONS
ELAPSED HOURS	NA						HRS
GROUNDWATER ELEV.	NA						FT MSL
PH FIELD	6.17						PH UNITS
PH FIELD	6.17						PH UNITS
PH FIELD	6.15						PH UNITS
PH FIELD	6.14						PH UNITS
PURGE DATE (YY/MM/DD)	96-07-18						YY/MM/DD
PURGING DEVICE	C						
PURGING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N						
PURGING MATERIAL	A						
SAMPLING DEVICE	C						
SAMPLING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED	N						
SAMPLING MATERIAL	A						
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	509						UMHOS/CM
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	509						UMHOS/CM
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	509						UMHOS/CM
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD	510						UMHOS/CM
TUBING-PURGING	G						
TUBING-SAMPLING	G						
WATER TEMPERATURE IN DEG. CELSIUS FIELD	23						DEGREES C
WELL DEPTH TOTAL	91						FT
CHEMICAL METHODS & ROBOTICS:							
CYANIDE, TOTAL	ND	0.010					MG/L
INORGANICS:							
ALKALINITY, BICARBONATE (AS CACO3)	102	5.00					MG/L
ANTIMONY-TOTAL	ND	0.00200					MG/L
ARSENIC-TOTAL	0.0081	0.00300					MG/L
BARIUM-TOTAL	0.0487	0.00100					MG/L
BERYLLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.000400					MG/L
CADMIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00440					MG/L
CALCIUM-DISSOLVED	16.1	0.140					MG/L
CHLORIDE	76.8	0.300					MG/L
CHROMIUM-TOTAL	0.0121	0.00400					MG/L
COBALT-TOTAL	ND	0.0100					MG/L
COPPER-TOTAL	0.0148	0.0100					MG/L
LEAD-TOTAL	ND	0.00100					MG/L
MAGNESIUM-DISSOLVED	5.07	0.240					MG/L
MERCURY-TOTAL	ND	0.000050					MG/L
NICKEL-TOTAL	ND	0.0190					MG/L
POTASSIUM-DISSOLVED	5.51	0.100					MG/L
SELENIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00300					MG/L
SILVER-TOTAL	ND	0.0100					MG/L
SODIUM-DISSOLVED	71.6	0.400					MG/L
SULFATE	22.7	1.00					MG/L
THALLIUM-TOTAL	ND	0.00200					MG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank G = EMI Subcontract Data

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte / Sample Point: / Sample Number: / Sampled:	950-TC-4 AP6029 18-JUL-1996		P Q L	TBK-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
TIN-TOTAL	ND		0.0500					MG/L
VANADIUM-TOTAL	0.0314		0.00670					MG/L
ZINC-TOTAL	0.0164		0.0100					MG/L
SUB-CONTRACT DATA:								
SULFIDE	ND	s	0.100					MG/L
SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANICS:								
1,2,4,5-TETRACHLOROBENZENE	ND		10.					UG/L
1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE	ND		10.					UG/L
1,3-DINITROBENZENE	ND		10.					UG/L
1,4-NAPHTHOQUINONE	ND		10.					UG/L
1-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND		10.					UG/L
2,3,4,6-TETRACHLOROPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND		50.					UG/L
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND		1					UG/L
2,4,6-TRICHLOROPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID	ND		1					UG/L
2,4-DIMETHYLPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L
2,4-DINITROPHENOL	ND		50.					UG/L
2,4-DINITROTOLUENE	ND		10.					UG/L
2,6-DICHLOROPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L
2,6-DINITROTOLUENE	ND		10.					UG/L
2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID	ND		1					UG/L
2-ACETYLAMINOFLUORENE	ND		10.					UG/L
2-CHLORONAPHTHALENE	ND		10.					UG/L
2-CHLOROPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L
2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE	ND		10.					UG/L
2-METHYLPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L
2-NAPHTHYLAMINE	ND		10.					UG/L
2-NITROANILINE	ND		50.					UG/L
2-NITROPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L
3,3'-DICHLOROBENZIDINE	ND		20.					UG/L
3,3'-DIMETHYLBENZIDINE	ND		10.					UG/L
3-METHYLCHOLANTHRENE	ND		10.					UG/L
3-METHYLPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L
3-NITROANILINE	ND		50.					UG/L
4,4'-DDD	ND		0.1					UG/L
4,4'-DDE	ND		0.1					UG/L
4,4'-DDT	ND		0.1					UG/L
4,6-DINITRO-2-METHYLPHENOL	ND		50.					UG/L
4-AMINOBIPHENYL	ND		10.					UG/L
4-BROMOPHENYL-PHENYL ETHER	ND		10.					UG/L
4-CHLORO-3-METHYLPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L
4-CHLOROANILINE	ND		10.					UG/L
4-CHLOROPHENYL PHENYL ETHER	ND		10.					UG/L
4-METHYLPHENOL	ND		10.					UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte / Sample Point: / Sample Number: / Sampled:	950-TC-4 AP6029 18-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
4-NITROANILINE	ND	50.					UG/L
4-NITROPHENOL	ND	50.					UG/L
5-NITRO-O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.					UG/L
7,12-DIMETHYLBENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.					UG/L
ACENAPHTHENE	ND	10.					UG/L
ACENAPHTHYLENE	ND	10.					UG/L
ACETOPHENONE	ND	10.					UG/L
ALDRIN	ND	0.1					UG/L
ALPHA-BHC	ND	0.1					UG/L
ANTHRACENE	ND	10.					UG/L
AROCLOR 1016	ND	1					UG/L
AROCLOR 1221	ND	1					UG/L
AROCLOR 1232	ND	1					UG/L
AROCLOR 1242	ND	1					UG/L
AROCLOR 1248	ND	1					UG/L
AROCLOR 1254	ND	1					UG/L
AROCLOR 1260	ND	1					UG/L
BENZO[A]PYRENE	ND	10.					UG/L
BENZO[B]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.					UG/L
BENZO[G,H,I]PERYLENE	ND	10.					UG/L
BENZO[K]FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.					UG/L
BENZYL ALCOHOL	ND	10.					UG/L
BENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.					UG/L
BETA-BHC	ND	0.1					UG/L
BIS(2-CHLOROETHOXY)METHANE	ND	10.					UG/L
BIS(2-CHLOROETHYL)ETHER	ND	10.					UG/L
BIS(2-CHLOROISOPROPYL)ETHER	ND	10.					UG/L
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	ND	50.					UG/L
BUTYLBENZYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.					UG/L
CHLORDANE	ND	1					UG/L
CHLOROBENZILATE	ND	10.					UG/L
CHRYSENE	ND	10.					UG/L
DELTA-BHC	ND	0.05					UG/L
DI-N-BUTYLPHTHALATE	28	10.					UG/L
DI-N-OCTYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.					UG/L
DIALLATE	ND	10.					UG/L
DIBENZOFURAN	ND	10.					UG/L
DIBENZ[A,H]ANTHRACENE	ND	10.					UG/L
DIELDRIN	ND	0.1					UG/L
DIETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.					UG/L
DIMETHOATE	ND	10.					UG/L
DIMETHYLPHTHALATE	ND	10.					UG/L
DINOSEB	ND	10.					UG/L
DIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.					UG/L
DISULFOTON	ND	10.					UG/L
ENDOSULFAN I	ND	0.05					UG/L
ENDOSULFAN II	ND	0.1					UG/L
ENDOSULFAN SULFATE	ND	0.5					UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank s = EML Subcontract Data

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: 950-TC-4 Sample Number: AP6029 Sampled: 18-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
ENDRIN	ND	0.1					UG/L
ENDRIN ALDEHYDE	ND	0.1					UG/L
ETHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.					UG/L
FAMPHUR	ND	10.					UG/L
FLUORANTHENE	ND	10.					UG/L
FLUORENE	ND	10.					UG/L
HEPTACHLOR	ND	0.05					UG/L
HEPTACHLOR EPOXIDE	ND	0.5					UG/L
HEXACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.					UG/L
HEXACHLOROCYCLOPENTADIENE	ND	100					UG/L
HEXACHLOROETHANE	ND	10.					UG/L
HEXACHLOROPROPENE	ND	10.					UG/L
INDENO[1,2,3-CD]PYRENE	ND	10.					UG/L
ISODRIN	ND	10.					UG/L
ISOPHORONE	ND	10.					UG/L
ISOSAFROLE	ND	10.					UG/L
KEPONE	ND	50.					UG/L
LINDANE (GAMMA-BHC)	ND	0.1					UG/L
METHAPYRILENE	ND	10.					UG/L
METHOXYCHLOR	ND	0.5					UG/L
METHYL METHANESULFONATE	ND	10.					UG/L
METHYL PARATHION	ND	10.					UG/L
N-NITROSODI-N-BUTYLAMINE	ND	10.					UG/L
N-NITROSODI-N-PROPYLAMINE	ND	10.					UG/L
N-NITROSODIETHYLAMINE	ND	10.					UG/L
N-NITROSODIMETHYLAMINE	ND	10.					UG/L
N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	ND	10.					UG/L
N-NITROSOMETHYLETHYLAMINE	ND	10.					UG/L
N-NITROSOPIPERIDINE	ND	10.					UG/L
N-NITROSOPYRROLIDINE	ND	10.					UG/L
NITROBENZENE	ND	10.					UG/L
O,O,O-TRIETHYL PHOSPHOROTHIOATE	ND	10.					UG/L
O-TOLUIDINE	ND	10.					UG/L
P-(DIMETHYLAMINO)AZOBENZENE	ND	10.					UG/L
P-PHENYLENEDIAMINE	ND	100					UG/L
PARATHION	ND	10.					UG/L
PENTACHLOROBENZENE	ND	10.					UG/L
PENTACHLORONITROBENZENE	ND	10.					UG/L
PENTACHLOROPHENOL	ND	50.					UG/L
PHENACETIN	ND	10.					UG/L
PHENANTHRENE	ND	10.					UG/L
PHENOL	ND	10.					UG/L
PHORATE	ND	20.					UG/L
PRONAMIDE	ND	10.					UG/L
PYRENE	ND	10.					UG/L
SAFROLE	ND	10.					UG/L
SYM-TRINITROBENZENE	ND	10.					UG/L
THIONAZIN	ND	10.					UG/L

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

EVENT SUMMARY REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: 950-TC-4 Sample Number: AP6029 Sampled: 18-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
TOXAPHENE	ND	1					UG/L
VOLATILE ORGANICS:							
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200	ND	0.200	ND	0.200	UG/L
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,2-DIBROMO-3-CHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.008					UG/L
1,2-DIBROMOETHANE	ND	0.020					UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700	ND	0.700	ND	0.700	UG/L
2-BUTANONE	ND	8.00	ND	8.00	ND	8.00	UG/L
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700	ND	0.700	ND	0.700	UG/L
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00	ND	3.00	ND	3.00	UG/L
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	UG/L
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	UG/L
ACETONE	ND	9.00	ND	9.00	ND	9.00	UG/L
ACETONITRILE	0		0		0		UG/L
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	UG/L
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	UG/L
BENZENE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200	ND	0.200	ND	0.200	UG/L
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	UG/L
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	UG/L
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	0.6	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	0.6	0.600	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	UG/L
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	UG/L
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: 950-TC-4 Sample Number: AP6029 Sampled: 18-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-1 AP6030 16-JUL-1996	P Q L	TBK-TC-2 AP6032 19-JUL-1996	P Q L	Units
IODOMETHANE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL	0		0		0		UG/L
METHACRYLONITRILE	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	UG/L
METHYL-METHACRYLATE	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	UG/L
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
NAPHTHALENE	ND	0.900	ND	0.900	ND	0.900	UG/L
PROPIONITRILE	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	ND	1.00	UG/L
STYRENE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
TETRACHLOROETHENE	0.9	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
TOLUENE	0.8	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	ND	0.300	UG/L
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	ND	0.600	UG/L
TRICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	ND	0.400	UG/L
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	ND	0.800	UG/L
VINYL ACETATE	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	ND	2.00	UG/L
VINYL CHLORIDE	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	ND	0.500	UG/L
XYLENE(TOTAL)	ND	1.40	ND	1.40	ND	1.40	UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank s = EML Subcontract Data

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: TBK-TC-4 Sample Number: AP6029 Sampled: 18-JUL-1996	P Q L					Units
FIELD DATA:							
ACTUAL VOLUME PURGED							GALLONS
ELAPSED HOURS							HRS
GROUNDWATER ELEV.							FT MSL
PH FIELD							PH UNITS
PH FIELD							PH UNITS
PH FIELD							PH UNITS
PH FIELD							PH UNITS
PURGE DATE (YY/MM/DD)							YY/MM/DD
PURGING DEVICE							
PURGING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED							
PURGING MATERIAL							
SAMPLING DEVICE							
SAMPLING EQUIPMENT DEDICATED							
SAMPLING MATERIAL							
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD							UMHOS/CM
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD							UMHOS/CM
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD							UMHOS/CM
SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE FIELD							UMHOS/CM
TUBING-PURGING							
TUBING-SAMPLING							
WATER TEMPERATURE IN DEG. CELSIUS FIELD							DEGREES C
WELL DEPTH TOTAL							FT
CHEMICAL METHODS & ROBOTICS:							
CYANIDE, TOTAL							MG/L
INORGANICS:							
ALKALINITY, BICARBONATE (AS CACO3)							
ANTIMONY-TOTAL							MG/L
ARSENIC-TOTAL							MG/L
BARIUM-TOTAL							MG/L
BERYLLIUM-TOTAL							MG/L
CADMIUM-TOTAL							MG/L
CALCIUM-DISSOLVED							MG/L
CHLORIDE							MG/L
CHROMIUM-TOTAL							MG/L
COBALT-TOTAL							MG/L
COPPER-TOTAL							MG/L
LEAD-TOTAL							MG/L
MAGNESIUM-DISSOLVED							MG/L
MERCURY-TOTAL							MG/L
NICKEL-TOTAL							MG/L
POTASSIUM-DISSOLVED							MG/L
SELENIUM-TOTAL							MG/L
SILVER-TOTAL							MG/L
SODIUM-DISSOLVED							MG/L
SULFATE							MG/L
THALLIUM-TOTAL							MG/L

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: TBK-TC-4 Sample Number: AP6029 Sampled: 18-JUL-1996	P Q L					Units
TIN-TOTAL							MG/L
VANADIUM-TOTAL							MG/L
ZINC-TOTAL							MG/L
SUB-CONTRACT DATA:							
SULFIDE							MG/L
SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANICS:							
1,2,4,5-TETRACHLOROBENZENE							UG/L
1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE							UG/L
1,3-DINITROBENZENE							UG/L
1,4-NAPHTHOQUINONE							UG/L
1-NAPHTHYLAMINE							UG/L
2,3,4,6-TETRACHLOROPHENOL							UG/L
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOL							UG/L
2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID							UG/L
2,4,6-TRICHLOROPHENOL							UG/L
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL							UG/L
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID							UG/L
2,4-DIMETHYLPHENOL							UG/L
2,4-DINITROPHENOL							UG/L
2,4-DINITROTOLUENE							UG/L
2,6-DICHLOROPHENOL							UG/L
2,6-DINITROTOLUENE							UG/L
2-(2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXY)PROPIONIC ACID							UG/L
2-ACETYLAMINOFLUORENE							UG/L
2-CHLORONAPHTHALENE							UG/L
2-CHLOROPHENOL							UG/L
2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE							UG/L
2-METHYLPHENOL							UG/L
2-NAPHTHYLAMINE							UG/L
2-NITROANILINE							UG/L
2-NITROPHENOL							UG/L
3,3'-DICHLOROBENZIDINE							UG/L
3,3'-DIMETHYLBENZIDINE							UG/L
3-METHYLCHOLANTHRENE							UG/L
3-METHYLPHENOL							UG/L
3-NITROANILINE							UG/L
4,4'-DDD							UG/L
4,4'-DDE							UG/L
4,4'-DDT							UG/L
4,6-DINITRO-2-METHYLPHENOL							UG/L
4-AMINOBIPHENYL							UG/L
4-BROMOPHENYL-PHENYL ETHER							UG/L
4-CHLORO-3-METHYLPHENOL							UG/L
4-CHLOROANILINE							UG/L
4-CHLOROPHENYL PHENYL ETHER							UG/L
4-METHYLPHENOL							UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: TBK-TC-4 Sample Number: AP6029 Sampled: 18-JUL-1996	P Q L					Units
4-NITROANILINE							UG/L
4-NITROPHENOL							UG/L
5-NITRO-O-TOLUIDINE							UG/L
7,12-DIMETHYLBENZ[A]ANTHRACENE							UG/L
ACENAPHTHENE							UG/L
ACENAPHTHYLENE							UG/L
ACETOPHENONE							UG/L
ALDRIN							UG/L
ALPHA-BHC							UG/L
ANTHRACENE							UG/L
AROCLOR 1016							UG/L
AROCLOR 1221							UG/L
AROCLOR 1232							UG/L
AROCLOR 1242							UG/L
AROCLOR 1248							UG/L
AROCLOR 1254							UG/L
AROCLOR 1260							UG/L
BENZO[A]PYRENE							UG/L
BENZO[B]FLUORANTHENE							UG/L
BENZO[G,H,I]PERYLENE							UG/L
BENZO[K]FLUORANTHENE							UG/L
BENZYL ALCOHOL							UG/L
BENZ[A]ANTHRACENE							UG/L
BETA-BHC							UG/L
BIS(2-CHLOROETHOXY)METHANE							UG/L
BIS(2-CHLOROETHYL)ETHER							UG/L
BIS(2-CHLOROISOPROPYL)ETHER							UG/L
BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE							UG/L
BUTYLBENZYLPHTHALATE							UG/L
CHLORDANE							UG/L
CHLOROBENZILATE							UG/L
CHRYSENE							UG/L
DELTA-BHC							UG/L
DI-N-BUTYLPHTHALATE							UG/L
DI-N-OCTYLPHTHALATE							UG/L
DIALLATE							UG/L
DIBENZOFURAN							UG/L
DIBENZ[A,H]ANTHRACENE							UG/L
DIELDRIN							UG/L
DIETHYLPHTHALATE							UG/L
DIMETHOATE							UG/L
DIMETHYLPHTHALATE							UG/L
DINOSEB							UG/L
DIPHENYLAMINE							UG/L
DISULFOTON							UG/L
ENDOSULFAN I							UG/L
ENDOSULFAN II							UG/L
ENDOSULFAN SULFATE							UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank s = EML Subcontract Data

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

EVENT SUMMARY REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: TBK-TC-4 Sample Number: AP6029 Sampled: 18-JUL-1996	PQL					Units
ENDRIN							UG/L
ENDRIN ALDEHYDE							UG/L
ETHYL METHANESULFONATE							UG/L
FAMPHUR							UG/L
FLUORANTHENE							UG/L
FLUORENE							UG/L
HEPTACHLOR							UG/L
HEPTACHLOR EPOXIDE							UG/L
HEXACHLOROBENZENE							UG/L
HEXACHLOROCYCLOPENTADIENE							UG/L
HEXACHLOROETHANE							UG/L
HEXACHLOROPROPENE							UG/L
INDENO[1,2,3-CD]PYRENE							UG/L
ISODRIN							UG/L
ISOPHORONE							UG/L
ISOSAFROLE							UG/L
KEPONE							UG/L
LINDANE (GAMMA-BHC)							UG/L
METHAPYRILENE							UG/L
METHOXYCHLOR							UG/L
METHYL METHANESULFONATE							UG/L
METHYL PARATHION							UG/L
N-NITROSODI-N-BUTYLAMINE							UG/L
N-NITROSODI-N-PROPYLAMINE							UG/L
N-NITROSODIETHYLAMINE							UG/L
N-NITROSODIMETHYLAMINE							UG/L
N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE							UG/L
N-NITROSOMETHYLETHYLAMINE							UG/L
N-NITROSOPIPERIDINE							UG/L
N-NITROSOPYRROLIDINE							UG/L
NITROBENZENE							UG/L
O,O,O-TRIETHYL PHOSPHOROTHIOATE							UG/L
O-TOLUIDINE							UG/L
P-(DIMETHYLAMINO)AZOBENZENE							UG/L
P-PHENYLENEDIAMINE							UG/L
PARATHION							UG/L
PENTACHLOROBENZENE							UG/L
PENTACHLORONITROBENZENE							UG/L
PENTACHLOROPHENOL							UG/L
PHENACETIN							UG/L
PHENANTHRENE							UG/L
PHENOL							UG/L
PHORATE							UG/L
PRONAMIDE							UG/L
PYRENE							UG/L
SAFROLE							UG/L
SYM-TRINITROBENZENE							UG/L
THIONAZIN							UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

E V E N T S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: TBK-TC-4 Sample Number: AP6029 Sampled: 18-JUL-1996	P Q L					Units
TOXAPHENE							UG/L
VOLATILE ORGANICS:							
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200					UG/L
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500					UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500					UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,2-DIBROMO-3-CHLOROPROPANE							UG/L
1,2-DIBROMOETHANE							UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500					UG/L
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400					UG/L
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500					UG/L
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700					UG/L
2-BUTANONE	ND	8.00					UG/L
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700					UG/L
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00					UG/L
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800					UG/L
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00					UG/L
ACETONE	ND	9.00					UG/L
ACETONITRILE	0						UG/L
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00					UG/L
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00					UG/L
BENZENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200					UG/L
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00					UG/L
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400					UG/L
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400					UG/L
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300					UG/L
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600					UG/L
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400					UG/L
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400					UG/L
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400					UG/L
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.600					UG/L
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600					UG/L
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300					UG/L
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600					UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank s = EML Subcontract Data

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC

C L I E N T R E P O R T

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

Sample Point: TBK-TC-4
Sample Type: WELL
Sample Number: AP6029

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
REV: 00

Sampled: 18-JUL-1
Received: 19-JUL-1
Reported: 16-SEP-1

Analyte	Result	P Q L	Units	Comments	Method
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.800	UG/L		8240
VINYL ACETATE	ND	2.00	UG/L		8240
VINYL CHLORIDE	ND	0.500	UG/L		8240
XYLENE(TOTAL)	ND	1.40	UG/L		8240

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

EVENT SUMMARY REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: TBK-TC-4 Sample Number: AP6029 Sampled: 18-JUL-1996	P Q L					Units
TOXAPHENE							UG/L
VOLATILE ORGANICS:							
1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.200					UG/L
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,1,2,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.500					UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.500					UG/L
1,1-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
1,2,3-TRICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,2-DIBROMO-3-CHLOROPROPANE							UG/L
1,2-DIBROMOETHANE							UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.500					UG/L
1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300					UG/L
1,3-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.400					UG/L
1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.500					UG/L
2,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	ND	0.700					UG/L
2-BUTANONE	ND	8.00					UG/L
2-CHLORO-1,3-BUTADIENE	ND	0.700					UG/L
2-HEXANONE	ND	3.00					UG/L
3-CHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.800					UG/L
4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE	ND	1.00					UG/L
ACETONE	ND	9.00					UG/L
ACETONITRILE	0						UG/L
ACROLEIN	ND	2.00					UG/L
ACRYLONITRILE	ND	2.00					UG/L
BENZENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
BROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
BROMODICHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
BROMOFORM	ND	0.200					UG/L
BROMOMETHANE	ND	1.00					UG/L
CARBON DISULFIDE	ND	0.400					UG/L
CARBON TETRACHLORIDE	ND	0.400					UG/L
CHLOROBENZENE	ND	0.300					UG/L
CHLOROETHANE	ND	0.600					UG/L
CHLOROFORM	ND	0.400					UG/L
CHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.400					UG/L
CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
DIBROMOMETHANE	ND	0.400					UG/L
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.600					UG/L
ETHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.600					UG/L
ETHYLBENZENE	ND	0.300					UG/L
HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	ND	0.600					UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank s = EML Subcontract Data

WMX ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LABORATORIES, INC.

EVENT SUMMARY REPORT

Site: 950 - Lancaster Landfill
Disposal Facility
Post Office Box 631
600 East Avenue F
Lancaster CA 93535

ENS: 96-12752
MP: 950962
Rev / Task: 00 / 02
Sample Type: WELL
Reported: 16-SEP-1996

Analyte	Sample Point: TBK-TC-4 Sample Number: AP6029 Sampled: 18-JUL-1996	P Q L					Units
IODOMETHANE	ND	0.300					UG/L
ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL	0						UG/L
METHACRYLONITRILE	ND	0.800					UG/L
METHYL METHACRYLATE	ND	0.800					UG/L
METHYLENE CHLORIDE	ND	0.300					UG/L
NAPHTHALENE	ND	0.900					UG/L
PROPIONITRILE	ND	1.00					UG/L
STYRENE	ND	0.300					UG/L
TETRACHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300					UG/L
TOLUENE	ND	0.500					UG/L
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.300					UG/L
TRANS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	ND	0.300					UG/L
TRANS-1,4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE	ND	0.600					UG/L
TRICHLOROETHENE	ND	0.400					UG/L
TRICHLOROFLUOROMETHANE	ND	0.800					UG/L
VINYL ACETATE	ND	2.00					UG/L
VINYL CHLORIDE	ND	0.500					UG/L
XYLENE(TOTAL)	ND	1.40					UG/L

NA = Not Analyzed ND = Not Detected TBK = Trip Blank s = EML Subcontract Data

APPENDIX D

WELL SURVEY DATA

ARROW ENGINEERING

42138 TENTH STREET WEST
LANCASTER, CA 93534-7004
805/949-2525
FAX: 805/949-9775

Project: 96-2043

Mon Jul 22 16:42:58 1996

Ground water sampling points for RUST ENVIROMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE at northeast corner Avenue G and 10th Street East Lancaster, California

Point	Northing	Easting	Elevation	Description
4	4,382,811	4,253,928	2318.73	TC-01 (PVC)
			2317.9	TC-01 (GROUND)
5	4,381,928	4,253,954	2322.34	TC-02 (PVC)
			2321.4	TC-02 (GROUND)
6	4,381,216	4,253,945	2324.80	TC-03 (PVC)
			2324.0	TC-03 (GROUND)
7	4,380,308	4,253,977	2327.62	TC-04 (PVC)
			2326.6	TC-04 (GROUND)

Note: Coordinates and elevations are in feet, and are based on control information provided by RUST Environment and Infrastructure for previously existing monitoring wells in the same area.

APPENDIX B

ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOUR MAPS


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (ND)
MW-17 (ND)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
EX-7 (5)
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (17)
MW-2 (4)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (ND)
5
10
EX-10 (4)
TC-01 (0.7) 7/96
MW-11 (ND)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (5)
EX-8 (9)
50
MW-5 (100)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
10
EX-9 (6)
5
TC-02 (0.6) 7/96
MW-16 (NA) (APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (2)
MW-13 (ND)
TC-03 (1) 7/96
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (ND)
CAP-5 (ND)
0 500
SCALE IN FEET
TC-04 (0.9) 7/96
MW-14 (NA)
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(5) TETRACHLOROETHENE ISOCONCENTRATION (6/96) (µg/l)
5 TETRACHLOROETHENE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE INFERRED, ND=Not Detected), NA=Not Analyzed MCL= 5 ug/l
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER 600 E. AVENUE F LANCASTER, CA.
PCE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS 5-6/96
FIGURE
B-1
40107



PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

LANCASTER LANDFILL
AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.

PCE ISOCONCENTRATION
CONTOURS
7/96

FIGURE

B-2


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (ND)
MW-17 (ND)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
EX-7 (2)
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (1)
MW-2 (ND)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (ND)
EX-10 (ND)
TC-01 (ND) 7/96
5
MW-11 (ND)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (17)
EX-8 (2)
MW-5 (4)
EX-9 (1)
TW-1 (NA)
10
TW-2 (NA)
TC-02 (ND) 7/96
MW-16 (NA) (APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (ND)
MW-13 (ND)
TC-03 (ND) 7/96
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (ND)
CAP-5 (ND)
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
TC-04 (ND) 7/96
MW-14 (NA)
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(17) TRICHLOROETHENE CONCENTRATION (ug/l) 5-6/96
5 TRICHLOROETHENE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE INFERRED, ND=Not Detected), NA=Not Analyzed MCL= 5 ug/l
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER 600 E. AVENUE F LANCASTER, CA.
TCE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS 5-6/96
FIGURE
B-3

40107



PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

LANCASTER LANDFILL
AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.

TCE CONCENTRATIONS
CONTOURS
7/96

FIGURE
B-4


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (ND)
MW-17 (ND)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
EX-7 (ND)
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (5)
MW-2 (ND)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (ND)
1
5
EX-10 (2)
TC-01 (ND) 7/96
MW-11 (3)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
10
MW-3 (13)
EX-8 (5)
5
MW-5 (7)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
EX-9 (4)
TC-02 (ND) 7/96
1
MW-16 (ND) (APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (1)
MW-13 (1)
TC-03 (1) 7/96
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (ND)
CAP-5 (ND)
0 500
SCALE IN FEET
TC-04 (0.6) 7/96
MW-14 (ND)
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(7) DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE (DCDFM) CONTOURS (5-6/96) (µg/l)
— 1 — DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE INFERRED ND= Not detected NA= Not Available MCL= Not Listed
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER 600 E. AVENUE F LANCASTER, CA.
DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE (DCDFM) CONTOURS 5-6/96
FIGURE
B-5

40107



LEGEND

EX-1	INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7	GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01	TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(1)	DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE (DCDFM) CONTOURS (7/96) (µg/l)
— 1 —	DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE INFERRED ND= Not detected NA= Not Available MCL= Not Listed

PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

LANCASTER LANDFILL
AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.

DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE (DCDFM)
CONTOURS
7/96

FIGURE
B-6

40107



PREPARED BY:

RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

LANCASTER LANDFILL
AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.

(cis+trans)1,2 DCE CONCENTRATIONS
5-6/96

FIGURE

B-7


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (ND)
MW-17 (NA)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
EX-7 (3)
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (NA)
MW-2 (ND)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (ND)
EX-10 (ND)
TC-01 (ND)
MW-11 (0.5)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (ND)
EX-8 (6)
MW-5 (ND)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
EX-9 (ND)
TC-02 (ND)
MW-16 (NA)
(APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (ND)
MW-13 (NA)
TC-03 (ND)
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (NA)
CAP-5 (NA)
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
TC-04 (0.6)
MW-14 (NA)
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(6) (cis+trans) 1,2 DICHLOROETHENE CONCENTRATIONS (7/96) (µg/l) MCL= 6 µg/l
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.
(cis+trans) 1,2 DCE CONCENTRATIONS
7/96
FIGURE
B-8


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (ND)
MW-17 (ND)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
EX-7 (ND)
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (ND)
MW-2 (ND)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (ND)
EX-10 (ND)
TC-01 (ND) 7/96
MW-11 (ND)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (6)
EX-8 (4)
MW-5 (ND)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
EX-9 (ND)
TC-02 (ND) 7/96
MW-16 (NA) (APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (ND)
MW-13 (ND)
TC-03 (ND) 7/96
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (ND)
CAP-5 (ND)
0 500
SCALE IN FEET
TC-04 (ND) 7/96
MW-14 (NA)
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(6) VINYL CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION (5-6/96) (µg/l)
5 VINYL CHLORIDE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE INFERRED MCL= 0.5 µg/l
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.
VINYL CHLORIDE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS 5-6/96
FIGURE
B-9


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (ND)
MW-17 (NA)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
EX-7 (ND)
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (NA)
MW-2 (NA)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (ND)
EX-10 (ND)
TC-01 (ND)
MW-11 (NA)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (ND)
EX-8 (6)
MW-5 (NA)
EX-9 (ND)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
TC-02 (ND)
MW-16 (NA)
(APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (1)
MW-13 (ND)
TC-03 (ND)
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (NA)
CAP-5 (NA)
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
TC-04 (ND)
MW-14 (NA)
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(6) VINYL CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION (7/96) (µg/l)
5 VINYL CHLORIDE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE INFERRED MCL= 0.5 µg/l
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.
VINYL CHLORIDE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS 7/96
FIGURE
B-10


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (9.0)
MW-17 (3.7)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
EX-7 (11.0)
10
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (4.6)
MW-2 (2.9)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (5.6)
EX-10 (2.7)
TC-01 (110)
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
110
MW-11 (2.9)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (3.3)
EX-8 (6.5)
MW-5 (3.1)
EX-9 (2.6)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
TC-02 (42)
TC-03 (44)
TC-04 (76)
MW-16 (NA) (APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (4.0)
MW-13 (3.5)
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (3.4)
CAP-5 (3.3)
MW-14 (NA)
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(11) CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION (5-6/96) (mg/l)
10 CHLORIDE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE INFERRED NA= Not Analyzed
NOTE:
CONCENTRATIONS DETECTED IN THE TC-WELLS WERE CONTOURED BUT MAY BE ANOMOLOUS. THEY ARE NOT CONSISTENT WITH KNOW LEACHATE IMPACTED WELLS.
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.
CHLORIDE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS
5-6/96
FIGURE
B-11


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (9.3)
MW-17 (NA)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
10
EX-7 (10.7)
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (NA)
MW-2 (NA)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (5.1)
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
110
EX-10 (2.6)
TC-01 (110)
MW-11 (NA)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (NA)
EX-8 (8.2)
MW-5 (NA)
EX-9 (2.6)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
TC-02 (42.1)
TC-03 (44.7)
TC-04 (76.8)
MW-16 (NA)
(APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (3.7)
MW-13 (NA)
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (NA)
CAP-5 (NA)
MW-14 (NA)
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(5.1) CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION (7/96) (mg/l)
—110— CHLORIDE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE INFERRED NA= Not Analyzed
NOTE:
CONCENTRATIONS DETECTED IN THE TC-WELLS WERE CONTOURED BUT MAY BE ANOMOLOUS. THEY ARE NOT CONSISTENT WITH KNOW LEACHATE IMPACTED WELLS.
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.
CHLORIDE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS 7/96
FIGURE
B-12


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (11.9)
MW-17 (14.2)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
EX-7 (14.7)
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (13.6)
MW-2 (14.8)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (14.9)
EX-10 (14.9)
TC-01 (30.6) 7/96
MW-11 (15.3)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (18.3)
EX-8 (11.3)
MW-5 (14.1)
EX-9 (11.3)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
TC-02 (19.2) 7/96
TC-03 (19.9) 7/96
MW-16 (NA) (APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (12.1)
MW-13 (13.2)
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (14.0)
CAP-5 (13.2)
TC-04 (22.7) 7/96
MW-14 (NA)
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(18.3) SULFATE CONCENTRATIN (5-6/96) (mg/l)
12 SULFATE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE INFERRED Fence= Not Available
NOTE:
CONCENTRATIONS DETECTED IN THE TC-WELLS WERE CONTOURED BUT MAY BE ANOMOLOUS. THEY ARE NOT CONSISTENT WITH KNOW LEACHATE IMPACTED WELLS.
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.
SULFATE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS
5-6/96
FIGURE
B-13


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (11.3)
MW-17 (NA)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
EX-7 (13.7)
MW-4
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (NA)
MW-2 (NA)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (14.9)
EX-10 (14.8)
TC-01 (30.6)
MW-11 (NA)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (NA)
EX-8 (15.6)
MW-5 (NA)
EX-9 (15.2)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
TC-02 (19.2)
MW-16 (NA)
(APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (15.2)
MW-13 (NA)
TC-03 (19.9)
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (NA)
CAP-5 (NA)
TC-04 (22.7)
MW-14 (NA)
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(14.9) SULFATE CONCENTRATION (7/96) (mg/l)
—20— SULFATE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOUR DASHED WHERE INFERRED NA= Not Analyzed
NOTE:
CONCENTRATIONS DETECTED IN THE TC-WELLS WERE CONTOURED BUT MAY BE ANOMOLOUS. THEY ARE NOT CONSISTENT WITH KNOW LEACHATE IMPACTED WELLS.
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.
SULFATE ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS
7/96
FIGURE
B-14

40107


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (192)
MW-17 (169)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (ND)
CAP-3 (NA)
202
EX-7 (202)
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (177)
MW-2 (166)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (189)
180
180
160
EX-10 (169)
TC-01 (NA)
MW-11 (161)
200
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (202)
EX-8 (204)
MW-5 (199)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
EX-9 (170)
TC-02 (NA)
180
MW-16 (NA)
(APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (180)
MW-13 (166)
TC-03 (NA)
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (163)
CAP-5 (167)
160
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
TC-04 (NA)
MW-14 (NA)
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(180) TDS CONCENTRATION (5-6/96) (mg/l)
—160— TDS ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE INFERRED NA= Not Analyzed
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER
600 E. AVENUE F
LANCASTER, CA.
TDS ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS
5-6/96
FIGURE
B-15


MW-6 (NA)
MW-1 (NA)
MW-7 (NA)
EX-11 (188)
MW-17 (NA)
EX-1 (NA)
CAP-1 (NA)
CAP-3 (NA)
EX-7 (209)
MW-4 (NA)
EX-2 (NA)
MW-10 (NA)
MW-2 (NA)
IW-2 (NA)
IW-3 (NA)
IW-4 (NA)
IW-5 (NA)
IW-6 (NA)
MW-15 (180)
187
180
200
EX-10 (167)
TC-01 (NA)
MW-11 (NA)
MW-8 (NA)
MW-9 (NA)
MW-3 (NA)
EX-8 (221)
MW-5 (NA)
EX-9 (166)
TW-1 (NA)
TW-2 (NA)
TC-02 (NA)
MW-16 (NA)
(APPROXIMATE LOCATION)
EX-3 (180)
MW-13 (NA)
TC-03 (NA)
EX-4 (NA)
MW-12 (NA)
CAP-5 (NA)
0
500
SCALE IN FEET
TC-04 (NA)
MW-14 (NA)
LEGEND
EX-1 INJECTION/EXTRACTION WELL
MW-7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
TC-01 TEMPORARY CASE WELL
(180) TDS CONCENTRATION (7/96) (mg/l)
—200— TDS ISOCONCENTRATION CONTOURS DASHED WHERE OCCURS NA= Not Analyzed
PREPARED BY:
RUST ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE
LANCASTER LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER 600 E. AVENUE F LANCASTER, CA.
TDS ISOCONCENTRATIONS CONTOURS 7/96
FIGURE
B-16
40107

APPENDIX C

TIME-SERIES PLOTS

Time Series Plots



○ MW03
□ MW04

<all values fit within the vertical scale>



◇ MW02
⊕ MW05

MW05 on October 19, 1988 was 85.0 mg/L
MW05 on February 7, 1989 was 95.0 mg/L
MW05 on April 19, 1989 was 59.0 mg/L

Time Series Plots



⊠ EX7
⊕ EX11
▽ MW10
△ MW11
○ MW17

EX11 on December 13, 1995 was 54.5 mg/L



○ EX3
□ EX8
▽ EX9
△ EX10

<all values fit within the vertical scale>

Time Series Plots



○ MW03
□ MW04

<all values fit within the vertical scale>



◇ MW02
⊕ MW05

MW05 on April 19, 1989 was 51.0 mg/L

Time Series Plots



⊠ EX7
⊕ EX11
▽ MW10
△ MW11
○ MW17

<all values fit within the vertical scale>



○ EX3
□ EX8
▽ EX9
△ EX10

<all values fit within the vertical scale>

Time Series Plots



○ MW03
□ MW04

MW03 on February 2, 1990 was 2090.0 mg/L



◇ MW02
⊕ MW05

<all values fit within the vertical scale>

Time Series Plots



⊠ EX7
⊕ EX11
▽ MW10
△ MW11
○ MW17

EX11 on December 13, 1995 was 345.0 mg/L
MW17 on February 4, 1994 was 380.0 mg/L



○ EX3
□ EX8
▽ EX9
△ EX10

<all values fit within the vertical scale>

Time Series Plots



○ MW03
□ MW04

<all values fit within the vertical scale>



◇ MW02
⊕ MW05

MW05 on April 19, 1989 was 193.0 UG/L

Time Series Plots



⊠ EX7
⊕ EX11
▽ MW10
△ MW11
○ MW17

<all values fit within the vertical scale>



○ EX3
□ EX8
▽ EX8
△ EX10

<all values fit within the vertical scale>

Time Series Plots



○ MW03
□ MW04

<all values fit within the vertical scale>



⊠ MW02
⊕ MW05

<all values fit within the vertical scale>

Time Series Plots



⊠ EX7
⊕ EX11
▽ MW10
△ MW11
○ MW17

MW17 on February 4, 1994 was 44.0 UG/L
MW17 on June 3, 1994 was 37.0 UG/L
MW17 on September 15, 1994 was 17.0 UG/L



□ EX3
▽ EX8
△ EX9
◇ EX10

<all values fit within the vertical scale>

Time Series Plots



○ MW03
□ MW04

<all values fit within the vertical scale>



◇ MW02
⊕ MW05

<all values fit within the vertical scale>

Time Series Plots



⊠ EX7
⊕ EX11
▽ MW10
△ MW11
○ MW17

<all values fit within the vertical scale>



□ EX3
▽ EX8
△ EX9
◇ EX10

EX9 on December 14, 1995 was 36.0 UG/L

Time Series Plots



○ MW03
□ MW04

MW03 on February 7, 1995 was 34.0 UG/L



◇ MW02
△ MW05

MW05 on May 1, 1990 was 22.7 UG/L (ND)

Time Series Plots



⊠ EX7
⊕ EX11
▽ MW10
△ MW11
○ MW17

MW17 on February 4, 1994 was 14.00 UG/L
MW17 on June 3, 1994 was 11.00 UG/L



○ EX3
□ EX8
▽ EX9
△ EX10

<all values fit within the vertical scale>

Time Series Plots



○ MW03
□ MW04

<all values fit within the vertical scale>



◇ MW02
⊕ MW05

<all values fit within the vertical scale>

Time Series Plots



⊠ EX7
⊕ EX11
▽ MW10
△ MW11
○ MW17

<all values fit within the vertical scale>



○ EX3
□ EX8
▽ EX9
△ EX10

<all values fit within the vertical scale>