

## Aufman, Matt

---

**From:** Aufman, Matt  
**Sent:** Monday, April 27, 2015 8:32 AM  
**To:** 'Oliphant, Dave'  
**Cc:** Overgord, Jesse  
**Subject:** RE: Ardee Translite, Cleveland County REC Site: 24-hour notice of the potential for a newly identified receptor to groundwater plume

Hi Dave-

Thank you for the email and voicemail regarding the potential receptor for the off-site plume at the referenced site. I will put your notification in the file. We appreciate the timely notification.

Regards,  
Matt

Matthew Aufman  
Phone: (919) 707-8348  
<http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wm/sf/ihs/recprogram>

**INTERACTIVE MAPS WITH DWM SITES AND PERMITTED FACILITIES:**

<http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wm/gis/maps>

**ONLINE ACCESS TO SUPERFUND SECTION DOCUMENTS:**

<http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wm/sf-file-records>

---

**From:** Oliphant, Dave [mailto:DAVE.OLIPHANT@aecom.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 24, 2015 10:52 AM  
**To:** Aufman, Matt  
**Cc:** Oliphant, Dave; Overgord, Jesse  
**Subject:** RE: Ardee Translite, Cleveland County REC Site: 24-hour notice of the potential for a newly identified receptor to groundwater plume

Matt,

Good morning. Thank you, Kim, and Janet for coming to Asheville yesterday for the REC Program and RSM Annual Information Meeting.

After speaking by phone with the RP representative earlier this morning, I left you a voice mail. I want to make a 24-hour notice of the potential for a newly identified receptor to the off-site groundwater plume related to the Ardee translate facility. I opened the lab report yesterday (just received from lab) before leaving for Asheville, and saw the groundwater result for the first groundwater sample that we collected from the downgradient side of a relatively large creek. The VOC concentrations were non-detect, indicating that there is no evidence that the groundwater plume has migrated under the creek. So, there is the potential (no confirmation and no evidence) that the plume has discharged to the creek at some point in the past, at concentrations exceeding either the 2L standard or the federal MCL.

Here are data and observations details:

1. Three groundwater samples collected nearest the creek (within about 100 feet, which is the closest we can safely get to creek due to embankments), on the facility side of the plume:
  - a. Sample 22 (on north end of plume, showing horizontal bound): Non detect for all VOCs, except chloroform at 0.37J ug/L.

- b. Sample 25 (inside plume): 1,4-dioxane at 2.8 ug/L (2L standard is 3.0 ug/L); 1,1-DCE at 5.6 ug/L (2L standard currently is 350 ug/L, but federal standard is 7 ug/L); so neither of these concentrations exceeds the 2L standard; no other VOCs detected in the sample
- c. Sample 28 (on south end of plume, showing horizontal bound): 0.32J for toluene (assumed lab artifact since found in several other samples)

Note that all concentrations are below the 2L standard

2. One groundwater sample collected on the opposite side of creek from facility:
  - a. Sample 27: no VOCs detected
3. Creek is up to 20 feet wide and maybe 1 to even 2 feet deep in pools in deepest points, so it is a relatively large creek
4. We sampled creek at one point directly downgradient of Sample 25: No VOCs detected in creek sample

#### Inferences:

1. We have no definitive evidence that groundwater concentrations exceeding the 2L standards have entered the creek.
2. It is possible (although there is no past data confirming) that in the past, concentration in groundwater at point 25 were higher than currently, and may have exceeded the 2L standard for 1,4-dioxane. We only have one sample for that location, and that sample is in the middle of the NCDOT highway construction, and that well had to be abandoned after sampling (NCDOT requirement).
3. It is possible that VOCs in the past have discharged to the creek; however, there is no definitive evidence that any VOCs have ever entered the creek.
4. It is most likely that any VOCs discharging to the creek in the past would be diluted to non detect levels quickly, due to the size of the creek.
5. There are no current visible receptors downstream of the potential discharge point. The land appears to be undeveloped and overgrown, probably farmland in the past.

#### Future:

1. We will sample the creek water and sediment in the future, pending getting access to the area from NCDOT, which is unlikely soon; the size of the creek suggests any discharging concentrations in the past or other times would be quickly diluted.

Please let me know if I need to provide any other information at this time.

Dave Oliphant  
AECOM and RSM  
864-380-6950

---

**From:** Aufman, Matt [<mailto:matt.aufman@ncdenr.gov>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2015 2:06 PM  
**To:** Oliphant, Dave  
**Subject:** RE: Ardee Translite, Cleveland County REC Site

Hi Dave-  
I am available any time today. Just call me whenever.  
Matt

Matthew Aufman  
Phone: (919) 707-8348  
<http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wm/sf/ihs/recprogram>

**INTERACTIVE MAPS WITH DWM SITES AND PERMITTED FACILITIES:**