

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New England District

Final

Phase I USEPA SOW – Demonstrate Plume Capture, Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 5.e, Validate the Extent of Capture by Evaluating Concentration Trends in NIA Monitoring Locations as Compared to Flow Paths Developed from the Updated Groundwater Flow Model

Area of Contamination 5 – Shepley's Hill Landfill Former Fort Devens Army Installation Devens, Massachusetts

Contract No. W912WJ-19-D-0014 Contract Delivery Order No. W912WJ-20-F-0022

December 9, 2021

Phase I USEPA SOW – Phase I USEPA SOW – Demonstrate Plume Capture, Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 5.e, Validate the Extent of Capture by Evaluating **Concentration Trends in NIA Monitoring Locations as Compared to Flow Paths Developed from the Updated Groundwater Flow Model**

Area of Contamination 5 – Shepley's Hill Landfill **Former Fort Devens Army Installation Devens**, Massachusetts

December 9, 2021

Prepared By: SERES-Arcadis 8(a) JV 2, LLC 669 Marina Drive, Suite B-7 Charleston, South Carolina 29492 Tel 843 216 8531

Our Ref: Contractor No. W912WJ-19-D-0014 Contract Delivery Order No. W912WJ-20-F-0022

Andrew Vitolins, PG **Project Manager**

Heather Levesque, PMP **Deputy Project Manager**

Received By:

REDDY.PENELOPE. W.1502105066

Digitally signed by REDDY.PENELOPE.W.1502105066 Date: 2021.12.09 11:22:40 -05'00'

Penelope Reddy **USACE** Project Manager

This document is intended only for the use of the individual or entity for which it was prepared and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited.

Prepared For:

United States Army Corps of Engineers New England District

Contents

| A | crony | ns and Abbreviations | iv |
|---|-------|---|-----|
| 1 | Int | oduction | . 1 |
| | 1.1 | Goals of Technical Memorandum | . 2 |
| | 1.2 | Background – Development of Scope of Work for Technical Memorandum | . 4 |
| 2 | Gr | undwater Chemistry Data | . 5 |
| | 2.1 | Pre-Arsenic Treatment Plant Upgrade Data (2010 to 2015) | . 5 |
| | 2.1 | Northern Impact Area | . 5 |
| | 2.1 | 2 Nearfield Area | . 5 |
| | 2.2 | Post-Arsenic Treatment Plant Upgrade Data (2016 to 2020) | . 6 |
| | 2.2 | Northern Impact Area | . 6 |
| | 2.2 | 2 Nearfield Area | . 6 |
| 3 | Tr | nd Analyses – Northern Impact Area | . 7 |
| | 3.1 | Methodology | . 7 |
| | 3.2 | Pre-Arsenic Treatment Plant Upgrade Trends (2010 to 2015) | . 7 |
| | 3.3 | Post ATP-Upgrade Trends (2016-2020) | . 7 |
| | 3.4 | Long-Term Trends After ATP Extraction Well Installation (March 2006 - 2020) | . 8 |
| 4 | Ne | rfield Area Wells and Model Flow Paths | . 9 |
| | 4.1 | Trend Analysis for Nearfield Area Wells (2010-2020) | . 9 |
| | 4.2 | Trend Analysis for Nearfield Wells Pre and Post ATP Extraction Well Installation (March 2006) . | . 9 |
| | 4.3 | Flow Paths and Trend Analysis Results | 10 |
| | 4.4 | Arsenic Mass Flux | 11 |
| | 4.4 | 1 Methodology | 11 |
| | 4.4 | 2 Mass-Flux Calculation | 12 |
| 5 | Su | nmary and Conclusions | 14 |
| | 5.1 | Summary | 14 |
| | 5.2 | Conclusions | 15 |
| 6 | Re | erences | 17 |

Tables

| Table 1 | List of Monitoring Wells and Piezometers |
|---------|--|
| Table 2 | Summary of Well Construction for Phase 1 Designated Wells |
| Table 3 | Summary of Available Groundwater Chemistry Datasets for North Impact Area |
| Table 4 | Summary of Available Groundwater Chemistry Datasets for Nearfield Area |
| Table 5 | Summary of Dissolved Arsenic Trends for North Impact Area |
| Table 6 | Summary of Dissolved Arsenic Trends for Nearfield Area |
| Table 7 | Arsenic Flux in the Overburden Across East to West Section from SHL-23 to SHL-21 |
| | |

Figures

| Figure 1 | Site Location Map |
|----------|---|
| Figure 2 | Long-Term Monitoring Well Network |
| Figure 3 | 2010-2015 North Impact Area Arsenic Concentration Trends |
| Figure 4 | 2016-2020 North Impact Area Arsenic Concentration Trends |
| Figure 5 | November 4, 2020 Groundwater Capture Zone, Model-Generated Particle Tracks, and Arsenic Trends |
| Figure 6 | November 4, 2020 Vertical Groundwater Capture Zone, Model-Generated Particle Tracks, and Arsenic Trends |
| Figure 7 | East-West Upgradient Cross Section with Groundwater Model Hydrostratigraphic Units |

Attachments

- Attachment 1 Mann Kendall Statistical Analysis Plots
- Attachment 2 Mann-Kendall Statistical Analysis Plots for NIA Wells Post ATP Extraction Well Installation (March 2006-2020)
- Attachment 3 Arsenic Trend Plots and Mann-Kendall Statistical Analysis Plots for Nearfield Area Wells Pre and Post ATP Extraction Well Installation
- Attachment 4 Response to Comments

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| 3PE | three-point estimation |
|------------------|---|
| µg/L | microgram per liter |
| ATP | arsenic treatment plant |
| CL | cleanup level |
| Geosyntec | Geosyntec Consultants, Inc. |
| gpm | gallon per minute |
| HSU | hydrostratigraphic unit |
| NIA | North Impact Area |
| S-A JV | SERES-Arcadis 8(a) Joint Venture 2, LLC |
| SHL | Shepley's Hill Landfill |
| site | Area of Contamination 5 – Shepley's Hill Landfill, located at the former Fort Devens Army Installation in Devens, Massachusetts |
| SOW | scope of work |
| Technical Memo 1 | Phase I USEPA SOW – Demonstrate Plume Capture Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 1.g Delineate Capture Zone based on Hydraulic and Geochemical Data |
| Technical Memo 2 | Phase I USEPA SOW – Demonstrate Plume Capture Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 2.d Delineate Lateral and Vertical Extent Upgradient |
| Technical Memo 4 | Phase I USEPA SOW – Demonstrate Plume Capture, Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 4.e, Validate the Updated Groundwater Flow Model with Sufficient Field- Measured Hydraulic Data to Confirm Conclusions |
| Technical Memo 5 | Phase I USEPA SOW – Demonstrate Plume Capture, Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 5.e, Validate the Extent of Capture by Evaluating Concentration Trends in NIA Monitoring Locations as Compared to Flow Paths Developed in the Updated Groundwater Flow Model |
| UCL | upper confidence limit |
| USEPA | United States Environmental Protection Agency |

1 Introduction

SERES-Arcadis 8(a) Joint Venture 2, LLC (S-A JV) prepared this Phase I USEPA SOW – Demonstrate Plume Capture, Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 5.e, Validate the Extent of Capture by Evaluating Concentration Trends in NIA Monitoring Locations as Compared to Flow Paths Developed in the Updated Groundwater Flow Model (Technical Memo 5) in accordance with a scope of work (SOW; United States Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA] 2016) developed by the USEPA, Region 1, for the Area of Contamination 5 – Shepley's Hill Landfill (SHL), located at the former Fort Devens Army Installation in Devens, Massachusetts (site; Figure 1). Technical Memo 5, listed as Phase I Subtask 5.e in the SOW, is the fifth of five memoranda required by the USEPA in accordance with the SOW (USEPA 2016). The S-A JV prepared this Technical Memo 5 on behalf of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, New England District, under contract number W912WJ-19-D-0014.

The EPA SOW is based on a Conceptual Site Model (CSM) that assumes the SHL is the primary source of arsenic in the groundwater and that, by intercepting the "plume" emanating from that source, a groundwater extraction and treatment remedy would result in the restoration of groundwater downgradient of the remedial system. This EPA CSM also includes the assumption that advective transport is the primary mechanism of contaminant migration. The SOW goal of Technical Memo 5 is to evaluate whether "plume capture" is occurring based on arsenic concentration trends in groundwater. As presented to the EPA in numerous meetings and correspondence, the Army disagrees with this CSM, as there is substantial evidence that advective transport is not the only mechanism of contaminant migration, and that the naturally-occurring geochemical conditions associated with wetland and natural organic matter deposits, combined with geogenic arsenic sources, contribute to arsenic in groundwater in and downgradient from the area of current groundwater extraction. Further, the Army believes failure to account for these documented geochemical conditions and arsenic inputs provides misleading conclusions concerning the efficacy of a groundwater extraction and treatment remedy for restoration of downgradient groundwater.

The SOW-stated purpose of Technical Memo 5 is to evaluate capture zones estimated by the groundwater model developed for SHL using MODFLOW (Geosyntec Consultants, Inc. [Geosyntec] 2020). The following Technical Memos prepared by the S-A JV in 2021 included analyses of groundwater flow potential, recharge, and pumping influence using three-point estimation (3PE) analysis and the groundwater flow model to estimate the capture zone created by the two extraction wells (EW-01 and EW-04) used by the arsenic treatment plant (ATP) to recover arsenic impacted groundwater:

- Phase I USEPA SOW Demonstrate Plume Capture Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 1.g Delineate Capture Zone based on Hydraulic and Geochemical Data (Technical Memo 1; S-A JV 2021a, submitted June 11, 2021)
- Phase I USEPA SOW Demonstrate Plume Capture Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 2.d Delineate Lateral and Vertical Extent Upgradient (Technical Memo 2; S-A JV 2021b, draft submitted May 17, 2021)
- Phase I USEPA SOW Demonstrate Plume Capture, Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 4.e, Validate the Updated Groundwater Flow Model with Sufficient Field-Measured Hydraulic Data to Confirm Conclusions (Technical Memo 4; S-A JV 2021c, draft submitted June 14, 2021).

The 3PE analysis was performed using monitoring wells and piezometers located within the Nearfield Area (the area encompassing the extraction wells and the wells/piezometers immediately downgradient of the extraction

wells), located hydraulically upgradient of the Northern Impact Area (NIA). The location of the Nearfield Area and NIA is shown on Figure 2.

The findings of the three technical memoranda indicate that the migration of arsenic within the underlying aquifers and capture of arsenic by the ATP extraction wells is dependent on multiple factors that include hydraulic head, recharge, and geochemical conditions. The following lines of evidence have been used to assess the extent of capture by the ATP extraction wells:

- The 3PE analysis provided in Technical Memo 1 (S-A JV 2021a)
- An assessment of geochemical conditions within the aquifer that impact the dissolution and ionic state of arsenic provided in Technical Memo 1 (S-A JV 2021a)
- An assessment of groundwater flow from Shepley's Hill, Plow Shop Pond, and the bedrock aquifer evident on potentiometric maps provided in Technical Memos 1 and 4 (S-A JV 2021a, 2021c)
- Groundwater flow calculations along the toe of the landfill estimated by the groundwater flow model provided in Technical Memo 4 (S-A JV 2021c)
- Results of particle tracking simulations by the groundwater model for SHL provided in Technical Memo 4 (S-A JV 2021c)
- Trend analysis using statistical methods provided in Sections 3 and 4 of this Technical Memo 5

The results of the SHL model (Geosyntec 2020) constitute an additional line of evidence that supports characterization of the extent of capture created by the extraction wells. The complex nature of the groundwater flow and arsenic geochemistry at the site precludes a single method approach toward approximating the capture zone at the ATP. While the 3PE analysis provides a direct mathematical formula from which water level data can be used to calculate hydraulic gradients and groundwater flow directions within triangular areas, it is a simplistic method that does not take into account the complexities of groundwater flow under pumping conditions. Accordingly, the SHL groundwater flow model is better suited to evaluate hydraulic capture of a recovery well since the 3PE analysis treats each triangular area as an independent analysis, whereas the groundwater model simulates all aspects of the groundwater flow regime (including vertical components of flow) and honors a water mass balance across the area. Furthermore, the size of the 3PE triangles provide a much coarser assessment of flow direction and magnitude than the SHL groundwater flow model because the model is much more discretized within each 3PE triangle area. 3PE also represents the gradient and direction for a single time whereas the groundwater flow model results are for an average of three months. A 3PE analysis could vary significantly over a three month period. For these reasons, Army believes that the groundwater model is the preferred tool for estimating capture extent because it reasonably represents groundwater levels and flow.

This Technical Memo 5 presents the results of the required trend analysis (as prescribed in the SOW [USEPA 2016]). Additionally, an evaluation of arsenic mass flux is presented based on hydraulic parameters presented in the model to provide an estimate of arsenic flux through the aquifer and potential arsenic mass recovered by the system. Sections 1.1 and 1.2 provide additional detail regarding the goals and background of the scope of this Technical Memo 5. The evaluation of trend analyses and arsenic mass flux is presented in Sections 2, 3, and 4.

1.1 Goals of Technical Memorandum

The goal of Technical Memo 5 is to evaluate the degree of hydraulic and arsenic mass capture by evaluating concentration trends in NIA monitoring locations as compared to flow paths developed from the updated groundwater model. Trend analysis of several Nearfield Area wells has also been conducted and are included for

comparison. Mann-Kendall statistical trend analysis is commonly used to evaluate if remedial measures are decreasing contaminant concentrations in groundwater at landfills and other cleanup sites, and indicate whether the concentration trend over time is increasing, decreasing, or if there is insufficient evidence of a statically significant trend for each dataset.

It is important to note that arsenic trends in the NIA are not necessarily a good indicator of "plume capture," and therefore the objective of understanding extent of capture based on these trends is unlikely to be met. More specifically, a lack of a decreasing arsenic trend in the NIA does not in itself imply that water emanating from the landfill has not been prevented from entering the NIA. The NIA comprises a naturally reducing zone with influence from wetland and natural organic matter deposits. This reducing condition is expected to prevent attenuation and/or contribute to release of arsenic derived from geogenic sources; this is in addition to the desorption of adsorbed arsenic in equilibrium with the aqueous phase, which also serves to replenish dissolved arsenic and extend the timeframe for washout of arsenic via advection. Accordingly, arsenic concentrations are likely to remain elevated as the reducing condition is sustained, even as the NIA receives groundwater inflow from areas other than the landfill.

Several EPA-authored guidance documents support thorough characterization and evaluation of the conceptual site model when assessing remedial performance with respect to inorganic constituents. EPA guidance indicates: "development of general knowledge of the redox status of the aquifer throughout the plume is important relative to understanding the processes of contaminant attenuation (or lack thereof) within the plume" (USEPA 2007), "hydrogeology and groundwater and aquifer geochemistry together form the framework for understanding contaminant fate and transport at a site", and "evaluation of aquifer mineralogy and solid-phase contaminant speciation is typically an important part of identification of the contaminant immobilization process [...] for inorganic contaminants." (USEPA 2015). Technical Memo 1 (S-A JV 2021a) included a summary of geochemical conditions at SHL, including geogenic sources of arsenic that continue to contribute to the aquifer both upgradient and downgradient of the ATP extraction wells. These conditions result in groundwater at SHL and the NIA remaining at concentrations orders of magnitude greater than the CLs, regardless of the upgradient ATP capture zone.

The EPA's "A Systematic Approach for Evaluation of Capture Zones at Pump and Treat Systems" document includes evaluation of concentration trends as Step 5 of the "Six Steps for Systematic Evaluation of Capture Zones" and includes a real-life example in Example B1 (Example Capture Zone Evaluation, ECCA Site) where concentrations trends are not considered to be an indicator of capture zone performance due to there being "continuing sources of ground-water impacts", noting that "this line of evidence would provide ambiguous interpretations (i.e., these wells might not clean up over time whether or not capture is sufficient)" (USEPA 2008). As discussed above, the Army posits that there are ongoing geogenic sources of arsenic to the system and that evaluation of arsenic contaminant trends at SHL provides similarly ambiguous results. Results of performing Steps 1 through 4 of the USEPA's recommended Six Steps for Systematic Evaluation of Capture Zones (USEPA 2008) indicate that the ATP is achieving capture as specified in the Remedial Design and Remedial Action Workplan (CH2MHill 2005).

Arsenic trends are compared to the estimated capture zones documented in Technical Memos 1 and 4 (S-A JV 2021a, 2021c) to evaluate if there is a correlation between the two (Section 4). Monitoring wells with arsenic that has been documented to exhibit an increasing or decreasing trend are compared to hydraulic gradients and particle tracking pathways presented in model simulations (included in Technical Memo 4) to evaluate the overall zone of influence of extraction wells EW-01 and EW-04.

In addition to the evaluation of trend analyses presented in Sections 3 and 4, a calculation of mass flux of arsenic passing through the northern boundary of the landfill was performed, using aquifer flow rates calculated by the model. A comparison of the arsenic mass flux upgradient of the ATP to the arsenic mass estimated through calculation to be recovered by the extraction wells provides additional insight into the arsenic mass capture performance of the ATP.

1.2 Background – Development of Scope of Work for Technical Memorandum

The SOW (USEPA 2016) lists 56 monitoring wells/piezometers within the NIA and Nearfield Area identified for trend analysis. The intent of the analysis was to compare arsenic trends to flow paths developed from the groundwater model (Geosyntec 2020). Initially, the SOW included arsenic trend analysis for 2010 through 2015, which represents the period prior to upgrading the ATP system. On the groundwater modeling call on June 15, 2020, the USEPA indicated that the available period of record should include 2010 to 2015 and post-upgrade 2016 to 2019. Data for 2020 were also included in trend analyses, as 2020 data were included in Technical Memos 1, 2, and 4 (S-A JV 2021a, 2021b, 2021c).

The USEPA's statistical software package ProUCL's Mann-Kendall statistical trend analysis was used to evaluate arsenic concentrations over time at the subject monitoring wells. A total of 68 wells were reviewed and prioritized for this effort (32 within the NIA and 36 in the Nearfield Area) and are presented in Table 1. Monitoring wells located in the NIA and Nearfield Area are shown on Figure 2. Well construction information for these wells is presented in Table 2. Arsenic concentrations used in the trend analysis were retrieved from the Former Fort Devens Environmental Restoration Program Database. Arsenic concentration data collected from 2010 to 2015 and 2016 to 2020 for monitoring wells at SHL were chosen based upon the SOW (USEPA 2016) and the availability of data for each well.

2 Groundwater Chemistry Data

Arsenic concentration data reported for long-term monitoring events and other sampling events at SHL are compiled and maintained in the Former Fort Devens Environmental Restoration Program Database. Tables 3 and 4 include the arsenic concentrations reported for 68 monitoring wells and piezometers at SHL in the NIA and Nearfield Areas (respectively) for 2010 through 2020. Locations are shown on Figure 2.

2.1 Pre-Arsenic Treatment Plant Upgrade Data (2010 to 2015)

System upgrades to the ATP made in January 2015 resulted in a moderate increase in the combined total average extraction rate of the two extraction wells by approximately 15 to 20 percent. This section summarizes the dissolved arsenic concentrations for monitoring wells and piezometers in the NIA and Nearfield Area during the period 2010 to 2015, as prescribed in the USEPA SOW.

2.1.1 Northern Impact Area

Arsenic concentrations ranged from 0.15 to 3,700 micrograms per liter (μ g/L) at the 32 monitoring wells and piezometers in the NIA from 2010 to 2015. Eleven wells had arsenic concentrations less than the cleanup level (CL) of 10 μ g/L, with concentrations ranging from 1.5 to 9.7 μ g/L. Arsenic concentrations were less than the CL from 2010 to 2015 at SHM-10-03, SHM-10-08, SHM-10-10, SHM-13-01, SHM-13-02, SHM-13-08, SHM-13-15, and SHM-05-42A. Eight wells (SHM-10-02, SHM-10-05A, SHM-10-04, SHM-10-16, SHM-13-03, SHM-13-05, SHM-13-14D, and SHM-05-41A) had arsenic concentrations both less than and greater than the CL during the same time period. The remaining wells and piezometers had arsenic concentrations greater than the CL in the NIA from 2010 to 2015 (SHM-05-41B, SHM-05-41C, SHM-13-04, SHM-13-06, SHM-13-07, SHM-05-40X, SHM-99-31C, SHM-99-32X, SHM-05-42B, SHM-13-14S, SHM-07-03, SHM-05-39A, SHM-05-39B, SHM-07-05, SHM-99-31A, and SHM-99-31B). Monitoring well SHM-05-40X had the highest arsenic concentrations, ranging from 2,970 to 3,700 μ g/L.

2.1.2 Nearfield Area

Arsenic concentrations ranged from 0.14 to 4,100 μ g/L at the 36 monitoring wells and piezometers in the Nearfield Area from 2010 to 2015. Seven wells (EPA-PZ-2012-5B, SHL-23, EPA-PZ-2012-4A, SHM-96-5C, SHL-5, SHL-8D, and SHL-8S) had arsenic concentrations less than the CL of 10 μ g/L, with concentrations ranging from 0.14 to 8.7 μ g/L from 2010 to 2015. Three wells had arsenic concentrations less than and greater than the CL, including SHL-5, SHM-10-06A, and SHM-96-5C. The remaining wells and piezometers had arsenic concentrations greater than the CL in the Nearfield Area from 2010 to 2015. EPA-PZ-2012-3B had the highest arsenic concentration, ranging from 3,830 to 4,070 μ g/L.

2.2 Post-Arsenic Treatment Plant Upgrade Data (2016 to 2020)

This section summarizes the dissolved arsenic concentrations for monitoring wells and piezometers in the NIA and Nearfield Area for the period 2016 to 2020.

2.2.1 Northern Impact Area

Arsenic data for the same 32 monitoring wells and piezometers in Section 2.1.1 were reviewed for 2016 to 2020. Arsenic concentrations ranged from 1.5 to 3,100 μ g/L. Fifteen wells had arsenic concentrations less than the CL of 10 μ g/L, with concentrations ranging from 1.5 to 9.1 μ g/L. Arsenic concentrations were less than the CL from 2016 to 2020 at SHM-05-42A, SHM-07-03, SHM-10-02, SHM-10-03, SHM-10-04, SHM-10-05A, SHM-10-08, SHM-10-10, SHM-13-01, SHM-13-02, SHM-13-14D, SHM-13-15, SHM-99-32X, SHM-13-14S, and SHM-99-31B. SHM-13-05 and SHM-13-14D had arsenic concentrations both less than and greater than the CL. The remaining wells and piezometers were greater than the CL in the NIA from 2016 to 2020. SHM-05-40X had the highest arsenic concentration, ranging from 25 to 3,100 μ g/L.

2.2.2 Nearfield Area

Arsenic data for the same 36 monitoring wells and piezometers in Section 2.1.2 were reviewed for 2016 to 2020. Arsenic concentrations ranged from 1.5 to 4,000 μ g/L. Twelve wells had arsenic concentrations less than the CL of 10 μ g/L, with concentrations ranging from 1.5 to 9.4 μ g/L. Arsenic concentrations were less than the CL from 2016 to 2020 for EPA-PZ-2012-1A, EPA-PZ-2012-2A, EPA-PZ-2012-2B, EPA-PZ-2012-4A, EPA-PZ-2012-5A, EPA-PZ-2012-5B, EPA-PZ-2012-6A, EPA-PZ-2012-7A, SHL-22, SHL-5, SHL-8D, and SHL-8S. SHM-93-22C had arsenic concentrations both less than and greater than the CL from 2016 to 2020. The remaining wells and piezometers had arsenic concentrations greater than the CL in the Nearfield Area from 2016 to 2020. EPA-PZ-2012-3B had the highest arsenic concentrations, ranging from 2,700 to 4,000 μ g/L.

3 Trend Analyses – Northern Impact Area

This section summarizes the Mann-Kendall trend analyses results for monitoring wells located in the NIA (Figure 2).

3.1 Methodology

The USEPA software package ProUCL (Version 5.1) was used to generate arsenic trend estimates for 32 monitoring wells in the NIA. The Mann-Kendall test was used to determine the presence and direction of a trend (i.e., decreasing, increasing, or unknown). Mann-Kendall analysis is a nonparametric test for linear trend that involves listing the concentrations in temporal order and computing all differences that may be formed between a given measurement and earlier measurements. The test statistic (sum of trend, S value) is the difference between the number of strictly positive differences and the number of strictly negative differences. If there is an underlying increasing trend, then these differences will tend to be positive, indicated by a sufficiently large positive S value. The p-value of the correlation provides a measure of the level of significance of the statistical test. Correlations were accepted as statistically significant for p-values less than or equal to 0.05 (95% confidence level). Trend analyses were performed for three time periods: before the ATP upgrades (2010 to 2015), after the ATP upgrades (2016 to 2020), and long-term trend after the ATP extraction wells were installed (March 2006 to 2020). The results of the trend analyses for each period are described in Sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.

3.2 Pre-Arsenic Treatment Plant Upgrade Trends (2010 to 2015)

The Mann-Kendall test was used to evaluate trends at NIA monitoring wells before the ATP upgrades (2010 to 2015). Of the 32 wells where trend analyses were attempted, 31% (10 monitoring wells) could not have trend analyses performed either because there were less than two data points before 2015 or there were a large number of instances where arsenic was not detected, as noted in Table 5. Mann-Kendall trend analysis was performed on the remaining 22 monitoring wells. The evaluation identified that of the 22 monitoring wells statistically tested, four wells (18%) were found to have statistically significant increasing concentrations, seven wells (32%) were found to have statistically significant decreasing concentrations, and 11 wells (50%) showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level. The results are presented in Table 5. Figure 3 shows the arsenic concentration trend result for each location. The Mann-Kendall ProUCL output for each well is provided in Attachment 1.

3.3 Post ATP-Upgrade Trends (2016-2020)

The Mann-Kendall test was used to evaluate trends at NIA monitoring wells after the ATP upgrades (2016 to 2020). Of the 32 wells where trend analyses were attempted, 50% (16 monitoring wells) could not have trend analyses performed because there were a large number of instances where arsenic was not detected, as noted in Table 5. Mann-Kendall trend analysis was performed on the remaining 15 monitoring wells. The evaluation identified that of the 15 monitoring wells statistically tested, one well (6%) was found to have statistically significant increasing concentrations, one well (6%) were found to have statistically significant decreasing concentrations, and 14 wells (88%) showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level.

The highest arsenic concentration in groundwater between 2016 and 2020 was at SHM-13-06and was similar to the highest concentration detected at the same location between 2010 and 2015 (3,180 μ g/L in June 2013 compared to 3,100 μ g/L in April 2019). The results are presented in Table 5. Figure 4 shows the arsenic concentration trend result for each location. The Mann-Kendall ProUCL output for each well is provided in Attachment 1.

3.4 Long-Term Trends After ATP Extraction Well Installation (March 2006 - 2020)

To understand the long-term impacts of the ATP extraction well operation, the Mann-Kendall Trend analyses were performed for wells having data immediately after the installation of the ATP extraction wells (in March 2006) and were continuously sampled through November 2020. Seven wells in the NIA had sufficient data to perform this analysis after ATP operation began (SHM-05-40X, SHM-05-41A, SHM-05-41B, SHM-05-41C, SHM-05-42B, SHM-99-31C, and SHM-99-32X). The table below shows post ATP system Mann-Kendall trend analysis results.

| Well ID | Post-ATP Trend (March 2006-2020) |
|------------|---|
| SHM-05-40X | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |
| SHM-05-41A | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |
| SHM-05-41B | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |
| SHM-05-41C | No statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level |
| SHM-05-42B | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |
| SHM-99-31C | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |
| SHM-99-32X | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |

Six of the seven wells (86%) had statistically significant decreasing concentrations after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. One well (14%; SHM-05-41C) showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level. SHM-05-40X, approximately 450 ft hydraulically downgradient of the base boundary, was sampled first in 2006 when the ATP first began to operate and had a concentration of 3,610 μ g/L. The concentration was 2,100 μ g/L in 2020. The Mann-Kendall ProUCL output for each well is provided in Attachment 2.

4 Nearfield Area Wells and Model Flow Paths

This section summarizes the Mann-Kendall trend analyses and comparison of trend analyses to model-generated flow paths described in Technical Memo 4 (S-A JV 2021c).

4.1 Trend Analysis for Nearfield Area Wells (2010-2020)

Mann-Kendall trend analyses (described in Section 3.1) were performed for upgradient well clusters included in Technical Memo 2 (S-A JV 2021b) and all Nearfield area wells used in the 3PE analyses performed in Technical Memo 1 (S-A JV 2021a), for a total of 36 wells. These wells are in the Nearfield Area. The trend analyses were performed using all available data from 2010 through 2020. Trend analyses were performed for the aggregate 2010 through 2020 period rather than splitting into two periods as in the NIA since many wells in the Nearfield Area were recently installed (after 2013). Of the 36 wells where trend analyses were attempted, 33% (12 monitoring wells) could not have trend analyses performed because there were many instances when arsenic was not detected, as noted in Table 6. Mann-Kendall trend analysis was performed on the remaining 24 monitoring wells. The evaluation identified that of the 24 monitoring wells statistically tested, no wells (0%) were found to have statistically significant increasing concentrations, 8 wells (33%) were found to have statistically significant increasing concentrations, 8 wells (33%) were found to have statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level. The results are presented in Table 6. Figure 5 shows the arsenic concentration trend result for each location. The Mann-Kendall ProUCL output for each well is provided in Attachment 1.

4.2 Trend Analysis for Nearfield Wells Pre and Post ATP Extraction Well Installation (March 2006)

To understand the long-term impacts of the ATP extraction well operation, the Mann-Kendall Trend analyses were performed for wells that had sufficient data both before the installation of the ATP extraction wells (in March 2006) and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Six wells in the Nearfield Area had sufficient data to perform the analyses both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells (SHL-9, SHL-22, SHM-93-22B, SHM-93-22C, SHM-96-5B, and SHM-96-5C). The table below shows the pre and post ATP system Mann-Kendall trend analysis results.

| Well ID | Pre-ATP Trend (through 2006) | Post-ATP Trend (March 2006-2020) |
|------------|---|---|
| SHL-9 | No statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level | No statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level |
| SHL-22 | Statistically Significant Increasing Concentrations | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |
| SHM-93-22B | Statistically Significant Increasing Concentrations | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |

| SHM-93-22C | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |
|------------|---|---|
| SHM-96-5B | No statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |
| SHM-96-5C | No statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level | Statistically Significant Decreasing Concentrations |

Two of the six wells (33%; SHL-22 and SHM-93-22B) went from statistically significant increasing concentrations before the installation of the ATP extraction wells to statistically significant decreasing concentrations after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Two of the six wells (33%; SHM-96-5B and SHM-96-5C) went from no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level before the installation of the ATP extraction wells. One wells to statistically significant decreasing concentrations after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. One well (17%; SHL-9) showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level before level both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. One well (17%; SHL-9) showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. The historical arsenic trends and Mann-Kendall ProUCL output for each well is provided in Attachment 3.

4.3 Flow Paths and Trend Analysis Results

Reverse particle tracking was used to evaluate the model-predicted capture of ATP extraction wells EW-01 and EW-04, as described in Technical Memo 4 (S-A JV 2021c). As summarized in Technical Memo 4, in general, the model-predicted capture zones extend farther to the north, east, and west than the capture zones estimated from the 3PE analysis in Technical Memos 1 and 2 (S-A JV 2021a, 2021b). The limited extent of the capture zone demonstrated by the 3PE analysis included in Technical Memo 1 (S-A JV 2021a) is partially constrained in the eastern portion of the site, as the easternmost triangles are spatially limited by the existing well network. The model accounts for flow potential in the eastern portion of the site (east of the monitoring well SHM-10-06A) that the 3PE analysis cannot fully represent due to the lack of additional triangles in that area. Both the model-predicted capture zones and the capture zones estimated from the 3PE analysis fully encompass the northern edge of the SHL boundary.

A comparison of the 2010 to 2020 arsenic trend analyses described in Section 4.1 to the reverse particle pathlines from the extraction wells for November 2020 (from Technical Memo 4) is shown on Figure 5. There are 18 wells within both the model-predicted capture zone and the capture zone estimated from the 3PE analysis (Figure 5). No wells were found to have statistically significant increasing concentrations, four wells (22%) were found to have statistically significant decreasing concentrations, nine wells (50%) showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level, and five wells (28%) had a large number of instances where arsenic was not detected (therefore trend analyses were not performed). There are 5 wells outside both the model-predicted capture zone and the capture zone estimated from the 3PE analysis (Figure 5; SHM-05-42B, SHM-05-41C, SHM-10-16, SHL-8S, and SHL-8D). No wells were found to have statistically significant increasing concentrations, five wells (28%) were found to have statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level, and significant decreasing concentrations, five wells (28%) were found to have statistically significant increasing concentrations, five wells (28%) were found to have statistically significant increasing concentrations, five wells (28%) were found to have statistically significant decreasing concentrations, six wells (33%) showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level, and seven wells (39%) had a large number of instances where arsenic was not detected (therefore trend analyses were not performed). Based

on these results, there is no significant difference in arsenic trend results inside and outside the both the modelpredicted capture zone and the capture zones estimated from the 3PE analysis.

To understand the vertical distribution of the particle pathlines along the location of the cross-section shown on Figure 5, forward particle pathlines from the cross-section location were evaluated. Thirty particles were initialized at the midpoint of each layer in model layers 2, 3, and 4. These particles were released transiently from 2012 through 2020. The vertical particle pathlines for the forward particle paths from the cross-section location is shown on Figure 6. Extraction wells EW-01 and EW-04 are projected onto the cross section. All particles terminate at the extraction wells, indicating that the model shows complete capture for particles originating from the cross-section location.

4.4 Arsenic Mass Flux

Since the capture zone delineated using the 3PE analyses indicate there could be areas between SHM-10-06 and SHL-21 where arsenic in groundwater exceeding the CL may not be captured at all times¹ (Figure 5 and 6), a calculation of arsenic mass flux was performed to evaluate the relative mass of arsenic that could migrate into the NIA if groundwater exceeding the CL were not always captured.

The groundwater flow model (Geosyntec 2020) presented in Technical Memo 4 (S-A JV 2021c) was used to evaluate two scenarios:

- 1. Non-pumping conditions (assuming the current upgradient dissolved arsenic concentrations are representative of the pre-pumping dissolved concentrations)
- 2. Average 2016 to 2020 pumping conditions representative of ATP operation since system upgrades were completed in 2015.

In addition, estimates of arsenic flux migrating from the landfill under pumping and non-pumping conditions were compared to the total arsenic removed from the system by the ATP extraction wells (EW-01 and EW-04).

4.4.1 Methodology

Mass flux, expressed as mass through time, represents the total mass of a solute conveyed by groundwater through a defined transect. Mass flux can be estimated as the product of groundwater (Darcy) flux across a transect and the solute concentration in groundwater. The east-west transect used is the transect presented in Technical Memos 1 and 2 (S-A JV 2021a, 2021b) located upgradient of the ATP extraction wells (extending from soil boring SB-2017-06 to monitoring well SHL-21) and extending from the water table to the top of the bedrock (Figure 6). The arsenic concentration data included the most recently collected monitoring well data when available, and vertical profile data collected from the 2017 transect borings.

¹ The key design criterion for the ATP extraction wells, as specified in the 100% Design (CH2MHill 2005) were to "provide containment of the groundwater plume in the vicinity of the base boundary," seek to reduce the design rate of 50 gpm as appropriate, and to focus groundwater extraction in the deeper part of the glacial aquifer. It should be noted the modeling results presented in the final design of the ATP extraction system did not include full capture east of the landfill boundary (between wells SHM-10-06 and SHM-21; Figures A-8 and A-9 of CH2MHill 2005).

The Darcy flux across this section was calculated using the SHL groundwater flow model (Geosyntec 2020). A cross section along model row 76, corresponding to the location of the transect, was superimposed on the hydrogeologic cross section on Figure 7. The cross section was subdivided into 16 discrete areas of solute mass flux based on model layers and hydraulic conductivity zone boundaries. In the model, these areas were defined in the overburden (Layers 1 through 4) as individual hydrostratigraphic units (HSUs). The Darcy flux for each HSU was calculated for average of each stress period from 2016 to 2020 under ATP pumping and non-pumping conditions. The groundwater flux values generated by the model for the two scenarios are presented in Table 7.

To assess the impact of groundwater on the eastern end of the transect where arsenic in groundwater exceeding the CL may not be captured at all times, a similar calculation was performed for the portion of the transect between wells SHM-10-06 and SHL-21. Groundwater flux through this area is presented separately in Table 7 and represents the sum of groundwater flux from HSUs 4, 5, 15, and 26.

4.4.2 Mass-Flux Calculation

For each HSU, a representative arsenic concentration was estimated using available data from sample locations within each HSU. For the HSUs specified in Layer 1 (HSUs 2 through 5) and Layer 4 (HSUs 31, 32, and 33), available arsenic data were limited to one datapoint. Consequently, the arsenic concentrations estimated for these HSUs were either the detected concentration or half the reporting limit for non-detects. For HSUs defined in Layers 2 and 3, arsenic data were available from multiple sampling depths and locations. The representative arsenic concentrations for these HSUs were calculated using multiple methods including the geometric mean, the arithmetic mean, and the 95% upper confidence limit (UCL) used to represent an upper bound determined using ProUCL. The arsenic concentrations for these HSUs, determined using each method, are presented in Table 7. The arsenic mass flux through each HSU was estimated by multiplying the model-generated groundwater flux by the representative arsenic concentration. The arsenic mass flux through the transect is the cumulative mass flux from individual HSUs. Table 7 presents the arsenic mass flux estimates across the transect during the pumping and non-pumping scenarios for each "representative" arsenic concentration estimate (average, geometric mean, and 95% UCL).

Mass flux during ATP operation.

Under pumping conditions, the model-estimated groundwater flux through the east-west transect is 39.3 gallons per minute (gpm). The estimated groundwater flux through the area where arsenic in groundwater exceeding the CL may not be captured at all times is 5.1 gpm and represents 13.1% of the total groundwater flux migrating northward from the landfill area; and the other 86.9% (34.2 gpm) of the groundwater flowing through the transect flows to the extraction wells. Compared to the 2016 to 2020 average ATP extraction rate of 50.1 gpm, the flow migrating from the landfill in the overburden represents 68% of the groundwater captured by the ATP extraction system. Based on these rates, 34.2 gpm extracted by the ATP system is from the landfill, and 15.9 gpm of the groundwater captured by the ATP originates from areas located downgradient (e.g., the NIA), cross-gradient (e.g., Shepley's Hill), or from bedrock beneath the system.

Under average 2016 to 2020 pumping conditions, the arsenic mass flux across the east-west section is estimated to be 222 to 280 pounds per year (based on average and geometric mean concentrations in each HSU), with an upper bound of 491 pounds per year based on 95% UCL concentrations. Across the area where arsenic in groundwater exceeding the CL may not be captured at all times, arsenic mass flux was 0.7 to 3.9 pounds per year with an upper bound of 16.9 pounds per year based on 95% UCL concentrations. Based on these estimates, the arsenic mass flux across the area where arsenic in groundwater exceeding the captured at all times, arsenic mass flux across the area area where arsenic in groundwater exceeding the CL may not be captured at all times.

times is 0.3 to 1.4% of the total mass flux from the area underneath the landfill cap, with an upper bound of 3.4% using 95% UCL concentrations.

Mass flux under non-pumping conditions.

To compare these estimates to the fluxes that occurred before the ATP extraction system was implemented, a similar calculation was performed with the following assumptions:

- No pumping took place, and therefore the groundwater flux was estimated using the model with no pumping at the ATP extraction wells. Under non-pumping conditions, 33.6 gpm flows across the entire east-west section.
- The same HSUs were used for the non-pumping scenario as for the pumping scenario (just less total flow).
- The same dissolved arsenic concentrations were assumed for each HSU as were assumed for the pumping scenario (arsenic trend analyses of upgradient wells within the landfill area were performed as part of the 2020 SHL Annual report and the majority of those wells showed insufficient evidence of a statistically significant trend at the 95% level).

Based on these assumptions, the arsenic flux across the entire section without pumping is estimated to be 181 to 230 pounds per year, with an upper bound of 410 pounds per year based on 95% UCL concentrations.

Arsenic mass captured by the ATP extraction wells.

The arsenic mass captured by the ATP was estimated using the average arsenic concentrations detected in the influent raw water sampled from each well from 2016 to 2020 and the average 2016 to 2020 pumping rates. The total arsenic mass captured by the ATP system pumping at a rate of 50.1 gpm is estimated to be 466 pounds per year. Table 7 also presents an estimate of the upper bound for arsenic captured by the ATP using maximum concentrations for the extraction wells during the 5-year periods. Compared to the arsenic removed by the extraction system, the estimated arsenic flux migrating from the landfill using average well and vertical profile concentrations in the transect accounts for 48 to 60% of the arsenic mass captured by the ATP. (Comparing the upper bound of the mass migrating through the transect [i.e., using 95% UCL values] with the upper bound of the ATP captured mass, the transect account for 85% of the captured mass.). The rest of the arsenic captured by the ATP extraction wells originates from areas located downgradient (e.g., the NIA), cross-gradient (e.g., Shepley's Hill), or from bedrock beneath the system.

5 Summary and Conclusions

5.1 Summary

Mann-Kendall trend analyses were performed on NIA monitoring wells for both pre-ATP upgrades (2010 to 2015) and post-ATP upgrades (2016 to 2020). The analysis for the pre-ATP upgrades period identified 18% of wells tested with statistically significant increasing concentrations, 32% of wells with statistically significant decreasing concentrations, and 50% of wells with no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence levels. The analysis for post-ATP upgrades period identified 6% of wells with statistically significant increasing concentrations, 6% of wells with statistically significant decreasing concentrations, and 88% of wells with no statistically significant decreasing concentrations, and 88% of wells with no statistically significant decreasing concentrations, and 88% of wells with no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence levels.

Mann-Kendall trend analyses were also performed for Nearfield Area monitoring wells for 2010 to 2020. Of the 36 wells where trend analyses were attempted, 33% (12 monitoring wells) could not have trend analyses performed because there were a large number of non-detects. The Mann-Kendall test was performed on the remaining 24 monitoring wells. The evaluation identified that of the 24 monitoring wells statistically tested, no wells (0%) had statistically significant increasing concentrations, 8 wells (33%) had statistically significant decreasing concentrations, and 16 wells (67%) showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence levels.

To understand the long-term impacts of the ATP extraction well operation, Mann-Kendall Trend analyses were performed for wells that had sufficient data both before the installation of the ATP extraction wells (in March 2006) and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Six wells in the Nearfield Area had sufficient data to perform the analyses both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells (SHL-9, SHL-22, SHM-93-22B, SHM-93-22C, SHM-96-5B, and SHM-96-5C). Thirty-three percent (33%) of the monitoring wells went from statistically significant increasing concentrations before the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Thirty-three percent (33%) of the wells went from no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level before the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Seventeen percent (17%) of the wells showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Seventeen percent (17%) of the wells showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Seventeen percent (17%) of the wells showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Seventeen percent (17%) of the wells showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Seventeen percent (17%) of the wells showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Seventeen percent (17%) of the wells showed no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction wells. Seventeen percent (17%)

3PE analyses (presented and discussed in this Technical Memo 5 and Technical Memos 1, 2, and 4 [S-A JV 2021a, 2021b, 2021c]) indicate there could be areas between SHM-10-06 and SHL-21 where the arsenic may not be captured by the extraction wells at all times². A mass flux analysis was performed to quantify the potential arsenic mass not captured by the ATP extraction wells. The ATP extracts approximately 50 gpm under average 2016 to 2020 operating conditions. Under these conditions, results of the mass flux calculation indicate about

² The key design criterion for the ATP extraction wells, as specified in the 100% Design (CH2MHill 2005) were to "provide containment of the groundwater plume in the vicinity of the base boundary," seek to reduce the design rate of 50 gpm as appropriate, and to focus groundwater extraction in the deeper part of the glacial aquifer. It should be noted the modeling results presented in the final design of the ATP extraction system did not include full capture east of the landfill boundary (between wells SHM-10-06 and SHM-21; Figures A-8 and A-9 of CH2MHill 2005).

13.1% (5.1 gpm) of the overburden groundwater migrating northward from the landfill migrates though the hypothetical bypass area between monitoring wells SHM-10-06 and SHL-21. The mass of arsenic present in the 5.1 gpm that may bypass the ATP is estimated to be 0.7 to 3.9 pounds per year using the geometric and arithmetic mean arsenic concentrations. This is approximately 0.3 to 1.4% of the approximately 220 to 280 pounds per year of arsenic that migrates through the overburden across the entire transect between SB-2017-06 and SHL-21 (under average 2016-2020 pumping conditions). Using 95% UCL arsenic concentrations, the upperbound estimate of arsenic mass present in the 5.1 gpm that may bypass the ATP is estimated to be 16.9 pounds per year, approximately 3.4% of the total arsenic mass flux that migrates through the overburden across the entire transect. Of that volume, 39.3 gpm is estimated to be migrating in overburden northward from the landfill. If 5.1 gpm bypasses the ATP through the hypothetical bypass area, then only 34.2 gpm extracted by ATP system is from the landfill, and 15.9 gpm of the groundwater captured by the ATP originates from areas located downgradient (e.g., the NIA), cross-gradient (e.g., Shepley's Hill), or from bedrock beneath the system. These mass flux analyses indicate if the capture zone were extended to the east, the ATP would only achieve 0.7 to 16.9 more pounds per year more of arsenic removal.

5.2 Conclusions

The ATP was installed as a contingency remedy triggered by conditions of the ROD. ATP system performance, per the final May 2005 Remedial Design and Remedial Action Workplan by CH2M Hill, was "to be evaluated through hydraulic monitoring demonstrating appropriate capture zone dimensions for the containment system." The primary design criteria for the ATP was that it provide containment of the groundwater plume in the vicinity of the base boundary and meet POTW discharge requirements.

Results of analysis of pre-and post ATP system installation Mann-Kendall trend analyses at monitoring wells with available data and the calculated estimate of mass flux provide additional lines of evidence to validate the extent of capture of the ATP. These analyses showed that downgradient of the ATP extraction wells, all wells had either a neutral response (i.e., had no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level or had statistically significant decreasing concentrations both before and after the installation of the ATP extraction well) or a positive response (i.e., went from statistically significant increasing concentrations or no statistically significant trend at the selected 95% confidence level before the installation of the ATP extraction wells to statically significant decreasing concentrations after the installation of the ATP extraction wells). Comparing these two lines of evidence to other lines of evidence (e.g., 3PE analysis, particle tracking model simulations) presented in previous technical memorandums (Technical Memos 1, 2, and 4 [S-A JV 2021a, 2021b, 2021c]) indicate that the groundwater flow model presents a reasonable representation of the capture zone created by the two extraction wells and should be viewed as an additional line of evidence in combination with other methods.

While improvements in groundwater quality at several locations in the Nearfield and NIA over time are apparent, the data indicate that continued ATP operation will not result in the achievement of the current groundwater cleanup goals in these areas. As evidenced in the Technical Memoranda provided to date, the ATP is capturing approximately 87% of the overburden groundwater flow from the landfill, and approximately 97% of the associated arsenic mass flux – with an estimated capture zone that corresponds to the design capture zone presented in the Remedial Design and Remedial Action Workplan [CH2MHill 2005]. The discrepancy between system performance and remedy effectiveness is due to the fact that geogenic sources of arsenic are present, and will persist, downgradient of the ATP regardless of the ATP's operational status. Downgradient of the ATP in the NIA, discharge of groundwater from mineralized bedrock zones will continue to contribute dissolved arsenic to overburden, while arsenic in the overburden may exhibit limited attenuation and/or may continue to be mobilized

due to naturally reducing conditions associated with the presence of wetlands in that area. These conditions are likely to result in extended or even unachievable cleanup timeframes for the NIA and Nearfield area and, therefore, cannot be ignored.

6 References

- CH2MHill. 2005. Remedial Design and Remedial Action Workplan. Final 100% Submittal. Groundwater Extraction, Treatment, and Discharge Contingency Remedy. Shepley's Hill Landfill, Fort Devens, Massachusetts. May.
- Geosyntec. 2020. SHL Groundwater Flow Model Revision Report. Shepley's Hill Landfill, Fort Devens, Massachusetts. December.
- S-A JV. 2021a. Final Phase I EPA SOW Demonstrate Plume Capture Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 1.g Delineate Capture Zone based on Hydraulic and Geochemical Data. Shepley's Hill Landfill, Former Fort Devens Army Installation, Devens, Massachusetts. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New England District. June 11.
- S-A JV. 2021b. Draft Phase I EPA SOW Demonstrate Plume Capture Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 2.d Delineate Lateral and Vertical Extent Upgradient. Shepley's Hill Landfill, Former Fort Devens Army Installation, Devens, Massachusetts. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New England District. May 17.
- S-A JV. 2021c. Draft Phase I USEPA SOW Demonstrate Plume Capture, Technical Memorandum Phase I Subtask 4.e, Validate the Updated Groundwater Flow Model with Sufficient Field-Measured Hydraulic Data to Confirm Conclusions. Shepley's Hill Landfill, Former Fort Devens Army Installation, Devens, Massachusetts. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New England District. June 14.
- S-A JV. 2021d. Final 2020 Annual Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring Report. Shepley's Hill Landfill, Former Fort Devens Army Installation, Devens, Massachusetts. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New England District. August.
- USEPA. 2007. Monitored Natural Attenuation of Inorganic Contaminants in Ground Water. Volume 1 Technical Basis for Assessment. EPA/600/R-07/139. Office of Research and Development. October.
- USEPA. 2008. A Systematic Approach for Evaluation of Capture Zones at Pump and Treat System. EPA 600/R-08/003. Office of Research and Development. January.
- USEPA. 2015. Use of Monitored Natural Attenuation for Inorganic Contaminants in Groundwater at Superfund Sites. Directive 9283.1-36. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. August.
- USEPA. 2016. Letter from Lynn A. Jennings (USEPA) to William O'Donnell (Army) re: Former Fort Devens Installation – Dispute Resolution, 2015 Devens Five Year Review (FYR) Report. February 24.

Tables



| Area | Well ID | Included in | Rationale for Inclusion | | |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | SHM-03-22B | Ves | | | |
| | SHM-96-5B | Yes | | | |
| | SHL-23 | Yes | | | |
| | SHL-5 | Yes | | | |
| | SHL-8S | Yes | | | |
| | SHL-8D | Yes | | | |
| | SHL-9 | Yes | | | |
| | SHL-22 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-93-22C | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-1A | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-1B | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-2A | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-2B | Yes | Part of USEPA SOW | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-3A | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-3B | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-4A | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-4B | Yes | | | |
| Nearfield | EPA-PZ-2012-5A | Yes | | | |
| inearrieid | EPA-PZ-2012-5B | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-6A | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-6B | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-7A | Yes | | | |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-7B | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-96-5C | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-10-06 | No | | | |
| | SHM-10-06A | No | | | |
| | SHP-2016-1B | No | | | |
| | SHP-2016-2B | No | | | |
| | SHP-2016-3B | No | Used to delineate capture zones | | |
| | SHP-2016-4B | No | as part of the 3PE analyses in | | |
| | SHP-2016-5B | No | Technical Memo 1 (SERES- | | |
| | SHP-2016-06B | No | Arcadis JV 2021) | | |
| | SHP-2016-6A | No | | | |
| | SHP-2016-6C | No | | | |
| | SHP-05-45B | No | | | |
| | SHP-05-46B | No | | | |
| | SHM-05-41B | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-05-41C | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-10-16 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-13-03 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-13-04 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-13-06 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-13-07 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-13-08 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-05-40X | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-99-31C | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-99-32X | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-05-41A | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-05-42A | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-05-42B | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-10-10 | Yes | | | |
| North Impact Area | SHM-13-02 | Yes | Part of USEPA SOW | | |
| (NIA) | SHM-13-05 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-13-14S | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-13-14D | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-13-15 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-13-01 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-10-02 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-10-03 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-10-04 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-07-03 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-10-05A | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-10-08 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-05-39A | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-05-39B | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-07-05 | Yes | | | |
| | SHM-99-31A | Yes | | | |

Notes/Abbreviations

USEPA = United States Environmental Protection Agency

SOW = Scope of Work

Technical Memo 1 = Phase I USEPA SOW - Demonstrate Plume Capture Technical

References:

USEPA. 2016. Letter from Lynn A. Jennings (USEPA) to William O'Donnell (Army) re: Former Fort Devens Installation – Dispute Resolution, 2015 Devens Five Year Review (FYR) Report. February 24.

S-A JV. 2021. Final Phase I EPA SOW – Demonstrate Plume Capture Technical Memorandum

| Location Definition | | | | | Well Completion Info | Well Construction Interval | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Site | Location | North Coordinate | East Coordinate | Horizontal Datum | Surface Elevation * | Elevation Units | Top of Casing Elevation* | Depth to Top of Screen (Fee BGS) | Depth to t Bottom of Screen (Feet BGS) | Screen Diameter (Inches) |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-1A | 3028055.85 | 630191.11 | NAD83 | 219.91 | FT | 223.79 | 23.7 | 28.7 | 1 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-1B | 3028057.05 | 630192.91 | NAD83 | 219.81 | FT | 223.53 | 73.56 | 78.56 | 1 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-2A | 3028124.73 | 630287.28 | NAD83 | 219.72 | FT | 223.38 | 18.14 | 23.14 | 1 |
| AOC 5. Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-2B | 3028124.72 | 630290.4 | NAD83 | 219.76 | FT | 223.37 | 73.16 | 78.16 | 1 |
| AOC 5. Shenley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-P7-2012-3A | 3028088.07 | 630062 52 | NAD83 | 219.2 | FT | 222.65 | 19.09 | 24.09 | 1 |
| AOC 5 Shenley's Hill Landfill (5) | EDA-D7-2012-3B | 3028086 13 | 630064 63 | NAD83 | 210.25 | FT | 222.57 | 68.7 | 73.7 | 1 |
| ACC 5, Chepley's Fill Landill (5) | | 2020045.24 | 030004.03 | | 219.20 | | 222.01 | 40.50 | 73.7 | 1 |
| | EPA-PZ-2012-4A | 3028045.34 | 629992.07 | NAD83 | 223.3 | FI | 226.6 | 19.56 | 24.56 | 1 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-4B | 3028043.8 | 629989.87 | NAD83 | 223.51 | FT | 226.39 | 79.5 | 84.5 | 1 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-5A | 3028184.86 | 630151.89 | NAD83 | 216.33 | FT | 220.01 | 17.95 | 22.95 | 1 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-5B | 3028186.12 | 630155.26 | NAD83 | 216.2 | FT | 219.38 | 68.46 | 73.46 | 1 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-6A | 3028066.25 | 629894.69 | NAD83 | 230.71 | FT | 234.25 | 24.19 | 29.19 | 1 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-6B | 3028069.24 | 629894.4 | NAD83 | 230.85 | FT | 234.08 | 74.23 | 79.23 | 1 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-7A | 3028106.48 | 629801.05 | NAD83 | 234.42 | FT | 234.16 | 23.87 | 28.87 | 1 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EPA-PZ-2012-7B | 3028109.22 | 629800.87 | NAD83 | 234.28 | FT | 234.03 | 58.82 | 63.82 | 1 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EW-01 | 3027960.2 | 629942.81 | NAD83 | 226.97 | FT | 226.8 | 60 | 85 | 6 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | EW-04 | 3027991 | 629895.33 | NAD83 | 227.36 | FT | 227.03 | 70 | 95 | 6 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHL-22 | 3028163.04 | 630056.4 | NAD83 | 218.9 | FT | 219.58 | 105 | 115 | 4 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHL-23 | 3027915.85 | 629712.8 | NAD83 | 239.44 | FT | 241.29 | 23 | 33 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHL-5 | 3028125.1 | 630192.21 | NAD83 | 216.81 | FT | 216.81 | 3 | 13 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHL-8D | 3028126.57 | 630407.1 | NAD83 | 218.83 | FT | 220.78 | 68 | 70 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHL-8S | 3028126.57 | 630407.1 | NAD83 | 218.83 | FT | 220.97 | 52 | 54 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHL-9 | 3028146.84 | 630009.57 | NAD83 | 220.88 | FT | 220.88 | 15 | 25 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-05-39A | 3028544.28 | 629761.38 | NAD83 | 221.79 | FT | 221.53 | 37 | 39 | 2 |
| AOC 5. Sheplev's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-05-39B | 3028543.68 | 629765.33 | NAD83 | 221.77 | FT | 221.51 | 66 | 68 | 2 |
| AOC 5. Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-05-40X | 3028514.16 | 629636.83 | NAD83 | 223.48 | FT | 223.19 | 32 | 34 | 2 |
| AOC 5 Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-05-41A | 3028290.82 | 629796 11 | NAD83 | 222.78 | FT | 222.78 | 42 | 44 | 2 |
| AOC 5 Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-05-41B | 3028299 22 | 629796 25 | NAD83 | 222.5 | FT | 222.33 | 62 | 64 | 2 |
| AOC 5 Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-05-41C | 3028285 47 | 629795 79 | NAD83 | 222.0 | FT | 222.50 | 88 | 93 | 2 |
| AOC 5. Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-05-424 | 3028376 14 | 630017 63 | | 213.65 | FT | 216.81 | 40 | 42 | 1 |
| AOC 5. Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-05-42B | 3028376.14 | 630017.63 | NAD83 | 213.65 | FT | 216.8 | 70 | 72 | 1 |
| AOC 5. Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-07-03 | 3028444 63 | 629/11 08 | | 213.03 | FT | 210.0 | 25 | 35 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM 07 05 | 3020444.03 | 629411.00 | | 227.90 NA | | 221.9 | 56 | 65 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Londfill (5) | SHM 10.02 | 2029700 12 | 629032.00 | | NA 220.10 | | 223.02 | 50 | 62 | 1.5 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-10-02 | 3020700.13 | 628426.22 | | 220.19 | | 223.03 | 53 | 63 | 1.5 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-10-03 | 3029000.27 | 628436.33 | NAD83 | 229.77 | FI | 232.05 | 58.5 | 68.5 | 1.5 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-10-04 | 3029485.34 | 628959.21 | NAD83 | 210 | FI | 212.61 | 55 | 65 | 1.5 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-10-05A | 3028943.39 | 630441.84 | NAD83 | 235.41 | FI | 235.09 | 50 | 60 | 1.5 |
| AUC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-10-06 | 3027882.54 | 630215.62 | NAD83 | 230.03 | | 232.91 | 69.5 | /9.5 | 1.5 |
| AUC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-10-06A | 3027895.73 | 630300.71 | NAD83 | 245.96 | FI | 248.54 | 11 | 8/ | 1.5 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-10-08 | 3028526.47 | 628351.74 | NAD83 | 211.86 | FT | 214.36 | 46 | 56 | 1.5 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-10-10 | 3028873.64 | 629105.25 | NAD83 | 215.4 | FT | 217.11 | 56 | 66 | 1.5 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-10-16 | 3028355.25 | 629834.23 | NAD83 | 216.72 | FT | 219.23 | 75 | 85 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-01 | 3028294.76 | 628556.66 | NAD83 | 205.77 | FT | 208.08 | 39 | 49 | 2 |

| Location Definition | | | | | | Well Completion Info | W | Well Construction Interval | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Site | Location | North Coordinate | East Coordinate | Horizontal Datum | Surface Elevation * | Elevation Units | Top of Casing Elevation* | Depth to Top of Screen (Fee BGS) | Depth to et Bottom of Screen (Feet BGS) | Screen Diameter (Inches) |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-02 | 3028713.88 | 628980.64 | NAD83 | 216.92 | FT | 218.72 | 60 | 70 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-03 | 3028990.91 | 629173.39 | NAD83 | 209.91 | FT | 212.05 | 42 | 52 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-04 | 3028606.18 | 629479.56 | NAD83 | 227.34 | FT | 227.02 | 20 | 30 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-05 | 3028776.73 | 629829.47 | NAD83 | 225.39 | FT | 225.14 | 75 | 85 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-06 | 3028694.87 | 629245.1 | NAD83 | 224.23 | FT | 223.89 | 36 | 46 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-07 | 3028760.82 | 629331.42 | NAD83 | 226.11 | FT | 225.64 | 27 | 37 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-08 | 3028837.54 | 629515.32 | NAD83 | 228.19 | FT | 227.9 | 55 | 65 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-14D | 3029016.63 | 629391.87 | NAD83 | 207.48 | FT | 210.48 | 45 | 55 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-14S | 3029020.58 | 629392.28 | NAD83 | 207.67 | FT | 210.55 | 5 | 15 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-13-15 | 3029072.16 | 629273.49 | NAD83 | 205.98 | FT | 210.58 | 50 | 60 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-93-22B | 3028169.92 | 630071.91 | NAD83 | 218.84 | FT | 219.39 | 82.3 | 92.3 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-93-22C | 3028158.6 | 630045.7 | NAD83 | 218.92 | FT | 220.69 | 124.3 | 134.3 | 4 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-96-5B | 3028112.94 | 630158.14 | NAD83 | 217.38 | FT | 218.92 | 80 | 90 | 4 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-96-5C | 3028105.39 | 630172.72 | NAD83 | 217.39 | FT | 218.39 | 50 | 60 | 4 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-99-31A | 3028559.08 | 629895.03 | NAD83 | 212.82 | FT | 214.34 | 4 | 14 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-99-31B | 3028559.47 | 629901.16 | NAD83 | 212.52 | FT | 214.39 | 50 | 60 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-99-31C | 3028561.83 | 629908.75 | NAD83 | 212.64 | FT | 214.6 | 68 | 78 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHM-99-32X | 3028574.65 | 630168.76 | NAD83 | 219.12 | FT | 221.28 | 72 | 82 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHP-05-45B | 3027956.77 | 629995.45 | NAD83 | 226.72 | FT | 229.11 | 65 | 75 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHP-05-46B | 3027946.62 | 630041.84 | NAD83 | 226.03 | FT | 227.6 | 65 | 75 | 2 |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHP-2016-06A | 3027906.15 | 629710.34 | NAD83 | 240.05 | FT | 241.9 | 81 | 86 | NA |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHP-2016-06B | 3027906.15 | 629710.34 | NAD83 | 240.05 | FT | 241.89 | 102 | 112 | NA |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHP-2016-06C | 3027906.15 | 629710.34 | NAD83 | 240.05 | FT | 241.92 | 123 | 133 | NA |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHP-2016-1B | 3027979.56 | 629933.53 | NAD83 | 224.69 | FT | 227.24 | 75 | 85 | NA |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHP-2016-2B | 3028200.3 | 629925.84 | NAD83 | 223.73 | FT | 225.95 | 80 | 85 | NA |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHP-2016-3B | 3028174.29 | 630007.26 | NAD83 | 221.13 | FT | 223.18 | 80 | 85 | NA |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHP-2016-4B | 3028146.65 | 629902.15 | NAD83 | 227.57 | FT | 229.75 | 85 | 90 | NA |
| AOC 5, Shepley's Hill Landfill (5) | SHP-2016-5B | 3028113.45 | 629963.58 | NAD83 | 224.88 | FT | 226.95 | 85 | 90 | NA |

Well Completion Information and Well Construction Interval is only applicable to the Location Type of Well

All Elevations are reported in feet relative to NAVD88 vertical datum

Bolded elevations are the most current values from the Well Maintenance Information table.

NA = not available

| Location ID: | SHM-05-39A |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 8/12/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 10/4/2011 | 10/4/2011 | 10/16/2012 | 10/16/2012 | 10/24/2013 | 10/24/2013 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 236 | 246 | NA | 227 | NA | 76.3 | NA | 146 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 246 | NA | 227 | NA | 76.3 | NA | 146 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 1 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-39A | SHM-05-39A | SHM-05-39A | SHM-05-39B | SHM-05-39B | SHM-05-39B | SHM-05-39B | SHM-05-39B | SHM-05-39B |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/29/2015 | 10/29/2015 | 10/26/2020 | 10/13/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 10/5/2011 | 10/5/2011 | 10/16/2012 | 10/16/2012 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 4.00 U | 4.00 U | NA | 162 | NA | 308 | NA | 364 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 162 | NA | 308 | NA | 364 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | 7.30 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 2 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-39B | SHM-05-39B | SHM-05-39B | SHM-05-39B | SHM-05-39B | SHM-05-40X | SHM-05-40X | SHM-05-40X | SHM-05-40X |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/24/2013 | 10/24/2013 | 10/29/2015 | 10/29/2015 | 10/26/2020 | 10/7/2010 | 10/7/2010 | 10/5/2011 | 10/5/2011 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 113 | NA | 293 | 293 | NA | 3640 | NA | 3700 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 113 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3640 | NA | 3700 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | 420 | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 3 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-40X |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/17/2012 | 10/24/2013 | 10/24/2013 | 10/13/2014 | 10/13/2014 | 10/29/2015 | 10/29/2015 | 6/30/2016 | 7/8/2016 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 3100 | NA | 3070 | NA | 3060 | 2060 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2970 | NA | 3100 | NA | 3070 | NA | NA | 2800 | 3100 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 2800 |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 4 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-40X |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/21/2016 | 12/15/2016 | 6/6/2017 | 11/17/2017 | 11/17/2017 | 4/17/2018 | 11/26/2018 | 11/26/2018 | 4/23/2019 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2400 | 2300 J | 270 J | NA | NA | 1900 | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 2400 J | 25.0 J | 2200 | 2100 | NA | 2400 | 2600 | 2100 |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 5 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-40X | SHM-05-40X | SHM-05-40X | SHM-05-40X | SHM-05-40X | SHM-05-40X | SHM-05-41A | SHM-05-41A | SHM-05-41A |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/8/2019 | 11/8/2019 | 5/19/2020 | 5/19/2020 | 11/11/2020 | 11/11/2020 | 4/21/2010 | 4/21/2010 | 10/7/2010 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 26.9 | 66.7 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 26.9 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 2200 | 2100 | 1900 | 1900 | 2300 | 2100 | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 6 of 69

| 3 |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 7 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-41A |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 5/22/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 4/23/2014 | 4/23/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 |
| Historical (ug/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 12.3 | 12.5 | NA | NA | 9.70 | 14.2 | NA | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 12.5 | 9.70 | NA | NA | 14.2 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 8 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-41A | SHM-05-41A | SHM-05-41A | SHM-05-41A | SHM-05-41A | SHM-05-41B | SHM-05-41B | SHM-05-41B | SHM-05-41B |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/18/2016 | 11/20/2017 | 11/16/2018 | 11/8/2019 | 11/6/2020 | 4/21/2010 | 4/21/2010 | 8/9/2010 | 10/7/2010 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1370 | 1440 | 1040 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 1130 | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 19.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1370 | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 18.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 18.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 9 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-41B |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/7/2010 | 4/4/2011 | 10/4/2011 | 10/4/2011 | 4/11/2012 | 4/11/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 5/22/2013 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 1370 | NA | NA | 771 | 860 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1040 | 1050 | NA | 1370 | 771 | NA | NA | 860 | 812 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 10 of 69
| | SI IIVI-05-4 I D |
|---|------------------|
| Sample Date: 5/22/2013 10/23/2013 10/23/2013 4/23/2014 4/23/2014 10/9/2014 10/9/2014 6/8/2015 | 6/8/2015 |
| Historical (µg/L) | |
| Arsenic 812 716 NA NA 678 638 NA 626 | 626 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) NA NA NA NA NA NA NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | |
| Arsenic NA NA 716 678 NA NA 638 NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 11 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-41B |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 6/27/2016 | 11/18/2016 | 6/6/2017 | 11/20/2017 | 4/20/2018 | 11/16/2018 | 4/18/2019 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 614 | 614 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 670 | 730 | 630 | NA | 330 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 620 | NA | 510 | 360 |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 12 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-41B | SHM-05-41B | SHM-05-41B | SHM-05-41C | SHM-05-41C | SHM-05-41C | SHM-05-41C | SHM-05-41C | SHM-05-41C |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/8/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 11/6/2020 | 4/21/2010 | 4/21/2010 | 10/7/2010 | 10/7/2010 | 4/4/2011 | 10/4/2011 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 896 | 787 | NA | NA | 917 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | 896 | NA | NA | 787 | 750 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 530 | 420 | 570 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 13 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-41C |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/4/2011 | 4/11/2012 | 4/11/2012 | 10/18/2012 | 10/18/2012 | 5/21/2013 | 5/21/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 765 | 782 | NA | NA | 709 | 890 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 917 | 765 | NA | NA | 782 | 709 | NA | NA | 890 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 14 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-41C |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/23/2014 | 4/23/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 6/8/2015 | 6/8/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 6/27/2016 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 1490 | 946 | NA | 883 | 883 | 851 | 851 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1490 | NA | NA | 946 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 810 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 15 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-41C | SHM-05-42A |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/18/2016 | 6/6/2017 | 11/20/2017 | 4/20/2018 | 4/15/2019 | 11/8/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 11/6/2020 | 4/22/2010 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 820 J | 390 | NA | 800 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.50 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | 740 | NA | 91.0 | 29.0 | 660 | 610 | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 16 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-42A |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/22/2010 | 8/12/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 4/5/2011 | 4/5/2011 | 10/7/2011 | 10/7/2011 | 4/11/2012 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2.50 | 1.25 | 1.20 | NA | 1.10 | NA | 0.800 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | 1.20 | NA | 1.10 | NA | 0.800 | 2.30 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 17 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-42A |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/11/2012 | 10/18/2012 | 10/18/2012 | 5/22/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 4/23/2014 | 4/23/2014 | 10/9/2014 |
| Historical (ug/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2.30 | 0.700 | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 2.00 U | 2.00 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 0.700 | 0.890 U | NA | 2.00 U | 2.00 U | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 18 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-42A | SHM-05-42B |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/9/2014 | 10/28/2015 | 10/28/2015 | 11/18/2016 | 11/28/2017 | 11/15/2018 | 11/5/2019 | 11/9/2020 | 4/22/2010 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 4.00 U | 4.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | 72.2 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 19 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-42B |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/22/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 4/1/2011 | 4/5/2011 | 10/7/2011 | 10/7/2011 | 4/11/2012 | 4/11/2012 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 72.2 | 197 | NA | 189 | NA | 230 | NA | NA | 239 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 197 | NA | 189 | NA | 230 | 239 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 20 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-42B |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/18/2012 | 10/18/2012 | 5/22/2013 | 5/22/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 4/23/2014 | 4/23/2014 | 10/9/2014 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 241 | NA | NA | 238 | 232 | NA | NA | 229 | 215 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 241 | 238 | NA | NA | 232 | 229 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 21 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-05-42B | SHM-07-03 |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 10/9/2014 | 10/28/2015 | 10/28/2015 | 11/18/2016 | 11/28/2017 | 11/15/2018 | 11/5/2019 | 11/9/2020 | 8/12/2010 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 206 | 206 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.290 J |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 215 | NA | NA | 180 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | 160 | 160 | 170 | 160 | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 22 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-03 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 5/28/2013 | 6/9/2015 | 6/9/2015 | 6/30/2016 | 6/1/2017 | 11/17/2017 | 4/17/2018 | 11/19/2018 | 4/18/2019 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 2.00 U | 2.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1.00 U | NA | NA | 3.20 | 1.50 U | NA | 3.10 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | NA | 3.00 U | 3.00 U |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected:

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 23 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-03 | SHM-07-05 | SHM-07-05 | SHM-07-05 | SHM-07-05 | SHM-10-02 | SHM-10-02 |
|--|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 11/7/2019 | 5/15/2020 | 11/11/2020 | 8/12/2010 | 6/30/2016 | 6/1/2017 | 4/18/2018 | 6/7/2010 | 6/7/2010 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | 3180 | NA | NA | NA | 0.410 J | 0.670 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.370 J | 0.330 J |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | l | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 11.0 | 54.0 | 430 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 24 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-02 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 6/7/2010 | 6/7/2010 | 6/7/2010 | 6/7/2010 | 6/7/2010 | 6/8/2010 | 6/8/2010 | 7/15/2010 | 9/7/2010 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1.64 | 2.43 | 5.87 | 36.9 | 24.8 | 127 | 84.6 | 0.740 | 1.11 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 0.740 J | 0.410 J | 0.410 J | 0.870 J | 4.64 | 0.610 J | 8.68 | 0.430 J | 1.07 |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 25 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-02 | SHM-10-02 | SHM-10-02 | SHM-10-02 | SHM-10-02 | SHM-10-02 | SHM-10-02 | SHM-10-02 | SHM-10-02 |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/22/2012 | 10/22/2012 | 5/29/2013 | 6/8/2015 | 6/8/2015 | 11/21/2017 | 11/28/2018 | 11/14/2019 | 11/10/2020 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1.10 | NA | NA | 3.20 J | 3.20 J | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 1.10 | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 26 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-03 | SHM-10-03 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 6/10/2010 | 6/10/2010 | 6/10/2010 | 6/10/2010 | 6/10/2010 | 7/14/2010 | 9/7/2010 | 10/23/2012 | 10/23/2012 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 0.890 | 6.79 | 14.6 | 42.1 | 8.74 | 2.36 | 1.47 J | 1.00 U | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 0.500 | 0.610 J | 0.565 U | 0.920 J | 3.47 | 0.780 J | 0.510 J | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 1.00 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 27 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-03 | SHM-10-03 | SHM-10-03 | SHM-10-03 | SHM-10-03 | SHM-10-03 | SHM-10-03 | SHM-10-04 | SHM-10-04 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 5/24/2013 | 6/9/2015 | 6/9/2015 | 11/21/2017 | 11/28/2018 | 11/14/2019 | 11/10/2020 | 6/8/2010 | 6/8/2010 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 4.20 | 4.20 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.26 | 2.19 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.180 J | 0.180 J |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | 3.00 U | 8.50 | 1.90 J | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 28 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-04 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 6/8/2010 | 6/8/2010 | 6/8/2010 | 6/8/2010 | 6/8/2010 | 6/8/2010 | 6/8/2010 | 7/14/2010 | 9/7/2010 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1.22 | 3.37 | 13.7 | 8.02 | 24.3 | 26.7 | 214 | 1.62 | 1.00 J |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 0.180 J | 0.150 J | 0.260 J | 0.330 J | 0.330 J | 1.27 | 15.1 | 0.640 | 0.790 J |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 29 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-04 | SHM-10-04 | SHM-10-04 | SHM-10-04 | SHM-10-04 | SHM-10-04 | SHM-10-04 | SHM-10-04 | SHM-10-04 |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/22/2012 | 10/22/2012 | 5/29/2013 | 6/8/2015 | 6/8/2015 | 11/21/2017 | 11/26/2018 | 11/14/2019 | 11/12/2020 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1.00 U | NA | NA | 2.00 U | 2.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 1.00 U | 1.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 30 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-05A |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 6/9/2010 | 6/9/2010 | 6/9/2010 | 6/9/2010 | 6/9/2010 | 6/9/2010 | 6/9/2010 | 6/9/2010 | 6/9/2010 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 0.930 | 13.0 | 4.86 | 3.48 | 29.8 | 65.0 | 24.5 | 364 | 911 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 0.620 J | 0.350 J | 1.12 | 0.390 J | 0.590 | 2.18 | 5.09 | 4.16 | 1.92 |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020 Page 31 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-05A |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 7/15/2010 | 9/8/2010 | 10/23/2012 | 10/24/2012 | 10/24/2012 | 5/22/2013 | 5/22/2013 | 6/9/2015 | 6/9/2015 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 4.70 | 5.68 | 3.00 | 20.0 U | NA | NA | 3.10 | 3.00 J | 3.00 J |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 4.60 | 5.21 | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | 3.10 | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 32 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-05A | SHM-10-05A | SHM-10-05A | SHM-10-05A | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 11/16/2017 | 11/13/2018 | 11/12/2019 | 11/12/2020 | 6/3/2010 | 6/3/2010 | 6/3/2010 | 6/3/2010 | 6/3/2010 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.08 | 3.19 | 3.60 | 3.77 | 19.8 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.640 | 0.760 | 0.310 J | 0.850 J | 1.06 |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 2.10 | 3.00 U | 2.00 J | 2.00 J | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 33 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 6/3/2010 | 7/15/2010 | 9/7/2010 | 10/22/2012 | 10/22/2012 | 5/21/2013 | 6/8/2015 | 11/21/2017 | 11/26/2018 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2.07 | 2.72 | 1.40 | 1.90 | NA | NA | 3.60 J | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 0.730 J | 0.730 J | 1.55 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1.90 | 1.90 U | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | 2.00 J |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 34 of 69

| Location ID: S | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-08 | SHM-10-10 |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: 1 | 11/14/2019 | 11/10/2020 | 6/2/2010 | 6/2/2010 | 6/2/2010 | 6/2/2010 | 6/2/2010 | 6/2/2010 | 6/3/2010 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 0.340 J | 1.59 | 1.29 J | 1.86 J | 4.40 J | 11.1 | 13.7 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | 0.270 J | 0.270 J | 0.565 U | 1.13 J | 2.47 J | 2.82 U | 1.13 U |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) 3 | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 35 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 7/13/2010 | 8/12/2010 | 9/8/2010 | 10/24/2012 | 10/24/2012 | 5/29/2013 | 11/20/2013 | 11/20/2013 | 10/10/2014 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2.00 J | 3.62 J | 2.57 J | 1.00 | NA | NA | 2.00 J | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 1.25 J | NA | 2.40 J | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1.00 | 1.70 U | NA | 2.00 J | 2.60 J |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 36 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-10 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 10/23/2015 | 10/23/2015 | 11/29/2016 | 11/27/2017 | 11/20/2018 | 11/11/2019 | 11/9/2020 | 8/17/2010 | 8/18/2010 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2.90 J | 2.90 J | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 170 | 333 J |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4.81 | 1.97 |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 3.50 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020 Page 37 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 8/18/2010 | 8/18/2010 | 8/19/2010 | 8/19/2010 | 8/19/2010 | 9/2/2010 | 10/20/2010 | 10/23/2012 | 10/24/2012 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 19.9 | 445 | 248 J | 256 | 19.3 | 487 | 1180 | 1600 | 1500 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 1.89 | NA | 216 J | 248 | 3.44 | 495 | 1090 | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 38 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 |
|--|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/24/2012 | 5/28/2013 | 5/28/2013 | 11/20/2013 | 11/20/2013 | 10/28/2015 | 10/28/2015 | 6/27/2016 | 11/29/2016 |
| Historical (ug/l) | | | | | | | | | |
| historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 1350 | 1530 | NA | 1760 | 1760 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1600 | 1350 | NA | NA | 1530 | NA | NA | 1900 | 1600 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 39 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 | SHM-10-16 |
|--|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 6/2/2017 | 11/17/2017 | 11/17/2017 | 11/15/2018 | 11/15/2018 | 11/13/2019 | 11/13/2019 | 11/21/2019 | 5/6/2020 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1800 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 1200 | 1200 | 1100 | 1100 | 1200 | 1100 | 1100 | 1100 |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 40 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-10-16 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 |
|--|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/12/2020 | 5/7/2013 | 5/7/2013 | 5/7/2013 | 5/7/2013 | 5/7/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 10/27/2015 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 1.00 U | 1.00 U | 1.00 U | 1.10 U | 1.30 U | 2.20 J | NA | 2.10 J |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.20 J | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 1100 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020 Page 41 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-01 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 10/27/2015 | 11/28/2017 | 11/26/2018 | 11/14/2019 | 11/9/2020 | 4/15/2013 | 4/15/2013 | 4/15/2013 | 4/15/2013 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2.10 J | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.930 J | 0.820 J | 0.930 J | 0.950 J |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 1.50 | 1.50 J | 1.90 J | 3.00 UJ | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 42 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/15/2013 | 4/15/2013 | 4/16/2013 | 5/29/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 10/10/2014 | 10/23/2015 | 10/23/2015 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 0.890 J | 0.950 J | 1.20 | NA | 2.70 J | NA | NA | 2.60 J | 2.60 J |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | 2.50 U | NA | 2.70 J | 2.60 J | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 43 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-02 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 11/29/2016 | 11/27/2017 | 11/15/2018 | 11/11/2019 | 11/5/2020 | 4/16/2013 | 4/16/2013 | 4/16/2013 | 4/17/2013 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.600 J | 1.70 | 17.6 | 22.6 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1.80 J | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 3.00 | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 44 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/17/2013 | 5/29/2013 | 5/29/2013 | 11/20/2013 | 11/20/2013 | 4/23/2014 | 4/23/2014 | 10/10/2014 | 10/10/2014 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 357 | NA | 318 | 137 | NA | NA | 120 | NA | 80.8 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 318 | NA | NA | 137 | 120 | NA | 80.8 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 45 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 |
|--|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 6/8/2015 | 6/8/2015 | 10/23/2015 | 10/23/2015 | 6/28/2016 | 11/29/2016 | 6/6/2017 | 11/27/2017 | 4/25/2018 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 75.5 | 75.5 | 68.7 | 68.7 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 53.0 | 55.0 | 46.0 | NA | 26.0 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 46.0 | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 46 of 69
| Location ID: | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-03 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 11/19/2018 | 4/16/2019 | 11/11/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 10/29/2020 | 5/28/2013 | 5/28/2013 | 4/24/2014 | 4/24/2014 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2060 | NA | 61.1 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2060 | NA | 61.1 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 44.0 | 110 | 140 | 150 | 83.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 47 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/13/2014 | 10/13/2014 | 6/9/2015 | 6/9/2015 | 10/28/2015 | 10/28/2015 | 6/28/2016 | 7/8/2016 | 11/28/2016 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 693 | NA | 620 | 620 | 212 | 212 | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 693 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 20.0 | 320 | 140 J |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 21.0 | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 48 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 | SHM-13-04 |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 12/15/2016 | 6/6/2017 | 11/14/2017 | 4/17/2018 | 11/13/2018 | 4/15/2019 | 11/12/2019 | 5/20/2020 | 11/6/2020 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 600 | 400 | NA | 340 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 320 | 350 | 160 | NA | 190 J | 430 | 600 | 200 | 260 J |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 49 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-05 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 4/9/2013 | 4/10/2013 | 4/10/2013 | 4/10/2013 | 4/10/2013 | 4/10/2013 | 4/10/2013 | 4/10/2013 | 5/28/2013 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 0.600 J | 0.550 J | 0.670 J | 33.5 | 69.4 | 2.40 | 56.8 | 96.5 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 8.90 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 50 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-05 |
|--|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 5/28/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 10/13/2014 | 10/13/2014 | 10/28/2015 | 10/28/2015 | 11/28/2016 | 11/16/2017 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 8.90 | 6.80 | NA | 11.0 | NA | 12.3 | 12.3 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 6.80 | NA | 11.0 | NA | NA | 11.0 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 8.40 |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 51 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-05 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/13/2018 | 11/12/2019 | 11/6/2020 | 4/18/2013 | 6/13/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 4/24/2014 | 4/24/2014 | 10/13/2014 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2850 | 2360 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | 85.0 | 3180 | 2540 | 2850 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 12.0 | 16.0 | 6.40 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 52 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 |
|---|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 10/13/2014 | 6/8/2015 | 6/8/2015 | 12/22/2015 | 6/28/2016 | 7/8/2016 | 11/28/2016 | 12/15/2016 | 6/9/2017 |
| Historical (un/l.) | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 2460 | 2460 | 2160 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2360 | NA | NA | NA | 2500 | 2400 | 2700 | 3200 | 2400 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2500 | NA | 2800 | 2800 |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 53 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-06 | SHM-13-07 |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 11/14/2017 | 4/17/2018 | 11/13/2018 | 4/16/2019 | 4/16/2019 | 11/12/2019 | 5/19/2020 | 11/9/2020 | 4/18/2013 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1.80 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 2700 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 2700 | NA | 2400 | 3100 | 2900 | 1900 | 2900 | 2200 | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 54 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 4/19/2013 | 4/19/2013 | 4/19/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 4/24/2014 | 4/24/2014 | 10/10/2014 | 6/8/2015 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 3170 | 1650 | 135 | 1340 | NA | NA | 1280 | NA | 946 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1340 | 1280 | NA | 962 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 55 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 |
|--|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 6/8/2015 | 10/23/2015 | 10/23/2015 | 6/28/2016 | 11/28/2016 | 6/7/2017 | 11/28/2017 | 4/17/2018 | 11/20/2018 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 946 | 531 | 531 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | 320 | 140 | 230 | NA | 470 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 620 | NA | 490 |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 56 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-07 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 |
|--|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 4/16/2019 | 11/11/2019 | 5/22/2020 | 11/5/2020 | 4/22/2013 | 4/22/2013 | 4/22/2013 | 4/22/2013 | 4/22/2013 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1.70 | 1.50 | 1.90 | 288 | 1080 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 470 | 750 | 400 | 420 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 57 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 4/22/2013 | 6/13/2013 | 6/13/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 11/21/2013 | 4/24/2014 | 4/24/2014 | 10/13/2014 | 6/8/2015 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 20.6 | NA | 928 | 994 | NA | NA | 1040 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 975 |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 928 | NA | NA | 994 | 1040 | NA | 978 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 58 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 |
|--|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 6/8/2015 | 10/28/2015 | 10/28/2015 | 6/28/2016 | 11/28/2016 | 6/6/2017 | 11/14/2017 | 4/17/2018 | 11/19/2018 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 954 | 954 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 975 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | 770 | 870 | 900 | NA | 830 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 810 | NA | 310 |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 59 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-08 | SHM-13-14D | SHM-13-14D | SHM-13-14D | SHM-13-14D | SHM-13-14D |
|--|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/16/2019 | 11/11/2019 | 5/22/2020 | 11/10/2020 | 2/19/2014 | 2/19/2014 | 10/10/2014 | 10/10/2014 | 12/2/2016 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 7.90 | NA | 9.60 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 7.90 | NA | 9.60 | NA | 9.10 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 800 | 930 | 630 | 1000 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 60 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-14D | SHM-13-14D | SHM-13-14D | SHM-13-14D | SHM-13-14S | SHM-13-14S | SHM-13-14S | SHM-13-14S | SHM-13-14S |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/27/2017 | 11/15/2018 | 11/11/2019 | 10/29/2020 | 2/19/2014 | 2/19/2014 | 10/10/2014 | 10/10/2014 | 12/2/2016 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | 2.00 U | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | 2.00 U | NA | 4.00 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 11.0 | 6.10 | 12.0 | 3.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 61 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-14S | SHM-13-14S | SHM-13-14S | SHM-13-14S | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 11/27/2017 | 11/15/2018 | 11/11/2019 | 10/29/2020 | 2/3/2014 | 2/3/2014 | 2/3/2014 | 2/4/2014 | 2/4/2014 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.00 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 3.00 | 3.00 U | 1.90 J | 1.50 J | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 62 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 2/4/2014 | 2/4/2014 | 2/19/2014 | 2/19/2014 | 10/10/2014 | 10/10/2014 | 12/2/2016 | 11/27/2017 | 11/15/2018 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 35.5 | 34.0 | NA | 3.80 J | NA | 8.10 | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 3.80 J | NA | 8.10 | NA | 5.50 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 5.70 | 1.60 J |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 63 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-13-15 | SHM-13-15 | SHM-99-31A | SHM-99-31A | SHM-99-31A | SHM-99-31A | SHM-99-31A | SHM-99-31B | SHM-99-31B |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/11/2019 | 10/29/2020 | 10/13/2010 | 10/5/2011 | 10/18/2012 | 10/23/2013 | 11/2/2020 | 8/12/2010 | 10/13/2010 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 28.8 | 39.2 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 17.4 | 18.4 | 17.7 | 14.2 | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 5.10 | 7.10 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 20.0 | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 64 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-99-31B | SHM-99-31C |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/13/2010 | 10/5/2011 | 10/5/2011 | 10/18/2012 | 10/18/2012 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/30/2020 | 10/13/2010 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 59.3 | NA | 60.1 | NA | 61.6 | NA | NA | 239 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 39.2 | NA | 59.3 | NA | 60.1 | NA | 61.6 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 1.90 J | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 65 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-99-31C |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/13/2010 | 10/5/2011 | 10/5/2011 | 10/18/2012 | 10/18/2012 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/13/2014 | 10/13/2014 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 244 | NA | 206 | NA | 205 | NA | 180 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 239 | NA | 244 | NA | 206 | NA | 205 | NA | 180 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 66 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-99-31C | SHM-99-31C | SHM-99-31C | SHM-99-31C | SHM-99-31C | SHM-99-32X | SHM-99-32X | SHM-99-32X | SHM-99-32X |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/28/2017 | 11/29/2018 | 11/14/2019 | 5/19/2020 | 10/30/2020 | 10/13/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 10/4/2011 | 10/4/2011 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 173 | NA | 173 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 173 | NA | 173 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 200 | 160 | 140 | 180 | 140 | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 67 of 69

| Location ID: | SHM-99-32X |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/17/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/13/2014 | 10/13/2014 | 10/28/2015 | 11/21/2016 | 11/28/2017 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 131 | NA | 107 | NA | 93.5 | NA | 76.4 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 131 | NA | 107 | NA | 93.5 | NA | 59.0 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 60.0 |

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;

UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 68 of 69

Location ID: SHM-99-32X SHM-99-32X SHM-99-32X SHM-99-32X SHM-99-32X Sample Date: 11/15/2018 11/12/2019 11/13/2019 5/19/2020 10/30/2020 Historical (µg/L) Arsenic NA NA NA NA NA Arsenic (Dissolved) NA NA NA NA NA Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) Arsenic NA NA NA NA NA Arsenic (Dissolved) 6.30 47.0 55.0 22.0 26.0

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

- J Estimated Value
- Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected. The analyte was not detected;
- UJ due to discrepancies in meeting certain analyte-specific quality control criteria.

NA Not analyzed

Table 3 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_NIA_2010-2020

Page 69 of 69

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-1A | EPA-PZ-2012-1B | EPA-PZ-2012-1B |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/13/2014 | 10/13/2014 | 10/22/2015 | 10/22/2015 | 6/28/2016 | 11/17/2016 | 5/25/2017 | 11/14/2017 | 4/16/2018 | 11/13/2018 | 4/16/2019 | 11/7/2019 | 5/19/2020 | 10/30/2020 | 10/13/2014 | 10/13/2014 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2.00 U | NA | 4.00 U | 4.00 U | NA | 160 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Couple Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | ed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Couple Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | ed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 1.50 U | 1.50 U | 1.50 U | NA | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 160 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 3.00 | NA | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 1.50 U | 3.00 U | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Quanner

Undefined Qualifier J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed



| Former | Fort Deve | ens, N | lassac | huset | ts |
|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|----|
| | | | | | |

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-1B | EPA-PZ-2012-2A | EPA-PZ-2012-2A | EPA-PZ-2012-2A | EPA-PZ-2012-2A |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/22/2015 | 10/22/2015 | 6/28/2016 | 11/17/2016 | 5/25/2017 | 11/14/2017 | 4/16/2018 | 11/13/2018 | 4/16/2019 | 11/7/2019 | 5/19/2020 | 10/30/2020 | 10/14/2014 | 10/14/2014 | 10/22/2015 | 10/22/2015 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 288 | 288 | NA | 2.00 U | NA | 4.00 U | 4.00 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coup Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | bled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coup Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L | bled) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 20.0 | 260 | 240 | NA | 170 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 200 | NA | 170 | 160 | 220 | 150 | <mark>210</mark> | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| | Former | Fort | Devens, | Massa | chuset |
|--|--------|------|---------|-------|--------|
| | | | | | |

| Location ID: | EDA DZ 2012 24 | EDA D7 2012 2A | | EDA DZ 2012 2A | EDA D7 2012 2B | EDA DZ 2012 2B | EDA D7 2012 2B | EDA DZ 2012 2B | EDA D7 2012 2B | EDA DZ 2012 2B |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Location ID. | LFA-FZ-2012-2A | LFA-FZ-2012-2D | LFA-FZ-2012-2D | LFA-FZ-2012-2D | LFA-FZ-2012-2D | LFA-FZ-2012-2B | LFA-FZ-2012-2D |
| Sample Date: | 6/29/2016 | 11/17/2016 | 5/31/2017 | 11/8/2017 | 4/16/2018 | 11/13/2018 | 4/12/2019 | 10/24/2019 | 5/19/2020 | 11/5/2020 | 10/14/2014 | 10/14/2014 | 10/22/2015 | 10/22/2015 | 6/29/2016 | 11/17/2016 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 2.00 U | NA | 4.00 U | 4.00 U | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coup Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (μg/L) | led | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coup Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L | led) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1.60 J | 1.50 U | 1.50 U | NA | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 1.50 U | 1.50 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | NA | 1.90 J | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 1.50 U | 3.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed



| Former | Fort L | Devens, | Massac | husett |
|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|
| | | | | |

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-2B | EPA-PZ-2012-3A |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 5/31/2017 | 11/8/2017 | 4/16/2018 | 11/13/2018 | 4/12/2019 | 10/24/2019 | 5/20/2020 | 11/5/2020 | 10/8/2014 | 10/8/2014 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 6/29/2016 | 11/18/2016 | 5/25/2017 | 11/8/2017 |
| listerial (un) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 21.2 | NA | 16.4 | 16.4 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coup Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | bled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coup Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L | bled .) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 3.30 | NA | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 21.2 | NA | NA | 14.0 | 23.0 | 19.0 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 3.00 | NA | 3.00 U | NA | 12.0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Former | FUIL | Devens, | iviassa | Jinusen |
|--------|------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | | | 1 |

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-3A | EPA-PZ-2012-3A | EPA-PZ-2012-3A | EPA-PZ-2012-3A | EPA-PZ-2012-3A | EPA-PZ-2012-3A | EPA-PZ-2012-3B |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/24/2018 | 11/14/2018 | 4/16/2019 | 10/28/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 11/2/2020 | 10/9/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 6/29/2016 | 11/18/2016 | 5/25/2017 | 11/9/2017 | 4/24/2018 | 11/14/2018 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3830 | NA | 4070 | 4070 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Couple Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | ed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Couple Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | ed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 13.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3830 | NA | NA | 3500 | 3600 | 4000 | NA | 2900 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 15.0 | 15.0 | 16.0 | 17.0 | 12.0 | NA | 3400 | NA | 3000 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

guanner

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

in the analyzou

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-3B | EPA-PZ-2012-3B | EPA-PZ-2012-3B | EPA-PZ-2012-3B | EPA-PZ-2012-3B | EPA-PZ-2012-4A |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/16/2019 | 4/16/2019 | 10/28/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 11/2/2020 | 10/8/2014 | 10/8/2014 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 6/28/2016 | 11/17/2016 | 5/25/2017 | 11/8/2017 | 4/16/2018 | 11/13/2018 | 4/15/2019 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4.80 | NA | 5.60 | 5.60 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupl Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | led | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupl Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | ed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4.80 | NA | NA | 2.80 J | 5.10 | 2.90 J | NA | 2.50 J | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 2700 | 3000 | 3200 | 3200 | 2700 | NA | 3.40 | NA | 3.50 | 2.50 J |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-4A | EPA-PZ-2012-4A | EPA-PZ-2012-4A | EPA-PZ-2012-4B |
|--|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/31/2019 | 5/19/2020 | 10/30/2020 | 10/6/2014 | 10/6/2014 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 6/29/2016 | 11/17/2016 | 5/25/2017 | 11/8/2017 | 11/8/2017 | 4/16/2018 | 11/13/2018 | 11/13/2018 | 4/15/2019 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | 2680 | NA | 3520 | 3520 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupl Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | led | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupl Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | ed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2680 | NA | NA | 2700 | 2200 | 2300 | NA | NA | 1900 | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 4.50 | 2.70 J | <mark>3.6</mark> | NA | 2300 | 2500 | NA | 2000 | 2100 | 2000 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was

analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-4B | EPA-PZ-2012-4B | EPA-PZ-2012-4B | EPA-PZ-2012-4B | EPA-PZ-2012-4B | EPA-PZ-2012-4B | EPA-PZ-2012-5A |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/31/2019 | 10/31/2019 | 5/19/2020 | 5/19/2020 | 10/29/2020 | 10/29/2020 | 10/14/2014 | 10/14/2014 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 6/30/2016 | 11/17/2016 | 5/31/2017 | 11/10/2017 | 4/23/2018 | 11/15/2018 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | 4.00 U | 4.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coup Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (μg/L) | bled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coup Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | oled) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 1.50 U | 1.50 U | 1.50 U | NA | 1.50 J | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 2100 | 2000 | 1800 | 2000 | 2000 | 1900 | NA | 3.00 | NA | 1.50 J |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-5A | EPA-PZ-2012-5A | EPA-PZ-2012-5A | EPA-PZ-2012-5A | EPA-PZ-2012-5B |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/12/2019 | 11/5/2019 | 5/22/2020 | 11/10/2020 | 10/14/2014 | 10/14/2014 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 6/30/2016 | 11/17/2016 | 5/31/2017 | 11/10/2017 | 4/23/2018 | 11/15/2018 | 4/12/2019 | 11/5/2019 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.20 J | NA | 3.70 J | 3.70 J | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | i | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.20 J | NA | NA | 1.50 U | 2.40 J | 1.60 J | NA | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 1.50 J | 2.20 J | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA | 3.00 | NA | 12.0 | 2.70 J | 14.0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-5B | EPA-PZ-2012-5B | EPA-PZ-2012-6A | EPA-PZ-2012-6B |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 5/22/2020 | 11/10/2020 | 10/9/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 11/17/2016 | 5/24/2017 | 11/9/2017 | 4/20/2018 | 11/9/2018 | 4/22/2019 | 10/25/2019 | 5/22/2020 | 11/11/2020 | 10/9/2014 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | 4.00 U | 4.00 U | NA | 515 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Couple Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | d | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Couple Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | d | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 1.60 J | 1.50 U | NA | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 2.40 J | 2.50 J | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | NA | 3.00 U | 1.60 J | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-6B | EPA-PZ-2012-7A | EPA-PZ-2012-7A | EPA-PZ-2012-7A |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/9/2014 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 6/30/2016 | 11/17/2016 | 5/24/2017 | 11/9/2017 | 4/20/2018 | 11/9/2018 | 4/22/2019 | 10/25/2019 | 5/22/2020 | 11/11/2020 | 10/14/2014 | 10/14/2014 | 10/27/2015 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 386 | 386 | NA | 2.00 U | NA | 4.00 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Cou Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (μg/L) | upled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Cou Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/ | upled /L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 515 | NA | NA | 440 | 370 | 430 | NA | 96.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 350 | NA | 300 | 350 | 370 | 220 | 300 | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was

analyzed for, but not detected. NA not analyzed



| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-7A | EPA-PZ-2012-7B | EPA-PZ-2012-7B | EPA-PZ-2012-7B | EPA-PZ-2012-7B | EPA-PZ-2012-7B |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/27/2015 | 6/29/2016 | 11/21/2016 | 5/24/2017 | 11/17/2017 | 4/18/2018 | 11/16/2018 | 4/19/2019 | 10/31/2019 | 5/22/2020 | 11/6/2020 | 10/14/2014 | 10/14/2014 | 10/27/2015 | 10/27/2015 | 6/29/2016 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 4.00 U | NA | 1250 | NA | 1330 | 1330 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupl Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | ed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupl Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/L) | ed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 1.80 J | 1.50 U | 1.50 U | NA | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1250 | NA | NA | 1000 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | NA | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 2.30 J | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Juaimer

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was

analyzed for, but not detected. NA not analyzed

inter analyzou

| | onner | | 1110350 | GIIUSCI |
|--|-------|--|---------|---------|
| | | | | • |

| Location ID: | EPA-PZ-2012-7B | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 11/21/2016 | 5/24/2017 | 11/17/2017 | 4/18/2018 | 11/16/2018 | 4/19/2019 | 11/5/2019 | 5/22/2020 | 11/6/2020 | 4/21/2010 | 4/21/2010 | 10/12/2010 | 10/12/2010 | 4/6/2011 | 4/6/2011 | 10/7/2011 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 69.6 | 46.5 | NA | 57.9 | NA | 45.7 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Cou Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | upled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Cou Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg/ | upled /L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1000 | 1500 | NA | 1300 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 69.6 | NA | NA | 46.5 | NA | 57.9 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | 1200 | NA | 1100 | 1500 | 1300 | 1400 | 1300 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Juaimer

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was

analyzed for, but not detected. NA not analyzed

inter analyzou


Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 |
|--|-------------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/7/2011 | 4/10/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 5/28/2013 | 5/28/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 4/24/2014 | 4/24/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/26/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 11/17/2016 | 11/13/2017 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 16.5 | NA | NA | 34.1 | 53.1 | NA | NA | 49.2 | 44.5 | NA | 15.9 | 15.9 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (| Coupled (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 45.7 | 41.9 J | NA | 16.5 | 34.1 | NA | NA | 53.1 | 49.2 | NA | NA | 44.5 | NA | NA | 9.40 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 6 10 |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

Table 4. Summary of Available Groundwater Chemistry Datasets for Nearfield Area Former Fort Devens, Long Term Monitoring Former Fort Devens, Massachusette

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-22 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 |
|--|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|----------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/12/2018 | 11/4/2019 | 11/3/2020 | 11/3/2020 | 8/12/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 10/15/2012 | 10/15/2012 | 6/9/2015 | 6/10/2015 | 10/21/2015 | 10/26/2015 | 7/8/2016 | 11/22/2016 | 12/22/2016 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.140 J | 0.500 U | NA | 0.500 U | NA | 2.00 U | 2.00 U | 4.00 U | 4.00 U | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (| Coupled (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.500 U | NA | 0.500 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1.50 U | 1.50 U | 1.50 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 5.00 | 6.20 | 2.40.1 | 2.20 J | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1 50 11 | NA | 1 50 11 |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Jualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

Table 4. Summary of Available Groundwater Chemistry Datasets for Nearfield Area Former Fort Devens, Long Term Monitoring Former Fort Devens, Macaachusetts

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-23 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 |
|--|-------------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 5/24/2017 | 11/27/2017 | 11/8/2018 | 11/13/2019 | 11/12/2020 | 4/22/2010 | 4/22/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 4/10/2012 | 10/15/2012 | 10/15/2012 | 5/21/2013 | 5/21/2013 | 10/22/2013 | 10/22/2013 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.40 | 4.80 | NA | NA | 4.50 | NA | NA | 3.70 | 15.1 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (| Coupled (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.40 | NA | NA | 4.80 | 3.70 J | NA | 4.50 | 3.70 | NA | NA | 15.1 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 1.50 U | 3.00 | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Quaimer

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

October 2020 data for EPA-PZ-2012-1B and EPZ-PZ-2012-4A were switched.

Table 4 - ENV.ChemCrossTab_Historical_Nearfield_2010-2020

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-5 | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D |
|--|------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|----------|----------|
| Sample Date: | 4/22/2014 | 4/22/2014 | 10/13/2014 | 10/13/2014 | 10/21/2015 | 10/21/2015 | 11/17/2016 | 11/10/2017 | 11/8/2019 | 11/9/2020 | 4/22/2010 | 4/22/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 4/5/2011 | 4/5/2011 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 2.00 U | 13.3 | NA | 12.6 | 12.6 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.600 | 0.500 U | NA | 0.500 U | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (| Coupled µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 13.3 | NA | NA | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | 0.600 | NA | NA | 0.500 U | NA | 0.500 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.70 | 5.10 | 4.60 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

Table 4. Summary of Available Groundwater Chemistry Datasets for Nearfield Area Former Fort Devens, Long Term Monitoring Former Fort Devens, Magazahuratta

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D |
|--|------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/6/2011 | 10/6/2011 | 4/11/2012 | 4/11/2012 | 10/15/2012 | 10/15/2012 | 5/21/2013 | 10/22/2013 | 10/22/2013 | 4/22/2014 | 4/22/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/27/2015 | 10/27/2015 | 11/17/2016 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 0.500 U | NA | NA | 0.500 U | 0.500 U | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 2.00 U | 2.00 U | NA | 4.00 U | 4.00 U | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (μg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (| Coupled µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 0.500 U | 0.500 U | NA | NA | 0.500 U | 0.720 U | NA | 2.00 U | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 1.50 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Quaimer

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was

analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

Table 4. Summary of Available Groundwater Chemistry Datasets for Nearfield Area Former Fort Devens, Long Term Monitoring Former Fort Devens, Massachusette

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8D | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S |
|--|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 11/8/2017 | 11/13/2018 | 10/24/2019 | 11/10/2020 | 4/22/2010 | 4/22/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 4/5/2011 | 4/5/2011 | 10/6/2011 | 10/6/2011 | 4/10/2012 | 10/15/2012 | 10/15/2012 | 5/28/2013 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.600 | 0.500 U | NA | 0.500 U | NA | 0.500 U | NA | NA | 0.500 U | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively O Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (| Coupled (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.600 | NA | NA | 0.500 U | NA | 0.500 U | NA | 0.500 U | 0.600 J | NA | 0.500 U | 0.930 U |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 3.00 | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Quaimer

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was

analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed



Table 4. Summary of Available Groundwater Chemistry Datasets for Nearfield Area Former Fort Devens, Long Term Monitoring Former Fort Devens, Long Term Monitoring

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-8S | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 |
|--|-----------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/22/2013 | 10/22/2013 | 4/22/2014 | 4/22/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/27/2015 | 10/27/2015 | 11/17/2016 | 11/8/2017 | 11/13/2018 | 10/24/2019 | 11/10/2020 | 4/21/2010 | 4/21/2010 | 10/12/2010 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 2.00 U | 2.00 U | NA | 4.00 U | 4.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 25.2 | 38.4 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | oupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μ | oupled ıg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 2.00 U | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 2.00 U | NA | NA | 1.50 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | 25.2 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3.00 | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | 3.00 U | NA | NA | NA |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Quaimer

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

int not unuly 200



Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/12/2010 | 4/6/2011 | 4/6/2011 | 10/7/2011 | 10/7/2011 | 4/10/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 5/28/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 4/23/2014 | 4/23/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/28/2015 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 25.7 | NA | 39.8 | NA | NA | 36.4 | NA | NA | 33.1 | NA | NA | 22.2 | 28.5 | NA | 18.5 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Plasma/Mass Spectrometry | Coupled (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 38.4 | NA | 25.7 | NA | 39.8 | 29.5 J | NA | 36.4 | 30.0 | NA | 33.1 | 22.2 | NA | NA | 28.5 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

Table 4. Summary of Available Groundwater Chemistry Datasets for Nearfield Area Former Fort Devens, Long Term Monitoring Former Fort Devens, Magazahuratta

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHL-9 | SHM-10-06 |
|--|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 10/28/2015 | 11/17/2016 | 11/15/2017 | 11/15/2017 | 11/12/2018 | 10/30/2019 | 10/30/2019 | 11/3/2020 | 5/24/2010 | 5/24/2010 | 5/24/2010 | 5/26/2010 | 5/26/2010 | 5/26/2010 | 5/26/2010 | 7/8/2010 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 18.5 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 17.2 | 120 | 155 | 67.5 | 683 | 2390 | 2540 | 2210 J |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 10.0 | 121 | 129 | 42.9 | 750 | 2070 | NA | 1680 J |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2660 | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Plasma/Mass Spectrometry | Coupled (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 38.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | 22.0 | 25.0 | 28.0 | 33.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Quaimer

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

in the analyzed

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06 | SHM-10-06A |
|--|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 9/8/2010 | 10/23/2012 | 10/23/2012 | 10/23/2012 | 5/23/2013 | 5/23/2013 | 10/8/2014 | 10/8/2014 | 10/22/2015 | 10/22/2015 | 11/21/2016 | 11/16/2017 | 11/12/2018 | 11/1/2019 | 10/30/2020 | 5/24/2010 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 2580 | 2300 | 1900 | NA | NA | 1980 | 1900 | NA | 2150 | 2150 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.590 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 2710 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.370 J |
| Trace Metals by Inductively (Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively (Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (| Coupled (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | 2300 | 1980 | NA | NA | 1900 | NA | NA | 1700 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1600 | 1200 | 1300 | 1000 | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A |
|---|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 5/24/2010 | 5/24/2010 | 5/25/2010 | 5/25/2010 | 5/25/2010 | 5/25/2010 | 5/25/2010 | 5/25/2010 | 7/7/2010 | 9/9/2010 | 10/24/2012 | 10/24/2012 | 10/24/2012 | 5/22/2013 | 11/20/2013 | 11/20/2013 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 595 | 1090 | 170 | 134 | 186 | 382 | 405 | 333 | 64.8 | 102 | 72.0 | 80.0 | NA | 72.8 | 22.9 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 55.1 | 18.0 | 36.7 | 58.6 | 106 | 1.13 U | 1.13 U | 1.17 J | 61.0 | 94.2 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | bupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg | oupled g/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 72.0 | NA | NA | 22.9 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was

analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-10-06A | SHM-93-22B |
|--|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/7/2014 | 10/7/2014 | 10/21/2015 | 10/21/2015 | 12/2/2016 | 11/30/2017 | 11/7/2018 | 11/7/2019 | 11/13/2020 | 4/21/2010 | 4/21/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 10/12/2010 | 4/6/2011 | 4/6/2011 | 10/11/2011 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 95.6 | NA | 4.00 U | 4.00 U | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 948 | 828 | NA | NA | NA | 1070 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Cou Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (μg/L) | ıpled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1040 | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Cou Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/I | ıpled ′L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 95.6 | NA | NA | 76.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 948 | NA | NA | 828 | 1040 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 74.0 | 64.0 | 63.0 | 71.0 | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B |
|---|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/11/2011 | 4/10/2012 | 4/10/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 5/28/2013 | 5/28/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 4/24/2014 | 4/24/2014 | 10/8/2014 | 10/8/2014 | 6/8/2015 | 6/8/2015 | 10/23/2015 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 1270 | 879 | NA | NA | 1150 | 1150 | NA | NA | 997 | 690 | NA | 1050 | 1050 | 670 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (μg/L) | pupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg | oupled g/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1070 | 1270 J | NA | NA | 879 | 1150 | NA | NA | 1150 | 997 | NA | NA | 690 | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed



| Location ID: | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22B | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C |
|--|------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/23/2015 | 6/27/2016 | 11/17/2016 | 5/23/2017 | 11/13/2017 | 4/24/2018 | 11/14/2018 | 4/12/2019 | 11/4/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 11/3/2020 | 4/21/2010 | 4/21/2010 | 10/12/2010 | 10/12/2010 | 4/6/2011 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 670 | NA | 14.6 | 15.8 | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (| Coupled μg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 630 | 480 | 310 | NA | 270 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 14.6 | NA | NA | 15.8 | 13.9 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | 360 | NA | 170 | 83.0 | 370 | 170 | 300 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C |
|---|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 4/6/2011 | 10/5/2011 | 10/5/2011 | 4/11/2012 | 4/11/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 5/28/2013 | 5/28/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 10/23/2013 | 4/24/2014 | 4/24/2014 | 10/8/2014 | 10/8/2014 | 10/23/2015 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 13.9 | NA | NA | 25.4 | 21.7 | NA | NA | 19.7 | 25.1 | NA | NA | 31.9 | 45.6 | NA | 137 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | oupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 13.9 | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μ | oupled g/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | 13.9 | 25.4 | NA | NA | 21.7 | 19.7 | NA | NA | 25.1 | 31.9 | NA | NA | 45.6 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-93-22C | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B |
|---|-----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 10/23/2015 | 11/29/2016 | 11/13/2017 | 11/14/2018 | 11/4/2019 | 11/11/2019 | 5/6/2020 | 11/3/2020 | 4/22/2010 | 4/22/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 4/5/2011 | 4/5/2011 | 10/6/2011 | 10/6/2011 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 137 | NA | NA | 1500 J | 846 | NA | 2030 | NA | 1900 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | oupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μ | oupled ıg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 120 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1500 J | NA | NA | 846 | NA | 2030 | NA | 1900 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | 3.80 | 3.80 | 4.30 | 4.20 | 4.50 | 4.40 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed



Table 4. Summary of Available Groundwater Chemistry Datasets for Nearfield Area Former Fort Devens, Long Term Monitoring Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B |
|--|--------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 4/10/2012 | 10/15/2012 | 10/15/2012 | 5/21/2013 | 5/21/2013 | 10/22/2013 | 10/22/2013 | 4/22/2014 | 4/22/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 6/5/2015 | 6/5/2015 | 10/21/2015 | 10/21/2015 | 6/27/2016 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 1380 | NA | NA | 1400 | 1660 | NA | NA | 1340 | 991 | NA | 1210 | 1210 | 799 | 799 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Cou Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | ıpled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Cou Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/ | ıpled 'L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 1680 J | NA | 1380 | 1400 | NA | NA | 1660 | 1340 | NA | NA | 991 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1100 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Quaimer

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5B | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C |
|--|-------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Sample Date: | 11/17/2016 | 5/31/2017 | 11/10/2017 | 4/23/2018 | 11/26/2018 | 4/23/2019 | 11/7/2019 | 5/19/2020 | 11/10/2020 | 11/10/2020 | 4/22/2010 | 4/22/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 10/11/2010 | 4/5/2011 | 4/5/2011 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 31.2 | 26.4 | NA | 35.0 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (| Coupled (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 990 | 1200 | NA | 980 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 31.2 | NA | NA | 26.4 | NA | 35.0 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | 990 | NA | 100 | 1100 | 41.0 | 1100 | 720 | 640 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C |
|--|------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample Date: | 10/6/2011 | 10/6/2011 | 4/10/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 10/17/2012 | 5/28/2013 | 5/28/2013 | 10/22/2013 | 10/22/2013 | 4/22/2014 | 4/22/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/9/2014 | 10/21/2015 | 10/21/2015 | 11/17/2016 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 24.5 | NA | NA | 7.70 | NA | NA | 10.4 | 5.50 | NA | NA | 10.9 | 17.7 | NA | 39.6 | 39.6 | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (μg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µ | Coupled μg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 24.5 | 8.70 J | NA | 7.70 | 10.4 | NA | NA | 5.50 | 10.9 | NA | NA | 17.7 | NA | NA | 42.0 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHM-96-5C | SHP-05-45B | SHP-05-46B | SHP-05-46B | SHP-05-46B | SHP-2016-06A | SHP-2016-06A | SHP-2016-06A | SHP-2016-06A | SHP-2016-06A | SHP-2016-06A | SHP-2016-06A | SHP-2016-06A |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| 11/10/2017 | 11/20/2018 | 11/7/2019 | 11/10/2020 | 10/28/2015 | 8/9/2010 | 10/28/2015 | 10/28/2015 | 6/15/2017 | 11/28/2017 | 4/18/2018 | 11/9/2018 | 4/17/2019 | 11/5/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 11/12/2020 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | 24.5 | 50.6 | 7.70 | 7.70 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 81.4 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| upled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| upled /L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 670 | NA | 280 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 34.0 | 31.0 | 13.0 | 29.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 520 | 600 | NA | 480 | 2800 | 860 | 760 | 640 |
| u u | NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Spled L) NA 34.0 | NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Ipled NA NA NA Jate NA NA NA NA NA | NA NA NA A NA NA | NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA | NA NA <th< td=""><td>NA NA <th< td=""><td>MA NA <th< td=""><td>MA NA <th< td=""><td>Almostor Almostor <th< td=""><td>Almood Almood Almood<</td><td>NA NA NA<</td><td>All No. N</td><td>AR NA NA<</td><td>And Na <t< td=""><td>And And A</td></t<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<> | NA NA <th< td=""><td>MA NA <th< td=""><td>MA NA <th< td=""><td>Almostor Almostor <th< td=""><td>Almood Almood Almood<</td><td>NA NA NA<</td><td>All No. N</td><td>AR NA NA<</td><td>And Na <t< td=""><td>And And A</td></t<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<> | MA NA NA <th< td=""><td>MA NA <th< td=""><td>Almostor Almostor <th< td=""><td>Almood Almood Almood<</td><td>NA NA NA<</td><td>All No. N</td><td>AR NA NA<</td><td>And Na <t< td=""><td>And And A</td></t<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<> | MA NA NA <th< td=""><td>Almostor Almostor <th< td=""><td>Almood Almood Almood<</td><td>NA NA NA<</td><td>All No. N</td><td>AR NA NA<</td><td>And Na <t< td=""><td>And And A</td></t<></td></th<></td></th<> | Almostor Almostor <th< td=""><td>Almood Almood Almood<</td><td>NA NA NA<</td><td>All No. N</td><td>AR NA NA<</td><td>And Na <t< td=""><td>And And A</td></t<></td></th<> | Almood Almood< | NA NA< | All No. N | AR NA NA< | And Na Na <t< td=""><td>And And A</td></t<> | And A |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | SHP-2016-06B | SHP-2016-06B | SHP-2016-06B | SHP-2016-06B | SHP-2016-06B | SHP-2016-06B | SHP-2016-06B | SHP-2016-06B | SHP-2016-06C | SHP-2016-1B |
|---|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Sample Date: | 6/15/2017 | 11/28/2017 | 4/18/2018 | 11/7/2018 | 4/17/2019 | 11/5/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 11/12/2020 | 11/28/2017 | 4/18/2018 | 11/7/2018 | 4/17/2019 | 11/5/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 11/12/2020 | 5/23/2017 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | pupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (µg | oupled g/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 850 | NA | 1300 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 210 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 120 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 830 J | 1300 | NA | 1300 | 1300 | 1200 | 1100 | 1100 | 280 | NA | 300 | 250 | 270 | 310 | 350 | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was

analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed



| Location ID: | SHP-2016-1B | SHP-2016-1B | SHP-2016-1B | SHP-2016-1B | SHP-2016-1B | SHP-2016-1B | SHP-2016-2B | SHP-2016-3B |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/14/2017 | 11/13/2018 | 4/22/2019 | 11/8/2019 | 5/19/2020 | 11/5/2020 | 5/24/2017 | 11/20/2017 | 4/23/2018 | 11/15/2018 | 4/19/2019 | 4/19/2019 | 10/24/2019 | 5/20/2020 | 11/6/2020 | 5/23/2017 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Co Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μ | coupled Jg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 350 | NA | 420 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 240 |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 170 | 130 | 120 | 180 | 110 | 140 | NA | 550 | NA | 430 | 450 | 410 | 560 | 260 | 520 | NA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

| Location ID: | SHP-2016-3B | SHP-2016-3B | SHP-2016-3B | SHP-2016-3B | SHP-2016-3B | SHP-2016-3B | SHP-2016-4B |
|--|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sample Date: | 11/15/2017 | 4/24/2018 | 11/12/2018 | 4/18/2019 | 5/20/2020 | 11/3/2020 | 5/24/2017 | 11/16/2017 | 11/16/2017 | 4/23/2018 | 11/12/2018 | 11/12/2018 | 4/19/2019 | 11/5/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 11/6/2020 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | Coupled | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively C Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (| Coupled /µg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA | 240 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1100 | NA | NA | 1300 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | 270 | NA | 240 | 230 | 160 | 180 | NA | 1800 | 2200 | NA | 1400 | 1500 | 1400 | 1500 | 650 | 3.00 U |
| | 210 | | 210 | 200 | 100 | 100 | 147 (| 1000 | 2200 | | 1100 | 1000 | 1100 | 1000 | 000 | 0.00 0 |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier

J Estimated Value

U Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed

Former Fort Devens, Massachusetts

| Location ID: | SHP-2016-5B |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sample Date: | 5/24/2017 | 11/20/2017 | 4/24/2018 | 11/14/2018 | 4/23/2019 | 4/23/2019 | 11/5/2019 | 5/21/2020 | 11/9/2020 |
| Historical (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Atomic Emission Spectrometry (µg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | NA |
| Trace Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry (μg/L) | | | | | | | | | |
| Arsenic | 620 | NA | 620 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arsenic (Dissolved) | NA | 700 | NA | 520 | 610 | 620 | 720 | 470 | 730 |

Notes:

Data loaded as 'Historical' is included in this report and is shown in italics.

Units

µg/L Micrograms per Liter

Qualifier

Undefined Qualifier J Estimated Value

U

Undetected: The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.

NA not analyzed



Table 5 Summary of Dissolved Arsenic Trends for North Impact Area

| Well ID | 2010-2015 As Trend | 2016-2020 As Trend |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| SHM-05-39A | No Trend | NA |
| SHM-05-39B | No Trend | NA |
| SHM-05-40X | No Trend | No trend |
| SHM-05-41A | Decreasing | No Trend |
| SHM-05-41B | Decreasing | No Trend |
| SHM-05-41C | No Trend | No Trend |
| SHM-05-42A | NA | NA |
| SHM-05-42B | No Trend | No Trend |
| SHM-07-03 | NA | NA |
| SHM-07-05 | NA | NA |
| SHM-10-02 | No Trend | NA |
| SHM-10-03 | NA | NA |
| SHM-10-04 | NA | NA |
| SHM-10-05A | Increasing | NA |
| SHM-10-08 | Increasing | NA |
| SHM-10-10 | No Trend | NA |
| SHM-10-16 | Increasing | Decreasing |
| SHM-13-01 | NA | NA |
| SHM-13-02 | No Trend | NA |
| SHM-13-03 | Decreasing | No Trend |
| SHM-13-04 | No trend | Increasing |
| SHM-13-05 | No Trend | No Trend |
| SHM-13-06 | Decreasing | No trend |
| SHM-13-07 | Decreasing | No Trend |
| SHM-13-08 | No Trend | No Trend |
| SHM-13-14D | NA | No Trend |
| SHM-13-14S | NA | NA |
| SHM-13-15 | NA | No trend |
| SHM-99-31A | NA | NA |
| SHM-99-31B | Increasing | NA |
| SHM-99-31C | Decreasing | No Trend |
| SHM-99-32X | Decreasing | No Trend |

Notes:

| | There were not enough data points to |
|------------|--|
| NA | run the Mann Kendall test. |
| | Insufficient statistical evidence of a |
| No Trend | significant trend. |
| Increasing | Statistically significant evidence of an increasing trend. |
| Decreasing | Statistically significant evidence of a decreasing trend. |

Table 6Summary of Dissolve Arsenic Trends for Nearfield Area

| Well ID | 2010-2020 As Trend | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|
| EPA-PZ-2012-1A | NA | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-1B | No Trend | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-2A | NA | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-2B | NA | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-3A | No Trend | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-3B | Decreasing | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-4A | No Trend | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-4B | Decreasing | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-5A | NA | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-5B | NA | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-6A | NA | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-6B | Decreasing | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-7A | NA | | |
| EPA-PZ-2012-7B | No Trend | | |
| SHL-22 | Decreasing | | |
| SHL-23 | NA | | |
| SHL-5 | No Trend | | |
| SHL-8D | NA | | |
| SHL-8S | NA | | |
| SHL-9 | No Trend | | |
| SHM-10-06 | Decreasing | | |
| SHM-10-06A | No Trend | | |
| SHM-93-22B | Decreasing | | |
| SHM-93-22C | No Trend | | |
| SHM-96-5B | Decreasing | | |
| SHM-96-5C | No Trend | | |
| SHP-05-45B | NA | | |
| SHP-05-46B | NA | | |
| SHP-2016-06B | No Trend | | |
| SHP-2016-1B | No Trend | | |
| SHP-2016-2B | No Trend | | |
| SHP-2016-3B | Decreasing | | |
| SHP-2016-4B | No Trend | | |
| SHP-2016-5B | No Trend | | |
| SHP-2016-6A | No Trend | | |
| SHP-2016-6C | No Trend | | |

Notes

| NA | There were not enough data points to run the Mann Kendall test. |
|------------|---|
| No Trend | Insufficient statistical evidence of a significant trend. |
| Increasing | Statistically significant evidence of an increasing trend. |
| Decreasing | Statistically significant evidence of a decreasing trend. |

| | Model | | Geometric | Sensitivity | Darcy Flux | Darcy Flux | Mass Flux Under Pumping Conditions | | | Mass Flux Under Ambient (Non- Pumping) Conditions | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| HSU Number | Hydraulic Conductivity (ft/d) | Mean Arsenic Conc. (µg/L) | Mean Arsenic Conc. (μg/L) | (95% UCL) Arsenic Conc. (µg/L) | Under Pumping Conditions (gpm) | Under Ambient Conditions (gpm) | Based on Geometric Mean (Ib/yr) | Based on Mean (Ib/yr) | Based on 95% UCL (Ib/yr) | Based on Geometric Mean (Ib/yr) | Based on Mean (Ib/yr) | Based on 95% UCL (Ib/yr) |
| 2 ⁵ | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3 | 21 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| 4 | 21 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| 5 | 48.8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.28 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 11 | 19 | 51 | 106 | 270 | 3.15 | 2.73 | 0.71 | 1.46 | 3.73 | 0.61 | 1.27 | 3.24 |
| 12 | 6 | 165 | 936 | 5,200 | 2.98 | 2.57 | 2.16 | 12.2 | 68.0 | 1.86 | 10.6 | 58.7 |
| 14 | 6 | 57 | 84.2 | 137 | 0.55 | 0.51 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 0.33 | 0.13 | 0.19 | 0.31 |
| 15 | 6 | 50 | 72.7 | 110 | 0.73 | 0.70 | 0.16 | 0.23 | 0.35 | 0.15 | 0.22 | 0.34 |
| 21 | 24 | 163 | 1,135 | 3,000 | 3.98 | 3.51 | 2.85 | 19.8 | 52.5 | 2.51 | 17.5 | 46.2 |
| 22 | 24 | 4,441 | 4,675 | 6,500 | 9.14 | 7.38 | 178 | 188 | 261 | 144 | 151 | 211 |
| 23 | 24 | 561 | 813 | 1,400 | 9.66 | 7.76 | 23.8 | 34.5 | 59.4 | 19.1 | 27.7 | 47.7 |
| 25 | 30 | 419 | 834 | 1,473 | 3.54 | 3.28 | 6.51 | 13.0 | 22.9 | 6.04 | 12.0 | 21.2 |
| 26 | 30 | 32 | 220 | 1,000 | 3.76 | 3.59 | 0.53 | 3.64 | 16.5 | 0.51 | 3.48 | 15.8 |
| 31 | 5 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 32 | 5 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 5.22 | 5.22 | 5.22 | 4.21 | 4.21 | 4.21 |
| 33 | 5 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 1.51 | 1.51 | 1.51 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.34 |
| | | Total A | cross East-Wes | t Cross Section | 39.3 | 33.6 | 222 | 280 | 491 | 181 | 230 | 410 |
| Total Across Area Where Arsenic in Groundwater Exceeding the CL May Not be Captured at All Times | | | 5.1 | 4.9 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 16.9 | 0.7 | 3.7 | 16.1 | | |
| Total Across Hypothetical Area Where Arsenic in Groundwater Exceeding the CL May Not be Captured at All Times as a % of Total Across East-West Cross Section | | | 13.1% | 14.5% | 0.3% | 1.4% | 3.4% | 0.4% | 1.6% | 3.9% | | |
| Total Across East-West Cross Section as a % of Total ATP Pumping Rate or Mass Removal | | | 78% | | 48% | 60% | 85% | | | | | |
| Total Flow Rate Across East-West Cross Section Less the Total Across Hypothetical Area Where Arsenic in Groundwater Exceeding the CL May Not be Captured at All Times as a % of Total ATP Pumping Rate | | | 68% | | - | | - | | | | | |

Table 7. Arsenic Flux in the Overburden Across East to West Section from SHL-23 to SHL-21

ATP Data

| ATP Extraction Well | Average 2016- 2020 Pumping Rate (gpm) | Average 2016- 2020 Dissolved Arsenic Conc. (μg/L) | Average 2016- 2020 Arsenic Removed (Ib/yr) | Maximum 2016-2020 Dissolved Arsenic Conc. (μg/L) | Maximum 2016-2020 Arsenic Removed (Ib/yr) |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| EW-01 | 32.5 | 1,610 | 229.9 | 1,900 | 271.4 |
| EW-04 | 17.5 | 3,066 | 235.8 | 4,000 | 307.6 |
| Total | 50.1 | | 466 | | 579 |

Notes:

1. The East-West Cross Section spans from monitoring well SHL-23 to SHL-21.

2. The hypothetical bypass area spans from monitoring well SHM-10-06 to SHL-21.

3. The hydrostratigraphic units (HSUs) were assigned to row 76 in the calibrated model.

4. Darcy flux is calculated in model Stress Period 18 which simulates long term average conditions.

5. Arsenic concentrations assigned to each hydrostratigraphic unit were calculated using dissolved arsenic concentrations in groundwater samples collected from profile borings in 2017 and the most recent time (Fall 2020) for monitoring wells. The HSU5 arsenic concentration for SHL-21 is from the most recent sample collected on 21 October 2015.

6. Pumping flux represents darcy flux with the Arsenic Treatment Plant (ATP) wells EW-01 and EW-04 operating at an average extraction rate of 50.1 gpm for 2016-2020. The same extraction rates are used to evaluate the ATP arsenic output.

7. Non-pumping flux represents groundwater flux calculated with extraction wells EW-01 and EW-04 not pumping.

8. Gray shaded cells include data for HSUs in the hypothetical bypass area between wells SHM-10-06 and SHL-21, which include HSUs 4, 5, 15, and 26.









| Former Fort Devens Boundary | PZ-12-07 | Well/Boring/Gauge Identification | 2021 Technical Me Shepley's Hill | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Overburden Monitoring Well/Piezometer | SHM-13-01 | LTM Well/Piezometer Annual Sampling (Fall) | Former Fort Devens A | | |
| Groundwater Profiling Location/Monitoring Well | 0111 40 | LTM Well/Diszometer Semienpuel | | | |
| Monitoring Well | SHL-10 | Sampling (Spring/Fall) | | | |
| Bedrock Monitoring Well | SHP-99-01B | LTM Well/Piezometer Hydraulic | | | |
| Bedrock Study Core | | Monitoring Only | Long-Term Monitori | | |
| Extraction Well | LTM = long-term r LTMMP = Long-Te | nonitoring erm Monitoring and Maintenance Plan | | | |
| Stream Gauge | | Ĩ | Nampaa | | |
| Soil Boring | Notes: 1. LTM well netwo | ork established from LTMMP Update | X SERES | | |
| Barrier Wall | (Sovereign 2015) | and LTMMP Addendum (KGS 2018). | Engineering & Services, LLC | | |
| | | 0 200 400 | ARCADIS | | |
| | | Feet | a joint venture | | |

¢

• ٢ ₽

 \odot \bigcirc

0

nical Memorandum ey's Hill Landfill evens Army Installation Massachusetts

nitoring Well Network

Figure

2



| | Legend | | | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| \triangle | Triangle for Vector Analysis | | | | | |
| | Groundwater Capture Zone from Technical Memo 1 (S-A JV, 2021) | | | | | |
| | Shepley's Hill Landfill Boundary | | | | | |
| | Fall 2020 Groundwater Contours | | | | | |
| | 2010-2015 Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis | | | | | |
| | Arsenic Concentration had a large number of non-detects; therefore a trend analysis could not be performed | | | | | |
| | Insufficient Evidence of a Statistically Significant Trend | | | | | |
| | Statistically Significant Evidence of a Decreasing Trend | | | | | |
| | Statistically Significant Evidence of an Increasing Trend | | | | | |
| | Scale in feet0200400 | | | | | |
| | Notes: | | | | | |
| | 1. Arsenic concentration trends eva using ProUCL Mann-Kendall stat | uated stical software | | | | |
| | 2. S-A JV = SERES-Arcadis 8(a) Joint Venture 2, LLC | | | | | |
| | 3. S-A JV. 2021. Draft Phase I EPA Demonstrate Plume Capture Tec Memorandum Phase I Subtask 1 Delineate Capture Zone based on Hydraulic and Geochemical Data Shepley's Hill Landfill, Former Fo Army Installation, Devens, Massa Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of New England District. March 28. | SOW hnical g t t Devens ichusetts. Engineers | | | | |
| | FORMER FORT DEVENS ARMY INSTALLA DEVENS, MASSACHUSETTS 2021 TECHNICAL MEMO SHEPLEY'S HILL LANDFILL | ΓΙΟΝ | | | | |
| | 2010-2015 North Impact Are Arsenic Concentration Trend | a Is | | | | |
| | SERRES Expecting & Service, LC ARCADIS a joint venture | FIGURE | | | | |



| | Legend | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Extraction Wells | | | | | | |
| \triangle | Triangle for Vector Analysis | | | | | | |
| | Groundwater Capture Zone from Technical Memo 1 (S-A JV, 2021) | | | | | | |
| | Shepley's Hill Landfill Boundary | | | | | | |
| | Fall 2020 Groundwater Contours | | | | | | |
| | 2016-2020 Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis | | | | | | |
| | Arsenic Concentration had a large number of non-detects; therefore a trend analysis could not be performed | | | | | | |
| | Insufficient Evidence of a Statistically Significant Trend | | | | | | |
| | Statistically Significant Evidence of a Decreasing Trend | | | | | | |
| | Statistically Significant Evidence of an Increasing Trend | | | | | | |
| | Scale in feet 0 200 400 | | | | | | |
| | Notes: | | | | | | |
| | 1. Arsenic concentration trends eva using ProUCL Mann-Kendall stat | luated istical software | | | | | |
| | 2. S-A JV = SERES-Arcadis 8(a) Joint Venture 2, LLC | | | | | | |
| | 3. S-A JV. 2021. Draft Phase I EPA Demonstrate Plume Capture Tec Memorandum Phase I Subtask 1 Delineate Capture Zone based on Hydraulic and Geochemical Data Shepley's Hill Landfill, Former Fo Army Installation, Devens, Massa Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of New England District. March 28. | SOW hnical .g t t t Devens tchusetts. Engineers | | | | | |
| | FORMER FORT DEVENS ARMY INSTALLA DEVENS, MASSACHUSETTS 2021 TECHNICAL MEMO SHEPLEY'S HILL LANDFILL | ΓΙΟΝ | | | | | |
| | 2016-2020 North Impact Are Arsenic Concentration Trend | ea Is | | | | | |
| | SERRES ARCADIS a joint venture | FIGURE | | | | | |







Attachment 1

Mann Kendall Statistical Analysis Plots
5 Year Trends 2010 to 2015





| n | 0 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 4.0825 |
| Standardized Value of S | -2.2045 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -10 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0080 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0137 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -378.9247 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 764,490.4582 |



Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-05-39A



| n | 5 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 4.0825 |
| Standardized Value of S | -1.2247 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -6 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.1170 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.1103 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -42.7399 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 86,177.4720 |



| 5 |
|--------|
| 0.9500 |
| 0.0500 |
| 4.0825 |
| |
| 0 |
| 0.5920 |
| |
| |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 7.5676 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -14,985.5135 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-05-40X 2010 to 2015





| n | 1 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 6.6583 |
| Standardized Value of S | -1.5019 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -11 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0680 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0666 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -214.1250 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 434,260.0498 |

Insufficient statistical evidence of a significant trend at the specified level of significance.



2016



Mann-Kendall Trend Test for SHM-05-41A

Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| n | 26 |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 45.3468 |
| Standardized Value of S | -3.3519 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -153 |
| Appx, Critical Value (0.05) | -1.6449 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0004 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -1.6618 |
|--------------------------|------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 3,368.5943 |



Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-05-41B 2010 to 2015

| n | 12 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 14.5831 |
| Standardized Value of S | -3.7715 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -56 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0000 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0001 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -128.3020 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 259,160.2411 |



| n | 12 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 14.5831 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.4800 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 8 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3190 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3156 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 33.3120 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -66,170.8845 |





| n | 11 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 12.8452 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.4671 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 7 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3240 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3202 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 14.3002 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -28,576.4247 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-10-02 2010 to 2015



2012.5 2012.8

Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| n | 3 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 1.9149 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.0000 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 1 |
| Tabulated p-value | |
| Approximate p-value | 0.5000 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 0.0048 |
|--------------------------|---------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -8.5769 |



| n | 21 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 33.1160 |
| Standardized Value of S | 2.9291 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 98 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0010 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0017 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -31.3830 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 63,173.1184 |

Statistically significant evidence of an increasing trend at the specified level of significance.

2013.4



| n | 13 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 16.3911 |
| Standardized Value of S | 1,6472 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 28 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0500 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0498 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -0.9317 |
|--------------------------|------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 1,876.8379 |

Statistically significant evidence of an increasing trend at the specified level of significance.

2012.8



| n | 9 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 9,5394 |
| Standardized Value of S | 1.0483 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 11 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.1790 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.1473 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 0.0368 |
|--------------------------|----------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -71.8353 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-10-16 2010 to 2015



| n | 6 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 5.3229 |
| Standardized Value of S | 1.8787 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 11 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0280 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0301 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 199.5605 |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -400,391.1031 |





| n | 4 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 2.7689 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.0000 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 1 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.6250 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.5000 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 0.4300 |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -863.8681 |



| n | ь |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 5.3229 |
| Standardized Value of S | -2.6301 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -15 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0010 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0043 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -83.7892 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 168,936.0916 |





Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-13-04 2010 to 2015

| n | 5 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 4.0825 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.7348 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -4 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.2420 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.2312 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -585,4598 |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 1,180,290.2723 |



Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-13-05 2010 to 2015



| n | 4 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 2.9439 |
| Standardized Value of S | 1.0190 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 4 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.1670 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.1541 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 1.9147 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -3,847.3134 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-13-06 2010 to 2015



| n | 6 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 5.3229 |
| Standardized Value of S | -1.8787 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -11 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0280 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0301 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -320.8738 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 649,041.2273 |

1025 1005 Arsenic (ug/L) 985 965 945 925 2013.4 2014.6 Sample Date 2013.7 2014.3 2014.0 2014.9 2015.2

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-13-08 2010 to 2015

Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| n | ь |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 5.3229 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.3757 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -3 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3600 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3536 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -1.0598 |
|--------------------------|------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 3,113.3042 |



Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-99-31B



| n | D |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 5.3229 |
| Standardized Value of S | 1.8787 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 11 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0280 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0301 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 5.0708 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -10,149.4948 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-99-31C 2010 to 2015



| n | ь |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 5.3229 |
| Standardized Value of S | -1.8787 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -11 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0280 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0301 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -12.0114 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 24,394.0758 |





Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-99-32X 2010 to 2015

| n | 5 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 4.0825 |
| Standardized Value of S | -2.2045 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -10 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0080 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0137 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -22.5600 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 45,544.2280 |

5 Year Trends 2016 to 2020



Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-13-07 2016 to 2020



| n | 10 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 11.1355 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.9878 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 12 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.1460 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.1616 |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 59.4141 |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -119,504.6286 |



| TI | 3 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 3.9581 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.0000 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -1 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.5920 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.5000 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 1.1000 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -2,200.3680 |



| n | 10 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 11.1803 |
| Standardized Value of S | -1.6100 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -19 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0540 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0537 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -50.0561 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 101,582.2614 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-05-41C 2016 to 2020



| n | 9 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 9.5917 |
| Standardized Value of S | -1.5639 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -16 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0600 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0589 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -85.7269 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 173,599.5074 |





| n . | 3 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 3,6056 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.5547 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -3 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.4080 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.2895 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -3.0000 |
|--------------------------|------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 6,222.6400 |



Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-10-16 2016 to 2020

| n | 8 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 7.8528 |
| Standardized Value of S | -2.5469 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -21 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0070 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0054 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -172.1954 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 348,961.5057 |





Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-13-03 2016 to 2020



| n | 10 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 11.1355 |
| Standardized Value of S | 1.1674 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 14 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.1080 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.1215 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 20.4164 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -41,137.8602 |



| 10 |
|---------|
| 0.9500 |
| 0.0500 |
| 11.1803 |
| 1.7889 |
| 21 |
| 0.0360 |
| 0.0368 |
| |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 54.6249 |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -109,998.9674 |





| n | 3 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 4.0825 |
| Standardized Value of S | |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 0 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0,5920 |
| Approximate p-value | |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -0.1600 |
|--------------------------|----------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 333.7808 |



Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-13-06 2016 to 2020 2872 2672 Arsenic (ug/L) 2272 2072 1872 2016.4 2018.8 Sample Date 2017.0 2017.6 2018.2 2019.4



| n | 10 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 11.0151 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.2724 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -4 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3640 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3927 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -65.7262 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 135,257.5250 |



| n | 10 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 11.1803 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.3578 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 5 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3640 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3603 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 0.0401 |
|--------------------------|----------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 704.0991 |



| n | 4 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 2,9439 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.3397 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 2 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3750 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3670 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 0.3912 |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -780.0524 |


| n | 4 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 2,9439 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.3397 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 2 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3750 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3670 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 0.2637 |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -526.6132 |





| n | Б |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 5.1316 |
| Standardized Value of S | -1.5590 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -9 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0680 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0595 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -13.9385 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 28,313,4606 |





| n | 6 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 5.3229 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.7515 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -5 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.2350 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.2262 |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -8.6268 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 17,455.1619 |



| n | ð |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 7.9582 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.6283 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -6 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.2740 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.2649 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -57.3270 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 117,902.7058 |

2010 to 2020 Trends

Mann-Kendall Trend Test for EPA-PZ-2012-1B



| n | 11 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 12.7671 |
| Standardized Value of S | -1.4099 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -19 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0820 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0793 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -8.5776 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 17,514.0150 |





| n | 11 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 12.7671 |
| Standardized Value of S | -1.2532 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -17 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0,1090 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.1051 |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -1.1068 |
|--------------------------|------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 2,250.1042 |



| n | |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 12.8062 |
| Standardized Value of S | -2.5769 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -34 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0030 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0050 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -204.5778 | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 416,222.7311 | |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test for EPA-PZ-2012-4A





| n | 11 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 12.8062 |
| Standardized Value of S | -1.1713 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -16 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.1090 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.1207 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -0.3386 |
|--------------------------|----------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 687.1550 |



^{2015 201} Sample Date

| n | 11 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 12.7671 |
| Standardized Value of S | -2.5064 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -33 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0050 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0061 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -192.2223 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 390,212.5784 |





| 11 |
|---------|
| 0.9500 |
| 0.0500 |
| 12.7279 |
| -2.1213 |
| -28 |
| 0.0130 |
| 0.0169 |
| |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -32.8914 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 66,717.1338 |



| n | |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 12.6623 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.6318 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 9 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.2710 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.2638 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 18.6009 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -36,251.6491 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHL-22



| n | 14 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 18.2665 |
| Standardized Value of S | -3.3942 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -63 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0000 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0003 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -6.1518 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 12,425.4076 |



| n | 10 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 11.1355 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.4490 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 6 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3000 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3267 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -0.0220 |
|--------------------------|---------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 51.4575 |



Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHL-9 2010 to 2020



| n | 15 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 20.2073 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.3959 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -9 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3490 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3461 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -0.0778 |
|--------------------------|----------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 187.2371 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-05-41A 2010 to 2020



| n | 16 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 22.1886 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.2704 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -7 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.4120 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3934 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -0.8977 |
|--------------------------|------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 1,828.8504 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test for SHM-10-06



Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| n | 11 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 12.8452 |
| Standardized Value of S | -2.8026 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -37 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0020 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0025 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -115.3541 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 234,290.5599 |



Mann-Kendall Trend Test for SHM-10-06A

| n | 12 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 14.5831 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.3429 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -6 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3690 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3659 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -0.5342 |
|--------------------------|------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 1,140.7267 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-93-22B 2010 to 2020



| n | 24 |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 40.2658 |
| Standardized Value of S | -3.9488 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -160 |
| Appx. Critical Value (0.05) | -1.6449 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0000 |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -93.7776 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 189,679.1776 |



| n | 19 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 28.5015 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.4210 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -13 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3390 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3369 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -0.4549 |
|--------------------------|----------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 944.3253 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-96-5b 2010 to 2020



| n | 20 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 30,7463 |
| Standardized Value of S | -2.8947 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -90 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0020 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0019 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -97.7865 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 198,215.0675 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHM-96-5C 2010 to 2020





| n | 15 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 20.2073 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.2969 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 7 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3850 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3833 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 0.5171 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -1,018.0542 |





| n | 9 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 9,5917 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.7298 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 8 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.2380 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.2328 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 125.7770 |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -253,091.5996 |





| n | 9 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 9.0738 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.0000 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 1 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.5400 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.5000 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 45.5729 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -90,867.0659 |



| n | 1 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 6.6583 |
| Standardized Value of S | 1.5019 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 11 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0680 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0666 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 27.4544 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -55,159.0230 |



Sample Date



| ri - | 1 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 6,5828 |
| Standardized Value of S | |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 0 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.5000 |
| Approximate p-value | |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -1.1468 |
|--------------------------|------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 2,454.3149 |





Sample Date



Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| n | 8 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 8.0829 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.6186 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 6 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.2740 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.2681 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | 2.9719 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | -5,557.9995 |



| (|
|---------|
| 0.9500 |
| 0.0500 |
| 6.3770 |
| -2.0386 |
| -14 |
| 0.0150 |
| 0.0207 |
| |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -26.3200 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 53,363.3351 |



| n | 9 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 9,4868 |
| Standardized Value of S | -0.3162 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -4 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.3810 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.3759 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -217.0491 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 439,597.9148 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test SHP-2016-5B



| n | 9 |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 9,3986 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.2128 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 3 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.4600 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.4157 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -0.0252 |
|--------------------------|----------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 674.2121 |



Mann-Kendall Statistical Analysis Plots for NIA Wells Post ATP Extraction Well Installation (March 2006-2020)



Mann-Kendall Trend Test for SHM-05-40X

Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| n | 22 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 35.4354 |
| Standardized Value of S | -4.2895 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -153 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0000 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0000 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -146.1817 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 297,409.5924 |



Mann-Kendall Trend Test for SHM-05-41A

Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| n | 26 |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 45.3468 |
| Standardized Value of S | -3.3519 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -153 |
| Appx, Critical Value (0.05) | -1.6449 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0004 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -1.6618 |
|--------------------------|------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 3,368.5943 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test for SHM-05-41B



Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| n | 32 |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 61.6658 |
| Standardized Value of S | -6.8271 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -422 |
| Appx. Critical Value (0.05) | -1.6449 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0000 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -150.8877 |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 304,944.4059 |



Mann-Kendall Trend Test for SHM-05-41C

| n | 31 |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 58.8359 |
| Standardized Value of S | 0.2040 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | 13 |
| Appx, Critical Value (0.05) | 1.6449 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.4192 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -11.2874 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 23,451.8820 |

Mann-Kendall Trend Test for SHM-05-42B



| n | 26 |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 45.3284 |
| Standardized Value of S | -4.3019 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -196 |
| Appx, Critical Value (0.05) | -1.6449 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0000 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -7.3049 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 14,918.5910 |
Mann-Kendall Trend Test for SHM-99-31C



Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| n | 19 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 28.5307 |
| Standardized Value of S | -4.6616 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -134 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0000 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0000 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -9.4895 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 19,324.2547 |

Statistically significant evidence of a decreasing trend at the specified level of significance.

Mann-Kendall Trend Test for SHM-99-32X



Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| n | 18 |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| Level of Significance | 0.0500 |
| Standard Deviation of S | 26.4008 |
| Standardized Value of S | -4.0908 |
| M-K Test Value (S) | -109 |
| Tabulated p-value | 0.0000 |
| Approximate p-value | 0.0000 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

| OLS Regression Slope | -13.0109 |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| OLS Regression Intercept | 26,313.5466 |

Statistically significant evidence of a decreasing trend at the specified level of significance.

Attachment 3

Arsenic Trend Plots and Mann-Kendall Statistical Analysis Plots for Nearfield Area Wells Pre and Post ATP Extraction Well Installation **Arsenic Trend Plots**



SERES ARCADIS



SERES

ARCADIS

















Mann-Kendall Statistical Analysis Plots for Nearfield Area Wells Pre and Post ATP Extraction Well Installation



SHL-9 Post-ATP Mann-Kendall Trend Test



26

0.9500

0.0500

45.3578

-0.1102

-1.6449

0.4561

-0.1360

304.1699

-6



21

0.9500

0.0500

3.5330

118 0.0000

0.0002

6.2651



SHM-99-22B Pre-ATP Mann-Kendall Trend Test



Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

18

113

SHM-93-22B Post-ATP Mann-Kendall Trend Test



32

0.9500

0.0500

61.6495

-6.3099

-390 -1.6449

0.0000

-185.1359

373,897.5368







Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

| | 18 |
|------------------------|---------|
| onfidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| evel of Significance | 0.0500 |
| tandard Deviation of S | 26.3818 |
| tandardized Value of S | 1.0992 |
| I-K Test Value (S) | 30 |
| abulated p-value | 0.1300 |
| pproximate p-value | 0.1358 |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

OLS Regression Slope80.1627OLS Regression Intercept-157,259.2910

Insufficient statistical evidence of a significant trend at the specified level of significance.



32

0.9500

0.0500

61.6198

-3.7650

-1.6449

0.0001

-88.5188

-233



SHM-96-5C Post-ATP Mann-Kendall Trend Test



| | 26 |
|----------------------------|---------|
| onfidence Coefficient | 0.9500 |
| evel of Significance | 0.0500 |
| tandard Deviation of S | 45.3578 |
| tandardized Value of S | -2.5354 |
| I-K Test Value (S) | -116 |
| ppx. Critical Value (0.05) | -1.6449 |
| pproximate p-value | 0.0056 |
| | |
| | |

OLS Regression Line (Blue)

Mann-Kendall Trend Analysis

OLS Regression Slope -1.7154 OLS Regression Intercept 3,482.8189

Statistically significant evidence of a decreasing trend at the specified level of significance.



Response to Comments



| Proje | ct Name: | Former Fort Devens Army Installation Shepley's Hill Landfill | Date: | 9 December 2021 | |
|-------|--|--|---|---|-------------|
| Loca | tion: Devens, Massachusetts Reviewer: Multiple | | Multiple | | |
| Docu | ment Name: | Technical Memo | | | |
| Prepa | ared By: | Seres Arcadis 8(a) JV | | | |
| No. | Ref. Page / Para. | COMMENTS | 1 | RESPONSE | Disposition |
| | | Carol Keating (EPA) | | | |
| 1. | | In several instances, the memorandum postular naturally-occurring geochemical conditions and arsenic sources are significant contributors to o in groundwater downgradient of the capture zor extraction system. However, no definitive evide provided in support. Given the geologic setting, that groundwater in some areas at the site may concentrations unrelated to the landfill that are above the cleanup level of 10 ug/l. However, it assessment of arsenic concentrations in ground to the landfill (i.e., an assessment of backgroun has been contemplated but not been completed Completion of this study is necessary to provide determine the final remedy for the site. | tes that geogenic bserved arsenic ne of the nce was it is possible support arsenic somewhat is noted that dwater unrelated d conditions) d to date. e data to | The Army has provided support for naturally-occurring geochemical conditions and geogenic arsenic sources that are known contributors to observed arsenic in groundwater downgradient of the ATP on several occasions, most recently in Technical Memo 1, Section 4 (final document submitted on June 11, 2021). Gannett Fleming's 2012 Final Shepley's Hill Bedrock Investigation also contained support for geogenic sources of arsenic. The Army agrees that an assessment of background conditions (i.e., groundwater conditions unrelated to the landfill) is necessary to support an updated Conceptual Site Model (CSM) that will set the stage for the evaluation and selection of an effective remedy in accordance with CERCLA guidelines. Accordingly, the Army proposes to move forward with a Background Conditions Assessment that will be in accordance with the evaluation listed in the Phase 2, Task 2 of the SOW for the Informal Dispute for Shepley's Hill Landfill (SHL). | |



| No. | Ref. Page / | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|----------------|--|--|-------------|
| 2. | | In addition, it should be noted that detection of arsenic at concentrations significantly above the cleanup level in wells screened in bedrock does not necessarily mean there will be sufficient groundwater flux from bedrock to the overlying alluvial aquifer to impact remedial options. For example, wells SHP-2016-6A/B/C are screened in bedrock adjacent to well SHL-23 which is screened in the alluvial aquifer. Arsenic concentrations in groundwater in the bedrock well cluster routinely exceed 500 ug/l. However, arsenic concentrations in the alluvial aquifer well are consistently below the cleanup level (10 ug/l). Also, arsenic concentrations observed in the vertical profile SB-2017-06 of the alluvial aquifer adjacent to this area ranged from undetected at 1.5 ug/l to a maximum of 18 ug/l which are orders of magnitude less than concentrations in the alluvial aquifer from bedrock in this area may be quite limited in terms of the effect on the existing remedy. | It is acknowledged that higher concentrations in the bedrock do not necessarily mean there is sufficient groundwater flux from bedrock to the alluvial aquifer to correspond to high arsenic concentrations in certain portions of the Nearfield Area. However, as noted in previous responses to comments, there are times during the year that groundwater flow is upward from the bedrock to the overburden, as noted below: "Continuous water level monitoring data from 2007 to 2010 in bedrock and overburden wells N5-P1 and N5-P2 located within the landfill footprint (Figure 1.2) indicate seasonal changes in the direction of the vertical gradient at that location (Gannett Fleming 2012). In periods of high recharge and low evapotranspiration (generally winter/spring), the direction of groundwater flow, primarily derived from precipitation recharge on Shepley's Hill, is reported to be upward from the bedrock to the overburden beneath the landfill. In periods of low recharge and high evapotranspiration (generally summer/fall), the direction of groundwater flow is reported to be downward from the overburden sands to the underlying bedrock but with a shallower gradient than is associated with the upward flows observed in the winter/spring. The long- | |



| No. | Ref. Page / Para. | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|-------------------------|--|---|-------------|
| | | | term average head difference indicates a net upward discharge of bedrock groundwater to overburden (Gannett Fleming 2012)." | |
| 3. | | The memorandum repeatedly attempts to dismiss the results of previous hydraulic gradient analyses performed by both USEPA and the Army using the 3PE spreadsheet tool (Beljin and others, 2014) in favor of the predictions of the flow model, which has not been validated, for the purpose of providing a detailed definition of the capture envelope surrounding the extraction wells. The hydraulic gradient analyses using observed hydraulic head data obtained at multiple locations and times indicated that the groundwater flow model appears to overestimate the influence of extraction on hydraulic gradients and overestimate the extent of the capture zone. This conclusion has been reported in previous documents (e.g., S-A JV, 2021a, 2021b) and in the original report describing the updated model (Geosyntec Consultants, 2020). The memorandum provides no analyses or other data to support its contention. It should be noted that the overestimation of the influence of the extraction wells is also evidenced by potentiometric surface maps created using observed hydraulic head data in addition to the 3PE results. The results of hydraulic gradient analyses using observed field data should not be dismissed as proposed in the memorandum. | It is noted that the Army worked extensively with the EPA over a period of four years to develop and calibrate the groundwater model used in this analysis, and that the associated model report was approved by EPA verbally on June 15, 2020 and in a letter dated December 3, 2020. The groundwater model and field data are generally in agreement when estimating the capture zone areas presented in this memorandum and in previous memoranda. The Army concurs that, as noted in the Technical Memo 4 text, the inferred capture zone generated by the groundwater model is slightly larger than that inferred from the 3PE analyses presented in Technical Memos 1 and 2. Figures 2 through 11 of Technical Memo 4 (attached) show a comparison between the model-generated and 3PE generated groundwater flow vectors. These vectors are very similar for most of the 3PE triangles for all 10 time periods that were evaluated from 2016 through 2020. As noted previously, 3PE analysis is a method limited spatially to large triangular areas that uses data for a single point in | |



| No. | Ref. Page / | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|----------------|--|--|-------------|
| | Para. | | time and does not take into account the | |
| | | | complexities of groundwater flow under | |
| | | | pumping conditions. It is Army's opinion | |
| | | | that the SHL groundwater flow model is the | |
| | | | preferred tool for estimating capture extent | |
| | | | because it simulates all aspects of the | |
| | | | groundwater flow regime (including vertical | |
| | | | components of flow adjacent to the | |
| | | | extraction wells where the water table is | |
| | | | sloped) and honors a water mass balance | |
| | | | across the area. | |
| 4. | | The memorandum provided several series of plots of the | The ATP extraction system does have an | |
| | | temporal trends of arsenic in wells within both the Nearfield | impact on arsenic concentrations at many | |
| | | Area and in the North Impact Area as required by the scope of | monitoring wells; however, many of the | |
| | | work. For each plot, Mann-Kendall trend analysis was used to | trends were not statistically significant. The | |
| | | determine whether a statistically significant trend was present. | permanence of the effects in the absence | |
| | | I ne trends relative to operation of the extraction system were | of continuous pumping is not known. As | |
| | | trende relative to apositio flow paths projected by the model | previously noted in Technical Memo T, the | |
| | | However, such an analysis would have been irrelevant since | in site groundwater is primarily dependent | |
| | | the model appears to overestimate the capture envelope and | on redox conditions. As groundwater flows | |
| | | projects complete capture of the contaminant plume migrating | north from the ATP toward Nonacoicus | |
| | | north from the area of the landfill | Brook redox conditions become more | |
| | | The discussion of the contaminant trend analyses correctly | laterally and vertically variable. Based on | |
| | | indicates that many of the wells displayed significant downward | arsenic. DO. and iron results. conditions | |
| | | trends in arsenic concentrations indicating the major influence | within shallow overburden downgradient of | |
| | | of the extraction system on the contaminant plume. In addition, | the ATP and into the NIA were observed to | |
| | | it appears that the system upgrade in 2015 may have had a | be relatively oxidizing, with relatively low | |
| | | significant impact as indicated by the arsenic trends observed | arsenic and iron concentrations. However, | |
| | | at well SHM-10-16 which is located immediately downgradient | at greater depths, conditions were | |
| | | of the capture zone. Prior to the 2015 system upgrade, arsenic | reducing, and arsenic and iron | |
| | | concentrations in this well were increasing. The trend reversed | concentrations were elevated. The | |
| | | and concentrations began to decrease in approximately 2016 | geochemical profiles of iron and arsenic | |
| | | following the increase in extraction rate associated with the | were attributed to the reductive dissolution | |



| No. | Ref. Page / Para. | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|-------------------------|---|--|-------------|
| | | system upgrade. However, concentrations have been relatively stable for the past two to three years. Other wells, such as SHM-05-41B, exhibited similar but less dramatic behavior. Although not definitive, this behavior would be consistent with an increased degree of plume capture associated with the increase in pumping rate in 2015 but still not total containment of the plume. It is also noted that many of the wells that displayed no trend in the data also had arsenic concentrations that were below or close to the cleanup level. Results of the background study would be needed before the behavior of arsenic in these wells could be properly interpreted. | of iron oxides and concurrent release of both arsenic and iron into groundwater upgradient of the NIA. The vertical redox gradient, which changes from more oxic at shallow depths to more reducing at greater depths, potentially reflects the influence of oxic meteoric recharge. The Army intends to conduct a cleanup timeframe evaluation to support an updated CSM that will become part of the FFS for SHL. The cleanup timeframe evaluation will provide the anticipated timeframe to cleanup for arsenic in both Nearfield and NIA monitoring wells under groundwater extraction and other similar hydraulic control and barrier remedy scenarios. Like the previously mentioned Background Conditions Assessment, this evaluation will support the CSM and set the stage for effective evaluation and selection of a remedy, in accordance with CERCLA guidelines. | |
| 5. | | Figure 5 presents the model-generated capture zone surrounding the extraction wells using reverse particle tracks. Although it is difficult to follow individual particle tracks given the scale and label placement in this figure, it appears that the projected particle tracks may not align with observed chemistry is some areas. For example, particle tracks from the area between wells SHM-10-06 and SHM-10-06A appear to pass through well EPA-PZ-2012-3B. This would appear to be unlikely since arsenic concentrations observed at EPA-PZ- 2012-3B are approximately twice the concentrations observed at SHM-10-06 and over an order of magnitude higher than the | Arsenic concentrations at EPA-PZ-2012- 3B (screened from 68.7 to 73.7 ft bgs) have declined from concentrations of nearly 4,000 ppb to below 3,000 ppb from 2012 to 2020. The Mann-Kendall analysis performed on this well found statistically significant evidence of a decreasing trend, indicating this well is likely within the groundwater capture zone, however no data exists at EPA-PZ-2012-3B before the | |



| No. | Ref. Page / Para. | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|-------------------------|--|---|-------------|
| | | highest arsenic concentration measured in the vertical groundwater profile obtained from boring SB-2017-12 located between SHM-10-06 and SHM-10-06A. A complete review of groundwater chemistry in wells located along forward particle tracks generated by the model may provide another line of evidence that the model overestimates the size of the capture zone. | installation of the ATP extraction wells in 2006. Similarly, arsenic concentrations at SHM- 10-06 (69.5 to 79.5 ft bgs) have declined from approximately 2,000 ppb to less than 1,000 ppb from 2010 to 2020. The Mann- Kendall analysis performed on this well found statistically significant evidence of a decreasing trend, indicating this well is likely within the groundwater capture zone, however no data exists at SHM-10-06 before the installation of the ATP extraction wells in 2006. It should be noted as demonstrated by both the groundwater flow model and the 3PE analyses, there is not a direct flow path from SHM-10-06 to EPA-PZ-2012-3B. | |
| 6. | | The memorandum included an estimate of arsenic mass flux across the east-west transect located upgradient of the extraction wells and extending from soil boring SB-2017-06 to well SHL-21. It appears that this may be a useful tool for conceptualizing possible groundwater and arsenic transport in this area. However, uncertainties in the hydraulic conductivity of aquifer materials and, particularly, the detailed distribution of arsenic in groundwater will result in significant uncertainty in the conclusions of this analysis. In particular, the calculated contaminant fluxes through various parts of the aquifer are subject to significant uncertainty due to the high degree of spatial heterogeneity in the subsurface arsenic distribution and the relatively low number of samples available to characterize the contaminant flux. It is recommended that this analysis not | It is acknowledged that the mass-flux calculations as presented in this technical memo have a degree of uncertainty associated with them due to heterogeneity of arsenic and hydraulic conductivity distributions. However, it should be noted the EPA/MassDEP were involved in the development of the SHL groundwater flow model and agreed to the hydraulic conductivity values used in that model (and subsequently used for this analysis). Furthermore, the hydraulic conductivity distribution was based on empirical data (such as slug and pumping tests). | |



| No. | Ref. Page / Para. | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|-------------------------|--|--|-------------|
| | | be accepted as a definitive line of evidence for the existence of major sources of arsenic not associated with the landfill as the discussions in this section of the document imply. The analysis also provided an estimate of the arsenic flux in the area of well SHM-10-06 that may not be captured by the extraction wells. Although the estimated flux through the assumed area is relatively small in comparison with the estimated flux through the rest of the cross section, it is noted that flux is still several pounds per year which can result in significant exceedance of the cleanup level depending on how it is distributed in groundwater. | However, in an effort to quantify the effect of these uncertainties, the mass flux was calculated using three different arsenic concentrations: the geometric mean, the arithmetic mean, and the 95% UCL. This analysis was not intended to be a definitive line of evidence for the existence of major non-landfill associated arsenic sources, but rather to provide an additional line of evidence for evaluation of the efficacy of the current remediation system in conjunction with the other hydrogeologic and geochemical factors presented in the memorandum. Use of mass flux in this manner is a commonly accepted practice in the evaluation of remedy effectiveness at EPA-regulated sites nationwide. As documented in previous comments and submissions, most of the arsenic mass from the landfill is being captured by the ATP extraction wells. Although a small amount of arsenic mass is bypassing the ATP extraction wells, this mass contribution is not sufficient to sustain the elevated arsenic concentrations observed in the NIA. Therefore, there must be other factors that contribute to those concentrations. | |
| 7. | | All data presented to date indicate that the extraction system exerts a major influence on the contaminant plume. In this document, this conclusion is evidenced by the decreasing | As stated in previous comments, there is a geogenic component to elevated arsenic | |



| No. | Ref. Page / | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|------------------------|--|---|-------------|
| | <u>Para.</u> | contaminant trends observed since extraction began and since the system upgrade in 2015. However, all lines of evidence based on field data presented to date are consistent with the conservative interpretation that some of the landfill-impacted groundwater may not always be captured by the extraction wells, especially during times of increased precipitation. Given the available data, it is recommended that additional enhancement to the extraction system, such as increasing the overall extraction rate using a new well(s) located east of EW- 1/EW-4 and/or incorporation of alternative remedial approaches be considered. | concentrations, particularly in the NIA where redox conditions are reducing. Applicable alternative remedial options, including enhancements to the existing groundwater extraction and treatment system, will be evaluated in accordance with CERCLA guidance as part of the upcoming Focused Feasibility Study. | |
| 8. | Page 8, Section 3.3 | Discussion in this section states that the highest arsenic concentration in the North Impact Area between 2016 and 2020 was at well SHM-13-04. This appears to be in error since the data provided in Table 3 indicates that arsenic concentrations during this time period were greater at wells SHM-13-06, SHM- 13-07, and SMH-13-08 than at SHM-13-04. It is recommended that this discussion be corrected for clarity. | The discussion in the text was updated to indicate that arsenic concentrations between 2016 and 2020 was the highest at SHM-13-06. | |
| 9. | Table 5 | Several of the entries in Table 5 do not appear to be supported by the trend analysis plots in Attachment 1. For example, the arsenic trend from 2010 to 2015 at well SHM-05-41B is listed as "Increasing" in the table. However, examination of the Mann- Kendall analysis plot for this well indicates it was decreasing in concentration. Discrepancies were also noted for wells SHM- 05-40X and SHM-13-06. In addition, the plot for well SHM-13- 06 during the period from 2010 to 2015 in Attachment 1 is misidentified. It is recommended that the tables and figures in the finalized document, including the attachments, be checked for errors. | Table 5 had a transcription error and was updated to reflect the trend analyses in Attachment 1. The plot for well SHM-13-06 during the period from 2010 to 2015 in Attachment 1 was updated. Since Figures 3 and 4 used the trend information noted in Table 5 as the basis for the posting, Figures 3 and 4 were also updated. | |
| 10. | Table 6, Figure 5 | Some of the entries in Table 6 do not appear to be supported by the trend analysis plots in Attachment 1 and the data in Table 4. For example, an arsenic concentration trend from 2010 to 2020 at well SHL-23 was calculated to be increasing using measurements that were non-detect according to the | Table 6 had a transcription error and was updated to reflect the trend analyses in Attachment 1. | |



| No. | Ref. Page / Para. | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|--|--|--|-------------|
| | | data presented in Table 4. It appears this well should have been labeled NA in Table 6 and no trend analyzed. The lack of data is correctly labeled for this well in Figure 5. Well SHM-96- 5C is labeled as having a decreasing trend in Table 6 and Figure 5. However, the plot provided for this well in the attachment indicates no statistically significant trend was found. Again, it is recommended that the tables and figures in the finalized document be checked for errors. | | |
| | | David Chaffin (DEP) | | |
| 1. | Section 1.0, Second Paragraph, and Section 1.1, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Paragraphs | Substantial evidence would be required to demonstrate the Army's alternative conceptual site model is more than an argument intended to cast doubt on the potential for groundwater extraction to control and contain arsenic at the site. More specifically, substantial evidence would be required to show that sources other than the landfill – wetlands, natural organic matter deposits, geogenic sources, etc. – contribute significantly to the plume, which otherwise appears to be a typical case of a disposal site mobilizing metals as observed elsewhere at Devens (e.g., AOCs 43G, 57, and 69W) and at landfills across the Commonwealth. | As discussed in the previous responses to comments, groundwater from the bedrock does at times discharge into the overburden and there are naturally reducing conditions (in addition to landfill conditions) which: 1) limit the natural attenuation of arsenic and 2) stabilize naturally occurring arsenic (coming from bedrock and released from overburden sediments) in solution. As has been mentioned in previous documents, there are wetlands/peat areas within the landfill boundary. | |
| 2. | Section 1.0, Sixth Paragraph | MassDEP does not agree with the Army's conclusion that the groundwater model is "better suited" or the "preferred tool" for evaluating capture. On the contrary, the 3PE analyses, which were derived from field measurements, should be used to represent actual site conditions, and the model, which is a mathematical simulation, should be judged by making comparisons to the 3PE analyses. As explained in MassDEP comments on preceding tech memos (e.g., MassDEP Comments 3 and 4 on Tech Memo 4.e), such comparisons indicate that the model is not accurate enough for capture zone analysis. | As noted in the response to EPA Comment 3, the groundwater model and field data are generally in agreement when estimating the capture zone areas presented in this memorandum and in previous memoranda. As noted in the Technical Memo 4 text, the groundwater model inferred capture zone width along the transect between SHL-23 and SHL-21 is approximately 16% larger than that inferred from the 3PE analyses presented | |



| No. | Ref. Page / Para. | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|-------------------------|--|--|-------------|
| | | | in Technical Memos 1 and 2. 3PE analysis is a method limited spatially to large triangular areas that uses data for a single point in time and does not take into account the complexities of groundwater flow under pumping conditions. It is Army's opinion that the SHL groundwater flow model is the preferred tool for estimating capture extent because it simulates all aspects of the groundwater flow regime (including vertical components of flow adjacent to the extraction wells where the water table is sloped) and honors a water mass balance across the area. | |
| 3. | Section 5.2 | MassDEP does not agree with the conclusions presented here: The trend analyses and flux calculations do not support the conclusion that the groundwater model can be viewed as a line of evidence indicating that the capture zone of the extraction wells during 2015 through 2020 was large enough to achieve the stated design objective: "containment of the groundwater plume in the vicinity of the base boundary" On the contrary, as acknowledged here, the trend analyses show that groundwater extraction has significantly reduced arsenic concentrations in downgradient wells screened across the core of the plume. Smaller reductions were observed in wells located horizontally and vertically away from the plume core, and reductions were not observed in more distant wells, and these trends were enhanced after extraction rates were increased in 2015 (Figures 3 and 4, Attachments 1, 2, and 3), but not sufficient to fully capture the plume. Thus, changes in the spatial distribution of arsenic revealed by the trend analyses support the | As discussed in the Technical Memo 4 responses to comments, the key design criterion for the ATP extraction wells, as specified in the 100% Design (CH2MHill 2005) were to "provide containment of the groundwater plume in the vicinity of the base boundary," seek to reduce the design rate of 50 gpm as appropriate, and to focus groundwater extraction in the deeper part of the glacial aquifer". It should be noted the modeling results presented in the final design of the ATP extraction system did not include full capture east of the landfill boundary (between wells SHM-10-06 and SHM-21; Figures A-8 and A-9 of CH2MHill 2005). | |



| No. | Ref. Page / Para. | COMMENTS | | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|-------------------------|--|---|--|-------------|
| | | conclusion that the actual extent of capture during 2015 through 2020 was substantially smaller than predicted by the model. This result is consistent with comparisons of field data-to-model predictions presented in preceding tech memos and reinforces the conclusion that the model overpredicted the extent of capture and is not accurate enough to be used for capture zone analysis (e.g., MassDEP Comments 3 and 4 on Tech Memo 4.e). Regarding the flux estimates, the memo does not include a comparison to field-data-based flux estimates to confirm the flux estimates, and the flux estimates to confirm the quantity of arsenic capture dbecause they were derived from the over-estimated capture zones predicted by the groundwater model. Consequently, the predicted fluxes might be viewed as high-end estimates but cannot be viewed as a line of evidence indicating that the actual capture zones during 2015 through 2020 were large enough to contain the groundwater plume. The statement indicating that continued ATP operation will not result in the achievement of the remedial goals is misleading because of the implication that the groundwater plume in the vicinity of the base boundary cannot be contained by groundwater extraction. While the pump and treat system as operated during 2015 through 2020 did not achieve the remedial goals, this does not mean that the system cannot be modified, expanded, or supplemented to improve capture and achieve the remedial goals. These possibilities, along with alternative technologies, should be considered during the up-coming feasibility study. The statement indicating that the system cannot achieve remedial goals due to downgradient geogenic sources is | • | The mass flux estimates were derived using a combination of the calibrated groundwater flow model generated parameters (such as the hydraulic conductivity distribution and Darcy flow rates), but the arsenic concentrations were derived from field data. The hydraulic conductivity distribution in the calibrated groundwater flow model was also based on field-derived data. The current ATP operation will not result in decreases of arsenic concentrations in the aquifer to MCLs within a reasonable timeframe. As stated above, the Army intends to move forward with a cleanup timeframe evaluation as part of the FFS and Background Conditions Assessment in accordance with Phase II, Task 2 of the SOW for the Informal Dispute for Shepley's Hill Landfill (SHL). Alternative remedial options, including enhancements to the existing pump and treat system, will be evaluated as part of the upcoming Focused Feasibility Study. It is speculative to state that concentrations at SHM-93-22B may have been significantly lower prior to capping. We are not aware of data that would support that statement. Concentrations could have also been higher prior to capping, but we also do | |



| No. | Ref. Page / Para. | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|-------------------------|---|---|-------------|
| | | speculative and the suggested contribution of nearby wetlands is misleading. As explained in comments on preceding tech memos (e.g., MassDEP Comments 4 through 7 on Tech Memo 1.g), site data clearly indicate that the arsenic plume is almost entirely attributable to reducing conditions induced by the landfill. For example, arsenic concentrations at well SHM-93-22B increased from less than 500 ug/L during the late 1990s to more than 3,000 ug/L before groundwater extraction commenced in 2006 (Attachment 3), and the early samples collected from well SHM-93-22B were obtained several years after the site was capped (1986–1992), indicating that concentrations prior to capping may have been significantly lower. In addition, while geogenic sources might contribute to the plume, the magnitude of these contributions is not known; prior studies have not attempted to quantify them. The suggested contribution of nearby wetlands is misleading because the wetlands are not hydraulically connected to the arsenic plume; minor impacts to shallow groundwater might be attributable to the wetlands, but these impacts do not extend into the deep overburden aquifer where the arsenic plume is located. As the upcoming feasibility study approaches, MassDEP looks forward to refocusing work at this site from arguments that cast doubt on the potential for groundwater extraction to contain arsenic at the site to actions that directly address the primary problem at the site: landfill-impacted groundwater migrating from the landfill. | not have the data to support that statement. The conclusions in Section 5.2 did not imply that the wetlands were a source of arsenic, but that the wetlands have naturally reducing conditions which may contribute to increasing arsenic mobilization within the groundwater. We look forward to working with MassDEP on alternative remedial options, including but not limited to groundwater extraction, that will address landfill-impacted groundwater. | |
| 4. | Figure 7 | The elevation of the top of bedrock surface east of well SHL-21 appears to be different than the surface used in the groundwater model. Was the surface used to calculate fluxes | The mass flux was calculated using the bedrock surface in the groundwater model. The bedrock surface in the groundwater | |


| No. | Ref. Page / Para. | COMMENTS | RESPONSE | Disposition |
|-----|-------------------------|---|--|-------------|
| | | altered from that used in the groundwater model? Could a bedrock high be located between SHL-21 and Plow Shop Pond, and if so, how would this affect the flow paths predicted by the groundwater model? Could adjustments to the bedrock surface here improve the match between the capture zones predicted by the model and capture zones indicated by 3PE flow vectors? | model was developed by Geosyntec (see Figure 5.2 of the Geosyntec Groundwater Model Report). The mass flux was calculated along row 76 of the groundwater flow model, where the overburden thickness varied from approximately 60 to 100 ft. The bedrock high on Figure 7 between SHL-21 and Plow Shop Pond is projected onto the cross-section and actually occurs south of the cross-section location at approximately row 85. | |
| | | END OF COMMENTS | | |



















