



Environmental Functional Area
Water, Air, Monitoring & Analysis Group

UCRL-AR-143121-10

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Experimental Test Site 300

Compliance Monitoring Program for the
Closed Building 829 Facility

Annual Report
2010

Author

Michael A. Revelli

**This work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.**

**Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Experimental Test Site 300**

**Compliance Monitoring Program for the
Closed Building 829 Facility**

**Annual Report
2010**



Author

Michael A. Revelli

**Environmental Functional Area
Water, Air, Monitoring & Analysis Group**

Table of Contents

1.0	General Description of the Building 829 (B-829) Facility at Site 300	1
1.1	Description of Site 300	1
1.2	Description of the B-829 Facility	1
2.0	Post-Closure Monitoring and Inspection Activities	1
2.1	Groundwater Monitoring	2
2.2	Inspection and Maintenance	3
3.0	Results of Post-Closure Monitoring and Inspection for CY 2010	3
3.1	Discussion of Monitoring Results	3
3.2	Inspection of B-829 Facility	5
4.0	References	6

Tables

Table 1.	Constituents of concern, typical analytical reporting limit (RL), background concentration limit (CL), and statistical limit (SL) for B-829 Facility monitoring wells W-829-15, W-829-22, and W-829-1938	8
Table 2.	B-829 area well W-829-15, monitoring results for year 2010	10
Table 3.	B-829 area well W-829-22, monitoring results for year 2010	12
Table 4.	B-829 area well W-829-1938, monitoring results for year 2010	14

Figures

Figure 1.	Locations of LLNL Livermore site and Site 300	16
Figure 2.	Location of the closed B-829 Facility at LLNL Site 300	17
Figure 3.	Location of the closed B-829 Facility and monitoring wells at LLNL Site 300.....	18
Figure 4.	B-829 Facility post-closure inspection checklist.....	19
Figure 5.	B-829 Facility monitoring well inspection checklist.....	20

Appendices

Appendix A.	Groundwater Elevation and Constituent of Concern Concentration Plots
Appendix B.	LLNL Site 300 Building 829 Landfill Cap Annual Engineering Inspection
Appendix C.	Acronyms and Abbreviations

1.0 General Description of the Building 829 (B-829) Facility at Site 300

1.1 Description of Site 300

The Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) Experimental Test Site (Site 300), is owned by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and, effective October 1, 2007, has been operated by Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC (LLNS). This site is located in the southern Altamont Hills of the Diablo Range, which is part of the Coast Range Physiographic Province. It is situated about 20 km (12 mi) east of the LLNL main site (**Figure 1**). Site 300 covers an area of approximately 28.3 km² (10.9 mi²) north of Corral Hollow Road (**Figure 2**). Its elevation ranges from about 150 m (490 ft) in the southeast corner to about 530 m (1740 ft) in the northwest area. The western one-sixth of the site lies in Alameda County; the remaining portion is in San Joaquin County. The surrounding land is primarily agricultural. Site 300 is an active Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) site.

1.2 Description of the B-829 Facility

As shown in **Figure 2**, the B-829 Facility is located in the High-Explosives (HE) Process Area Operable Unit in the south-central portion of Site 300. The B-829 Facility, part of the B-829 Complex, was used to thermally treat explosives process waste generated by operations at Site 300 and similar waste from explosives research operations at the LLNL Livermore site. The B-829 Facility was operated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) as an interim status treatment facility. Built in 1955, the B-829 Facility consisted of three separate burn pits, which were constructed in unconsolidated sediments, and an open-air burn unit. The B-829 Facility was closed in 1998, and an impervious cap was constructed over the burn pits as described in the *Final Closure Plan for the High-Explosives Open Burn Treatment Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Experimental Test Site 300 (B-829 Final Closure Plan)* (Mathews and Taffet, 1997).

2.0 Post-Closure Monitoring and Inspection Activities

Monitoring and inspection of the closed burn pits during the post-closure period reflect the prime consideration: to protect human health and the environment by preventing any infiltration of rainwater that may cause the low concentrations of metals, radioactivity (i.e., gross alpha and gross beta), explosive compounds and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in near-surface soils to migrate to groundwater. The design of the post-closure plan was originally presented in Chapter 2 of the *B-829 Final Closure Plan* (Mathews and Taffet, 1997).

In January 2002, LLNL submitted a revised *Post-Closure Permit Application for the B829 Facility* (LLNL, 2001) to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Subsequently, in February 2003, the DTSC issued the *Hazardous Waste Facility Post-Closure Permit for the B829 Facility* (DTSC, 2003), effective April 3, 2003 through April 2, 2013.

LLNL requested a permit modification in April 2005 (LLNL, 2005) to amend the text of the Building 829 Post Closure Operation Plan (formerly known as the "Post Closure Permit Application"). The revised operations plan reflects reductions in monitoring frequency for

wells W-829-15 and W-829-22 as provided in Part III, 4(a) of the permit (DTSC, 2003), and includes statistical limits for constituents of concern consistent with the data contained in the LLNL Site 300 *Compliance Monitoring Program for the Closed Building 829 Facility Annual Report 2004* (Revelli, 2005). On July 20, 2005, DTSC granted LLNL permission to implement these changes immediately (DTSC, 2005). A second modification was requested by LLNL in April 2008 (LLNL, 2008) to update current operations, and DTSC determined that LLNL could implement the five Class 1 changes that do not need DTSC's prior approval (DTSC, 2009).

2.1 Groundwater Monitoring

Based on groundwater samples recovered from boreholes, previous CERCLA remedial investigations determined that the perched groundwater near the B-829 Facility was contaminated with VOCs, primarily trichloroethene (TCE), but that the deeper regional aquifer was free of any contamination stemming from operation of the facility (Webster-Scholten, 1994). Subsequent assays of soil samples obtained from shallow boreholes prior to closure revealed that low concentrations of HE compounds, VOCs, and metals exist beneath the burn pits (Mathews and Taffet, 1997). Conservative transport modeling indicates that the shallow contamination will not adversely impact the regional aquifer, primarily because its downward movement is blocked by more than 100 m (330 ft) of unsaturated Neroly Formation sediments that include interbeds of claystone and siltstone. At this location in the regional aquifer, the flow rate is low; an estimated 0.05 to 0.1 gallons/minute. The groundwater flow velocity is about 20 feet/year, and the direction of flow is approximately ESE.

Beginning in 1999, the dual-purpose, groundwater-monitoring program described in the *B-829 Final Closure Plan* (Mathews and Taffet, 1997) was initiated for this area to track the fate of contaminants in the soil and perched water-bearing zone, and to monitor the deep regional aquifer for the unlikely appearance of any potential contaminants from the closed burn facility. This monitoring program remained in effect through the first quarter of 2003, at which time LLNL began implementation of the provisions specified in the *Hazardous Waste Facility Post-Closure Permit for the B829 Facility* (DTSC, 2003). Following the guidance outlined in the DTSC *Technical Completeness* (DTSC, 2002) assessment, LLNL installed one additional groundwater monitoring well (W-829-1938) at the point of compliance (POC) within 10 ft of the edge of the capped High Explosive Open Burn Treatment Facility. This well was screened in the regional aquifer, beneath the B-829 Facility. Since the first quarter of 2004, and continuing through 2010, well W-829-1938 has been used for quarterly collection of groundwater samples from the regional aquifer, as part of the permit-specified monitoring network (**Figure 3**). Also shown in **Figure 3** are two previously existing wells (W-829-15 and W-829-22), which were each sampled once in 2010, in accordance with the DTSC-approved change in sampling frequency (from quarterly to annually) for these two wells (DTSC, 2005). All samples collected from the B-829 Facility monitoring network wells in 2010 were analyzed for the permit-specified constituents of concern. Constituents of concern, as defined by Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Chapter 15, are waste constituents, reaction products, and hazardous constituents that are reasonably expected to be in or derived from the B829 burn pits. The data obtained during CY 2010 are discussed in **Section 3.1**.

LLNL uses statistical methods consistent with the state regulations [CCR Title 22, Section 66264.97(e)(8)(D)] to accomplish the monitoring and reporting provisions of the post-

closure plan (Mathews and Taffet, 1997). The methodology relies on our ability to establish a background concentration, which is defined as the concentration limit (CL), for each constituent of concern. Additionally, statistically determined limits of concentration (SLs) for the constituents of concern have been calculated from the monitoring data.

The CL and SL values presented in **Table 1** replicate those limits documented in previous annual reports. For wells W-829-15 and W-829-22, established before the permit (DTSC, 2003) was issued, the limits were first included in the 2002 Annual Report (Revelli, 2003). For well W-829-1938, developed in accordance with DTSC requirements (DTSC, 2002), the CLs and SLs were first included in the 2005 Annual Report (Revelli, 2006). These SL values (**Table 1**) served as the limits against which the analytical results from 2010 were compared. The SLs for most constituents of concern in **Table 1** are given as the analytical reporting limits (RLs), because the measurements are below the detection limits for those constituents.

SLs provide the basis for comparison with constituent of concern measurements in subsequent years to identify potential releases to the deep regional aquifer. If a future measurement exceeds an SL, LLNL will implement a method of data verification that involves two discrete retests, in accordance with CCR Section 66264.97(e)(8)(E). If an exceedance is confirmed by either or both of the retests, these results will be interpreted and reported as “statistically significant evidence of a release of the constituent of concern to groundwater.”

2.2 Inspection and Maintenance

The permit (DTSC, 2003) requires that LLNL perform quarterly inspections of the monitoring wells and monthly visual inspections of the closed B-829 Facility (final cover cap, drainage and diversion ditches, groundwater monitoring system, signage, etc.). Additional inspections are required after major rainstorms, significant earthquakes, or other events that may cause substantial damage to the capped facility. Any deficiencies noted, such as erosion of the cover, fissures or low spots, burrowing by animals, and bare areas needing reseeded, are remediated. In addition to these inspections performed by LLNL staff, an independent, California-registered Professional Engineer (PE) must perform an annual engineering inspection. The PE prepares a written inspection report, which includes comments and recommendations, and submits that documentation to LLNL.

3.0 Results of Post-Closure Monitoring and Inspection for CY 2010

3.1 Discussion of Monitoring Results

CY 2010 analytical results for the well locations W-829-15, W-829-22, and W-829-1938 are listed in **Tables 2, 3, and 4**, respectively. The annual sampling required for wells W-829-15 and W-829-22 (DTSC, 2005) was conducted during the second quarter of 2010, while well W-829-1938 was sampled quarterly. Note that all non-detections of constituents are shown in the data tables as being less than (<) the analytical reporting limit.

Appendix A presents graphical depictions of the pre-sampling groundwater elevations (GWE) and concentration trends for all confirmed constituent of concern detections above their respective RLs, for the permit-specified wells (W-829-15, W-829-22, and W-829-1938). Graphs

for the two established wells (W-829-15 and W-829-22) present data accumulated over the last ten years, going back to 2001. The graphs for well W-829-1938, which was installed during CY 2003, present twenty-eight quarters of data; beginning with the first-quarter results from CY 2004.

In addition to the pre-sampling GWE measurements plotted in **Appendix A**, LLNL collects quarterly GWE measurements for the wells in this network as part of a larger, site-wide study. **Tables 2 and 3** include the quarterly results of this GWE study for the two wells in the B-829 network (W-829-15 and W-829-22) that were only sampled once during the year. The GWEs, for any given well, show essentially no fluctuation (approximately one foot or less) across the four quarterly measurements.

LLNL also collects field data for pH, temperature, and specific conductance at the time of sampling. With one exception (discussed below) the CY 2010 field data (see **Tables 2, 3, and 4**) are consistent with results from recent years. Only the 2Q/10 pH value (8.88) at well W-829-1938 fell outside the recorded historical range (6.98 – 8.08) for this parameter. This extreme value is suspect, however; first because the field log sheets indicate a pH range of 7.19 to 7.81 measured during the two days immediately prior to sampling (in conjunction with well purge operations), and second because the pH values recorded during both the 3Q/10 and 4Q/10 sampling events (7.48 and 7.79, respectively) fell well within the historical range. LLNL will continue to monitor the pH at this location and document the results in future annual reports.

As in past years, the concentration trends shown in **Appendix A** generally reflect the natural background variability of the analytes detected at each of the three monitoring well locations. Other than the 2Q/10 barium concentration in well W-829-15 (50 $\mu\text{g/L}$, which remains at approximately twice the originally calculated background concentration) and the 1Q/10 and 3Q/10 concentrations of manganese in well W-829-1938 (<10 $\mu\text{g/L}$ and 25 $\mu\text{g/L}$, respectively, which are less than half the originally calculated background concentration), these metal concentrations are not significantly different from background concentrations (the CLs shown in **Table 1**) for the deep aquifer beneath the HE Process Area. Nevertheless, as shown in the corresponding **Appendix A** plots, these results for barium and manganese are consistent with previously reported values. Two plots, chromium at well W-829-15 and gross beta at well W-829-15, suggest that the more recent data (CY 2003 and beyond) might indicate less variable and slightly lower background values (as compared to the CLs presented in **Table 1**) for these constituents. Similarly, nickel concentrations at well W-829-1938 have remained below the reporting limit (5 $\mu\text{g/L}$) for the last five years, after initial detections in CY 2004 and CY 2005. Of the three wells in this network (W-829-15, W-829-22, and W-829-1938), W-829-15 was the first completed (March 1995) and has the longest operation history. LLNL will continue to monitor for similar trends in background concentrations as additional data become available.

During CY 2010, there were no confirmed constituent of concern detections, above their respective SLs, in groundwater samples from any of the three monitoring wells. Among the inorganic constituents, perchlorate was not detected above its RL in any sample. The metal constituents of concern that were detected in CY 2010 samples all show concentrations below their respective statistical limits (the SLs shown in **Table 1**). All results for gross alpha and gross beta (the radioactive constituents of concern) were below their RL and SL values,

respectively. Neither organic nor explosive constituents of concern were detected in any samples at concentrations above their respective RLs.

3.2 Inspection of the B-829 Facility

During CY 2010, LLNL staff completed fifteen post-closure inspections (twelve routine monthly and three post-rain) of the covered area at the B-829 Facility and four quarterly inspections of the monitoring well network. The monthly inspection checklist form, used during these LLNL inspections, is provided in **Figure 4**. The checklist form used to document the monitoring well inspections, which are required quarterly, is shown in **Figure 5**. All completed forms are retained for three years in the Site 300 Manager's Office files.

The required annual cap inspection by a California-registered Professional Engineer was completed on June 16, 2010. [A copy of the *Building 829 Landfill Cap Annual Engineering Inspection* (Moore, 2010) is included in this report as **Appendix B**.] The inspection included a review of existing documentation on the cap as well as an on-site inspection. With two exceptions (i.e., evidence of two cracks on the west side of the cap, and observed vegetation accumulation and growth), all items required to be inspected under Title 22 of the CCR, Part 66264.228(k) were noted to be in good condition. The annual engineering inspection report contains three recommendations; repair the cracks on the west side of the cap, remove vegetative debris from drainage ditch, and remove vegetative growth from the drainage ditch and repair cracks as necessary. Those recommendations, which encompassed similar observations of weeds noted during the January, June, and July LLNL monthly inspections, were implemented by the Site 300 Manager's Office during CY 2010.

4.0 References

- California Code of Regulations*. Title 22, Section 66264.97(e)(8)(D). State of California, Sacramento, CA.
- California Code of Regulations*. Title 22, Section 66264.97(e)(8)(E). State of California, Sacramento, CA.
- California Code of Regulations*. Title 22, Section 66264.228(k). State of California, Sacramento, CA.
- Department of Toxic Substances Control (2002), *Technical Completeness of Post-Closure Permit Application, Capped High Explosive Open Burn Treatment Facility, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Site 300, EPA ID No. CA-2890090002*. Department of Toxic Substances Control, Berkeley, CA (Letter: October 23, 2002).
- Department of Toxic Substances Control (2003), *Transmittal of Documents Relating to the Final Post Closure Permit Decision for Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Site 300, EPA ID No. CA-2890090002*. Department of Toxic Substances Control, Berkeley, CA (Letter: February 21, 2003).
- Department of Toxic Substances Control (2005), *Class 1 Modifications to Post-Closure Operation Plan, Building 829, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) Site 300, Livermore, California, 94550. EPA ID No. CA-2890090002*. Department of Toxic Substances Control, Berkeley, CA (Letter: July 20, 2005).
- Department of Toxic Substances Control (2009), *Acknowledgement of Five Class 1 Modifications and Denial of Two Requested Permit Modifications U.S. Department of Energy/Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300, Building 829 Post-Closure Permit, Livermore, California, 94551. EPA ID No. CA-2890090002*. Department of Toxic Substances Control, Berkeley, CA (Letter: January 22, 2009).
- Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (2001). *Revisions to the Post-Closure Permit Application for the Building 829 HE Open Burn Treatment Facility – Volume 1* (Revised December 2001). Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA (UCRL-AR-139697-01).
- Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (2005). Letter to the DTSC re: *B-829 High Explosives Open Burn Treatment Facility Post Closure Permit Modification, EPA ID No. CA-2890090002*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), Site 300. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA (PRA05-015, April 21, 2005).
- Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (2008). Letter to the DTSC re: *Modifications to the Building 829 Post-Closure Operation Plan, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300, Tracy, California – EPA ID No. CA-2890090002*. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA (PRA07-121, April 28, 2008).
- Mathews, S., and M. J. Taffet (1997). *Final Closure Plan for the High-Explosives Open Burn Treatment Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Experimental Test Site 300*. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA (UCRL-ID-111753 Rev.1).
- Moore, W. W. (2010). *LLNL Site 300 Building 829 Landfill Cap Annual Engineering Inspection*. Abri Environmental Engineering, Inc., Livermore, CA (Report: June 2010).

- Revelli, M. A. (2003). *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 – Compliance Monitoring Program for the Closed Building 829 Facility – Annual Report 2002*. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA (UCRL-AR-143121-02).
- Revelli, M. A. (2005). *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 – Compliance Monitoring Program for the Closed Building 829 Facility – Annual Report 2004*. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA (UCRL-AR-143121-04).
- Revelli, M. A. (2006). *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 – Compliance Monitoring Program for the Closed Building 829 Facility – Annual Report 2005*. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA (UCRL-AR-143121-05).
- Webster-Scholten, C. P., ed. (1994). *Final Site-Wide Remedial Investigation Report, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA (UCRL-AR-108131).

Table 1. Constituents of concern, typical analytical reporting limit (RL), background concentration limit (CL)^a, and statistical limit (SL)^b for B-829 Facility monitoring wells W-829-15, W-829-22, and W-829-1938.

Constituent of concern	Typical analytical RL	Unit of measure	Well W-829-15		Well W-829-22		Well W-829-1938	
			CL	SL	CL	SL	CL	SL
Antimony	5	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Arsenic	2	μg/L	17	22	<2.9	2.9	26	42
Barium	25	μg/L	26	75	<RL	RL	22	30
Beryllium	0.5	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Cadmium	0.5	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Chromium	1	μg/L	2.2	7.8	0.9	1.5	0.8	3.9
Cobalt	25	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Copper	10	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Lead	2	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Manganese	10	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	63	150
Mercury	0.2	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Molybdenum	25	μg/L	24	27	<RL	RL	23	32
Nickel	5	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	4.9	19
Selenium	2	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Silver	0.5	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Vanadium	25	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Zinc	20	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	11	30
Perchlorate	4	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL

(continued)

Table 1. Constituents of concern, typical analytical reporting limit (RL), background concentration limit (CL)^a, and statistical limit (SL)^b for B-829 Facility monitoring wells W-829-15, W-829-22, and W-829-1938 (concluded).

Constituent of concern	Typical analytical RL	Unit of measure	Well W-829-15		Well W-829-22		Well W-829-1938	
			CL	SL	CL	SL	CL	SL
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
1,1-Dichloroethene	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
1,2-Dichloroethane	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Benzene	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Carbon disulfide	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Chloroform	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Dichlorodifluoromethane	2	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Ethylbenzene	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Freon 113	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Tetrachloroethene	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Toluene	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Total xylene isomers	2	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Trichloroethene	0.5	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Trichlorofluoromethane	1	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	5	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Phenols	5	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
HMX	1.0	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
RDX	1.0	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
TNT	5.0	μg/L	<RL	RL	<RL	RL	<RL	RL
Gross alpha	0.074	Bq/L	0	0.123	0	RL	0.01	0.11
Gross beta	0.11	Bq/L	1.81	3.77	0.27	0.43	0.42	0.55

^a CL is defined as the average background concentration of a constituent of concern.

^b SL is defined as the concentration of a constituent of concern, above which an exceedance occurs.

Table 2. B-829 area deep well W-829-15, monitoring results for year 2010.

(Constituent detections, when printed in bold, are discussed in the text.)

Constituents	Sampling dates 2010			
	1/27/2010 ^a	4/15/2010	7/21/2010 ^a	10/28/2010 ^a
Field Data (units)				
Groundwater elevation (feet)	696.7	696.8	697.7	697.0
pH (pH Units)		8.21		
Temperature (degrees Celsius)		23.6		
Specific conductance ($\mu\text{mho/cm}$)		1042		
Inorganic ($\mu\text{g/L}$)				
Antimony		< 5		
Arsenic		18		
Barium		50		
Beryllium		< 0.5		
Cadmium		< 0.5		
Chromium		< 1		
Cobalt		< 25		
Copper		< 10		
Lead		< 2		
Manganese		< 10		
Mercury		< 0.2		
Molybdenum		25		
Nickel		< 5		
Selenium		< 2		
Silver		< 0.5		
Vanadium		< 25		
Zinc		< 20		
Perchlorate		< 4		
Turbidity (NT Units)		0.29		
Organic ($\mu\text{g/L}$)				
1,1,1-Trichloroethane		< 1		
1,1-Dichloroethene		< 1		
1,2-Dichloroethane		< 1		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene		< 1		
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene		< 1		
1,2-Dichloroethene (total)		< 1		
Benzene		< 1		
Carbon disulfide		< 1		
Chloroform		< 1		
Dichlorodifluoromethane		< 2		
Ethylbenzene		< 1		
Freon 113		< 1		
Tetrachloroethene		< 1		
Toluene		< 1		
Total xylene isomers		< 2		
Trichloroethene		< 0.5		
Trichlorofluoromethane		< 1		
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate		< 5		
Phenol		< 5		

(continued)

Table 2. B-829 area deep well W-829-15, monitoring results for year 2010 (concluded).
(Constituent detections, when printed in bold, are discussed in the text.)

Constituents	Sampling dates 2010			
	1/27/2010 ^a	4/15/2010	7/21/2010 ^a	10/28/2010 ^a
Explosive ($\mu\text{g/L}$)				
HMX		< 1		
RDX		< 1		
TNT		< 5		
Radioactive (Bq/L)^b				
Gross alpha		0.030 \pm 0.041		
Gross beta		0.61 \pm 0.13		

^a No sampling required other than measurement of groundwater elevation (GWE).

^b Radioactivity results in Becquerels/liter (Bq/L) are shown as the reported sample radioactivity and associated 2σ counting errors.
(Divide these values by 0.037 to convert them to picocuries/liter.)

The reported value is negative when the measured sample radioactivity is less than the measured background activity.

The result is zero when the measured sample radioactivity is equal to the measured background activity.

Table 3. B-829 area deep well W-829-22, monitoring results for year 2010.

(Constituent detections, when printed in bold, are discussed in the text.)

Constituents	Sampling dates 2010			
	1/27/2010 ^a	4/15/2010	7/6/2010 ^a	10/28/2010 ^a
Field Data (units)				
Groundwater elevation (feet)	653.0	652.9	652.8	652.5
pH (pH Units)		8.45		
Temperature (degrees Celsius)		25.1		
Specific conductance ($\mu\text{mho/cm}$)		1018		
Inorganic ($\mu\text{g/L}$)				
Antimony		< 5		
Arsenic		< 2		
Barium		< 25		
Beryllium		< 0.5		
Cadmium		< 0.5		
Chromium		< 1		
Cobalt		< 25		
Copper		< 10		
Lead		< 2		
Manganese		< 10		
Mercury		< 0.2		
Molybdenum		< 25		
Nickel		< 5		
Selenium		< 2		
Silver		< 0.5		
Vanadium		< 25		
Zinc		< 20		
Perchlorate		< 4		
Turbidity (NT Units)		< 0.1		
Organic ($\mu\text{g/L}$)				
1,1,1-Trichloroethane		< 1		
1,1-Dichloroethene		< 1		
1,2-Dichloroethane		< 1		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene		< 1		
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene		< 1		
1,2-Dichloroethene (total)		< 1		
Benzene		< 1		
Carbon disulfide		< 1		
Chloroform		< 1		
Dichlorodifluoromethane		< 2		
Ethylbenzene		< 1		
Freon 113		< 1		
Tetrachloroethene		< 1		
Toluene		< 1		
Total xylene isomers		< 2		
Trichloroethene		< 0.5		
Trichlorofluoromethane		< 1		
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate		< 5		
Phenol		< 5		

(continued)

Table 3. B-829 area deep well W-829-22, monitoring results for year 2010 (concluded).
(Constituent detections, when printed in bold, are discussed in the text.)

Constituents	Sampling dates 2010			
	1/27/2010 ^a	4/15/2010	7/6/2010 ^a	10/28/2010 ^a
Explosive ($\mu\text{g/L}$)				
HMX		< 1		
RDX		< 1		
TNT		< 5		
Radioactive (Bq/L)^b				
Gross alpha		-0.005 \pm 0.035		
Gross beta		0.17 \pm 0.07		

^a No sampling required other than measurement of groundwater elevation (GWE).

^b Radioactivity results in Becquerels/liter (Bq/L) are shown as the reported sample radioactivity and associated 2σ counting errors.

(Divide these values by 0.037 to convert them to picocuries/liter.)

The reported value is negative when the measured sample radioactivity is less than the measured background activity.

The result is zero when the measured sample radioactivity is equal to the measured background activity.

Table 4. B-829 area deep well W-829-1938, monitoring results for year 2010.

(Constituent detections, when printed in bold, are discussed in the text.)

Constituents	Sampling dates 2010			
	1/14/2010	4/15/2010	7/15/2010	10/21/2010
Field Data (units)				
Groundwater elevation (feet)	706.4	706.6	706.8	706.5
pH (pH Units)	7.39	8.88^a	7.48	7.79
Temperature (degrees Celsius)	20.3	18.40	21.4	21.9
Specific conductance ($\mu\text{mho/cm}$)	1073	1076	1052	1050
Inorganic ($\mu\text{g/L}$)				
Antimony	< 5	< 5	< 5	< 5
Arsenic	24	28	26	22
Barium	< 25	28	28	29
Beryllium	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5
Cadmium	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5
Chromium	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Cobalt	< 25	< 25	< 25	< 25
Copper	< 10	< 10	< 10	< 10
Lead	< 2	< 2	< 2	< 2
Manganese	< 10	56	25	61
Mercury	< 0.2	< 0.2	< 0.2	< 0.2
Molybdenum	< 25	< 25	< 25	< 25
Nickel	< 5	< 5	< 5	< 5
Selenium	< 2	< 2	< 2	< 2
Silver	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5
Vanadium	< 25	< 25	< 25	< 25
Zinc	< 20	< 20	< 20	< 20
Perchlorate	< 4	< 4	< 4	< 4
Turbidity (NT Units)	0.15	0.23	0.27	0.52
Organic ($\mu\text{g/L}$)				
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
1,1-Dichloroethene	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
1,2-Dichloroethane	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Benzene	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Carbon disulfide	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Chloroform	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Dichlorodifluoromethane	< 2	< 2	< 2	< 2
Ethylbenzene	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Freon 113	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Tetrachloroethene	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Toluene	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Total xylene isomers	< 2	< 2	< 2	< 2
Trichloroethene	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5
Trichlorofluoromethane	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	< 5	< 5	< 5	< 5
Phenol	< 5	< 5	< 5	< 5

(continued)

Table 4. B-829 area deep well W-829-1938, monitoring results for year 2010 (concluded).
(Constituent detections, when printed in bold, are discussed in the text.)

Constituents	Sampling dates 2010			
	1/14/2010	4/15/2010	7/15/2010	10/21/2010
Explosive ($\mu\text{g/L}$)				
HMX	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
RDX	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
TNT	< 5	< 5	< 5	< 5
Radioactive (Bq/L)^b				
Gross alpha	0.031 \pm 0.040	0.006 \pm 0.027	0.008 \pm 0.038	0.004 \pm 0.038
Gross beta	0.25 \pm 0.07	0.47 \pm 0.10	0.36 \pm 0.08	0.37 \pm 0.09

^a As discussed in the text, this data point has been flagged as suspect.

^b Radioactivity results in Becquerels/liter (Bq/L) are shown as the reported sample radioactivity and associated 2σ counting errors. (Divide these values by 0.037 to convert them to picocuries/liter.)

The reported value is negative when the measured sample radioactivity is less than the measured background activity.

The result is zero when the measured sample radioactivity is equal to the measured background activity.




Figure 1. Locations of LLNL Livermore site and Site 300.




Figure 2. Location of the closed B-829 Facility at LLNL Site 300.




Figure 3. Location of the closed B-829 Facility and monitoring wells at LLNL Site 300.

Post-Closure Inspection Checklist

Location: _____ Inspector's name: _____

Date: _____ Inspector's signature: _____

Time: _____ Site 300 EA signature and date: _____

Condition of the facility	Condition as described?	If correction needed, describe condition and needed repairs.	Corrections completed?	Date completed
DESCRIPTION	Yes / No	INSPECTOR'S COMMENTS	Y/N	DATE
1. Cap is in good condition.				
a. No settlement or gullying observed.				
b. No surface erosion visible.				
c. No fissures visible.				
d. No cracks visible.				
e. No low spots visible.				
f. No animal burrows visible.				
g. No bare spots observed.				
h. No subsidence observed.				
i. No vegetation beyond topsoil layer observed.				
2. Runoff is diverted away from the cap.				
3. Erosion controls are present and in good condition (i.e, grading, vegetation, and clear diversion channels).				
4. Permanent, surveyed benchmarks are present and maintained.				
5. Groundwater monitoring network is in good working order.				
a. Well label is intact and legible.				
b. Surface seal is intact.				
c. No evidence of damage (i.e, settlement, pipe tilting, poor protective pipe condition, standing water around the pipe, etc.) is observed.				
6. Warning sign is in place.				
7. Emergency Coordinator's name and phone number posted.				
8. Communications are in good working order.				
9. Access available to emergency vehicles.				
10. Copy of Post-Closure Plan is on file at Site 300.				
11. Other observations attached.				

LS:KF:mt

Figure 4. B-829 Facility post-closure inspection checklist.

B829 Monitoring Well Inspection Checklist

Well No.	Is Well No. clearly marked?	Is surface seal intact?	Is well capped & locked ?	Is there evidence of damage?	Is there settlement?	Is there standing water?	Is reference point marked?
829-15							
829-22							
829-1938							

Comment Log

Well No.	Comments/Repair(s) Needed	Nature of Repair	Date Repair Completed	Completed by (name)
829-15				
829-22				
829-1938				

Form date: 5/5/06, rev.1

Inspection date: _____

Time: _____

Inspector name: _____

Signature: _____

Figure 5. B-829 Facility monitoring well inspection checklist.

Appendix A

**Groundwater Elevation and
Constituent of Concern Concentration Plots**

Appendix A

Groundwater Elevation and Constituent of Concern Concentration Plots

As required by the monitoring and reporting provisions of 22 CCR 66264.97(e), this appendix presents graphical depictions of groundwater elevations and concentration trends. Concentration-versus-time plots have been prepared for all confirmed constituent of concern (COC) detections above their respective analytical reporting limits (RLs), for the permit-specified wells. The graphs for the two established wells (W-829-15 and W-829-22) present data accumulated over the last ten years, going back to 2001. The graphs for well W-829-1938, first monitored in CY 2004, present the twenty-eight quarters of data available.


The sequence of graphs is by parameter (groundwater elevation, concentration, or activity) and by well. Graphs show the reported parameter on the y-axis, with time on the x-axis (time in years is divided into quarterly sample periods). The header and the vertical axis labels on each plot give the units of measurement. Statistical limits of concentration (SLs) are shown on the COC graphs as horizontal dotted lines. The numerical value of an SL is also given in the plot legend. Three different symbols are used to plot the COC data: a black diamond, an inverted white triangle, and a plus sign. Their different uses are explained below.

COC detections are plotted as black diamonds. Analytical laboratories report COC measurements above RLs as detections. (The RL for a COC is a contractual concentration value near zero.) COC concentrations below RLs are non-detections and are reported as "less than the RL." For non-radioactive COCs, non-detections are assigned RL values and appear as inverted white triangles in the data graphs.


Non-detections of radioactive COCs, however, are treated differently. The reported value for radioactive COCs is the measured sample radioactivity minus the measured background radioactivity. When the result of this calculation is less than the RL, the value is plotted as a plus sign, indicating an estimated non-detection. (Note that the calculated value may be negative, or zero, if the measured sample radioactivity is less than, or equal to, the measured background activity.) When the reported activity is greater than the RL, the value is plotted as a black diamond, indicating a radioactive COC detection.

Building 829 GW Elevation (Feet)

Monitoring Point W-829-15






Monitoring Point W-829-22






Building 829 GW Elevation (Feet)



Monitoring Point W-829-1938









































Appendix B

LLNL Site 300

Building 829 Landfill Cap

Annual Engineering Inspection

Abri Environmental Engineering, Inc.

Environmental Management and Compliance Consultants

LLNL SITE 300 BUILDING 829 LANDFILL CAP ANNUAL ENGINEERING INSPECTION

June 2010

CERTIFICATION

Based on the information reviewed, I certify that this annual inspection and evaluation report fairly describes the condition of the closed Building 829 Landfill.

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete.



William W. Moore, P.E.
California Civil Engineer, No. 18,340

6/30/10

Table of contents

Executive Summary	1
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Inspection Observations and Recommendations	2
2-1. Condition of Access Control (Fences, Gates and Warning Signs)	2
2-2 Condition of Vegetation	2
2-3 Erosion	2
2-4 Cracking	2
2-5 Disturbance by Adverse Weather	2
2-6 Seepage.....	2
2-7 Slope Stability.....	3
2-8 Subsidence	3
2-9 Settlement	3
2-10 Condition of Groundwater Monitoring System	3
2-11 Condition of Run-On and Run-Off Control Systems	3
2-12 Condition of Surveyed Benchmarks	3
2-13 Burrowing Animals.....	3
2-14 List of recommendations for Building 829 Landfill.....	3

Figures

<i>Figure 1 LLNL Location Map</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Figure 2 Building 829 Landfill Location Map</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Figure 3 Building 829 Landfill Warning Signs.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Figure 4 Building 829 Vegetation Condition Over the Cap</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Figure 5 Crack On the West Side of the Cap.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Figure 6 Crack On the West Side of the Cap.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Figure 7 Building 829 Vegetative Debris Accumulation and Growth in Concrete Drainage Ditch</i>	<i>8</i>

Executive Summary

Abri Environmental Engineering has performed the annual inspection of the Building 829 landfill cap at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) Site 300 located near the City of Tracy. Mr. William W. Moore, P.E., conducted this annual inspection on June 16, 2010. Mr. Moore is a California Registered Civil Engineer, with extensive experience in civil engineering, and hazardous waste management.

This report has been prepared consistent with the scope of work, dated February 25, 2010 and in compliance with 22CCR Section 66264.228(K). The report is based on the observations made during the inspection and review of the documents listed in section 1.0.

Building 829 Landfill cap is in good condition. The vegetation cover is thick and covers the soil cap over the pits; there is no visible erosion of the cap; and the drainage system is in good condition and appears to be functioning as intended. The groundwater monitoring system appears to be in good condition as well. Evidence of two approximately two-foot and eight-foot cracks in the West side of the cap, vegetation accumulation and growth were observed. Recommendations on these observations are made in section 2-14.

1.0 Introduction

LLNL Site 300, EPA ID Number CA2890090002, is owned by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and is operated jointly by the Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC (LLNS) and DOE. The site comprises approximately 7,000 acres of largely undeveloped land and is primarily used as an explosives test facility. Site 300 is located 15 miles southeast of the LLNL Livermore Site, and 6 miles southwest of downtown City of Tracy, California, see Figure 1. About one-sixth of the site is in Alameda County and the balance is in San Joaquin County.

Building 829 landfill area is located in the southeastern side of Site 300, See Figure 2. Building 829 area was used to burn explosives and explosive contaminated wastes at the HE Open Burn Treatment Facility. In 1997 LLNL closed the facility according to a DTSC approved RCRA closure plan. As a result, the area was closed as a landfill with an engineered cap consisting of a minimum of 2 ft compacted general fill, a layer of geosynthetic material and a minimum of 2 ft vegetative soil.

The inspection of the cap included walking the surface and perimeter of the cap. Weather conditions were sunny, temperatures in low 80's degree F with winds of about 5-10 miles per hour.

In conjunction with the inspection, the following project files and documents were reviewed:

- Closure Plan for the High-Explosives Open Burn Treatment Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Experimental Test Site 300, dated July 1993,
- Specification PCS-1227, Site 300 Building 829 HE Burn Pits Closure, dated September 1997,
- Annual Pit Survey Data from 2001 to 2009,
- B829 Monitoring Well Inspection Checklists, dated July 6, 2009, October 6, 2009, January 14, 2010 and April 6, 2010.
- Monthly Post-Closure Inspection Checklists, dated June 3, 2009 until May 6, 2010.

2.0 Inspection Observations and Recommendations

The inspection of the cap included walking the surface and perimeter of the cap. The following sections describe the condition and recommendations.

The landfill has a 3 ft high retaining wall at the southwest corner of the cap. The wall appears to be in good condition and appears to be performing as intended.

2-1. Condition of Access Control (Fences, Gates and Warning Signs)

LLNL Site 300 is a highly secured site with around the clock armed guards and perimeter fence. The entrance to the site is on Corral Hollow Road, which is secured by gates, fences and armed guards. Warning signs in English are posted adjacent to the pit, see Figure 3.

2-2 Condition of Vegetation

The landfill is covered with thick and well-established vegetation, see Figure 4.

2-3 Erosion

There was no erosion visible on the site.

2-4 Cracking

There were two "dry out" cracks approximately 1.5 feet and 8 feet in length visible on the west side of the cap, see Figures 5 and 6. No other cracking or other desiccation of the cover was visible during the site visit.

2-5 Disturbance by Adverse Weather

No erosion or other evidence of disturbance/damage due to adverse weather (i.e. freezing and thawing) was observed at the site.

2-6 Seepage

No evidence of seepage or discharge was observed beyond the existing collection structures at the facility.

2-7 *Slope Stability*

No indication of slope instability was observed. There was no sign of slumping or shallow, localized failure.

2-8 *Subsidence*

No evidence of subsidence was observed over the pit.

2-9 *Settlement*

Results of the annual pit survey data from 2001 to 2009 showed maximum settlement of 0.18 feet.

2-10 *Condition of Groundwater Monitoring System*

No evidence of compromise in structural integrity of the groundwater monitoring wells was observed.

2-11 *Condition of Run-On and Run-Off Control Systems*

Surface runoff diversion structures consist of a perimeter drainage V-ditch. The V-ditch has expansion joints every 12 ft and every other one is caulked. The remaining expansion joints appear to be saw cuts partially onto the surface of the concrete. The structure also collects water from the "drainage layer" of the cap through a series of drainage pipes. Concrete lining appears to be in good condition. Evidence of vegetation growth and debris accumulation in the drainage ditch were observed, see Figure 7. It is recommended that vegetative debris and growth be removed and cracks in the concrete ditch sealed as necessary.

2-12 *Condition of Surveyed Benchmarks*

The settlement markers appeared to be in good condition. One of the ten tubes locating the settlement markers was laying on the ground at the time of the inspection, and because of the thick vegetation, the team was not able to locate the settlement marker. However, the surveyors confirmed that the settlement marker was present in 2009 and made measurements as indicated by data reviewed by Abri Environmental Engineering staff.

2-13 *Burrowing Animals*

A few shallow small burrowing animal holes, approximately 3 inches in diameter were observed.

2-14 *List of recommendations for Building 829 Landfill*

- Repair the cracks on the west side of the cap.
- Remove vegetative debris from the drainage ditch.
- Remove vegetative growth from the drainage ditch and repair cracks as necessary.




Figure 1 LLNL Location Map




Figure 2 Building 829 Landfill Location Map



Figure 3 Building 829 Landfill Warning Signs



Figure 4 Building 829 Vegetation Condition Over the Cap



Figure 5 Crack On the West Side of the Cap



Figure 6 Crack On the West Side of the Cap



Figure 7 Building 829 Vegetative Debris Accumulation and Growth in Concrete Drainage Ditch

Appendix C

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Appendix C

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CCR	California Code of Regulations
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act
CL	concentration limit
COC	constituent of concern
CY	calendar year
DOE	Department of Energy
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
GWE	groundwater elevation
HE	high explosives
LLC	Limited Liability Corporation
LLNL	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
LLNS	Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC
PE	Professional Engineer
POC	point of compliance
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RL	reporting limit
SL	statistically determined limit of concentration
TCE	trichloroethene
VOC	volatile organic compound



Environmental Functional Area, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
P.O. Box 808, L-627, Livermore, California 94551

What This Is

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Monitoring of the Building 829 Facility, Site 300 Annual Report for 2010

1. Driver and purpose of document:

This document complies with the reporting requirements identified in the *Post-Closure Permit Application* (UCRL-AR-139697-01) and in the *Final Closure Plan for the Building 829 (B-829) Facility* (UCRL-ID-111753 Rev.1). The report documents the results of Calendar Year (CY) 2010 groundwater sampling, collected from the wells that constitute the monitoring network for the B-829 Facility. The report also documents the facility inspections, conducted by LLNL staff, and an annual inspection, conducted by an independent, California-registered Professional Engineer. The primary recipient is: Mr. Alfred Wong, Team Leader for the Used Oil and Tanks Team, Department of Toxic Substances Control.

2. Commitments made in this document:

No new commitments.

3. Key findings:

There were no confirmed detections above statistical limits (SLs) for any of the permit-specified constituents of concern in the CY 2010 groundwater samples from the three wells in the B-829 network.

4. Due date:

March 1, 2011; however, the Blue Folder due date is set 5 days in advance to allow for delivery of the report prior to the due date.

5. Technical reviewers:

Stan Terusaki, Permits and Regulatory Affairs Division
Vic Madrid, Environmental Restoration Department
Karen Folks, Site 300

6. Name and number of responsible analyst:

If you have any questions on this document, please call Mike Revelli at ext. 2-1982.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report also reflects the work of the following individuals/organizations:

Eric Walter & ERD's Site 300 Sampling Team – Sample Collection
Della Burrus and Connie Wells – ERD Data Management
Stan Terusaki – Regulatory Liaison with DTSC
Don MacQueen – Statistical Analyses

Certification

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Monitoring of the Building 829 Facility, Site 300 Annual Report for 2010

The undersigned certifies that the information contained in this report is true and correct to the best of his knowledge.



Michael A. Revelli, Environmental Scientist
Water, Air, Monitoring & Analysis Group



Date

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, and accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."



Gretchen Gallegos, Group Leader
Water, Air, Monitoring & Analysis Group



Date

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY & HEALTH

Environmental Functional Area

Water, Air, Monitoring & Analysis

Action Item(s)

ES&H # _____

EFA # AI11-005

Due:
3/1/11

Document ID #

WAMA11:014

**Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Monitoring of the Building 829 Facility,
Site 300, Annual Report for 2010 (UCRL-AR-143121-10)**

Document Name

**Mr. Alfred Wong, Team Leader for the Used Oil and Tanks Team,
Department of Toxic Substances Control**

Submitted To

(Thurs) Feb 24, 2011

Processing Due Date

[Signature]
Michael A. Revelli, Environmental Scientist

2/2/11
Date Signed

[Signature]
Chris G. Campbell, Environmental Scientist

2/3/11
Date Signed

[Signature]
Gretchen Gallegos, Group Leader (WAMA)

2/3/11
Date Signed

[Signature]
Concurrent Review

2/7/11
Date Signed

Victor M. Madrid, California Registered Geologist

[Signature]
Concurrent Review

2/7/11
Date Signed

Leslie S. Ferry, Site 300 Restoration Project Leader

2/9/11
Date Signed

[Signature]
John E. Scott, Site 300 Site Manager

2/9/11
Date Signed

Document(s) to be signed by: Bruce Schultz, Environmental Functional Area Manager

*****Please do NOT forward to the next person*****

Contact Rosie Depue @ 4-6505 for pick-up/coordination.

Thank you.

Sent to Recipient(s) <u>2-24-11</u> FedX <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cert Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Reg Mail <input type="checkbox"/>	IM Review <input type="checkbox"/> <u>470651</u> Draft <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>2/11/11</u> Final <input type="checkbox"/>	EPDdocs <input type="checkbox"/> Categ. # _____
Paper copy distribution <input type="checkbox"/> _____ Email Transmittal <input type="checkbox"/> _____	Scan/PDF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>2-23-11</u>	Final File(s) on Server <input type="checkbox"/> _____ (Primary _____ Alternate _____)