

RECEIVED

OCT 27 1995

COMMUNICATIONS SECTION



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 6
1445 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 1200
DALLAS, TX 75202-2733

George Sylvester
UNIVAR Corp.
32131 Steven Way
Conifer, CO 80433

October 24, 1995

&

Katy Brantingham
Geragty & Miller
8222 So. 48th Street, Suite 140
Phoenix, AZ 85044

RE: 5-year Review
Edmunds Street Superfund Site
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dear George and Katy:

Both Susan Morris, New Mexico Environment Department (NMED), and Bert Gorrod, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), have reviewed the draft 5-Year Review Report prepared by Geragty & Miller, Inc. for the Edmunds Street Superfund Site in the South Valley area in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The report was received on October 11, 1995.

NMED and EPA approve the report as written, except, as we discussed, for the use of the word "voluntary" and the implication of that word's use. Please prepare the final report and distribute it to the appropriate people. It is reminded that an agreement has been made to revise the vertical scale of the "Time Trends in Concentrations" graphs for the influent, effluent, and recovery wells RW-01 through RW-04.

If you have any questions, call me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Herb Gorrod".

Herbert M. Gorrod, RPM
South Valley Superfund Site

cc. Susan Morris, NMED



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 6
1445 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 1200
DALLAS, TX 75202-2733

DEC 14 1995

George Sylvester
UNIVAR Corp.
32131 Steven Way
Conifer, CO 80433

December 7, 1995

&

Katy Brantingham
Geraghty & Miller
8222 So. 48th Street, Suite 140
Phoenix, AZ 85044

RE: 5-year Review
Edmunds Street Superfund Site
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dear George and Katy:

Thank you for submitting the 5-Year Review of the Edmunds Street Superfund Site, South Valley area, Albuquerque, New Mexico in accordance with the Consent Decree of June 1988. Both the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED), and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), have reviewed the 5-Year Review Report prepared by Geraghty & Miller, Inc. for the Edmunds Street Superfund Site. The report was received on November 13, 1995. NMED and EPA approve This 5-Year Review; you may distribute it to your mailing list. From this report, there are certain observations that can be drawn:

1. From the exhibits and maps presented, it is difficult for the average reader to locate the SV-10 area, presumably the source of the ground water contamination. It lies to the east of GM-03.
2. It is not well known but the first indication of ground water contamination in the South Valley area was recognized in 1978 due to unpleasant odors in the Van Waters & Rogers (VWR) well #A-1, a facility water supply well. These odors caused sampling of the nearby City water supply wells.
3. It is difficult to believe the Edmunds Street release could be responsible for contamination in the City well, San Jose #6. The past and present direction of ground water flow does not allow this possibility, although withdrawal in the abandoned City wells CA-28 and CA-29 may have pulled the plume slightly to the northwest.

4. The original design of the infiltration gallery was inadequate. It was necessary to modify the infiltration gallery on several occasions:

- a. Put a bed of gravel below the original gallery to absorb the treated water more easily,
- b. Place an extension on the initial infiltration pipe,
- c. Add a second pipe in the gallery to take more water.

Each of these was designed to increase the volume of water returned to the aquifer.

5. It is note-worthy that it has required 3,933,384 gallons of water to recover one gallon of contaminant.

6. There are no exhibits, similar to Appendices L-N, that show the contaminant movement in the "deeper" zone. However, in viewing the analyses of wells GM-9D, 11D, 14D, and 15D in Table 3, several points should be noted:

- a. In comparing the elevations of the shallow and deep screens in the GM-09, 11, 14, and 15 areas, the difference in the screen depths on the first three is about 60-feet, but the GM-15 has a separation of 94-feet.

Is the GM-15D screened in the same permeable zone as the other three? Stratigraphic dip is to the east, but topography rises to the east; therefore, there could be a 34-foot difference in elevation.

- b. What is the source of contamination in the deeper zone? The GM-15D shows TCE and no PCE. The other deep wells, GM-11D and 14D mostly have PCE, the major contaminant at the Edmunds Street Site and lesser amounts of TCE.

No hazardous substance has been found in GM-09D. It is the most westerly deep well and adjacent to the GM-09S, a shallow well with a high contaminant level. The GM-09D is, also, east of and down-gradient to the primary release area, the SV-10 area.

PCE was the prime contaminant in the GM-11D and 14D. The GM-11D showed PCE from 2/89 to ?. (NOTE: No samples were taken between 8/89 and 4/93.) PCE levels were below the MCL at 15-19 ppb. No PCE was found when sampling resumed in 1993.

PCE was noted in GM-14D from 2/89 to 7/92. The levels increased from 8 ppb, initially, to 71 ppb in 4/91 and then fell below detection levels in

10/92. Based on contaminant presence, it would appear that the hazardous materials in the GM-11D and 14D are connected to the shallower plume at the Edmunds Street Site. If this presumption is correct, the VOCs moved down the stratigraphic section in such a way that the GM-09D was not affected. That would place the source either north or east of GM-09D.

c. The contaminant in the GM-15D is not consistent with the Edmunds Street suite of VOCs. There is no PCE and very low levels of TCE. The TCE did not appear until 10/23 and has maintained a 5-7 ppb level since then. TCE is the primary VOC found in the GE plume to the north and east. There may be an additional, unrecognized, source of TCE in the vicinity.

7. VWR is reminded that they have agreed to revise the vertical scale of the "Time Trends in Concentrations" graphs for all of the monitoring wells. It is necessary to get a better picture of the decline of contaminant levels in the individual wells.

None of the observations above require an answer, but you may respond if you wish. Item #7 is an action item and must be addressed during your next Annual Report. If you have any questions or wish to discuss my observations, please call me.

Sincerely,



Herbert M. Gorrod, RPM
South Valley Superfund Site

cc. Susan Morris, NMED
Baird Swanson, NMED
Kent Bostick, Jacobs Engineering