



**NAVFAC**  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command

**ENGINEERING SERVICE CENTER**  
Port Hueneme, California 93043-4370

# **TECHNICAL REPORT**

## **TR-2341-ENV**

### **Final Technical Report**

### **DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION OF A**

### **REGENERATED CELLULOSE DIALYSIS**

### **MEMBRANE DIFFUSION SAMPLER**

### **FOR MONITORING GROUND WATER QUALITY**

### **AND REMEDIATION PROGRESS**

### **AT DoD SITES FOR PERCHLORATE AND**

### **EXPLOSIVES COMPOUNDS (ER-0313)**

by

U.S. Geological Survey, Trenton, NJ  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command Engineering Service Center, Port Hueneme, CA

September 30, 2010

---

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.



| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE   |             |   |                            | Form Approved<br>OMB No. 0704-0811                             |   |
|---|-------------|---|----------------------------|--|---|
| <p>The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information, if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p><b>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</b></p>  |             |   |                            |  |   |
| 1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)<br><b>SEPTEMBER 2010</b>  |             | 2. REPORT TYPE<br><b>TECHNICAL REPORT - FINAL</b> |                            | 3. DATES COVERED (From - To)                                   |   |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE<br><b>FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT<br/> DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION OF A REGENERATED<br/> CELLULOSE DIALYSIS MEMBRANE DIFFUSION SAMPLER<br/> FOR MONITORING GROUND-WATER QUALITY AND<br/> REMEDATION PROGRESS AT DOD SITES FOR<br/> PERCHLORATE AND EXPLOSIVES COMPOUNDS (ER-0313)</b>   |             |   |                            | 5a. CONTRACT NUMBER  |   |
|   |             |   |                            | 5b. GRANT NUMBER   |   |
|   |             |   |                            | 5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER                                     |   |
|   |             |   |                            | 5d. PROJECT NUMBER   |   |
| 6. AUTHOR(S)<br><b>Thomas E. Imbriotta, U.S. Geological Survey, Trenton, NJ<br/> Joseph S. Trotsky, Naval Facilities Engineering Command<br/> Engineering Service Center, Port Hueneme, California</b>  |             |   |                            | 5e. TASK NUMBER  |   |
|   |             |   |                            | 5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER   |   |
|   |             |   |                            |  |   |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESSES<br>Commanding Officer<br>Naval Facilities Engineering Command<br>Engineering Service Center<br>1100 23rd Ave<br>Port Hueneme, CA 93043-4370  |             |   |                            | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER<br><b>TR-2341-ENV</b> |   |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)<br>Environmental Security Technology Certification Program<br>901 North Stuart Street, Suite 303<br>Arlington, VA 22203   |             |   |                            | 10. SPONSOR/MONITORS ACRONYM(S)<br><b>ESTCP</b>                |   |
|   |             |   |                            | 11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)                         |   |
| 12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT<br>Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.  |             |   |                            |  |   |
| 13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES   |             |   |                            |  |   |
| 14. ABSTRACT<br>This final technical report documents the demonstration and validation of regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion samplers (RCDM samplers) for use in collecting groundwater samples for perchlorate and a suite of explosives compounds. This project, ER-0313, was funded by the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP). The primary objectives of the project were; (1) to determine the usefulness of RCDM samplers in collecting perchlorate and a suite of explosives compounds from groundwater, (2) to determine the optimum equilibration times for these constituents to diffuse into the RCDM sampler, (3) to compare water-quality results and sampling costs from samples collected with RCDM samplers to samples collected with a low-flow purging technique, and (4) to transfer the technology while gaining regulatory acceptance. Equilibration times were determined in bench-scale testing for perchlorate and 14 nitroaromatic and nitramine explosives compounds. Field comparisons were conducted at two Department of Defense (DoD) sites: (1) Aberdeen Proving Grounds (APG), Maryland, and, (2) Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey. Samples collected with the two sampling techniques were compared graphically and statistically to determine the significance of any differences found. RCDM samplers were found to cost significantly less than samples collected with a low-flow purging procedure. Sampling time was reduced by 84%, compared to low-flow purging. The total sampling costs per sample were calculated to be 71% less with an RCDM sampler, compared to low-flow purging. |             |   |                            |  |   |
| 15. SUBJECT TERMS<br>Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP); regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane samplers; dialysis samplers; final report; diffusion sampling; PDB samplers; perchlorate, explosives ER-0313  |             |   |                            |  |   |
| 16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:   |             |   | 17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT | 18. NUMBER OF PAGES  | 19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON           |
| a. REPORT   | b. ABSTRACT | c. THIS PAGE                                      |                            |  | 19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) |
| U   | U           | U   |                            |  |   |



**Final Technical Report**  
**for**  
**Demonstration and Validation of a Regenerated Cellulose**  
**Dialysis Membrane Diffusion Sampler for Monitoring**  
**Ground-Water Quality and Remediation Progress at DoD**  
**Sites for Perchlorate and Explosives Compounds**  
**(ER-0313)**

**by**

**U.S. Geological Survey**  
**810 Bear Tavern Road, Suite 206**  
**West Trenton, NJ 08628**

**Naval Facilities Engineering Command Engineering Service Center**  
**1100 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue**  
**Port Hueneme, CA 93043-4370**



**Environmental Security**  
**Technology Certification**  
**Program**

**September 30, 2010**



# CONTENTS

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| <b>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....</b>                       | <b>VI</b>   |
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....</b>                                 | <b>VII</b>  |
| <b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>                               | <b>VIII</b> |
| <b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>                                 | <b>1</b>    |
| 1.1 BACKGROUND.....  | 1           |
| 1.2 OBJECTIVES OF DEMONSTRATION .....                        | 2           |
| 1.3 REGULATORY DRIVERS.....                                  | 3           |
| <b>2.0 TECHNOLOGY .....</b>                                  | <b>4</b>    |
| 2.1 TECHNOLOGY DESCRIPTION.....                              | 4           |
| 2.2 TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....                             | 8           |
| 2.3 ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE TECHNOLOGY .....       | 10          |
| <b>3.0 PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES.....</b>                       | <b>11</b>   |
| <b>4.0 SITE DESCRIPTIONS .....</b>                           | <b>14</b>   |
| 4.1 LOCATION AND HISTORY OF DEMONSTRATION SITES .....        | 14          |
| 4.2 GEOLOGY/HYDROGEOLOGY OF DEMONSTRATION SITES .....        | 17          |
| 4.3 CONTAMINANT DISTRIBUTIONS AT DEMONSTRATION SITES .....   | 17          |
| <b>5.0 TEST DESIGN .....</b>                                 | <b>19</b>   |
| 5.1 CONCEPTUAL EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN .....                     | 19          |
| 5.2 BASELINE CHARACTERIZATION .....                          | 19          |
| 5.3 LABORATORY BENCH-SCALE STUDY RESULTS .....               | 20          |
| 5.4 DESIGN OF TECHNOLOGY COMPONENTS .....                    | 22          |
| 5.4.1 Construction of RCDM Samplers .....                    | 22          |
| 5.5 FIELD TESTING .....                                      | 24          |
| 5.5.1 Field Demonstration Preparation and Mobilization ..... | 24          |
| 5.5.2 Field Demonstration Sampling Events .....              | 24          |
| 5.5.3 Field Demonstration Wells .....                        | 24          |
| 5.5.4 Residuals Handling.....                                | 27          |
| 5.6 SAMPLING METHODS .....                                   | 27          |
| 5.6.1 Sampler Deployment.....                                | 27          |
| 5.6.2 Sample Frequency .....                                 | 27          |
| 5.6.3 Tested Chemical Constituents.....                      | 27          |
| 5.6.4 Sample Collection.....                                 | 28          |
| 5.6.5 Sample Preservation.....                               | 30          |
| 5.6.6 Summary of Samples Collected.....                      | 31          |
| 5.6.7 Demobilization.....                                    | 31          |
| 5.6.8 Additional Sampling Methods Information.....           | 31          |
| 5.7 ANALYTICAL METHODS .....                                 | 32          |
| 5.7.1 Selection of Analytical/Testing Methods.....           | 32          |
| 5.7.2 Selection of Analytical/Testing Laboratory .....       | 32          |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 5.8 GRAPHICAL COMPARISON METHODS .....   | 32        |
| 5.9 STATISTICAL COMPARISON METHODS .....   | 33        |
| 5.9.1 Correlations. ....   | 33        |
| 5.9.2 Normality Testing. ....  | 33        |
| 5.9.3 Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test. ....  | 33        |
| 5.10 SAMPLING RESULTS .....  | 33        |
| 5.10.1 Perchlorate Sampling Results from Field Demonstration at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland .....     | 33        |
| 5.10.2 Explosives Compounds Sampling Results from Field Demonstration at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey ..... | 34        |
| 5.10.3 Quality Assurance/Quality Control Sample Results .....  | 39        |
| <b>6.0 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT.....</b>   | <b>40</b> |
| 6.1 EVALUATION OF FIELD COMPARISON RESULTS FOR PERCHLORATE.....  | 40        |
| 6.1.1 Graphical Analysis of Perchlorate Results.....   | 40        |
| 6.1.2 Statistical Comparison of Perchlorate Results .....  | 41        |
| 6.2 EVALUATION OF FIELD COMPARISON RESULTS FOR EXPLOSIVES COMPOUNDS.....                                     | 43        |
| 6.2.1 Graphical Analysis of Explosives Compounds .....   | 43        |
| 6.2.2 Statistical Comparison of Explosives Compounds Results.....  | 47        |
| 6.3 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF THE RCDM SAMPLER.....  | 50        |
| 6.3.1 Ability of RCDM Sampler to Equilibrate and Equilibration Times.....                                    | 51        |
| 6.3.2 Ability of RCDM Sampler to Detect the Same Compounds as Low-Flow Purging. ....                         | 51        |
| 6.3.3 Maintenance of Dialysis Membrane Integrity. ....   | 51        |
| 6.3.4 Ease of Use. ....  | 52        |
| 6.3.5 Agreement Between Analyte Concentrations Obtained with Both Sampling Methods.....                      | 52        |
| 6.3.6 Sensitivity of RCDM Samplers.....  | 53        |
| 6.3.7 Reproducibility of RCDM Data. ....   | 53        |
| 6.3.8 Reduced Sampling Time. ....  | 54        |
| 6.3.9 Less Costly Sampling Method.....   | 54        |
| 6.4 DISCUSSION OF FIELD COMPARISON RESULTS .....   | 54        |
| 6.4.1 Comparison of Results to Previous Studies .....  | 54        |
| 6.5 RCDM SAMPLER USE CONSIDERATIONS .....  | 55        |
| 6.6 SUMMARY OF FIELD COMPAISON FINDINGS .....  | 57        |
| 6.4.1 Conclusions.....   | 57        |
| 6.4.2 Criteria For Use of RCDM Samplers .....  | 58        |
| <b>7.0 COST ASSESSMENT .....</b>   | <b>59</b> |
| 7.1 COST MODEL .....   | 59        |
| 7.2 COST DRIVERS.....  | 61        |
| 7.3 COST ANALYSIS .....  | 61        |
| 7.3.1 Basic Assumptions .....  | 61        |
| 7.3.2 Cost Comparison per Sample .....   | 62        |
| 7.3.3 Cost Comparison per Site.....  | 65        |
| <b>8.0 IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES .....</b>   | <b>66</b> |
| 8.1 RCDM GUIDANCE AND PROTOCOLS.....   | 66        |
| 8.2 LESSONS LEARNED.....   | 67        |
| 8.2.1 Regulatory Issues.....   | 67        |
| 8.2.2 End User Concerns.....   | 68        |
| 8.2.3 Procurement Issues.....  | 68        |



|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>9.0 REFERENCES.....</b>   | <b>69</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX A: POINTS OF CONTACT.....</b>                                      | <b>72</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL SAMPLING METHOD INFORMATION.....</b>                 | <b>73</b> |
| <i>B-1. Analytical Calibration Procedures and Quality Control Checks .....</i> | <i>73</i> |
| <i>B-2. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Procedures.....</i>                  | <i>73</i> |
| <i>B-3. Field Sample Handling Procedures and Notes.....</i>                    | <i>73</i> |
| <i>B-4. Sampler Cleaning.....</i>  | <i>74</i> |

## FIGURES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| FIGURE 2-1. DIFFUSION ACROSS A MEMBRANE (FICK’S LAW OF DIFFUSION) .....  | 4  |
| FIGURE 2-2. DISASSEMBLED REGENERATED CELLULOSE DIALYSIS MEMBRANE DIFFUSION SAMPLER,<br>SHOWING COMPONENT PARTS.....                                      | 6  |
| FIGURE 2-3. PARTIALLY ASSEMBLED REGENERATED CELLULOSE DIALYSIS MEMBRANE DIFFUSION<br>SHOWING PROTECTIVE MESH AND PVC PIPE EXTERNAL TO THE MEMBRANE ..... | 6  |
| FIGURE 2-4. ASSEMBLED REGENERATED CELLULOSE DIALYSIS MEMBRANE DIFFUSION SAMPLER WITH<br>PVC PIPE SECTIONS EXTERNAL TO THE MEMBRANE.....                  | 7  |
| FIGURE 2-5. REGENERATED CELLULOSE DIALYSIS MEMBRANE DIFFUSION SAMPLER WITH PERFORATED<br>POLYETHYLENE SUPPORT INSIDE THE MEMBRANE .....                  | 7  |
| FIGURE 4-1. WELLS SAMPLED FOR PERCHLORATE IN THE FIELD DEMONSTRATION AT ABERDEEN<br>PROVING GROUNDS, MARYLAND. ....                                      | 15 |
| FIGURE 4-2. ADDITIONAL WELL SAMPLED FOR PERCHLORATE AS PART OF THE FIELD DEMONSTRATION<br>AT ABERDEEN PROVING GROUNDS, MARYLAND. ....                    | 16 |
| FIGURE 4-3. WELLS SAMPLED FOR EXPLOSIVES COMPOUNDS AS PART OF THE FIELD DEMONSTRATION AT<br>PICATINNY ARSENAL, NEW JERSEY. ....                          | 16 |
| FIGURE 4-4. AREAL AND VERTICAL EXTENT OF RDX CONTAMINATION AT PICATINNY ARSENAL, NEW<br>JERSEY. ....   | 17 |
| FIGURE 5-1. RCDM SAMPLER THAT WILL BE SUSPENDED USING TEFLON-COATED STAINLESS-STEEL LINE<br>WITH AN EXTERNAL STAINLESS-STEEL WEIGHT. ....                | 23 |
| FIGURE 5-2. RCDM SAMPLER THAT WILL BE SUSPENDED IN A WELL USING A DEDICATED POLYETHYLENE<br>ROPE AND HAVING WEIGHTS INTERNAL TO THE PROTECTIVE MESH..... | 23 |
| FIGURE 5-6. REMOVAL OF DIFFUSION SAMPLER FROM A WELL PRIOR TO SAMPLING.....  | 29 |
| FIGURE 5-7. LOW-FLOW PURGING SET UP FOR A 4-INCH DIAMETER WELL. ....   | 30 |
| FIGURE 6-1. RCDM SAMPLER VERSUS LOW-FLOW PURGING RESULTS FOR PERCHLORATE. ....   | 40 |
| FIGURE 6-2. RCDM SAMPLER VERSUS LOW-FLOW PURGING RESULTS FOR RDX. ....   | 43 |
| FIGURE 6-3. RCDM SAMPLER VERSUS LOW-FLOW PURGING RESULTS FOR HMX. ....   | 44 |
| FIGURE 6-4. RCDM SAMPLER VERSUS LOW-FLOW PURGING RESULTS FOR 2,4,6-TRINITROTOLUENE. ....   | 44 |
| FIGURE 6-5. RCDM SAMPLER VERSUS LOW-FLOW PURGING RESULTS FOR 1,3,5-TRINITROBENZENE.....  | 45 |
| FIGURE 6-6. RCDM SAMPLER VERSUS LOW-FLOW PURGING RESULTS FOR 2-AMINO-4,6-<br>DINITROTOLUENE.....   | 46 |
| FIGURE 6-7. RCDM SAMPLER VERSUS LOW-FLOW PURGING RESULTS FOR 4-AMINO-2,6-<br>DINITROTOLUENE.....   | 46 |

## TABLES

|   |    |
|---|----|
| TABLE 2-1. ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE TECHNOLOGY.....  | 10 |
| TABLE 3-1. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES .....   | 12 |
| TABLE 4-1. LIST OF SAMPLED SITES, CHEMICAL CONTAMINANTS, AND CONCENTRATION RANGES .....   | 17 |
| TABLE 5-1. CHEMICAL CONSTITUENTS TESTED IN BENCH-SCALE TESTS .....  | 20 |
| TABLE 5-2. SUMMARY OF ALL BENCH-SCALE TESTING RESULTS: SUITABILITY AND EQUILIBRATION<br>TIMES OF ALL CHEMICALS TESTED.....  | 21 |
| TABLE 5-3. PERIODS OF SAMPLING AT FIELD DEMONSTRATION SITES .....   | 24 |
| TABLE 5-4. WELLS SAMPLED DURING THE FIELD DEMONSTRATIONS .....  | 25 |
| TABLE 5-5. CHEMICAL CONSTITUENTS ANALYZED IN SAMPLES FROM THE FIELD DEMONSTRATIONS ....   | 28 |
| TABLE 5-6. TOTAL NUMBER AND TYPES OF SAMPLES COLLECTED DURING PROJECT .....   | 31 |
| TABLE 5-7. ANALYTICAL METHODS USED FOR PERCHLORATE AND EXPLOSIVES COMPOUNDS SAMPLE<br>ANALYSIS .....  | 32 |
| TABLE 5-8. RESULTS FROM PERCHLORATE FIELD DEMONSTRATION SAMPLING .....  | 34 |
| TABLE 5-9. RESULTS FROM EXPLOSIVES COMPOUNDS FIELD DEMONSTRATION SAMPLING .....   | 35 |
| TABLE 6-1. CORRELATION OF SAMPLING TECHNIQUES FOR PERCHLORATE.....  | 41 |
| TABLE 6-2. STATISTICAL COMPARISON OF PERCHLORATE CONCENTRATIONS BY THE RCDM SAMPLER<br>AND LOW-FLOW PURGING USING THE WILCOXON SIGNED-RANK TEST .....                           | 42 |
| TABLE 6-3. RANGES OF CONCENTRATIONS MEASURED USING RCDM SAMPLERS FOR PERCHLORATE. ..  | 42 |
| TABLE 6-4. CORRELATION OF SAMPLING TECHNIQUES FOR EXPLOSIVES COMPOUNDS. ....  | 47 |
| TABLE 6-5. STATISTICAL COMPARISON OF EXPLOSIVES COMPOUNDS CONCENTRATIONS BY THE RCDM<br>SAMPLER AND LOW-FLOW PURGING USING THE WILCOXON SIGNED-RANK TEST .....                  | 48 |
| TABLE 6-6. RANGES OF CONCENTRATIONS MEASURED USING RCDM SAMPLERS FOR EXPLOSIVES<br>COMPOUNDS.....   | 49 |
| TABLE 6-7. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES .....   | 50 |
| TABLE 7-1. COST MODEL FOR RCDM SAMPLERS.....  | 60 |
| TABLE 7-2. COMPARISON OF MATERIALS, CONSTRUCTION LABOR, FIELD LABOR, AND PURGE WATER<br>DISPOSAL, AND TOTAL COSTS PER SAMPLE USING AN RCDM SAMPLER AND LOW-FLOW<br>PURGING..... | 64 |
| TABLE 7-3. COMPARISON OF SAMPLING COSTS OVER A 30-YEAR PERIOD FOR RCDM SAMPLERS AND<br>LOW-FLOW PURGING .....   | 65 |

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| APG        | Aberdeen Proving Grounds  |
| BTEX       | Benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes                     |
| COC        | Contaminant of concern  |
| Dialysis   | Regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane                         |
| DOC        | Dissolved organic carbon  |
| DoD        | Department of Defense   |
| GC-MS      | Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry                            |
| HMX        | Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine                |
| ICP-MS     | Inductively coupled plasma – mass spectrometry                  |
| ITRC       | Interstate Technology Regulatory Council                        |
| LRL        | Laboratory reporting level                                      |
| LDPE       | Low-density polyethylene  |
| MDL        | Minimum detection limit   |
| MNA        | Monitored natural attenuation                                   |
| MTBE       | Methyl tert-butyl ether   |
| NAES       | Naval Air Engineering Station                                   |
| NAWC       | Naval Air Warfare Center  |
| NBVC       | Naval Base Ventura County                                       |
| NAVFAC ESC | Naval Facilities Engineering Command Engineering Service Center |
| NJDEP      | New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection               |
| NTU        | Nephelometric turbidity units                                   |
| PAH        | Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons                                |
| PCB        | Polychlorinated biphenyls                                       |
| PDB        | Polyethylene diffusion bag                                      |
| PVC        | Polyvinyl chloride  |
| QA/QC      | Quality assurance/quality control                               |
| RDX        | Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine                         |
| RCDM       | Regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane                         |
| TDS        | Total dissolved solids  |
| USEPA      | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency                            |
| USGS       | U.S. Geological Survey  |
| VOC        | Volatile organic compound                                       |

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was funded by Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP) under project ER-0313. Their thoughtful reviews of project documents and their support significantly contributed to the success of the project. Thomas Imbrigiotta of U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and Joey Trotsky of Naval Facilities Engineering Command Engineering Service Center (NAVFAC ESC) contributed to the writing of this report. Lisa Antonczak of TestAmerica and Richard Daddow of USGS were responsible for arranging the efficient and consistent analysis of the samples collected in this study. Emily Majcher, Michelle Lorah, and Mastin Mount, of USGS supplied base contacts, well construction information and locations, and water-quality data for the wells sampled at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland. John Wrobel, Paul Harvey, and Allison O'Brien of the US Army arranged access to and disposal of purge water from the wells sampled at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland. Mark Magness, Paul Hatzinger, and Kevin Gerdes of Shaw Environmental supplied well construction information and water-quality data for the wells sampled at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey. Ted Gabel of the US Army arranged access to the wells sampled at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This final technical report documents the demonstration and validation of regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion samplers (RCDM samplers) for use in collecting groundwater samples for perchlorate and a suite of explosives compounds. This project, ER-0313, was funded by the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP). The primary objectives of the project were; (1) to determine the usefulness of RCDM samplers in collecting perchlorate and a suite of explosives compounds from groundwater, (2) to determine the optimum equilibration times for these constituents to diffuse into the RCDM sampler, (3) to compare water-quality results and sampling costs from samples collected with RCDM samplers to samples collected with a low-flow purging technique, and (4) to transfer the technology while gaining regulatory acceptance. Equilibration times were determined in bench-scale testing for perchlorate and 14 nitroaromatic and nitramine explosives compounds. Field comparisons were conducted at two Department of Defense (DoD) sites: (1) Aberdeen Proving Grounds (APG), Maryland, and, (2) Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey. Samples collected with the two sampling techniques were compared graphically and statistically to determine the significance of any differences found.

Two bench-scale equilibration tests were conducted that evaluated perchlorate and 14 nitroaromatic and nitramine explosives compounds using groundwater collected from the two field sites. Greater than 95% equilibrium was reached in RCDM samplers within 1 day for perchlorate and within 3 to 7 days for all explosives compounds. Lower temperatures were found to have a small effect in that they lengthened equilibration times for several explosives constituents from 3 days to 7 days. No perchlorate or explosives compound concentrations were determined to have desorbed from the dialysis membrane in the bench-scale test blanks. Coefficients of variation for triplicate RCDM sampler analyses were less than 4% for perchlorate and less than 16% for all explosives compounds. Based on the results of the bench-scale testing, and by adding a safety factor, a 7-day equilibration time was chosen for RCDM samplers for perchlorate samples and a 14-day equilibration time was chosen for explosives compound samples in the field demonstration.

The experimental design of the field demonstration was to sample groundwater from 8 to 11 wells per site at the two DoD sites with each of two sampling methods; the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging using a variable-speed peristaltic pump. Samples were collected at the same depth in each well using both sampling techniques. In all cases, the RCDM samplers were suspended in a well at the estimated depth of highest mass flux through the open interval and were allowed to equilibrate for at one to two weeks. After the RCDM samplers were retrieved and sampled, the pump intake was lowered to the same depth and the well was sampled using a low-flow purging procedure that included the monitoring of field parameters to stability prior to sample collection. All samples from a site were analyzed at the same laboratory for the same suite of constituents.

Results of the analyses for perchlorate showed excellent agreement between concentrations collected with RCDM samplers and low-flow purging. Statistical testing showed RCDM samplers recovered median concentrations that were not significantly different from median

concentrations recovered by low-flow purging. Results of the analyses for 4 of 6 explosives compounds also showed excellent agreement between concentrations collected with RCDM samplers and low-flow purging. For 4 of 6 explosives compounds (RDX, HMX, 2,4,6-trinitrotoluene, and 1,3,5-trinitrobenzene), statistical testing showed RCDM samplers recovered median concentrations of explosives compounds that were not significantly different from median concentrations recovered by low-flow purging. For 2 of 6 explosives compounds (2-amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene and 4-amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene), statistical testing showed RCDM samplers recovered median concentrations of explosives compounds that were significantly higher than median concentrations recovered by low-flow purging. For these latter two compounds it is recommended that RCDM samplers should only be used to qualitatively identify the presence/absence of these compounds in a well.

Water samples collected with RCDM samplers were found to cost significantly less than samples collected with a low-flow purging procedure. Specifically, field sampling time (and hence field labor costs) was 84% less when RCDM samplers were used compared to low-flow purging (a reduction of more than 6 fold). Overall, the total sampling costs per sample were calculated to be 71% less for a sample collected with an RCDM sampler compared to one collected by low-flow purging (a reduction of more than 3 fold). Such reductions in sampling costs are particularly significant when multiplied out over a typical 30-year long-term monitoring plan. Besides being able to collect samples more inexpensively for perchlorate and several explosives compounds in groundwater, in general, RCDM samplers were found to have the additional advantages that they were (1) easily constructed and deployed, (2) eliminated the production of essentially all purge water when sampling a well, (3) eliminated the need for field filtration of groundwater samples, and (4) eliminated cross-contamination between wells because they were disposable.

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

Collection of groundwater samples for long-term monitoring or to assess remedial progress at contaminated Department of Defense (DoD) sites is very costly in terms of manpower, time, and equipment requirements. Currently, the standard technique for groundwater collection is the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) low-flow purging procedure using a variable-speed submersible pump with disposable discharge tubing (Puls and Barcelona, 1996). The low-flow procedure requires a monitoring well to be pumped at low-flow rates (500-1000 mL/min) while field parameters are monitored to stability. Often this stabilization can take a long period of time (0.75 to 1.5 hours) prior to the time that samples can be collected. Following sample collection, time and effort must be spent decontaminating the pump and its components before it can be used in another well to prevent cross-contamination. Disposal of both contaminated purge water and wash water is also costly since they must be collected and transported offsite to treatment facilities for proper disposal. An additional problem in collecting groundwater samples with portable pumps or bailers is that the installation and removal of these sampling devices frequently results in increased turbidity in the groundwater brought to the surface. Low-flow purging requires that turbidity be monitored until it is less than 10 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) or becomes stable prior to sample collection. If turbidity is stable but exceeds 5-10 NTU, serious bias can result for many contaminants that sorb readily onto suspended particulates (Gibs et al. 2000). This introduces uncertainty into the assessment of inorganic and organic contaminant concentrations in groundwater, which can result in incorrect conclusions concerning the water quality or remediation status of a site.

Diffusion sampler technology has been evolving over several decades and has shown promise as a way to reduce groundwater sampling field time, equipment decontamination costs, and purge-water treatment costs, as well as a way to avoid the potential problems caused by turbidity in wells. All diffusion membrane samplers developed to date involve suspending a container made of a semi-permeable membrane filled with high-purity water at a given depth in the water column of a well. The system operates on the principle that given the proper amount of time, diffusion of dissolved chemical species across a semi-permeable membrane will occur until concentrations inside the sampler are equivalent to those in the water outside the sampler in a well. The diffusion membrane sampler is then brought to the surface and the enclosed water sample is transferred to sample bottles for analysis. Diffusion membrane samplers have sufficiently small membrane pores so that they do not allow the passage of suspended particulates into the sampler.

One design developed for a diffusion membrane sampler consists of a series of short open-ended rigid polypropylene cylinders with hydrophilic cellulose acetate or polysulfone flat filter membranes covering each end (Ronen et al. 1987; Magaritz et al. 1989). This sampler is restricted in the volume of sample it can collect at a depth because the rigid cylinders must be less than the diameter of the well. Another diffusion membrane sampler design consists of a tubular-shaped bag made of flexible low-density polyethylene (LDPE) (Vroblesky, 2001a, 2001b). The LDPE tube is heat-sealed on one end, filled with high-purity water, heat-sealed at the top, and then suspended in a well to equilibrate for two weeks. This type of diffusion

membrane sampler, unlike the short cylinder configurations, is inexpensive, can be made to any length to accommodate larger sample volume requirements, and can be constructed from small-diameter LDPE tubing that fits into small-diameter wells. These polyethylene diffusion bag (PDB) samplers have been shown to be useful only for collection of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) (such as, chlorinated solvents and benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX) compounds) because of the hydrophobic nature of the membrane material. The PDB sampler cannot be used for collection of inorganic contaminants (such as trace metals or other dissolved ionic species), inorganic parameters useful for monitored natural attenuation (MNA) (such as nitrate, iron, sulfate, or alkalinity), highly soluble organic compounds (such as methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) or acetone), or most semi-volatile organic compounds (such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)) (Interstate Technology Regulatory Council (ITRC), 2004).

Because it is usually necessary to collect samples for both inorganic and organic constituents when monitoring water quality and the progress of remediation at contaminated DoD sites, another diffusion membrane sampler design has recently been developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) (Imbrigiotta et al. 2002; Ehlke et al. 2004; Vroblesky et al. 2002; Vroblesky and Pravecek, 2002; Vroblesky et al. 2003, Imbrigiotta et al. 2007). This type of diffusion membrane sampler is constructed from commercially available tubular regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane. The dialysis membrane allows the passage of both dissolved inorganic and organic contaminants from ground water into the sampler. The regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane tubing can be purchased in a variety of diameters so the sampler may be configured to fit in both small- and large-diameter wells. The RCDM samplers can be made in various lengths to allow for the collection of a sufficient volume of water necessary for whatever analyses are of interest. The RCDM samplers are relatively low in cost, only slightly more than PDB samplers, and are disposable after one use. RCDM samplers have been shown to effectively sample wells for major cations, anions, nutrients, most trace metals, all VOCs, dissolved organic carbon, and methane (Imbrigiotta et al. 2007). Demonstration of the utility of these RCDM samplers for sampling for perchlorate and explosives compounds was performed as part of this project.

For the sake of brevity, throughout this report the regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion sampler will be referred to simply as the RCDM sampler or the dialysis sampler.

## **1.2 OBJECTIVES OF DEMONSTRATION**

The main goal of this project was to demonstrate and validate the usefulness of regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion samplers for monitoring groundwater at DoD sites. The more specific objectives of the project were as follows:

- (1) To determine if the RCDM samplers will collect valid samples for perchlorate and explosives compounds, chemical constituents relevant to the DoD for which there is no current information available,
- (2) To determine the optimum equilibration period for these contaminants to diffuse into RCDM samplers,



- (3) To compare the sampling efficiency and cost of the RCDM samplers to quantitatively recover these contaminants from wells at field sites with samples collected using the standard low-flow purging technique, and
- (4) To transfer the RCDM sampler technology to DoD and private end-users and to gain regulatory acceptance.

Objectives (1) and (2) were addressed during bench-scale testing at the USGS laboratory facility in West Trenton, New Jersey. Objectives (3) and (4) were addressed using the data generated during the field demonstrations conducted at two DOD field sites, Aberdeen Proving Grounds (APG), Maryland and Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey.


### **1.3 REGULATORY DRIVERS**

This demonstration responds to many DoD requirements, including: Navy 1.III.01.k Improved Field Analytical Sensors, Toxicity Assays, Methods, and Protocols to Supplement Traditional Sampling and Laboratory Analysis; and Air Force 124 Plume Location and Source Identification; 131 Improved Remediation Monitoring Technologies; 1608 Find and Track Organic Contaminant Plumes; and 2705 Methods to Reduce the Cost of Long-Term Monitoring. Other pertinent requirements include: 1.III.02.n; 130; 145; 244; 246; 249; 254; 255; and 1701.

## 2.0 TECHNOLOGY

### 2.1 TECHNOLOGY DESCRIPTION

Most of the diffusion membrane samplers developed to date involve suspending a container made of a semi-permeable membrane and filled with high-purity water in the water column of a well. These devices operate on the principle that given the proper amount of time, diffusion of dissolved chemical species across a semi-permeable membrane will occur until concentrations inside the sampler are equivalent to those in the groundwater. The ideal diffusion of chemicals through a membrane is described by Fick's Law of Diffusion and is dependent primarily on the concentration gradient across the membrane, the thickness of the membrane, and the diffusion coefficient for each chemical (Figure 2-1). Factors such as molecular size, membrane pore size, the hydrophobic/hydrophilic nature of the membrane, and water temperature can also affect the ability and speed of diffusion of chemicals across a membrane.




The RCDM samplers tested during this demonstration were constructed of regenerated cellulose. The membrane was obtained from Membrane Filtration Products, Inc., Seguin, Texas.<sup>1</sup> The membrane had a nominal molecular weight cut off of 8,000 Daltons with a pore size of 18 Angstroms (Å). The 100-millimeter (mm) width membrane has a filled diameter of 63.7 mm, a volume of 31.8 milliliters per centimeter (mL/cm), and comes in rolls 5 meters (m) in length. The 50-mm width membrane has a filled diameter of 31.8 mm, a volume of 7.94 mL/cm, and comes in rolls 10 m in length. The membrane was pre-cleaned by the manufacturer to remove trace metals and sulfides. The membrane was cut into lengths appropriate for the volume needed for analyses at a particular well and site.

Various components of the RCDM sampler are shown in Figures 2-2 through 2-5. Figure 2-2 shows the components of the sampler prior to assembly; Figure 2-3 shows the sampler partially constructed prior to being filled with deionized water, and Figure 2-4 shows the completed sampler ready for deployment in a well. The polyvinyl chloride (PVC) sections are external to the membrane and are included to remove pressure from the ends of the membrane to prevent leakage. A second version of the RCDM sampler is pictured in Figure 2-5. This version has a perforated PVC tube inside the dialysis membrane to keep the membrane from collapsing in waters with high ionic strength. Both versions work on the same diffusion principle and sample the same chemical species.

In 2000, Ehlke et al. (2004) conducted laboratory studies using regenerated cellulose dialysis membranes and demonstrated that dialysis membranes could equilibrate with selected inorganics and VOCs in the laboratory. Imbriotta et al. (2002) used these RCDM samplers in actual field sampling at the Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC), West Trenton, NJ site during 2000-2002 and found that the results compared favorably with those of a low-flow purging technique and a modified conventional purging technique for several major cations and anions, chlorinated VOCs, and a few trace elements. Vroblesky et al. (2002) and Vroblesky and Pravecek (2002) developed a version of the RCDM sampler and tested it at several field sites and found that it compared well to low-flow purge samples for several aromatic VOCs.

Expected applications of RCDM samplers will be to sample long-term monitoring wells at DoD sites: (1) where this method will save time and cost by not requiring the use of a pump to sample for a variety of dissolved organic and inorganic constituents, (2) where it would be difficult or impossible to bring in a pump and its power source, (wells in remote wilderness areas, wells inside buildings), (3) to sample wells where normal sampling activities would be extremely hazardous or inconvenient, (wells in high traffic areas, wells in airport runway areas, wells in residential areas near military bases), (4) where collection, transport, and treatment of purge water would be costly, difficult, or undesirable due to safety concerns, (wells at all hazardous waste sites, wells at remote hazardous waste sites, wells in populated areas near military bases), and (5) where wells have water with high turbidity when purged due to their construction or the formation they are completed in, (incorrect screen size and filter pack).

<sup>1</sup> The use of brand names in this report is for identification purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the USGS or the U.S. Navy.




**Figure 2-2. Disassembled regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion sampler, showing component parts**



**Figure 2-3. Partially assembled regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion sampler, showing protective mesh and PVC pipe external to the membrane**





**Figure 2-4. Assembled regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion sampler with PVC pipe sections external to the membrane**



**Figure 2-5. Regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion sampler with perforated polyethylene support inside the membrane**

## 2.2 TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

Prior to the start of this field demonstration, RCDM samplers were tested in laboratory bench-scale tests by a number of researchers. Ehlke et al. (2004) determined that known concentrations of VOCs and several inorganics would diffuse through dialysis membranes and equilibrate successfully within 1 week. Laboratory testing of equilibration times for selected anions and trace elements was also conducted by Vroblesky et al. (2002). They found that within 1-4 days all tested constituents reached equilibrium with the test ground water in their experiments. Leblanc (2003) lab-tested the dialysis membranes for permeability to explosive compounds and found that 75-80% equilibration of RDX (hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine) and HMX (octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine) concentrations were reached within 12 days at 4 °C. Harter and Talozzi (2004) found equilibration of specific conductance and nitrate was attained in 1-4 days at 21 °C. Parker and Mulherin (2006) conducted laboratory equilibration tests for HMX, 1,3,5-trinitrobenzene, RDX, and TNT (2,4,6-trinitrotoluene) at room temperature and found these explosive compounds equilibrated in RCDM samplers within 7 to 14 days. An extensive bench-scale equilibration testing of 22 cations and trace elements, 59 VOCs, 6 anions, silica, dissolved organic carbon, methane, and sulfide was conducted by Imbrigiotta et al. (2007). This study found equilibrium was reached in RCDM samplers within 1 to 3 days for all VOCs, all anions, silica, dissolved organic carbon, methane, and sulfide, and within 3 to 7 days for most cations and trace elements. RCDM samplers equilibrated slightly faster when inorganic constituent concentrations were higher than when they were lower. RCDM samplers equilibrated slightly slower at lower temperatures in that they lengthened equilibration times for several inorganic constituents from 3 days to 7 days and several VOCs from 1 day to 3 days. The only parameters that did not equilibrate in the RCDM samplers were mercury, silver, and tin, which all took greater than 28 days to equilibrate. Overall, studies conducted by various researchers (Ehlke et al. 2004; Ronen et al. 1987; Magaritz et al. 1989; Vroblesky et al. 2002; Harter and Talozzi, 2004; Imbrigiotta et al. 2007) indicated that for most organic and inorganic chemical species, the equilibrium period is probably less than 2 weeks.

Prior to this demonstration, RCDM samplers were also tested in the field by a number of researchers. Imbrigiotta et al. (2002) evaluated these samplers during three annual sampling events (9 to 15 wells per event) at the Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC), West Trenton, New Jersey, using 1-week equilibration times. They showed good correlation with low-flow purging and modified conventional purging (high-flow purging followed by low-flow purging) results for both chlorinated VOCs and selected inorganic constituents. The results of statistical analyses showed no significant difference at the 95% confidence level between sampling techniques for all constituents tested.

RCDM samplers have also been successfully tested in the field on a limited basis at Naval Air Station Fort Worth Joint Reserve Base, Texas (Vroblesky et al. 2002), at Hickam Air Force Base (AFB), Hawaii (Vroblesky and Pravecek, 2002), and at Andersen AFB, Guam (Vroblesky et al. 2003). These tests involved comparing RCDM samplers to PDB samplers for fuel-related VOCs and to low-flow purging for selected inorganic ions and trace elements. Their results showed good comparability for the RCDM samplers to the other sampling techniques for most compounds tested using a 2-week equilibration period. The authors pointed out that a shorter equilibrium period may have been possible for the RCDM samplers and would be advantageous

so as to minimize the potential for membrane biodegradation, iron fouling, and gradual loss of sampler water volume that can occur in high ionic strength groundwater.

A study by Harter and Talozzi (2004) found that nitrate and specific conductance were sampled equally well by dialysis samplers and a conventional purging method. A study comparing a number of different diffusion samplers and purging technologies was conducted in 20 wells at McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California (Parsons, 2005). RCDM samplers, PDB samplers, rigid porous polyethylene samplers, polysulfone samplers, a downhole thief sampler, a disposable point-source bailer sampler, low-flow purging, and conventional purging were compared in samples analyzed for anions, trace metals, hexavalent chromium, 1, 4-dioxane, and VOCs. Results of the Parsons (2005) study indicated that RCDM samplers recovered concentrations of VOCs, anions, 1,4-dioxane, and hexavalent chromium as well as or better than low-flow purging. Parsons (2005) noted that RCDM samplers generally recovered lower concentrations of trace metals than low-flow purging in their tests, although results for specific trace metals were not given. Overall, the RCDM sampler was rated equal to low-flow purging in Parsons (2005).

An extensive field comparison study of 27 wells at three DoD sites by Imbrigiotta et al (2007) compared RCDM samplers, PDB samplers, and low-flow purging. VOC concentrations collected with RCDM samplers and PDB samplers showed excellent statistical agreement for all 24 of the VOCs evaluated. VOC concentrations collected with RCDM samplers and low-flow purging showed no significant differences for 21 of the 24 VOCs evaluated. Results of the analyses for most inorganic constituents (28 of 30) also showed no significant difference between concentrations collected with RCDM samplers and low-flow purging.

Additional laboratory testing was conducted in the pre-demonstration portion of this project. The bench-scale testing was performed to determine the time required to reach equilibrium between the groundwater (outside the RCDM sampler) and the water sample (inside the RCDM sampler) for perchlorate and 14 nitroaromatic and nitramine explosives compounds. The results of the pre-demonstration testing are presented in Section 5.3 of this report.

## 2.3 ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE TECHNOLOGY

The advantages and limitations of the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging are compared in Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1. Advantages and Limitations of the Technology**

| <b>Regenerated Cellulose Dialysis Membrane Diffusion Sampler (RCDM)</b>   | <b>Low-Flow Purging</b>  |
|---|--|
| <b>Advantages</b>   |  |
| No purge water is produced to drum, transport, or treat.  | Purge water is produced to drum, transport, and treat.   |
| No particulates can pass through the membrane so no sample filtration is necessary.                                 | Turbidity is minimized but not eliminated so sample filtration is still recommended.                       |
| Sampler is disposable so no decontamination is needed between wells.  | Pump must be decontaminated between wells.   |
| Time in field is minimized for field personnel.   | Time in field can be 0.75-1.5 hours waiting for field parameters to stabilize.                             |
| Dialysis membrane is fairly inexpensive; slightly more than LDPE, but still far less than the cost of a pump setup. | Initial investment in pump setup is expensive (pump, control box, generator, extension cords, and tubing). |
| Can be used to sample for both inorganic and organic dissolved chemical species.                                    | Can be used to sample for both inorganic and organic dissolved chemical species.                           |
| <b>Limitations</b>  |  |
| Pre-cleaned dialysis membrane must be kept wet in preservative solution prior to use.                               | Pump must be cleaned prior to use.   |
| RCDM samplers lose water with time due to the nature of the dialysis process.                                       | Not applicable.  |
| Dialysis membranes are subject to attack by bacteria and fungi.   | Pumps are not affected by bacteria and fungi.  |
| Sample volume is finite.  | Sample volume is not limited.  |

The limitations of the RCDM sampler indicated in the table above with respect to the loss of water volume with time and the potential attack of the membrane by bacteria or fungi are not significant considerations when the equilibration time needed for the sampler is short (<2 weeks).



### **3.0 PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES**

The overall performance objective of this demonstration project was to evaluate the performance of RCDM samplers versus low-flow purging and to compare their costs. The performance was evaluated by comparing the water-quality results from samples collected at the same depth using both sampling techniques in a series of wells at two test sites. The performance objectives, data requirements, success criteria, and results achieved are tabulated in Table 3-1 and are discussed in more detail in Section 6.

**Table 3-1. Performance Objectives**

[RCDM sampler, regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane sampler;  $p < 0.05$ , 95 percent confidence level]

| Performance Objective   | Data Requirements   | Success Criteria   | Results  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Qualitative Performance Objectives</b>   |   |  |  |
| Determine if RCDM samplers equilibrate with perchlorate and explosives compounds in the laboratory.   | List of chemical constituents that equilibrated in the RCDM samplers in bench-scale testing.                            | All compounds tested equilibrate through the dialysis membrane.  | Criteria met.  |
| Determine if RCDM samplers and low-flow purging collect the same chemical constituents in the same wells in the field.                            | List of chemical constituents recovered by both RCDM and low-flow purging in each well.                                 | Detection of the same chemical constituents in field samples collected with both RCDM samplers low-flow purging.               | Criteria met.  |
| Determine if dialysis membrane integrity is maintained over the course of equilibration.  | Observations of the RCDM samplers after removal from the well.  | No perforations noted during the length of the test.   | Criteria met.  |
| Determine if RCDM samplers are easier to use than low-flow purging.   | Observations of the field sampling personnel.   | RCDM samplers should be as easy or easier to use than low-flow purging.  | Criteria met.  |
| <b>Quantitative Performance Objectives</b>  |   |  |  |
| Determine minimum equilibration times for RCDM samplers for perchlorate and explosives compounds.   | Bench-scale test concentration data.  | Minimum times to equilibration are determined. All compounds tested equilibrate in less than 4 weeks.                          | Criteria met.  |
| Determine if RCDM samplers and low-flow purging recover similar concentrations of detected perchlorate and explosives compounds in field samples. | Concentrations of perchlorate and explosives compounds in samples collected by both RCDM samplers and low-flow purging. | No significant difference (at $p < 0.05$ ) between chemical concentrations recovered by the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging. | Criteria met for perchlorate and 4 of 6 detected explosive compounds compared in field demonstration test wells. |
| Determine if RCDM samplers can collect low concentration samples.   | Concentrations of perchlorate and explosives compounds in samples collected by both RCDM samplers and low-flow purging. | Concentrations within 2-5 times the reporting limit can be detected.   | Criteria met.  |

|   |   |   |               |
|---|---|---|---------------|
| Determine reproducibility of RCDM and low-flow data   | Concentrations of perchlorate and explosives compounds collected by both RCDM samplers and low-flow purging.  | Concentrations within +/- 15% for perchlorate and +/- 30% for explosives compounds.                         | Criteria met. |
| Determine if use of RCDM samplers reduces field sample collection time compared to low-flow purging.  | Length of time to collect samples in the field with the RCDM sampler and with low-flow purging, (including installation, sample collection, and equipment decontamination). | Length of field time required to sample RCDM samplers should be at least 25% shorter than low-flow purging. | Criteria met. |
| Determine if use of RCDM samplers reduces field sample collection costs compared to low-flow purging. | Records of costs for equipment and supplies and record of personnel's field time.   | Cost savings using RCDM samplers should be at least 25% less than low-flow purging.                         | Criteria met. |

## **4.0 SITE DESCRIPTIONS**

### **4.1 LOCATION AND HISTORY OF DEMONSTRATION SITES**

Field comparison demonstrations were done at two sites; Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland and Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey. These sites were chosen because of following reasons:

- (1) the geology and hydrology of the sites were well characterized,
- (2) the construction of wells installed at the sites were well documented and met recommended minimum standards (ITRC, 2004),
- (3) the sites had existing water-quality analyses for perchlorate or the explosives compounds of interest to this project, and
- (4) the groundwater at the sites had a range of concentrations of the compounds of interest.

Aberdeen Proving Grounds is located on the Chesapeake Bay approximately 30 miles northeast of Baltimore, Maryland. Historical activities on this base have included research on nerve gas, explosives, munitions and their delivery systems over the past 80 years. In one area near West Canal Creek, perchlorate was used in the manufacture and storage of mortar shells. Perchlorate was spilled and/or leaked to the shallow groundwater system over the years in and around a number of buildings. Figures 4-1 and 4-2 show the locations of the wells sampled for perchlorate in the field demonstration at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland.

Picatinny Arsenal is located approximately 40 miles due west of New York City, NY in north central New Jersey. Historical activities at this base have included research and production of munitions of all types dating back for more than a century. In one area near Picatinny Lake, explosives were tested and stored. Over the years, explosives compounds have been spilled or leaked to the shallow groundwater system around a few of the buildings. Figure 4-3 shows the locations of wells sampled for explosives compounds in the field demonstration at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey.




Figure 4-1. Wells sampled for perchlorate in the field demonstration at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland.






Figure 4-2. Additional well sampled for perchlorate as part of the field demonstration at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland.




Figure 4-3. Wells sampled for explosives compounds as part of the field demonstration at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey.

## 4.2 GEOLOGY/HYDROGEOLOGY OF DEMONSTRATION SITES

The wells sampled for the field demonstration at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, are screened in a shallow unconsolidated sand-and-gravel aquifer in the coastal plain of Maryland (Figures 4-1 and 4-2). In the area of the wells shown on Figure 4-1, groundwater flows generally east to west towards a wetland area and Canal Creek within the base boundaries. In the area of the well shown on Figure 4-2, groundwater flows generally east towards Chesapeake Bay.

Picatinny Arsenal is located in the valley and ridge physiographic province of New Jersey. The base is located in a narrow elongated valley that extends from the northeast to the southwest. The wells sampled for the field demonstration at this site are screened in a shallow sand-and-gravel outwash aquifer surrounding Picatinny Lake (Figure 4-3). Groundwater generally flows from the west to east towards the lake in this area.

## 4.3 CONTAMINANT DISTRIBUTIONS AT DEMONSTRATION SITES


The primary contaminants in the wells sampled at Aberdeen Proving Grounds are perchlorate and chlorinated VOCs. The range of concentrations of these compounds is given on Table 4-1. The areal distribution of wells containing above detection concentrations of perchlorate from samples collected in 2005 are presented on Figures 4-1 and 4-2. The groundwater in these wells generally had detectable dissolved oxygen concentrations, pH's ranging from 4 to 6, and moderate to high ionic strength with total dissolved solids (TDS) concentrations ranging from 148 to 800 milligrams per liter (mg/L).

**Table 4-1. List of sampled sites, chemical contaminants, and concentration ranges**

[VOCs, volatile organic compounds; µg/L, micrograms per liter]

| Site                               | Chemical Contaminants | Concentration Ranges                           |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland | Perchlorate, VOCs     | Perchlorate <1-350 µg/L<br>VOCs <1 – 1000 µg/L |
| Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey      | Explosives compounds  | Explosives <1-1500 µg/L                        |

The main contaminants present in the wells sampled at Picatinny Arsenal are explosives compounds, primarily RDX and HMX. The range of concentrations of these compounds is also given in Table 4-1. The areal distribution of wells containing above detection concentrations of RDX is shown on Figure 4-4. The groundwater at the Picatinny Arsenal site generally had detectable dissolved oxygen concentrations, slightly acidic pH's ranging from 5 to 6, and moderate ionic strength with TDS concentrations ranging from 100 to 500 mg/L.



**Figure 4-4. Areal and vertical extent of RDX contamination at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey.**



## **5.0 TEST DESIGN**

### **5.1 CONCEPTUAL EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**

The general conceptual design of these field demonstrations was as follows:

- (1) RCDM samplers were constructed and deployed in 8 to 10 wells per site and allowed to equilibrate for at least the length of time determined to be necessary for equilibration in the bench-scale tests.
- (2) Once equilibrated, the RCDM samplers were removed and samples were collected from them.
- (3) A variable-speed low-flow pump was used to sample from the same depth as where the RCDM samplers had been positioned.
- (4) Samples collected with both techniques were then analyzed at the same laboratory for the appropriate compounds.
- (5) Finally, the analytical results were compared graphically (using 1:1 correspondence plots) and statistically (using non-parametric analysis of variance testing) to determine if the two sampling techniques were significantly different in their ability to recover perchlorate or any of the explosives compounds present in the groundwater.

### **5.2 BASELINE CHARACTERIZATION**

At Aberdeen Proving Grounds the most recent perchlorate contamination data was collected 2 years prior to the sampling done on this project (General Physics Corporation, 2005). Eleven wells were sampled prior to the actual field demonstration to determine the current groundwater concentrations of perchlorate in them. Selected wells were also sampled to determine current VOC concentrations and the background groundwater chemistry. A background well was pumped to collect the large volume sample used in the bench-scale testing for perchlorate.

At Picatinny Arsenal the latest explosives compounds data was collected less than 6 months prior to the sampling done on this project by another ESTCP funded project (ER-1425) (Paul Hatzinger, Shaw Environmental, written communication, 2008). Several other wells had been sampled less than 4 years prior to the sampling done on this project (Ted Gabel, Picatinny Arsenal, written communication, 2008). A background well was sampled to collect the large volume sample used in the bench-scale testing for explosives compounds.

### 5.3 LABORATORY BENCH-SCALE STUDY RESULTS

A significant portion of this project involved pre-demonstration testing to determine which chemical constituents would diffuse through the dialysis membrane and how long these chemicals would take to attain equilibrium with the groundwater. Additionally, the bench-scale work involved testing the effect of different water temperatures on equilibration times. A summary of all pre-demonstration testing with perchlorate and explosives compounds is given in this section.

During the pre-demonstration portion of this project, background water samples from the chosen field sites were collected and brought back to the laboratory to conduct bench-scale equilibration tests. Bench-scale equilibration tests were conducted that evaluated perchlorate and 14 explosives compounds (Table 5-1). During the bench-scale testing, RCDM samplers filled with deoxygenated deionized water were placed into containers containing groundwater test solutions (background field samples that had been spiked with known concentrations of the chemicals being tested). Groundwater test solutions were stirred once per day for the duration of the testing to minimize any concentration stratification in the containers. After specified times (0, 1, 3, 7, 14, 21, or 28 days of equilibration), an RCDM sampler was removed and sampled. A sample of the groundwater test solution was also collected at the same time. Concentrations of chemicals inside the sampler were compared to concentrations of chemicals outside the sampler at each time step. Time to equilibrium was defined as the time needed for the concentration inside the RCDM sampler to be at least 95% of the concentration in the groundwater test solution outside the sampler. All tests were run at room temperature (21°C) and at 10°C in an incubator. This was done in an effort to approximately bracket groundwater temperatures across the continental United States. The equilibration times determined for the chemical constituents in the bench-scale tests were used to guide the time needed for the RCDM samplers to equilibrate in the wells during the field demonstration.

**Table 5-1. Chemical Constituents Tested In Bench-Scale Tests**

| <b><i>Bench-Scale Test 8 (9 mg/L; 21°C and 10°C)</i></b>  |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Perchlorate   |                             |
| <b><i>Bench-Scale Test 9 (20 µg/L; 21°C and 10°C)</i></b> |                             |
| 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene (TNB)                               | 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (TNT) |
| 1,3-Dinitrobenzene  | 2,4-Dinitrotoluene          |
| 2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene                                | 2,6-Dinitrotoluene          |
| 4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene                                | 2-Nitrotoluene              |
| Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX)    | 3-Nitrotoluene              |
| 1,3,5-Trinitroperhydro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)               | 4-Nitrotoluene              |
| N-methyl-N,2,4,6-tetranitroaniline (Tetryl)               | Nitrobenzene                |

Equilibrium was reached in all RCDM samplers within:

- 1 day for perchlorate at both the 10°C and 21°C temperatures.

Perchlorate was not detected in any of the blanks, indicating that there was no desorption of this anion from the dialysis membrane material. Coefficients of variation for triplicate perchlorate analyses of water from the RCDM sampler and the test solutions were <4%. Thus, perchlorate is an excellent candidate chemical to be sampled using RCDM samplers.

Equilibrium was reached in RCDM samplers within:

- 3 to 7 days for the 14 explosives compounds tested.

Twelve of the 14 explosives compound equilibrated within 3 days at both 10°C and 21°C. HMX and 4-Nitrotoluene took 7 days to equilibrate at the colder temperature versus the warmer temperature. Trace concentrations of RDX and HMX were found in a few of the blanks. The authors believe that these trace concentrations were not the results of desorption from the dialysis membrane material, but instead most likely due to contamination of the equipment used to sample the test solutions in the bench-scale testing. Coefficients of variation of triplicate analyses from the RCDM samplers and test solutions for all 14 explosives compounds ranged between 5 and 16%. Based on the bench-scale results, all 14 explosives compounds tested were considered favorable candidate chemicals to be sampled using RCDM samplers.

The findings of all bench-scale testing are summarized in Table 5-2.

**Table 5-2. Summary of all bench-scale testing results: Suitability and equilibration times of all chemicals tested.**

| <b>Favorable Bench-Scale Equilibration Testing Results</b>                 |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Anions (1 day equilibration times at 21°C and 10°C)</i>                 |                       |
| Perchlorate  |                       |
| <i>Explosives compounds (3-7 day equilibration times at 21°C and 10°C)</i> |                       |
| 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene  | 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene |
| 1,3-Dinitrobenzene   | 2,4-Dinitrotoluene    |
| 2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene   | 2,6-Dinitrotoluene    |
| 4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene   | 2-Nitrotoluene        |
| Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX)                     | 3-Nitrotoluene        |
| 1,3,5-Trinitroperhydro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)                                | 4-Nitrotoluene        |
| N-methyl-N,2,4,6-tetranitroaniline (Tetryl)                                | Nitrobenzene          |

## 5.4 DESIGN OF TECHNOLOGY COMPONENTS

### 5.4.1 Construction of RCDM Samplers

The materials and methods of construction of RCDM samplers have been detailed in a protocol report written and published as part of this ESTCP project (Imbrigiotta and Trotsky, 2009). A brief summary of the construction process is as follows:

The dialysis membrane samplers tested during this demonstration were constructed of regenerated cellulose. The pre-cleaned membrane was obtained from Membrane Filtration Products, Inc., Sequin, Texas. The membrane has a nominal molecular weight cut off of 8,000 Daltons with a pore size of 18 Å. The 100-mm width membrane has a filled diameter of 63.7 mm, a volume of 31.8 mL/cm, and comes in rolls 5 m in length. The 100-mm wide membrane was used to make samplers that fit down 4-inch diameter wells. The 50-mm width membrane has a filled diameter of 31.8 mm, a volume of 7.94 mL/cm, and comes in rolls 10 m in length. The 50-mm wide membrane was used to make samplers that fit down 2-inch diameter wells. The membrane was purchased pre-cleaned to eliminate any possible contamination with trace metals and sulfides. The membrane was cut into lengths appropriate for the volume needed for analyses at a particular well and site.

Photos of the various stages of construction are presented in figures 2-2 through 2-5 in this report. The appropriate length of membrane is first rinsed with deionized water to remove the preservative solution it is shipped in. The membrane is either clamped or tied in a knot to close one end and clamped to a PVC valve at the opposite end. The membrane is slipped inside a protective polyethylene mesh and filled with nitrogen-sparged deionized water through the valve. With the valve closed, cable ties are used to close the ends of the mesh trapping the filled dialysis membrane inside. Weights can be included inside the protective mesh or attached externally. The sampler is attached to a disposable or dedicated polyethylene rope or a cleanable Teflon-coated stainless-steel line for suspension in a well. Examples of each type of RCDM sampler construction are shown in figures 5-1 and 5-2.

RCDM samplers were constructed in the USGS laboratory in West Trenton, New Jersey, within one week of being deployed in wells at each field site. For both the Maryland and New Jersey sites, RCDM samplers were stored in rigid PVC tubes filled with nitrogen-sparged deionized water and transported to the field in these tubes.



**Figure 5-1. RCDM sampler that will be suspended using Teflon-coated stainless-steel line with an external stainless-steel weight.**



**Figure 5-2. RCDM sampler that will be suspended in a well using a dedicated polyethylene rope and having weights internal to the protective mesh.**

## 5.5 FIELD TESTING

### 5.5.1 Field Demonstration Preparation and Mobilization

Access to and integrity of the wells to be sampled at each field demonstration site was checked one month prior to the start of the field comparison test at each site. RCDM samplers were constructed within one week prior to the start of each field test. Low-flow purge pumps were cleaned and equipment blanks were collected prior to their use in the field tests. All other equipment needed to carry out the field demonstration at each site was assembled and checked out the week prior to each field comparison test. If contaminated purge water had to be drummed at a site, the Site Manager was contacted in advance of the start of the field test to obtain the drums and make arrangements for transport and treatment of the purge water collected.

### 5.5.2 Field Demonstration Sampling Events

The periods of sampling at each of the two field demonstration sites are given in Table 5-3 below. The RCDM samplers were deployed in the test wells for about one week at the perchlorate field test site and for approximately two weeks at the explosives compounds field test site prior to the collection of samples. On the sample collection date, the RCDM samplers were removed from the test wells and sampled prior to the collection of samples by low-flow purging.

**Table 5-3. Periods of sampling at field demonstration sites**

| Demonstration Site                | RCDM Sampler Deployment Dates | Sample Collection Dates |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland | April 15, 2008                | April 22-24, 2008       |
| Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey     | August 15, 2008               | September 3-4, 2008     |

### 5.5.3 Field Demonstration Wells

The wells sampled during the field demonstrations are shown in Figures 4-1 to 4-4. Table 5-4 gives details about the wells sampled in the field demonstrations. Field sites, dates of sampling, well names, details of the well construction, water levels, and depths at which each sampler was used are given in this table.

**Table 5-4. Wells sampled during the field demonstrations**

[ft blse, feet below land surface elevation; PVC, polyvinyl chloride; RCDM, regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion sampler; Low-Flow, low-flow purging; Dup, duplicate]

| Site and Date                            | Well Name | Well Diameter (inches) | Casing Material | Total Depth (ft blse) | Open Interval Depth (ft blse) | Water Level (ft blse) | Sampling Technique                           | Sample Depth (ft blse)     |
|--|-----------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland       | CC-016A   | 4                      | PVC             | 23                    | 18-23                         | 9.85                  | RCDM <sup>a</sup><br>Low-Flow                | 19.5-21.5<br>20.5          |
| April 2008<br>(Sampling for Perchlorate) | CCJ-016B  | 4                      | PVC             | 37.5                  | 32.5-37.5                     | 9.09                  | RCDM<br>RCDM-Dup<br>Low Flow<br>Low-Flow-Dup | 34-36<br>34-36<br>35<br>35 |
| (Well locations in Figures 4-1 and 4-2)  | CCJ-017A  | 4                      | PVC             | 24.5                  | 19.5-24.5                     | 7.56                  | RCDM<br>Low-Flow                             | 21-23<br>22                |
|  | CC-017B   | 4                      | PVC             | 35                    | 30-35                         | 6.98                  | RCDM<br>Low-Flow                             | 31.5-33.5<br>32.5          |
|  | CC-018A   | 4                      | PVC             | 52                    | 47-52                         | 13.32                 | RCDM<br>Low-Flow                             | 48.5-50.5<br>49.5          |
|  | CC-021A   | 4                      | PVC             | 35                    | 30-35                         | 11.06                 | RCDM<br>Low-Flow                             | 31.5-33.5<br>32.5          |
|  | CCJ-030A  | 4                      | PVC             | 40                    | 35-40                         | 18.31                 | RCDM<br>Low-Flow                             | 36.5-38.5<br>37.5          |
|  | CCJ-110A  | 4                      | PVC             | 50                    | 45-50                         | 19.90                 | RCDM<br>Low-Flow                             | 46.5-48.5<br>47.5          |
|  | CCJ-111B  | 4                      | PVC             | 32.5                  | 27.5-32.5                     | 13.30                 | RCDM<br>Low-Flow                             | 29-31<br>30                |
|  | CC-118B   | 4                      | PVC             | 56                    | 51-56                         | 8.81                  | RCDM<br>Low-Flow                             | 52.5-54.5<br>53.5          |
|  | CC-135A   | 4                      | PVC             | 19                    | 14-19                         | 10.34                 | RCDM<br>Low-Flow                             | 15.5-17.5<br>16.5          |

**Table 5-4. Wells sampled during the field demonstrations (continued)**

| Site and Date                              | Well Name | Well Diameter (inches) | Casing Material | Total Depth (ft blse) | Open Interval Depth (ft blse) | Water Level (ft blse) | Sampling Technique  | Sample Depth (ft blse)     |
|--|-----------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey<br>Sept 2008 | 40MW1     | 4                      | PVC             | 36                    | 24-34                         | 11.00                 | RCDM <sup>b</sup><br>RCDM-Dup<br>Low-Flow<br>Low-Flow-Dup | 27-29<br>29-31<br>28<br>30 |
| Explosives Compounds Sampled               | 40MW2     | 4                      | PVC             | 36.2                  | 25-35                         | 11.07                 | RCDM<br>RCDM-Dup<br>Low-Flow<br>Low-Flow-Dup              | 29-31<br>31-33<br>30<br>32 |
| (Well locations in Figures 4-3 and 4-4)    | 40MW3     | 4                      | PVC             | 36.2                  | 26.5-36.5                     | 2.56                  | RCDM<br>Low-Flow  | 30-32<br>31                |
|  | 40MW6     | 2                      | PVC             | 33.6                  | 24-34                         | 12.62                 | RCDM <sup>c</sup><br>Low-Flow                             | 27-33<br>30                |
|  | 157MW1    | 4                      | PVC             | 35.7                  | 24-34                         | 6.98                  | RCDM<br>Low-Flow  | 30-32<br>31                |
|  | 157MW2    | 4                      | PVC             | 35.1                  | 25.8-35.8                     | 6.09                  | RCDM<br>Low-Flow  | 29-31<br>30                |
|  | 157MW3    | 4                      | PVC             | 35.7                  | 26.5-36.5                     | 6.40                  | RCDM<br>RCDM-Dup<br>Low-Flow<br>Low-Flow-Dup              | 29-31<br>31-33<br>30<br>32 |
|  | 157MW8 D  | 2                      | PVC             | 50.9                  | 35-50                         | 5.04                  | RCDM<br>Low-Flow  | 38-43<br>41                |

<sup>a</sup> One 2-ft long 1.75-inch diameter RCDM sampler was equilibrated per 4-inch diameter well to sample for perchlorate. If a duplicate sample is indicated, two RCDM samplers were suspended side-by-side.

<sup>b</sup> One 2-ft long 3.5-inch diameter RCDM sampler was equilibrated per 4-inch diameter well to sample for explosives compounds. If a duplicate is indicated two RCDM samplers were suspended vertically as closely as possible.

<sup>c</sup> Two 2-ft long 1.75-inch diameter RCDM samplers were stacked vertically to collect a sufficient volume of water for the explosives analysis in 2-inch diameter wells.



#### **5.5.4 Residuals Handling**

Essentially all of the water contained in the RCDM samplers was captured in filling sample containers and sent to the laboratory for analysis. The only residual wastewater produced during RCDM sampling was the few milliliters of water used to rinse each sample container. The empty RCDM samplers were properly disposed of at each site.

Low-flow pumping of each well did produce purge water that had to be drummed and disposed of properly at each site. The volume of purge water collected varied from well to well but was on average about 10 gallons per well. All procedures for proper disposal of purge water at each site were followed.

### **5.6 SAMPLING METHODS**

#### **5.6.1 Sampler Deployment**

RCDM samplers were deployed in the open interval of wells at the depths of highest mass flux of the primary chemicals of concern at each site. Depths were chosen based on knowledge of the well construction and water-chemistry results from previous sampling at each site and the pre-demonstration plan sampling. Duplicate samplers were deployed side by side where the diameter of the well allowed (1.75-inch samplers in 4-inch APG wells). Where the diameter of the well did not allow this, duplicate samplers were deployed as close as possible to one another vertically (3.5-inch samplers in 4-inch Picatinny wells or 1.75-inch samplers in 2-inch Picatinny wells). The variable-speed low-flow purge pump intake was positioned at a depth that corresponded with approximately the center of the RCDM sampler in each well to try and sample the same zone in the well.

#### **5.6.2 Sample Frequency**

Comparison field samples were collected once from wells at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds site and once from the wells at the Picatinny Arsenal site during the course of the field demonstrations. The dates each site was sampled are given in Table 5-3.

#### **5.6.3 Tested Chemical Constituents**

Comparison field samples were collected from each well at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds site and analyzed for perchlorate only. Comparison field samples were collected from each well at the Picatinny Arsenal site and analyzed for the list of explosives compounds shown in Table 5-5. Basically this was same list of nitroamines and nitroaromatics analyzed for in the bench-scale testing, with the addition of PETN and nitroglycerin. The latter two chemical constituents were not tested for equilibration times in the bench-scale tests, but were measured in the field samples because they were on the same analytical scan as all the other explosives compounds. The complete list of sampled chemical constituents and their minimum detection limits is given in Table 5-5.

**Table 5-5. Chemical constituents analyzed in samples from the field demonstrations**

[MDLs, minimum detection limits; µg/L, micrograms per liter; mg/L, milligrams per liter]

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| <b>Anions (MDL=0.009 mg/L)</b>                         |                       |
| Perchlorate  |                       |
| <b>Explosives compounds (MDLs=0.05-0.92 µg/L)</b>      |                       |
| 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene                                  | 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene |
| 1,3-Dinitrobenzene                                     | 2,4-Dinitrotoluene    |
| 2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene                             | 2,6-Dinitrotoluene    |
| 4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene                             | 2-Nitrotoluene        |
| Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX) | 3-Nitrotoluene        |
| 1,3,5-Trinitroperhydro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)            | 4-Nitrotoluene        |
| N-methyl-N,2,4,6-tetranitroaniline (Tetryl)            | Nitrobenzene          |
| Pentaerythritol tetranitrate (PETN)                    | Nitroglycerin         |

### 5.6.4 Sample Collection

The RCDM samplers were allowed to equilibrate for at least one week when collecting samples for perchlorate. The RCDM samplers were allowed to equilibrate for at least two weeks when collecting samples for explosives compounds. These equilibration times were actually longer than those determined during the bench-scale testing partially as a safety factor to make sure that chemical equilibrium was reached and partially to allow the well enough time to re-establish hydraulic equilibrium with the aquifer.

After the equilibration period, the field comparison sampling was conducted at each site. At the beginning of each field demonstration for each site, all necessary equipment was assembled at the field site. A dry run was conducted to insure that all equipment and supplies were present and performing as expected before proceeding with the demonstration.

After initial water levels were taken, the RCDM sampler was retrieved from each well and samples were collected immediately in appropriate containers (Figure 5-6). All samples were collected and preserved according to standard sampling protocols. All sample bottles were placed in a cooler on ice for transport back to the office.

Next, Teflon-lined polyethylene intake tubing attached to a variable-speed low-flow peristaltic pump was lowered into the well and centered at the depth at which the RCDM sampler was suspended during its equilibration. Low-flow purging at 500-1000 mL/min was conducted as per the USEPA and USGS protocols (Puls and Barcelona, 1996; Wilde et al., 1998) and field parameters (temperature, pH, specific conductance, dissolved oxygen, and turbidity) were monitored until stability was reached using a multi-parameter instrument (YSI 6920) in a flow-through cell at the surface (Figure 5-7). Field parameters were considered to be stabilized when three successive readings taken five minutes apart were within  $\pm 0.1^{\circ}\text{C}$  for temperature,  $\pm 0.1$  units for pH,  $\pm 5\%$  for conductance in  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ,  $<10$  NTU or  $\pm 5$  NTU if above 10 NTU for turbidity, and  $\pm 0.1$  mg/L for dissolved oxygen. After reaching stabilization of field parameters, samples were collected from the discharge line of the low-flow peristaltic pump. All samples were collected in appropriate sample containers and preserved according to standard sampling protocols. Samples were placed in a cooler on ice for transport back to the office.

Eleven wells were sampled during the field demonstration for perchlorate. All eleven wells contained detectable concentrations of perchlorate. Eight wells were sampled during the field demonstration for explosives compounds. However, because detectable and quantifiable concentrations of most explosives compounds were not present in all wells sampled, fewer comparisons of these constituents could be made overall. All wells sampled in this study are given in Table 5-4.



**Figure 5-6. Removal of diffusion sampler from a well prior to sampling**



**Figure 5-7. Low-flow purging set up for a 4-inch diameter well.**

(A peristaltic pump is being used to purge, a multiparameter field sonde is being used to monitor the stability of field parameters in a flow cell, and an electric tape is being used to monitor drawdown.)

### **5.6.5 Sample Preservation**

For perchlorate and explosives compounds analyses, all low-flow samples were filtered through 0.45  $\mu\text{m}$  pore-diameter polyethersulfone in-line capsule filters and chilled to 4°C for preservation. RCDM samples were not filtered through 0.45 micron filters because dialysis membranes are in and of themselves filters that have 18 Angstrom pores. All RCDM samples were chilled to 4°C for preservation.

### 5.6.6 Summary of Samples Collected

A summary of the total number and types of samples collected during both the pre-demonstration phase and the field demonstration phase of this project is given in the following table.

**Table 5.6. Total number and types of samples collected during project**

| Component                       | Matrix      | Number of Samples | Analytes   | Location                                 |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Pre-Demonstration Sampling      | Groundwater | 12                | Perchlorate, Field parameters <sup>1</sup>           | 11 wells at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, MD |
|                                 | Groundwater | 1                 | Explosives Compounds <sup>2</sup> , Field parameters | 1 well at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ          |
| Technology Performance Sampling | Groundwater | 11                | Perchlorate, Field parameters                        | 10 wells at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, MD |
|                                 | Groundwater | 11                | Explosives Compounds, Field parameters               | 8 wells at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ         |

<sup>1</sup> Field parameters include temperature, specific conductance, dissolved oxygen, pH, and turbidity.

<sup>2</sup> Explosives compounds include all compounds listed in table 5-5.

### 5.6.7 Demobilization

At each field comparison site, demobilization involved collecting the field equipment (i.e., pumps, multi-parameter meter, sonde, batteries, etc.), and returning it to the USGS office in West Trenton, New Jersey. Field equipment was checked and repairs were made as needed.

### 5.6.8 Additional Sampling Methods Information

Information on the calibration of analytical instrumentation, quality assurance/quality control sampling, field equipment decontamination procedures, and sample documentation procedures used in the field demonstrations are given in Appendix A.



## 5.7 ANALYTICAL METHODS

### 5.7.1 Selection of Analytical/Testing Methods

The groundwater samples collected for analysis were sent to a DoD-certified contract laboratory and the samples were analyzed using USEPA-approved methods. Perchlorate analyses were conducted using the USEPA SW-846 analytical protocol 6860 (USEPA, 2003). Explosives compounds were analyzed using USEPA SW-846 method 8330A (USEPA, 2003). All analytical methods were chosen to have sufficiently low detection levels so that the differences between sample results could be recognized if present. Details of the above mentioned analytical techniques used in this plan are given in the references shown in Table 5-7.

**Table 5-7. Analytical methods used for perchlorate and explosives compounds sample analysis**

| Matrix      | Chemical Constituent            | U.S. EPA Method No. | Container                        | Preservative/Holding Time                                  | References   |
|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Groundwater | Perchlorate, dissolved          | SW-846 6860         | 250 mL polyethylene bottle       | Filtered through 0.45 µm filter and chilled to 4°C/28 days | <a href="http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/test/main.htm">www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/test/main.htm</a> - search for method 6860  |
| Groundwater | Explosives compounds, dissolved | SW-846 8330A        | 1 Liter baked amber glass bottle | Filtered through 0.45 µm filter and chilled to 4°C/21 days | <a href="http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/test/main.htm">www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/test/main.htm</a> - search for method 8330A |

### 5.7.2 Selection of Analytical/Testing Laboratory

TestAmerica Laboratories, Lakewood, Colorado, was selected to analyze the samples in this field demonstration because it was a DoD-certified contract laboratory. This laboratory had the capability to run all the needed analyses within the appropriate sample holding times, meet all quality assurance requirements, and provide results in a timely manner.

## 5.8 GRAPHICAL COMPARISON METHODS

Field results were evaluated by making 1:1 plots of the data for each chemical constituent for the RCDM sampler versus low-flow purging. Ideally, if both sampling techniques work equally well in sampling for the constituent being plotted, all the points should lie on the 1:1 line. Although some deviation around the line is expected due to sampling and analytical variation, consistent deviation from the 1:1 relationship may indicate a sampling bias for a chemical constituent by one sampling method over another. These plots were presented as log-log plots because the chemical constituents found in the field comparison samples typically ranged from their detection limit up to 2 to 4 orders of magnitude higher in concentration. Analyses reported at less than the detection limit were assigned a value of one half the detection limit for the purposes of plotting the data. Each plot was divided into three parts. The white portion of each graph included all data points where both the sampling techniques being compared had concentrations above the laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the compound being plotted. Concentrations in this range had the greatest degree of confidence analytically. The yellow portion of each graph included all points where the concentrations for one or both of the sampling techniques were less than the laboratory reporting level but still above one half the

minimum detection limit (1/2 MDL). One half the minimum-detection limit was plotted wherever a “less than the detection limit” value was obtained for an analysis. Concentrations in this range, while still valid, had a lower degree of confidence analytically because small sampling or analytical errors can have a large effect on the magnitude of these lower concentration values. The rose-colored portion of each graph included concentrations that were less than one half the minimum detection limit. No data points were plotted in the rose-colored section of any of the graphs.

## **5.9 STATISTICAL COMPARISON METHODS**

Perchlorate was detected in 10 wells during this study, so statistical comparisons between RCDM samplers and low-flow purging were made using a maximum of 10 well comparisons. Explosives compounds were detected in 8 wells during this study. However, all explosives compounds were not detected in every well, so these compounds generated fewer comparison opportunities. Depending on their detection frequency, explosives compounds that could be compared in 4 or more cases were included in the statistical comparisons.

### **5.9.1 Correlations.**

Pearson’s correlation coefficients were calculated for the two sets of data plotted on each 1:1 plot using a statistical software package (S-PLUS, 2002). Positive correlation coefficients greater than 0.50 indicate a strong relationship between the two sets of data. High correlation coefficients do not necessarily indicate that the relationship is 1:1.

### **5.9.2 Normality Testing.**

Prior to any statistical testing of the data collected in the field demonstrations, the distribution of the data for each water-quality constituent was tested for normality. This was accomplished by running a univariate analysis, plotting box plots, and by applying a Kolmogorov-Smirnov goodness-of-fit test (S-PLUS, 2002). Chemical parameters from comparisons where at least one sampling technique had an above detection value were included in this analysis. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic of 0.05 or less indicated that the data distribution was significantly different from the normal distribution. Parametric statistical tests require the data distribution to be normal to be valid. If the data distribution for a chemical constituent was not normal, non-parametric statistical tests were used to compare sets of results.

### **5.9.3 Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test.**

To compare perchlorate and explosives compounds data, where the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging were used to collect samples, a Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used (S-PLUS, 2002). This test is the non-parametric equivalent to a student’s t-test on the ranked data from the two data sets. Differences determined at a significance level of  $p < 0.05$  were considered significant. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test determined if there was a significant difference between the median concentrations recovered by the two sampling techniques.

## **5.10 SAMPLING RESULTS**

### **5.10.1 Perchlorate Sampling Results from Field Demonstration at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland**

The results from field demonstration at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, MD, for the comparison of RCDM samplers and low-flow purging to collect perchlorate samples are given in Table 5-8.

**Table 5-8. Results from perchlorate field demonstration sampling**

[RCDM, regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane; LF, low-flow purging; FLDBLK, field equipment wash blank; µg/L, micrograms per liter]

|                  | Sample  | Sample | Perchlorate |
|------------------|---------|--------|-------------|
| Well             | Date    | Time   | (µg/L)      |
| CC016A-RCDM      | 4/22/08 | 1535   | <0.009      |
| CC016A-LF        | 4/22/08 | 1635   | <0.009      |
| CCJ016B-RCDM     | 4/22/10 | 1700   | 23.0        |
| CCJ016B-LF       | 4/22/08 | 1800   | 27.0        |
| CCJ016B-RCDM-DUP | 4/22/10 | 1705   | 22.0        |
| CCJ016B-LF-DUP   | 4/22/08 | 1805   | 25.0        |
| CCJ017A-RCDM     | 4/22/08 | 1330   | 7.3         |
| CCJ017A-LF       | 4/22/08 | 1415   | 8.2         |
| CC017B-RCDM      | 4/22/08 | 1430   | 2.9         |
| CC017B-LF        | 4/22/08 | 1510   | 2.9         |
| CC018A-RCDM      | 4/23/08 | 1320   | 2.6         |
| CC018A-LF        | 4/23/08 | 1410   | 2.6         |
| CC021A-RCDM      | 4/22/08 | 1825   | 41.0        |
| CC021A-LF        | 4/22/08 | 1910   | 41.0        |
| CCJ030A-RCDM     | 4/23/08 | 1635   | 9.2         |
| CCJ030A-LF       | 4/23/08 | 1725   | 9.2         |
| CCJ110A-RCDM     | 4/23/08 | 1540   | 24.0        |
| CCJ110A-LF       | 4/23/08 | 1620   | 24.0        |
| CCJ111B-RCDM     | 4/22/08 | 1045   | 16.0        |
| CCJ111B-LF       | 4/22/08 | 1230   | 15.0        |
| CC118B-RCDM      | 4/23/08 | 1435   | 20.0        |
| CC118B-LF        | 4/23/08 | 1510   | 19.0        |
| CC135A-RCDM      | 4/23/08 | 1215   | 170.0       |
| CC135A-LF        | 4/23/08 | 1255   | 170.0       |
| FLDBLK-RCDM      | 4/23/08 | 2200   | <0.009      |
| FLDBLK-LF        | 4/23/08 | 2245   | <0.009      |

Perchlorate was detected in 10 of 11 wells sampled at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds site. The concentrations ranged over approximately 4 orders of magnitude, from <0.009 to 170 µg/L.

#### **5.10.2 Explosives Compounds Sampling Results from Field Demonstration at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey**

The results from field demonstration at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ, for the comparison of RCDM samplers and low-flow purging are given in Table 5-9.



**Table 5-9. Results from explosives compounds field demonstration sampling.**

[RCDM, regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane; LF, low-flow purging; FLDBLK, field equipment blank; µg/L, micrograms per liter; J, above detection but below reporting limit; COL, more than 40% difference between primary and confirmation detector results with the lower of the two results reported]

|                 | Sample | Sample | 2-Amino-<br>4,6-dinitro<br>toluene | 4-Amino-<br>2,6-dinitro<br>toluene | 1,3-Dinitro<br>benzene | 2,4-Dinitro<br>toluene |
|-----------------|--------|--------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Well            | Date   | Time   | (µg/L)                             | (µg/L)                             | (µg/L)                 | (µg/L)                 |
| 40MW1-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1120   | 4.95                               | 7.40                               | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 40MW1-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1205   | 0.47                               | 0.97                               | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 40MW1-RCDM-DUP  | 9/4/08 | 1125   | 4.95                               | 7.40                               | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 40MW1-LF-DUP    | 9/4/08 | 1235   | 0.53                               | 1.10                               | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 40MW2-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1345   | 35.00                              | 33.50                              | <0.440                 | <0.420                 |
| 40MW2-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1425   | 8.75                               | 9.85                               | <0.440                 | <0.420                 |
| 40MW2-RCDM-DUP  | 9/4/08 | 1350   | 33.00                              | 33.50                              | <0.440                 | <0.420                 |
| 40MW2-LF-DUP    | 9/4/08 | 1455   | 7.00                               | 8.40                               | <0.440                 | <0.420                 |
| 40MW3-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1515   | 4.50                               | 8.55                               | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 40MW3-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1600   | 0.62                               | 1.45                               | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 40MW6-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1230   | 4.00                               | 4.55                               | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 40MW6-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1315   | 0.13                               | <0.058                             | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 157MW1-RCDM     | 9/3/08 | 1715   | 2.50                               | 3.00                               | 0.19 J COL             | 0.12 J COL             |
| 157MW1-LF       | 9/3/08 | 1810   | 0.079 J                            | 0.071 J                            | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 157MW2-RCDM     | 9/4/08 | 1000   | 0.89                               | 2.00                               | <0.180                 | <0.170                 |
| 157MW2-LF       | 9/4/08 | 1050   | <0.051                             | 1.01                               | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 157MW3-RCDM     | 9/3/08 | 1535   | 14.00                              | 11.00                              | <0.440                 | 0.6 J COL              |
| 157MW3-LF       | 9/3/08 | 1630   | 0.63                               | <0.058                             | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 157MW3-RCDM-DUP | 9/3/08 | 1540   | 15.00                              | 11.00                              | <0.440                 | 0.63 J COL             |
| 157MW3-LF-DUP   | 9/3/08 | 1700   | 0.54                               | <0.058                             | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| 157MW8D-RCDM    | 9/3/08 | 1420   | 20.00                              | 20.00                              | 0.57                   | 1.20                   |
| 157MW8D-LF      | 9/3/08 | 1510   | 1.40                               | 1.70                               | <0.180                 | <0.170                 |
| FLDBLK-RCDM     | 9/5/08 | 1045   | <0.051                             | <0.058                             | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
| FLDBLK-LF       | 9/5/08 | 1100   | <0.051                             | 0.080 J                            | <0.089                 | <0.084                 |
|                 |        |        |                                    |                                    |                        |                        |

**Table 5-9 (continued). Results from explosives compounds field demonstration sampling.**  
[RCDM, regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane; LF, low-flow purging; FLDBLK, field equipment blank; µg/L, micrograms per liter; J, above detection but below reporting limit; COL, more than 40% difference between primary and confirmation detector results with the lower of the two results reported]

|                 | Sample | Sample | 2,6-Dinitro<br>toluene | HMX            | Nitro<br>benzene | Nitro<br>glycerin |
|-----------------|--------|--------|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Well            | Date   | Time   | (µg/L)                 | (µg/L)         | (µg/L)           | (µg/L)            |
| 40MW1-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1120   | <0.064                 | 2.85           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 40MW1-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1205   | <0.064                 | 5.90           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 40MW1-RCDM-DUP  | 9/4/08 | 1125   | <0.064                 | 2.90           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 40MW1-LF-DUP    | 9/4/08 | 1235   | <0.064                 | 8.55           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 40MW2-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1345   | <0.320                 | 14.00          | <0.460           | <4.60             |
| 40MW2-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1425   | <0.320                 | 11.50          | <0.460           | <4.60             |
| 40MW2-RCDM-DUP  | 9/4/08 | 1350   | <0.320                 | 14.00          | <0.460           | <4.60             |
| 40MW2-LF-DUP    | 9/4/08 | 1455   | <0.320                 | 11.50          | <0.460           | <4.60             |
| 40MW3-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1515   | 0.43                   | 3.70           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 40MW3-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1600   | 0.19                   | 2.45           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 40MW6-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1230   | <0.064                 | 4.95           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 40MW6-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1315   | <0.064                 | 4.90           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 157MW1-RCDM     | 9/3/08 | 1715   | <0.064                 | 8.00           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 157MW1-LF       | 9/3/08 | 1810   | <0.064                 | 4.20           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 157MW2-RCDM     | 9/4/08 | 1000   | <0.130                 | 2.35           | <0.180           | <1.80             |
| 157MW2-LF       | 9/4/08 | 1050   | <0.064                 | 1.15           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 157MW3-RCDM     | 9/3/08 | 1535   | <0.320                 | 4.70           | <0.460           | <4.60             |
| 157MW3-LF       | 9/3/08 | 1630   | <0.064                 | 1.90           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 157MW3-RCDM-DUP | 9/3/08 | 1540   | <0.320                 | 4.60           | <0.460           | <4.60             |
| 157MW3-LF-DUP   | 9/3/08 | 1700   | <0.064                 | 1.90           | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| 157MW8D-RCDM    | 9/3/08 | 1420   | <0.130                 | 29.00          | <0.180           | <1.80             |
| 157MW8D-LF      | 9/3/08 | 1510   | <0.130                 | 20.00          | <0.180           | <1.80             |
| FLDBLK-RCDM     | 9/5/08 | 1045   | <0.064                 | <0.088         | <0.091           | <0.92             |
| FLDBLK-LF       | 9/5/08 | 1100   | <0.064                 | 0.167 J<br>COL | 0.091            | <0.92             |
|                 |        |        |                        |                |                  |                   |

**Table 5-9 (continued). Results from explosives compounds field demonstration sampling**  
[RCDM, regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane; LF, low-flow purging; FLDBLK, field equipment blank; µg/L, micrograms per liter; J, above detection but below reporting limit; COL, more than 40% difference between primary and confirmation detector results with the lower of the two results reported]

|                 | Sample | Sample | 2-Nitro<br>toluene | 3-Nitro<br>toluene | 4-Nitro<br>toluene | PETN   |
|-----------------|--------|--------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Well            | Date   | Time   | (µg/L)             | (µg/L)             | (µg/L)             | (µg/L) |
| 40MW1-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1120   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 40MW1-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1205   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 40MW1-RCDM-DUP  | 9/4/08 | 1125   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 40MW1-LF-DUP    | 9/4/08 | 1235   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 40MW2-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1345   | <0.430             | <0.420             | <1.00              | <2.10  |
| 40MW2-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1425   | <0.430             | <0.420             | <1.00              | <2.10  |
| 40MW2-RCDM-DUP  | 9/4/08 | 1350   | <0.430             | <0.420             | <1.00              | <2.10  |
| 40MW2-LF-DUP    | 9/4/08 | 1455   | <0.430             | <0.420             | <1.00              | <2.10  |
| 40MW3-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1515   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 40MW3-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1600   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 40MW6-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1230   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 40MW6-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1315   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 157MW1-RCDM     | 9/3/08 | 1715   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 157MW1-LF       | 9/3/08 | 1810   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 157MW2-RCDM     | 9/4/08 | 1000   | <0.170             | <0.170             | <0.40              | <0.83  |
| 157MW2-LF       | 9/4/08 | 1050   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 157MW3-RCDM     | 9/3/08 | 1535   | <0.430             | <0.420             | <1.00              | <2.10  |
| 157MW3-LF       | 9/3/08 | 1630   | <0.086             | <0.420             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 157MW3-RCDM-DUP | 9/3/08 | 1540   | <0.430             | <0.083             | <1.00              | <2.10  |
| 157MW3-LF-DUP   | 9/3/08 | 1700   | <0.086             | <0.170             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| 157MW8D-RCDM    | 9/3/08 | 1420   | <0.170             | <0.170             | <0.40              | <0.83  |
| 157MW8D-LF      | 9/3/08 | 1510   | <0.170             | <0.083             | <0.40              | <0.83  |
| FLDBLK-RCDM     | 9/5/08 | 1045   | <0.086             | <0.083             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
| FLDBLK-LF       | 9/5/08 | 1100   | <0.086             | <0.420             | <0.20              | <0.42  |
|                 |        |        |                    |                    |                    |        |

**Table 5-9 (continued). Results from explosives compounds field demonstration sampling**  
[RCDM, regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane; LF, low-flow purging; FLDBLK, field equipment blank; µg/L, micrograms per liter; J, above detection but below reporting limit; COL, more than 40% difference between primary and confirmation detector results with the lower of the two results reported]

|                 | Sample | Sample | RDX      | Tetryl | 1,3,5-Trinitro benzene | 2,4,6-Trinitro toluene |
|-----------------|--------|--------|----------|--------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Well            | Date   | Time   | (µg/L)   | (µg/L) | (µg/L)                 | (µg/L)                 |
| 40MW1-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1120   | 3.10     | <0.079 | <0.20                  | 1.30                   |
| 40MW1-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1205   | 8.10     | <0.079 | 0.83 J                 | 1.80                   |
| 40MW1-RCDM-DUP  | 9/4/08 | 1125   | 3.20     | <0.079 | <0.20                  | 1.20                   |
| 40MW1-LF-DUP    | 9/4/08 | 1235   | 17.50    | <0.079 | 1.00                   | 2.20                   |
| 40MW2-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1345   | 41.50    | <0.400 | 4.35 J                 | 62.00                  |
| 40MW2-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1425   | 48.00    | <0.400 | 4.80 J                 | 46.00                  |
| 40MW2-RCDM-DUP  | 9/4/08 | 1350   | 44.50    | <0.400 | 3.15 J                 | 54.50                  |
| 40MW2-LF-DUP    | 9/4/08 | 1455   | 55.00    | <0.400 | 4.35 J                 | 40.00                  |
| 40MW3-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1515   | 11.50    | <0.079 | <0.20                  | 12.50                  |
| 40MW3-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1600   | 11.00    | <0.079 | 0.35 J                 | 9.65                   |
| 40MW6-RCDM      | 9/4/08 | 1230   | 3.90     | <0.079 | 0.34 J                 | 1.75                   |
| 40MW6-LF        | 9/4/08 | 1315   | 11.00    | <0.079 | 1.00                   | 1.00                   |
| 157MW1-RCDM     | 9/3/08 | 1715   | 24.00    | <0.079 | 1.10                   | <0.072                 |
| 157MW1-LF       | 9/3/08 | 1810   | 21.00    | <0.079 | 4.20                   | <0.072                 |
| 157MW2-RCDM     | 9/4/08 | 1000   | 29.50    | <0.160 | <0.40                  | <0.140                 |
| 157MW2-LF       | 9/4/08 | 1050   | 25.50    | <0.079 | <0.20                  | <0.072                 |
| 157MW3-RCDM     | 9/3/08 | 1535   | 5.60     | <0.400 | 5.20                   | 47.00                  |
| 157MW3-LF       | 9/3/08 | 1630   | 5.00     | <0.079 | 4.40                   | 21.00                  |
| 157MW3-RCDM-DUP | 9/3/08 | 1540   | 6.20     | <0.400 | 4.80 J                 | 49.00                  |
| 157MW3-LF-DUP   | 9/3/08 | 1700   | 4.90     | <0.079 | 4.30                   | 18.00                  |
| 157MW8D-RCDM    | 9/3/08 | 1420   | 31.00    | <0.160 | 38.00                  | 12.00                  |
| 157MW8D-LF      | 9/3/08 | 1510   | 23.00    | <0.160 | 42.00                  | 4.10                   |
| FLDBLK-RCDM     | 9/5/08 | 1045   | 0.57 COL | <0.079 | <0.20                  | <0.072                 |
| FLDBLK-LF       | 9/5/08 | 1100   | 0.84     | <0.079 | <0.20                  | <0.072                 |
|                 |        |        |          |        |                        |                        |

Explosives compounds were detected in all 8 of the wells sampled at the Picatinny Arsenal site. While detection limits varied from compound to compound, concentrations typically ranged over 2 to 3 orders of magnitude, from <0.05 to 55 µg/L.

### **5.10.3 Quality Assurance/Quality Control Sample Results**

#### **5.10.3.1 Equipment Wash Blanks**

During the field demonstration at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, one wash blank was collected from the low-flow peristaltic purge pump and one was collected from an RCDM sampler and both were submitted for analysis of perchlorate. Perchlorate concentrations were found to be below detection ( $<0.009\text{ }\mu\text{g/L}$ ) in both samples (Table 5-8).

During the field demonstration at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ, one wash blank was collected from the low-flow peristaltic pump and one was collected from an RCDM sampler and both were submitted for analysis of the suite of 16 explosives compounds. No explosives compounds were detected in the RCDM blank except trace amounts of RDX ( $<0.6\text{ }\mu\text{g/L}$ ) (Table 5-9). The reason for this is not clear. It is possible that the deionized water used to fill the dialysis membranes was slightly contaminated in the lab, but this seems unlikely since most of the bench-scale test blanks were below detection limits for this compound. No explosives compounds were detected in the low-flow purging blank except trace amounts of RDX ( $<1.0\text{ }\mu\text{g/L}$ ), HMX ( $<0.17\text{ }\mu\text{g/L}$ ), and 4-amino-2,4-dinitrotoluene ( $<0.08\text{ }\mu\text{g/L}$ ) (Table 5-9). The latter two compounds were above their detection limits, but below their reporting limits. Again, it is possible that the laboratory deionized water used in the low-flow blank was somehow slightly contaminated with these compounds. It is also possible that the low-flow pump head tubing was not flushed sufficiently after sampling a well containing these explosives compounds. Use of a clean length of pump head tubing is recommended prior to each well.

#### **5.10.1.2 Duplicate Samples**

One set of duplicate samples was collected with both the RCDM sampler and the low-flow purge pump at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds site for perchlorate. The coefficient of variation of the RCDM sampler duplicates was  $<4\%$  and the low-flow purge pump duplicates was  $<6\%$ .

Three sets of duplicate samples were collected with both sampling techniques at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ for explosives compounds. Seven different explosive compounds were detected in the duplicate samples. The average coefficient of variation for duplicate RCDM samplers for these compounds was  $<5\%$ . The average coefficient of variation for duplicate low-flow samples for these compounds was  $<12\%$ .

The lower coefficients of variation for the RCDM sampler at both sites indicate that these diffusion samplers collect slightly more reproducible samples than low-flow purging. However, all of the observed sampling variations were well within acceptable sampling guidelines.

## 6.0 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

The effectiveness of these demonstration studies was qualitatively and quantitatively evaluated by comparing the perchlorate and explosives compounds chemical data collected using both the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging. Graphical comparisons of the data were done using 1:1 plots and statistical comparisons of the data were done using the Wilcoxon signed rank test. An evaluation of whether the performance objectives of the field demonstration were met is discussed as well as deployment considerations for use of RCDM samplers for the detected compounds.

### 6.1 EVALUATION OF FIELD COMPARISON RESULTS FOR PERCHLORATE

#### 6.1.1 Graphical Analysis of Perchlorate Results

The results for perchlorate found at above-detection-limit concentrations during the Aberdeen Proving Ground field demonstration were evaluated graphically by constructing a 1:1 correspondence plot. The concentration of perchlorate obtained with the RCDM sampler in a well was plotted versus the concentration obtained with low-flow purging in the same well. This correspondence plot is given below.




Figure 6-1. RCDM sampler versus low-flow purging results for perchlorate.

The plot of RCDM sampler versus low-flow purging results (Figure 6-1) shows excellent agreement between concentrations obtained using both sampling techniques starting at the detection limit and going up over 4 orders of magnitude in concentration. The data points were closely grouped on or near the 1:1 correspondence line. These results confirmed that the two sampling techniques collected nearly identical samples from wells in the field demonstration.

## 6.1.2 Statistical Comparison of Perchlorate Results

### 6.1.2.1 Correlation Analysis of Perchlorate.

Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was calculated by running a least-squares regression for all field comparison results between the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging for perchlorate (SPlus, 2002). The results are given in Table 6-1. The correlation between concentrations sampled with the RCDM sampler and concentrations sampled with low-flow purging were strongly positive (0.99). The high correlation value indicates that the data collected by different sampling techniques were closely and consistently matched.

**Table 6-1. Correlation of sampling techniques for perchlorate**

[RCDM, regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane sampler; LF, low-flow purging; vs., versus; n, number of comparisons correlated; r, Pearson's correlation coefficient; LSRE, least-squares regression equation]

| Compound    | n  | RCDM vs. LF |                |
|-------------|----|-------------|----------------|
|             |    | r           | LSRE           |
| Perchlorate | 10 | 0.99        | $y=0.99x+0.24$ |

The least-squares regression equation listed in Table 6-1 can also be used as another indicator of how well the two distributions being compared match. If the two distributions match exactly, the slope should be 1 and the intercept should be 0. The regression slope and intercept for the perchlorate data indicates excellent agreement between RCDM samplers and low-flow purging.

### 6.1.2.2 Normality Testing for Perchlorate Results

The perchlorate concentration data from all 10 wells sampled in the field comparison study were tested to determine if the data distributions were normal distributions. This was accomplished by a univariate analysis that included the construction of box plots and the application of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov goodness-of-fit test (S-PLUS, 2002). Wells where at least one sampling technique had an above detection value were included in this analysis. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic of 0.05 or less indicated that the data distribution was significantly different from the normal distribution. The perchlorate data were not normally distributed. Because the perchlorate results were not normally distributed, non-parametric statistical testing of the data was conducted. Non-parametric statistics do not require normal data distributions.

### 6.1.2.3 Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test on Perchlorate.

Perchlorate concentration data collected with the two different sampling techniques were compared using a non-parametric Wilcoxon signed rank test. The results of the testing are given in Table 6-2 below. No significant difference was found between samples collected with the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging. These results indicate that RCDM samplers were able to collect perchlorate as accurately as low-flow purging over a range of concentrations.

**Table 6-2. Statistical comparison of perchlorate concentrations by the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test**

|  |
|--|
| <b>Constituents where No Significant Difference was found between samples collected with the RCDM sampler and Low-Flow Purging [(at <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>); the 95% confidence level]</b> |
| Perchlorate (10) <sup>1</sup>  |

<sup>1</sup> Number of comparisons above the minimum detection limit.

#### **6.1.2.4 Concentration Range Measured for Perchlorate**

Because it is useful to know the concentration ranges over which RCDM samplers can function, the concentration range for detected perchlorate measured by the RCDM samplers in this demonstration study was given in Table 6-3. Because the wells sampled in this study were not contaminated over a wide range of concentrations, the full concentration range of use for RCDM samplers was most likely larger than that shown on Table 6-3.

**Table 6-3. Ranges of concentrations measured using RCDM samplers for perchlorate.**

| <b>Constituent Detected</b> | <b>Concentration range measured</b> |             |              |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| <b>Low</b>                  |                                     | <b>High</b> | <b>Units</b> |
| Perchlorate                 | 2.6                                 | 170         | µg/L         |



## 6.2 EVALUATION OF FIELD COMPARISON RESULTS FOR EXPLOSIVES COMPOUNDS

### 6.2.1 Graphical Analysis of Explosives Compounds

The results for the 6 explosives compounds found at above-detection-limit concentrations greater than 4 times during the field comparison portion of the study were evaluated graphically using 1:1 correspondence plots. Up to 11 comparisons were plotted on each graph if the explosive compound was found in all eight wells and 3 duplicate samples. Ideally, if both the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging collected an explosive compound equally, all points from the field comparison sampling (red symbols) would fall on the 1:1 correspondence line. However, because sampling and analytical variations did occur, the data points for most explosives compounds were scattered around the line. The closer the scatter in the data points was to the 1:1 line, the more comparable the data produced by the two sampling techniques. Plots for all constituents included in this group are given in figures 6-2 to 6-7.




Figure 6-2. RCDM sampler versus low-flow purging results for RDX.




Figure 6-3. RCDM sampler versus low-flow purging results for HMX.





Figure 6-4. RCDM sampler versus low-flow purging results for 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene.



**Figure 6-5. RCDM sampler versus low-flow purging results for 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene.**

The plots of RCDM sampler results versus low-flow purging results for RDX, HMX, 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene, and 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene all show generally excellent agreement between concentrations obtained using both sampling techniques starting at the detection limit and going up over 2 to 3 orders of magnitude in concentration. The data points were closely grouped on or near the 1:1 correspondence line. These results confirmed that the two sampling techniques collected nearly identical samples for these explosives compounds from wells in the field demonstration.

The plots of RCDM sampler results versus low-flow purging results for 2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene and 4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene did not show close agreement between concentrations obtained using both sampling techniques. Although the concentrations comparisons trended approximately parallel to the 1:1 correspondence line, most of the points fell below the line for both of these compounds. These results indicated that higher concentrations of these two explosives compounds were found inside the RCDM sampler than in the corresponding low-flow purge samples. A possible explanation for this phenomenon is that the amino groups present on both of these compounds sorb strongly to the dialysis membrane and cause locally higher concentrations inside the RCDM sampler. These results indicate that RCDM samplers should only be used for qualitative identification of these compounds not quantitative concentrations.




Figure 6-6. RCDM sampler versus low-flow purging results for 2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene.




Figure 6-7. RCDM sampler versus low-flow purging results for 4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene.

## 6.2.2 Statistical Comparison of Explosives Compounds Results

### 6.2.2.1 Correlation Analysis of Explosives Compounds.

Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) were calculated by running a least-squares regressions for all field comparison results between the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging for the 6 compounds found in four or more wells (SPlus, 2002). The results are given in Table 6-4. The correlation between concentrations sampled with the RCDM sampler and concentrations sampled with low-flow purging were all strongly positive (0.90-0.99). The high correlation values indicate that the data collected by different sampling techniques were closely and consistently matched over a range of concentrations.

**Table 6-4. Correlation of sampling techniques for explosives compounds.**

[RCDM, regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane sampler; LF, low-flow purging; vs., versus; n, number of comparisons correlated; r, Pearson's correlation coefficient; LSRE, least-squares regression equation]

| Compound                   | n  | RCDM vs. LF |                |
|----------------------------|----|-------------|----------------|
|                            |    | r           | LSRE           |
| RDX                        | 11 | 0.91        | $y=0.96x+3.17$ |
| HMX                        | 11 | 0.90        | $y=0.65x+1.37$ |
| 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene      | 11 | 0.94        | $y=0.61x-0.30$ |
| 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene      | 11 | 0.99        | $y=1.08x+0.46$ |
| 2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene | 11 | 0.99        | $y=0.23x-1.04$ |
| 4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene | 11 | 0.91        | $Y=0.28x-1.39$ |

The least-squares regression equation listed in Table 6-4 were also used as another indicator of how well the two distributions being compared matched. If the two distributions matched exactly, the slope would be 1 and the intercept would be 0. The regression slope for the first four compounds ranged from 1.08 to 0.61 indicating relatively good agreement between the best-fit lines for these compounds and the 1:1 correspondence line. For the latter two compounds, the slopes were much lower (0.28 – 0.23) indicating that the best-fit line differed substantially from the 1:1 correspondence line.

### 6.2.2.2 Normality Testing of Explosives Compounds Results

The explosives compounds concentration data from all 8 wells sampled in the field comparison study were tested to determine if the data distributions were normal distributions. This was accomplished by a univariate analysis that included the construction of box plots and the application of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov goodness-of-fit test (S-PLUS, 2002). Wells where at least one sampling technique had an above detection value were included in this analysis. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic of 0.05 or less indicated that the data distribution was significantly different from the normal distribution. All explosives compounds data were not normally distributed. Because the explosives compounds results were not normally distributed, non-parametric statistical testing of the data was conducted. Non-parametric statistics do not require normal data distributions.

### 6.2.2.3 Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test on Explosives Compounds.

Explosives compounds concentration data collected with the two different sampling techniques were compared using a non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank test. The results of the testing are given in Table 6-5 below. No significant difference in the recoveries of RDX, HMX, 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene, and 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene were found between samples collected with the RCDM samplers and low-flow purging. These results indicate that RCDM samplers were able to collect samples for these compounds as accurately as low-flow purging over a range of concentrations.

**Table 6-5. Statistical comparison of explosives compounds concentrations by the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test**

|   |
|---|
| <b>Constituents where no significant difference was found between samples collected with the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging at <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>; the 95% confidence level]</b> |
| RDX (8) <sup>1</sup>  |
| HMX (8)   |
| 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (6)   |
| 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene (7)   |
| <b>Constituents where a significant difference was found between samples collected with the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging (at <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>)</b>                           |
| 2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene (8)  |
| 4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene (8)  |

<sup>1</sup> Number of comparisons for each constituent above the minimum detection limit.

The two constituents that showed a significant difference in this test were 2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene and 4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene. Higher concentrations of both of these compounds were found in the RCDM samplers when compared to their concentrations found in low-flow purge samples. These two compounds differed from the other explosives compounds in that they contained amino groups. There is some evidence that some proteins that contain amino groups are sorbed more strongly to regenerated cellulose dialysis membranes (reference). If this occurred with the amino-containing explosives compounds, locally higher concentrations of these compounds may have been caused inside the RCDM sampler. RCDM samplers should therefore only be used for qualitative detection of these compounds in groundwater wells.

### 6.2.2.4 Concentration Range Measured for Explosives Compounds.

Because it is useful to know the concentration ranges over which RCDM samplers can function, the concentration range for detected explosives compounds measured by the RCDM samplers in this demonstration study was given in Table 6-6. However, the wells sampled in this study were not contaminated over a wide range of concentrations, so the full concentration range of use for RCDM samplers for these compounds was most likely larger than shown on Table 6-6.

**Table 6-6. Ranges of concentrations measured using RCDM samplers for explosives compounds.**

| <b>Compound Detected</b>   | <b>Concentration range measured</b> |             | <b>Units</b> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
|                            | <b>Low</b>                          | <b>High</b> |              |
| RDX                        | 0.57                                | 55          | µg/L         |
| HMX                        | 0.17                                | 29          | µg/L         |
| 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene      | 1.00                                | 62          | µg/L         |
| 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene      | 0.34                                | 42          | µg/L         |
| 2-Amino-4,6-dinitrobenzene | 0.54                                | 35          | µg/L         |
| 4-Amino-2,6-dinitrobenzene | 0.07                                | 33.5        | µg/L         |

### 6.3 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF THE RCDM SAMPLER

The performance of the RCDM sampler was assessed by determining if the performance objectives of the field demonstration from Table 3-1 were met. A summary of this assessment is given in Table 6-7 below. Each objective is discussed in more detail in subsequent sections.

**Table 6-7. Performance Objectives**

[RCDM sampler, regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane sampler;  $p < 0.05$ , 95 percent confidence level]

| Performance Objective   | Data Requirements   | Success Criteria   | Results  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Qualitative Performance Objectives</b>   |   |  |  |
| Determine if RCDM samplers equilibrate with perchlorate and explosives compounds in the laboratory.   | List of chemical constituents that equilibrated in the RCDM samplers in bench-scale testing.                            | All compounds tested equilibrate through the dialysis membrane.  | Criteria met.  |
| Determine if RCDM samplers and low-flow purging collect the same chemical constituents in the same wells in the field.                            | List of chemical constituents recovered by both RCDM and low-flow purging in each well.                                 | Detection of the same chemical constituents in field samples collected with both RCDM samplers low-flow purging.               | Criteria met.  |
| Determine if dialysis membrane integrity is maintained over the course of equilibration.  | Observations of the RCDM samplers after removal from the well.  | No perforations noted during the length of the test.   | Criteria met.  |
| Determine if RCDM samplers are easier to use than low-flow purging.   | Observations of the field sampling personnel.   | RCDM samplers should be as easy or easier to use than low-flow purging.  | Criteria met.  |
| <b>Quantitative Performance Objectives</b>  |   |  |  |
| Determine minimum equilibration times for RCDM samplers for perchlorate and explosives compounds.   | Bench-scale test concentration data.  | Minimum times to equilibration are determined. All compounds tested equilibrate in less than 4 weeks.                          | Criteria met. Perchlorate equilibrates within 1 day. Explosives compounds equilibrate within 7 days.             |
| Determine if RCDM samplers and low-flow purging recover similar concentrations of detected perchlorate and explosives compounds in field samples. | Concentrations of perchlorate and explosives compounds in samples collected by both RCDM samplers and low-flow purging. | No significant difference (at $p < 0.05$ ) between chemical concentrations recovered by the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging. | Criteria met for perchlorate and 4 of 6 detected explosive compounds compared in field demonstration test wells. |



|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| Determine if RCDM samplers can collect low concentration samples.  | Concentrations of perchlorate and explosives compounds in samples collected by both RCDM samplers and low-flow purging.   | Concentrations within 2-5 times the reporting limit can be detected.  | Criteria met. Values between detection limit and reporting limit were reported for most compounds. |
| Determine reproducibility of RCDM and low-flow data  | Concentrations of perchlorate and explosives compounds collected by both RCDM samplers and low-flow purging.  | Concentrations within +/- 15% for perchlorate and +/- 30% for explosives compounds.                         | Criteria met. <6% for perchlorate and <12% for explosives compounds.                               |
| Determine if use of RCDM samplers reduces field sample collection <b>time</b> compared to low-flow purging.  | Length of time to collect samples in the field with the RCDM sampler and with low-flow purging, (including installation, sample collection, and equipment decontamination). | Length of field time required to sample RCDM samplers should be at least 25% shorter than low-flow purging. | Criteria met. RCDM sampler field sample collection time was 84% shorter than low-flow purging.     |
| Determine if use of RCDM samplers reduces field sample collection <b>costs</b> compared to low-flow purging. | Records of costs for equipment and supplies and record of personnel's field time.   | Cost savings using RCDM samplers should be at least 25% less than low-flow purging.                         | Criteria met. 73% overall cost savings per sample over low-flow purging found.                     |

### 6.3.1 Ability of RCDM Sampler to Equilibrate and Equilibration Times.

Bench-scale testing showed that perchlorate diffused through the dialysis membrane and equilibrated within 1 day at both 10°C and 21°C. Bench-scale testing showed that 14 explosives compounds all diffused through the dialysis membrane and equilibrated within 7 days at the same temperatures. This indicated that RCDM samplers had the potential to sample for these compounds in the field and that they could equilibrate in less than 4 weeks. Four weeks is a conservative estimate for the life of the dialysis membrane in the field before bacteria will cause perforations in the membrane (Imbrigiotta and others, 2007).

### 6.3.2 Ability of RCDM Sampler to Detect the Same Compounds as Low-Flow Purging.

In greater than 93% of all sample comparisons, the same compounds were detected with the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging in the same well. In the few cases where there was disagreement, and one sampling method detected a compound that the other did not, the concentrations measured were usually very close to the detection limit

### 6.3.3 Maintenance of Dialysis Membrane Integrity.

No perforations of the dialysis membrane were noted in any of the RCDM samplers deployed and retrieved over the length of these field demonstrations. RCDM samplers for collection of

perchlorate concentrations were deployed and retrieved after 1 week. RCDM samplers for collection of explosives compounds were deployed and retrieved after 2 weeks.

#### **6.3.4 Ease of Use.**

Feedback from the personnel that deployed and retrieved the RCDM samplers and conducted the low-flow sampling at each well indicated that the RCDM samplers were considered much easier to use and sample with than low-flow purging. The major reasons cited were (1) there was less equipment to haul to the field with the RCDM sampler, (2) no decontamination was needed with the RCDM sampler, and (3) installation and retrieval of the RCDM sampler was simple and easy for a technician to learn quickly with minimal training, and (4) use of an RCDM sampler saved a great deal of time in the field.

#### **6.3.5 Agreement Between Analyte Concentrations Obtained with Both Sampling Methods.**

For perchlorate, the concentrations obtained with the RCDM sampler and with low-flow purging in 10 wells were compared statistically and found not to differ significantly at the 95% confidence level. A 1:1 correspondence plot was made and correlation coefficients and best-fit linear regression equations were calculated for the RCDM sampler and the low-flow purging concentration distributions. The comparison data plotted very close to the 1:1 correspondence line on the graph, the correlation was strongly positively ( $r > 0.99$ ), and the best fit linear regression equation had a slope very close to 1. These findings indicated that there was strong agreement between RCDM sampling results and low-flow purging results for perchlorate. It was concluded that RCDM samplers collected essentially identical samples of perchlorate as low-flow purging.

For RDX, HMX, 2,4,6-trinitrotoluene, and 1,3,5-trinitrobenzene, the concentrations obtained with the RCDM sampler and with low-flow purging in 8 wells were compared statistically and found not to differ significantly at the 95% confidence level. One-to-one correspondence plots were made and correlation coefficients and best-fit linear regression equations were calculated for the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging concentration distributions. The comparison data plotted fairly close to the 1:1 correspondence line on the graphs for these explosives compounds. In addition, the correlation coefficients were strongly positive (0.90-0.99) and the best-fit linear regression equation had strongly positive slopes (0.6-1.08). These findings indicated that there was strong agreement between RCDM sampling results and low-flow purging results for RDX, HMX, 2,4,6-trinitrotoluene, and 1,3,5-trinitrobenzene. It was concluded that RCDM samplers were able to collect essentially identical samples of these 4 explosives compounds as low-flow purging.

For 2-amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene and 4-amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene, the concentrations obtained with the RCDM sampler and with low-flow purging in 8 wells were compared statistically and found to differ significantly at the 95% confidence level. One-to-one correspondence plots were made and correlation coefficients and best-fit linear regression equations were calculated for the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging concentration distributions for these compounds. The comparison data consistently plotted below the 1:1 correspondence line on the graphs for these two explosives compounds indicating that higher concentrations were measured in the RCDM samplers than in the low-flow samples. In addition, although the correlation coefficients were strongly positive (0.91-0.99), the best-fit linear regression equation had weakly positive slopes

(0.24-0.28). These findings indicated that the RCDM data and the low-flow data did not match closely for these two compounds. There is a bias towards the RCDM samplers collecting higher concentrations of 2-amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene and 4-amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene than low-flow purging.

The cause of this bias may be in part due to these two compounds containing amino functional groups. There is evidence from laboratory dialysis work that selected proteins (containing amino functional groups) may be sorbed strongly to regenerated cellulose dialysis membranes by a mechanism called non-specific binding (Thermo Scientific, 2008; Boure and Vanholder, 2004). If this occurred with the amino-containing explosives compounds, locally higher concentrations of these compounds may have been caused on the dialysis membrane and consequently higher concentrations of these two compounds may have equilibrated inside the RCDM sampler.

It was concluded based on the results of our field demonstration that RCDM samplers were not able to collect quantitatively similar samples of these two explosives compounds as low-flow purging. However, it was also concluded that RCDM samplers could certainly be used to collect qualitative samples for 2-amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene and 4-amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene to determine their presence or absence in a well.

#### **6.3.6 Sensitivity of RCDM Samplers.**

RCDM samplers demonstrated excellent sensitivity by detecting concentrations between the detection limit and the reporting limit for most of the explosives compounds in groundwater samples collected over the course of the study (Table 5-9). These concentrations were easily within 2-5 times the reporting limit for most explosives compounds.

RCDM samplers demonstrated excellent sensitivity for perchlorate also by detecting concentrations within 2-5 times the reporting limit in the samples with the lowest perchlorate concentrations measured in this project.

#### **6.3.7 Reproducibility of RCDM Data.**

The guideline for this performance objective was to have coefficients of variation of <15% for perchlorate of <30% for explosives compounds for duplicate samples collected with RCDM and low-flow purging. The coefficient of variation for duplicate RCDM samples collected for perchlorate at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds site was <4%. The coefficient of variation for three sets of duplicate RCDM samples collected for 7 explosives compounds at the Picatinny Arsenal site was <5%. These results show that RCDM samplers collected highly reproducible results for both perchlorate and explosives compounds.

The coefficient of variation for duplicate low-flow purging samples collected for perchlorate was <6%. The coefficient of variation for three sets of duplicate low-flow purging samples collected for 7 explosives compounds was <12%. These results show that low-flow purging collected highly reproducible results for both perchlorate and explosives compounds also.

The lower coefficients of variation for the RCDM sampler at both sites indicate that these diffusion samplers collect slightly more reproducible samples than low-flow purging. However, all of the observed sampling variations were well within acceptable sampling guidelines.

### **6.3.8 Reduced Sampling Time.**

The length of time to collect samples in the field with RCDM samplers (installation, retrieval, sampling) was compared with the time to collect samples in the field with low-flow purging (installation, purging, field parameter monitoring, sample collection, filtration, and equipment decontamination) at all wells sampled in the ER-0313 study. On average it was found to take 0.5 person-hours to deploy, retrieve, and sample an RCDM sampler. On average it was found to take 3.2 person-hours to complete all the steps necessary to collect a low-flow purge sample. Therefore, it was calculated to take 84% less time to collect samples using an RCDM sampler than using low-flow purging. This was one of the major advantages field personnel noted for use of RCDM samplers over low-flow purging.

### **6.3.9 Less Costly Sampling Method.**

Because the field sample collection time using RCDM samplers was greatly reduced compared to low-flow purging, the field sample collection costs using RCDM samplers were also greatly reduced compared to low-flow purging. Based on this and other savings in materials costs, construction labor costs, and purge water disposal costs, an overall cost savings of 73% was determined using RCDM samplers over low-flow purging on a per sample basis. This cost savings easily exceed the hoped for 25% cost savings performance objective.

## **6.4 DISCUSSION OF FIELD COMPARISON RESULTS**

### **6.4.1 Comparison of Results to Previous Studies**

No previous studies on the usefulness of RCDM samplers to collect samples for perchlorate had been conducted. Very few previous studies on the usefulness of RCDM samplers to collect samples for explosives compounds had been done prior to this project.

Parker and Mulherin (2006) conducted laboratory equilibration tests for HMX, 1,3,5-trinitrobenzene, RDX, and TNT (2,4,6-trinitrotoluene) at room temperature and found these explosive compounds equilibrated in RCDM samplers within 7 to 14 days. Leblanc (2003) lab-tested the dialysis membranes for permeability to explosive compounds and found that 75-80% equilibration of RDX and HMX concentrations were reached within 12 days at 4 °C.

LeBlanc (2003) also conducted field-tests with his RCDM samplers by burying the samplers in the sediments of a lake near the Massachusetts Military Reservation, Cape Cod, MA in an attempt to determine if explosive compounds in groundwater from the base were discharging into the lake. Over 130 RCDM samplers were installed in the lake sediments and allowed to equilibrate for 13 to 27 days before retrieval and sampling. The results were compared with a like number of drive-point pore-water samples collected from the pore sediments of the lake adjacent to the locations where the RCDM samplers had been buried. Four explosive compounds were detected at low concentrations in samples from the RCDM samplers. No explosive compounds were detected in samples from the drive-point water samples. Because so few comparisons resulted, no conclusions were made about the applicability of RCDM samplers to quantitatively sample for explosives in this manner, but clearly the RCDM samplers did allow qualitative detection of several explosives compounds in the lake sediments.

The results of the current demonstration project agree with the findings of these previous studies and advance the knowledge of the usefulness of RCDM samplers in collection of samples for explosives and perchlorate. Bench-scale testing showed that concentrations of all explosives compounds in groundwater test solutions were found to equilibrate with concentrations in RCDM samplers suspended in this groundwater within 7 days at temperatures bracketing most of the groundwater temperatures in the continental United States. Field testing showed that concentrations of perchlorate, RDX, HMX, 2,4,6-trinitrotoluene, and 1,3,5-trinitrobenzene sampled with RCDM samplers were not significantly different than concentrations of these compounds sampled using low-flow purging.

## **6.5 RCDM SAMPLER USE CONSIDERATIONS**

Several factors should be taken into considerations prior to the use of RCDM samplers at a field site. These considerations were discussed in detail in both the ESTCP Final Technical Report (Imbrigiotta et al., 2007) of the first phase of this project and in the ESTCP Protocol Report (Imbrigiotta et al., 2008) published as part of the ER-0313 project. Because all these factors were not necessarily tested in this field demonstration, the authors felt it important for the sake of completeness to include a synopsis of the discussion from these reports.

- The volume of water contained in an RCDM sampler can be adjusted by varying the length and diameter of the membrane used to construct it. Once constructed, the volume of the sampler is finite. For this reason, it is important to carefully determine the minimum volume of water needed for all the chemical analyses that will be run on a sample before sampler construction begins.
- The maximum length of an RCDM sampler should be limited to the shortest of the following constraints: (1) 5 ft, (2) the open interval being sampled, or (3) the length of the zone of highest mass flux present in the open interval.
- RCDM samplers must (1) be submerged below the air/water interface in a well, (2) remain submerged and be allowed to equilibrate for an appropriate period of time for the chemicals of concern at a site, and (3) be sampled with a minimum of disturbance or aeration of the water inside to reduce the loss of volatile constituents or dissolved gases and to avoid changing the redox conditions of the ground-water sample.
- RCDM samplers require that groundwater be moving through the open interval of a well past the sampler to collect a sample representative of the groundwater in the aquifer.
- RCDM samplers require two trips to the field site to collect a sample; the first to deploy the sampler for equilibration, and the second to collect the sample. RCDM samplers can be installed easily by one person and retrieved and sampled easily by two persons.
- RCDM samplers, as well as low-flow purge pumps, should be deployed at the depth of highest mass influx of the chemical of primary concern in the open interval of a well.

- This depth should be determined if at all possible by vertical profiling the open interval of the well. If the open interval of a well is 5 feet (ft) or less, no vertical profiling is deemed necessary and the RCDM sampler should be suspended at the mid-depth of the interval (ITRC, 2004). If the open interval of a well is greater than 5 ft, both chemical and hydraulic vertical profiling should be conducted. Chemical profiling is usually done by sampling equilibrated RCDM or PDB samplers that have been suspended at closely spaced depths (<5 ft apart) over the open interval of a well. Hydraulic profiling is usually done by borehole flow meter testing or packer testing over the open interval of a well. If vertical profiling is not possible, knowledge of the site geology and past contamination history should be used to determine the depth of deployment.
- RCDM samplers made with regenerated-cellulose dialysis membrane must be kept hydrated once they are constructed. If allowed to dry out, the membrane's diffusion properties change, the material becomes stiff and brittle, and it essentially turns into cellophane.
- RCDM samplers lose less than 3% of their volume per week in wells with TDS up to 2300 mg/L because of the dialysis process. If sampler deployment times in the well are short (1-2 weeks) this loss can be taken into account when constructing the sampler and should not impact the use of these samplers.
- Regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane is a bioactive membrane in that it can be degraded by bacteria and fungi. Observations from other field tests have shown that RCDM samplers can conservatively last 4 to 6 weeks in a well at ~15°C before biodegradation may compromise the membrane. If equilibration times for the chemicals of concern are short (1-2 weeks) this should not restrict the use of these samplers in a well. If the equilibration times for the chemicals of concern are longer than 4 weeks, dialysis membranes should not be used in a well unless prior testing shows that they will survive the length of time without biodegrading. Warmer groundwater temperatures and high microbial populations can accelerate biodegradation.
- Differences between chemical concentrations collected with RCDM samplers and low-flow purging may be due to the fact that the sampling techniques use different mechanisms to collect samples. RCDM samplers can only equilibrate with chemical concentrations that are present at the depth at which they are suspended in an open interval under non-pumping conditions. Low-flow purging can collect samples that are drawn from different depths over the entire open interval or from areas of the aquifer adjacent to the open interval (Varlgen et al. 2006; Gibs et al., 1993; Reilly and Gibs, 1993). The fact that different concentrations can be obtained with the different sampling techniques does not mean one method is right and the other is wrong. It just means that the methods are sampling different water from the same well (ITRC, 2004).

## 6.6 SUMMARY OF FIELD COMPAISON FINDINGS

### 6.4.1 Conclusions

The following bullets describe most of the significant findings from the field comparison work in this project.

- RCDM samplers made of regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane can be used to collect quantitative concentrations for perchlorate, RDX, HMX, 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene and 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene, but should only be used to collect qualitative presence/absence data for 2-amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene or 4-amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene.
- A one-week deployment time was sufficient for equilibration of perchlorate, while a two-week deployment time was sufficient for equilibration of all explosives compounds monitored in the field demonstrations.
- For perchlorate, RDX, HMX, 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene, and 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene detected in wells sampled in the field demonstration, the graphs comparing RCDM sampler results to low-flow purging results showed a relatively tight grouping of data points around the 1:1 correspondence line, indicating good agreement between the two sampling techniques.
- Graphs for 2-amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene or 4-amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene comparing RCDM sampler results to low-flow purging results show poor grouping of data points around the 1:1 correspondence line, indicating that higher concentrations of these compounds were collected using RCDM samplers than low-flow purging.
- The correlation coefficients for perchlorate and all explosives compounds monitored in the field in this study were strongly positive between samples collected with RCDM samplers and low-flow purging.
- RCDM samplers recovered concentrations of perchlorate, RDX, HMX, 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene and 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene that were not statistically significantly different from concentrations recovered by low-flow purging.
- RCDM samplers recovered concentrations of 2-amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene or 4-amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene that were statistically significantly different from concentrations recovered by low-flow purging.

#### **6.4.2 Criteria For Use of RCDM Samplers**

The use of RCDM samplers would be advantageous over low-flow purging to sample wells for perchlorate or explosives compounds in the following situations:

- (1) where it would be difficult or impossible to bring in a pump and its power source, (wells in remote wilderness areas, wells inside buildings),
- (2) where normal sampling activities would be extremely hazardous or inconvenient, (wells in high traffic areas, wells in airport runway areas),
- (3) where it would be advantageous for sampling personnel to spend as short a period on site as possible, (residential areas near military bases),
- (4) where collection, transport, and treatment of purge water would be costly, difficult, or undesirable due to safety concerns, (wells at all hazardous waste sites, wells at remote hazardous waste sites, wells in populated areas near military bases),
- (5) where wells have water with high turbidity when purged due to their construction or the formation they are completed in, (incorrect screen size and filter pack), and
- (6) at sites where large numbers of long-term monitoring wells must be sampled for known concentrations of both inorganic and organic compounds, including either perchlorate or explosives compounds.

RCDM samplers should not be used in the following situations:

- (1) where “total” or unfiltered samples must be collected,
- (2) small diameter wells that require a large sample volume (>1 liter), or
- (3) wells that must be sampled quantitatively for 2-amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene or 4-amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene.



## **7.0 COST ASSESSMENT**

### **7.1 COST MODEL**

One of the objectives of this demonstration was to evaluate the cost savings produced by using RCDM samplers instead of traditional low-flow purging techniques. The costs for collecting samples with the RCDM sampler and low-flow purging have been estimated based on the costs experienced in both the laboratory and field portions of this project. Table 7-1 delineates the cost elements, data that must be tracked, and the estimated costs for each element that were considered in this cost model.

It should be noted that the site characterization costs may be greatly reduced if the investigator has worked at the site and already has recent information on the well construction, well depths, and contaminant concentrations. In addition, though ideally both chemical and hydraulic vertical profiling should be conducted on each well, up-front costs prior to the use of these sampling techniques may be reduced if the geohydrology of the open intervals of the wells at the site is already well characterized. If this is the case, only the chemical vertical profiling need be done.

**Table 7-1. Cost Model for RCDM Samplers**

| <b>Cost Element</b>                        | <b>Data Tracked During the Demonstration</b>   | <b>Costs</b>   |         |
|--|--|--|---------|
| Site characterization                      | Personnel time to obtain information on well construction, recent water chemistry, recent contaminant concentrations   | Project person, 80 hrs                                       | \$8000  |
| Vertical profiling - chemical              | Personnel time to construct, deploy, and retrieve diffusion samplers; analytical costs; Must be done once prior to diffusion sampling or low-flow purging (Assume 5 diffusion samplers per 20 ft open interval/well in 10 wells)   | 1 lab person, to construct 50 samplers, 8 hrs                | \$400   |
|  |  | 1 field person to deploy 50 samplers, 2 hrs                  | \$100   |
|  |  | 1 field person to retrieve and collect 50 samples, 5 hrs     | \$250   |
|  |  | Analytical costs   | \$5,000 |
| Vertical profiling – hydraulic/geophysical | Personnel time to test open interval with a borehole flow meter, rental of equipment; Should be done once prior to diffusion sampling or low-flow purging (Assume logging 10 wells)  | Borehole flow meter rental, 40 hrs                           | \$1,000 |
|  |  | Geophysics person to log 10 wells, 24 hrs                    | \$2,400 |
|  |  | Geophysics person to analyze collected data, 16 hrs          | \$1,600 |
| Material costs – RCDM samplers             | Costs of membrane, mesh, rope, stopcock, clamps, weights, regenerated cellulose lay-flat tubing (Assume 2 ft long by 2.5-inch diameter sampler in 10 wells)  | Material costs (10 samplers)                                 | \$370   |
| Construction costs – RCDM samplers         | Personnel time to assemble sampler (Assume 0.75 hr/sampler for 10 samplers)  | 1 lab person, 7.5 hrs  | \$375   |
| Operating costs – RCDM sampler             | Field personnel time to deploy, retrieve, and collect sample; purge water disposal   | 1 field person to deploy 10 samplers, 2 hrs                  | \$100   |
|  |  | 2 field persons to retrieve and collect 10 samplers, 3.5 hrs | \$175   |
|  |  | Purge water disposal   | \$0     |
| Material costs – Low-flow purging          | Rental of variable-speed submersible pump and control box , rental of generator, Teflon-lined polyethylene discharge tubing, extension cord, pump cleaning stand, pump cleaning supplies (deionized water, liquid detergent, methanol), 0.045 µ capsule filters for field filtration | Material costs   | \$1515  |
|  |  | Fuel for generator   | \$125   |
| Construction costs – Low-flow purging      | Personnel time to cut discharge tubing to length for 10 wells (Assume 10 min/well)(2 persons)  | 2 field persons, 3.5 hrs                                     | \$175   |
| Operating costs – Low-flow purging         | Field personnel time for: purging and field parameter stabilization, collection of sample, filtration, pump decontamination, purge water disposal, pump maintenance costs (Assume 96 minutes/well sampling 10 wells)   | 2 field persons to purge and stabilize 10 wells              | \$1600  |
|  |  | Purge water disposal   | \$50    |

## 7.2 COST DRIVERS

The cost drivers were:

- The difference in cost of renting the low-flow pumping equipment versus purchasing RCDM sampler construction materials,
- The amount of time involved in pumping to stabilize field parameters prior to sample collection versus deployment and retrieval of the RCDM samplers prior to sample collection,
- The remediation time frame for the cost comparison was considered to be 30 years.

## 7.3 COST ANALYSIS

The primary cost comparison has been conducted between the cost of constructing and using RCDM samplers, and renting and using the equipment needed to conduct low-flow purging to sample a well. Cost comparisons were made on both a per sample basis and on a per site basis. The costs for site characterization, chemical vertical profiling, and hydraulic vertical profiling were assumed to be one-time only costs that were needed for both sampling techniques - RCDM samplers and low-flow purging - in order to determine the proper sampling depth in a well. Because these costs were needed for both sampling methods, they were not included in the cost comparisons below.

### 7.3.1 Basic Assumptions

For the cost comparison made on a per sample basis, the following assumptions were used:

- The average well sampled was a 4-in diameter well, having a depth to water of approximately 10 ft below land surface, a total well depth of 40 ft below land surface, and an average sampling depth of 35 ft below land surface.
- All RCDM samplers were assumed to be 2.5 inches in diameter and 2 ft in length and contained 1.7 L of sampleable groundwater.
- The minimum required volume of groundwater for a perchlorate analysis was assumed to be 0.25 L.
- The minimum required volume of groundwater for an explosives compounds analysis was 1.0 L.
- RCDM samplers were constructed by laboratory personnel, not purchased commercially.
- During sampling, essentially no purge water was produced using RCDM samplers, while approximately 40 L (10 gallons) of purge water was produced during each low-flow purge sampling.
- The low-flow purging sample will require field filtration whereas the RCDM samplers will not.
- The laboratory and field personnel earn \$50/hour.

For the cost comparison made on a per site basis, the following assumptions were used:

- The sampling costs per well were applied to a typical site with 50 monitoring wells.
- The wells were sampled quarterly for a period of 30 years.

### 7.3.2 Cost Comparison per Sample

A detailed breakdown of materials, labor, and purge water disposal costs incurred in the use of RCDM samplers and low-flow purging on a per sample basis is given in the next two sections. The cost breakdown is summarized in Table 7-2.

#### 7.3.2.1 RCDM Sampler Costs

##### **RCDM Material Costs:**

The material costs for a 2.5-in diameter by 2-ft long dialysis membrane, PVC supports, outer protective mesh, stopcock, clamp, weights, and suspension rope are given below:

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| Membrane (\$9.75/ft)(2.5 ft)                  | \$24.40        |
| Protective mesh (\$0.50/ft)(3 ft)             | 1.50           |
| PVC supports (\$0.25 ea)(2/sampler)           | 0.50           |
| Weights (\$0.24/wt)(10 wts/sampler)           | 2.40           |
| Rope (\$0.10/ft)(40 ft)                       | 4.00           |
| Stopcock (\$3.00)(1/bag)                      | 3.00           |
| Miscellaneous (clamp, ties, etc)              | 0.50           |
| <u>Storage bag (\$0.10/ft)(3 ft)</u>          | <u>0.30</u>    |
| <b>Total materials costs per RCDM sampler</b> | <b>\$36.60</b> |

Note: This constructs a 2.5-inch diameter by 2-ft long sampler suitable for use in a 4-inch diameter well. Smaller dialysis membrane (1.25-inch diameter) can be purchased to make samplers that can be used in a 2-inch diameter well. The smaller diameter dialysis membrane costs approximately 25% less per unit length as the larger size and holds four times less volume. The material costs for a 1.25-inch diameter by 2-ft long RCDM sampler was calculated to be \$30.30.

##### **RCDM Construction Labor Cost:**

The time for one person in the laboratory to construct one RCDM sampler was 45 minutes. This involved rinsing the membrane, cutting the membrane, tying a knot in one end of the membrane, cleaning the associated stopcock, clamp, internal support, cutting the PVC supports to length, cutting the protective mesh to length, cleaning and installing the weights, assembling the pieces, filling the dialysis membrane with nitrogen-sparged deionized water, and closing up the sampler on the ends with cable ties. Once the dialysis membrane was wetted, it had to remain so. To accomplish this, the sampler was inserted into a thicker-walled larger diameter polyethylene sleeve partially filled with deionized water and knotted at both ends for storage in the refrigerator.

Using a labor rate of \$50/hour/person and the fact that it took 0.75 hours for one person to construct an RCDM sampler, the construction labor cost was calculated to be approximately \$38.

**RCDM Field Labor Cost:**

To deploy a single RCDM sampler it took one person 10 minutes. To recover and sample a single RCDM sampler from a well, it took two persons approximately 10 minutes. Thus a total field labor time of 0.5 hours was required to collect one sample.

At a labor rate of \$50/hour/person, the field labor cost would be approximately \$25.

**RCDM Purge Water Disposal Costs:**

Purge water disposal costs were estimated to be \$0.50/gallon. Because only 0.025 L or 0.007 gallons of purge water were expected to be produced from each RCDM sampler upon sampling, the purge water disposal costs were calculated to be less than \$0.01. Therefore, no additional costs were added for purge water disposal for the RCDM sampler.

**Total Costs for an RCDM Sampler:**

Total costs for materials, construction labor, and field labor for the collection of one sample using a 2.5-inch diameter by 2-ft long RCDM sampler were calculated to be \$100/sample. (The total cost for a 1.25-inch by 2-ft long RCDM sampler was determined to be only slightly less at about \$93/sample). These costs are itemized in Table 7-2 below.

**7.3.2.2 Low-Flow Purging Costs****Low-Flow Purging Material Costs:**

Materials costs for a submersible pump capable of pumping approximately 35 ft of head were used in the low-flow purging cost estimate. Material costs were calculated using rental equipment because it would be difficult to depreciate the cost of purchased equipment over the life of the equipment. Based on the time require to prepare the pump and collect a sample (approximately 1.6 hours/sample in this study) and experience in field sampling, it was realistically estimated that 15 samples could be collected per week (3 samples/day x 5 days) using such a pump to sample wells of this depth. Therefore, the weekly rental costs were divided by 15 in order to calculate the materials on a per sample basis. Teflon-lined polyethylene tubing was used as the discharge line for the pump. A 0.45  $\mu$  capsule filter was used in line to collect samples for dissolved constituents.

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Pump Rental (\$240/week)                        | \$16.00         |
| Tubing (\$2.00/foot) (40 feet)                  | 80.00           |
| Generator Rental (\$150/week)                   | 10.00           |
| Controller (\$150/week)                         | 10.00           |
| Decontamination solutions                       | 5.00            |
| Fuel for generator (5 gal x \$2.50/gal)         | 12.50           |
| Capsule filter (\$30 each)                      | 30.00           |
| <b>Total material costs per low-flow sample</b> | <b>\$163.50</b> |

**Low-Flow Purging Construction Labor Costs:**

The only construction labor cost associated with low-flow purging was measuring and cutting the new discharge tubing to length for each well. This was either done in the lab prior to going to the field or in the field as the pump was being installed. It was estimated that it would take 2 persons 10 minutes to accomplish this task. Therefore, the construction labor costs were calculated ( $0.17 \text{ hr} \times \$50/\text{hr/person} \times 2 \text{ persons}$ ) to be about \$17/sample.

**Low-Flow Purging Field Labor Costs:**

Field labor costs using a low-flow purging pump were estimated based on the average time it took to sample wells in this study. On average, it required two persons 96 minutes (1.6 hours) to collect a single sample from a well using the low-flow purge technique. This time included setting the pump in the well at the appropriate depth, purging the well, monitoring field parameter stabilization, sample collection, sample filtration, removal of the pump from the well, and decontamination of the pump. At a labor rate of \$50/hour/person, the total field labor cost would be ( $1.6 \text{ hours} \times \$50/\text{hour/person} \times 2 \text{ persons}$ ) or approximately \$160/sample.

**Purge Water Disposal Costs:**

Purge water disposal costs were estimated to be \$0.50/gallon. It was estimated that 10 gallons of purge water would probably be produced by low-flow purging in wells of this size and depth. The purge water disposal costs were calculated to be \$5/well.

**Total Costs for Low-Flow Purging:**

Total costs for materials, construction labor, field labor, and purge water disposal for the collection of one sample using low-flow purging were calculated to be \$331/sample. These costs are itemized in Table 7-2 below.

**Table 7-2. Comparison of materials, construction labor, field labor, and purge water disposal, and total costs per sample using an RCDM sampler and low-flow purging.**

| Costs/Sample              | RCDM Sampler | Low-Flow Purging |
|---------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Materials Cost            | \$37         | \$164            |
| Construction Labor Cost   | \$38         | 17               |
| Field Labor Cost          | \$25         | \$160            |
| Purge Water Disposal Cost | \$0          | \$5              |
| Total Cost/Sample         | \$100        | \$346            |

All cost comparisons have assumed that the RCDM samplers were produced by project personnel. These costs would be expected to drop significantly when the RCDM sampler is produced commercially.

Based on these estimates, a total cost savings of 71% would be realized by using an RCDM sampler to collect groundwater samples for perchlorate or explosives compounds rather than low-flow purging. Most of this savings is due to a significant reduction in field labor costs.

Field labor costs alone were reduced by 84% when using an RCDM sampler over low-flow purging. These significant cost savings are a strong reason to consider the use of RCDM samplers at DoD sites, particularly sites undergoing long-term monitoring where the contamination is known and is compatible with this sampler.

### 7.3.3 Cost Comparison per Site

Table 7-3 summarizes the life-cycle costs of the two sampling technologies evaluated in this project when used to monitor a typical site over the period of 30 years. All the basic assumptions for these calculations are given in Section 7.3.1 and Table 7-2.

**Table 7-3. Comparison of sampling costs over a 30-year period for RCDM samplers and low-flow purging**

| <b>Monitoring Costs</b>   | <b>RCDM Sampler</b> | <b>Low-Flow Purging</b> |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Sampling Cost/Sample (from Table 7-2)   | \$100               | \$346                   |
| Samples(Wells)/Site   | 50                  | 50                      |
| Sampling Costs per Site per Sampling Event                                    | \$5,000             | \$17,300                |
| Sampling Events per 30-year Period  | 120                 | 120                     |
| Total Sampling Costs per Site per 30-year Period                              | \$600,000           | \$2,076,000             |
| Total Sampling Cost Savings per Site per 30-year Period over Low-Flow Purging | \$1,476,000         | ---                     |

The savings attained through the use of RCDM samplers instead of low-flow purging over the course of a 30-year long-term monitoring plan can be significant.



## 8.0 IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

### 8.1 RCDM GUIDANCE AND PROTOCOLS

No technical guidance documents or protocol reports have been published that have dealt specifically with the use of RCDM samplers for collection of samples for perchlorate and explosives compounds. Most of the previously published RCDM sampler reports have given guidance on the construction and use of RCDM samplers for other types of elements or compounds. All reports mentioned below reflect in whole or in part, prior work done by the authors of this report.

The ESTCP Final Technical Report from the first phase of the ER-0313 project (Imbrigiotta et al., 2007) that detailed the findings RCDM samplers could successfully collect valid samples for VOCs, cations, anions, and most trace elements was published on the ESTCP website ([www.serdp-estcp.org](http://www.serdp-estcp.org)) and can be downloaded for free. The report contained guidance on the individual test results for the elements and compounds initially tested for sampling with RCDM samplers and how the RCDM samplers compared to PDB samplers and low-flow purging in recovery of these elements and compounds.

An ESTCP Protocol Report for construction and use of RCDM samplers was also published as part of the first phase of the ER-0313 project (Imbrigiotta et al., 2009). The Protocol Report contained details about the materials and methods that were used to construct the RCDM samplers in this project, issues that should be carefully considered prior to using RCDM samplers at a site, and deployment and recovery considerations for field use of RCDM samplers. This report was also published on the ESTCP website ([www.serdp-estcp.org](http://www.serdp-estcp.org)) and can be downloaded for free.

Both the PI and co-PI of this project are members of the Interstate Technical Regulatory Council (ITRC) Diffusion Sampler Team. This is a national group of state regulators, representatives from branches of the military, federal investigators, industry consultants, and sampling equipment manufacturers that are interested in transferring diffusion sampler technology to the public arena. Participation in this group has allowed the ITRC to be directly informed of the progress of this work with RCDM samplers and to get feedback on their concerns about the use of the technology. In 2006, the authors contributed to an ITRC overview document on fourteen passive sampling technologies including the RCDM sampler (ITRC, 2006). In 2007, an ITRC protocol document on the use of five passive samplers, one of which was the RCDM sampler, was written and published (ITRC, 2007). The authors wrote the section on the RCDM sampler based on their work on the first phase of the ESTCP ER-0313 project. This document provided guidance on how to deploy and collect samples using these samplers, and on the advantages, applicability, and limitations of these technologies. Both of these documents are available for free on the ITRC website (<http://www.itrcweb.org/guidancedocument.asp?TID=12>). The ITRC also has provided, and continues to provide (as of 2010), a free internet training class on the use of these five sampling devices. An archived copy of the most recent training session is also available on the ITRC Diffusion Sampler Team website.

Technology transfer was accomplished through NFESC by including the results of this demonstration on its website, in the RPM newsletter, and in a Tech Data Sheet. The results were also included on the Federal Remediation Technologies Roundtable website. General RCDM sampler research findings have been presented at technical conferences including the Navy Cleanup Conference, the USGS-DODEC Conference, and three poster presentations at the annual SERDP-ESTCP Conferences. RCDM sampler research findings on sampling for perchlorate and explosives compounds have been presented at the USGS-USEPA Toxics Substances Hydrology Conference and the National Water-Quality Monitoring Council Conference.

## **8.2 LESSONS LEARNED**

### **8.2.1 Regulatory Issues**

Regulatory acceptance of diffusion/passive samplers is currently being done on a state by state basis. New Jersey was the only responding state that had published guidance on using a specific passive sampling technology (PDBs) for sampling VOCs in groundwater (NJDEP, 2005). The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) guidance simply required that the open interval of a well be vertically profiled for VOC concentrations and subsequently sampled at the depth of the highest VOC concentration.

As an example, although the NJDEP PDB guidance does not specifically apply to RCDM samplers, the NJDEP site managers at the NAWC West Trenton, New Jersey site have adapted this guidance in their approval of RCDM use at this site. Initially, the NJDEP required a comparison study of the results of RCDM samplers to the results obtained using low-flow purging or high-flow purging and sampling procedures. The NJDEP approved the use of RCDM samplers in 25 wells at the NAWC site based on these comparison studies. However, after the PDB guidance was established (NJDEP, 2005), RCDM samplers were allowed in 15 additional wells at this site based primarily on doing the vertical VOC profiling required in the PDB guidance. The U.S. Navy is currently planning further comparison sampling in additional wells at the NAWC site. Based on the results of this comparison, NJDEP may approve the use of RCDM samplers as the sole sampling technique in additional wells at the NAWC site. The driving force behind the US Navy's support for the implementation of this technology is the large cost savings in their long-term monitoring plan.

A survey sent to the ITRC's state contacts confirmed that there are some regulatory barriers (statutes, regulations, or guidance) that either prohibit or impede the use of passive sampler technologies (ITRC 2007). Of the 16 states responding to the survey, 25% believed their state had, a prohibition to use of passive/diffusion sampling technologies because they required either three-well-volume purging or low-flow purging prior to groundwater sampling. Other states required that the wells be purged, which precluded using passive sampler technologies. Most all states appeared receptive to the use of passive/diffusion sampling technologies, but usually required a comparison sampling demonstration to verify agreement with the currently used sampling technology.

### **8.2.2 End User Concerns**

State regulators, environmental consultants, and the military can all be identified as end users of the results of this field demonstration. By far, the primary end user concern is whether the RCDM samplers will yield the same results as the low-flow purging or high-flow purging technologies currently in use at the site. Most state-regulators will want to see a side-by-side comparison of RCDM samplers and whatever sampling technique is currently being employed at a site. This requires the collection and analysis of at least one to two sets of extra samples to accomplish the comparison which can be costly to the site responsible party. In most cases, the comparison results will agree and the regulators should agree to use of the RCDM samplers. However, if the comparison results do not agree between the RCDM samplers and the purging sampling techniques, the state regulators may be reluctant to allow replacement of the current sampling technique with RCDM samplers. A large part of gaining acceptance of RCDM samplers at a site is educating the state regulators on how the samplers work and why the RCDM samplers may be giving valid results that do not agree exactly with the current sampling technique being used at the site. Publications on RCDM sampling such as the documents discussed in Section 8.1 will go a long way towards helping with this education process.

Limitations of the RCDM sampler technology were found to be minimal. Samplers made with regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane must be kept hydrated between the time they are constructed and deployed. This is easily remedied by storing the RCDM sampler in a polyethylene sleeve partially filled with water. Purported limitations of RCDM samplers due to water volume loss with time in high ionic strength waters and due to biodegradation were not significant when equilibration times in wells were one to two weeks as was found in this study.

### **8.2.3 Procurement Issues**

The fact that RCDM samplers are not currently commercially available is a stumbling block to having these samplers tested at more sites. Because there are currently (2010) no commercially available RCDM samplers of the type being tested in this demonstration, the samplers must be custom built by the user. One manufacturer was contacted about commercializing the RCDM sampler and was initially enthusiastic. However, they were also developing another passive sampler, so they have not moved forward as quickly on the RCDM sampler. The lesson from this is that researchers should contact several potential manufacturers during ESTCP testing to spur on the process of commercialization more quickly.

## 9.0 REFERENCES

- Boure, T. and R.Vanholder. 2004. *Which dialyser membrane to choose?* Nephrology Dialysis Transplant. 19 (2):293-296.
- Ehlke, T.A., Imbrigiotta, T.E., and Dale, J.M. 2004. *Laboratory comparison of polyethylene and dialysis membrane diffusion samplers.* Ground Water Monitoring and Remediation. 24 (1): 53-59.
- General Physics Corporation. 2005. *Canal Creek Study Area, Groundwater and surface water perchlorate sampling results.* General Physics Corporation Report number GP-R-123E05067, Contract No. DAAD05-97-D-7003, 38 p.
- Gibs, J, Brown, G.A, Turner, K.S., MacLeod, C.L., Jelinski, J.C., and Koehnlein, S.A. 1993. *Effects of small-scale vertical variations in well-screen inflow rates and concentrations of organic compounds on the collection of representative ground-water quality samples.* Ground Water. 35 (2): 201-208.
- Gibs, J., Z. Szabo, T. Ivahnenko, F.N. Wilde. 2000. *Change in field turbidity and trace element concentrations during well purging.* Ground Water. 38 (4): 577-588.
- Harter, T. and S. Talozzi. 2004. *A simple, inexpensive dialysis sampler for small diameter monitoring wells.* Ground Water Monitoring and Remediation. 24 (4):97-105.
- Imbrigiotta, T.E., Trotsky, J. S., Place, M.C. 2007. *Demonstration and validation of a regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion sampler for monitoring ground-water quality and remediation progress at DoD sites (ER-0313).* ESTCP Final Technical Report for Project ER-0313, <http://www.estcp.org/Technology/upload/ER-0313-FR.pdf>.
- Imbrigiotta, T.E., Trotsky, J. S., Place, M.C. 2008. *Protocol for use of regenerated cellulose dialysis membrane diffusion samplers (ER-0313).* ESTCP Protocol Report for Project ER-0313, <http://www.estcp.org/Technology/upload/ER-0313-Protocol.pdf>.
- Imbrigiotta, T.E., Ehlke, T.A., Lacombe, P.J., and Dale, J.M. 2002. *Comparison of dialysis membrane diffusion samplers and two purging methods in bedrock wells.* In A.R. Gavaskar and A.S.C. Chen (Eds.), *Remediation of Chlorinated and Recalcitrant Compounds.* Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Remediation of Chlorinated and Recalcitrant Compounds, Monterey, California. May 2002.
- Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (ITRC). 2004. *Technical and regulatory guidance for using polyethylene diffusion bag samplers to monitor volatile organic compounds in ground water.* ITRC Technical/Regulatory Guidelines Report. <http://www.itrcweb.org/Documents/DSP-3.pdf>, February 2004. 24 p.
- Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (ITRC). 2006. *Technology Overview of Passive Sampler Technologies.* DSP-4. Washington, D.C.: Interstate Technology & Regulatory Council, Authoring Team. <http://www.itrcweb.org/Documents/DSP-4.pdf>. March 2006. 115 p.

- Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (ITRC). 2007. *Protocol for Use of Five Passive Samplers to Sample for a Variety of Contaminants in Groundwater*. DSP-5. Washington, D.C.: Interstate Technology & Regulatory Council, Diffusion/Passive Sampler Team. <http://www.itrcweb.org/Documents/DSP-5.pdf>, February 2007, 121 p.
- LeBlanc, D.R. 2003. *Diffusion and drive-point sampling to detect ordnance-related compounds in shallow ground water beneath Snake Pond, Cape Cod, Massachusetts, 2001-2002*. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 03-4133. 20 p.
- Magaritz, M., Wells, M., Amiel, A.J., and Ronen, D. 1989. *Application of a multi-layer sampler based on the dialysis cell technique for the study of trace metals in ground water*. *Applied Geochemistry*. 4: 617-624.
- New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). 2005. *Field sampling procedures manual: Passive diffusion bag (PDB) samplers*. Chapter 5A, p 24-26. [www.nj.gov/dep/srp/guidance/fspm/pdf/chapter05\\_all.pdf](http://www.nj.gov/dep/srp/guidance/fspm/pdf/chapter05_all.pdf).
- Parker, L.V. and Mulherin, N.D. 2006. *Preliminary studies of alternative passive diffusion devices for sampling explosives*. In Proceedings for the 2006 North American Environmental Field Conference and Exposition, Tampa, Florida, January 10-12, 2006. 11 p.
- Parsons. 2005. *Results report for the demonstration of no-purge groundwater sampling devices at former McClellan Air force Base, California*. Contract No. F44650-99-D-0005. October 2005. 400 p.
- Puls, R.W., and Barcelona, M.J. 1996. *Ground water issue: Low-flow (minimal draw-down) ground-water sampling procedures*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Report EPA/540/S-95/504, R.S. Kerr Environmental Research Center, Ada, Oklahoma.
- Reilly, T.E. and Gibs, J. 1993. Effects of physical and chemical heterogeneity on water-quality samples obtained from wells. *Ground Water*. 31 (5): 805-813.
- Ronen, D., Magaritz, M., and Levy, I. 1987. *An in situ multilevel sampler for preventive monitoring and study of hydrochemical profiles in aquifers*. *Ground Water Monitoring Review*. 7(4): 69-74.
- S-PLUS. 2002. *S-PLUS 6.1 for Windows, Professional Edition, Release 1*. Insightful Corporation, Seattle, Washington. Revision Date May 23, 2002.
- Thermo Scientific. 2008. *Dialysis: an overview*. Thermo Scientific Tech Tip #20. [www.piercenet.com/files/TR0020-Dialysis-overview.pdf](http://www.piercenet.com/files/TR0020-Dialysis-overview.pdf).
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2003. *SW-846 Online, Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods*. <http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/test/main.htm>.

- Varljen, M.D., Barcelona, M.J., Obereiner, J., and Kaminski, D. 2006. *Numerical simulations to assess the monitoring zone achieved during low-flow purging and sampling*. Ground Water Monitoring and Remediation. 26 (1): 44-52.
- Vroblesky, D.A. 2001a. *Users guide for polyethylene-based passive diffusion bag samplers to obtain volatile organic compound concentrations in wells, Part 1: Deployment, recovery, data interpretation, and quality control and assurance*. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 01-4060. 18 p.
- Vroblesky, D.A. 2001b. *User's guide for polyethylene-based passive diffusion bag samplers to obtain volatile organic compound concentrations in wells. Part 2: Field Tests*. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 01-4061. 120 p.
- Vroblesky, D.A., Manish, Joshi, Morrell, Jeffrey, and Peterson, J.E. 2003. *Evaluation of passive diffusion bag samplers, dialysis samplers, and nylon-screen samplers in selected wells at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, March-April 2002*. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 03-4157. 29 p.
- Vroblesky, D.A., Petkewich, M.D., and Campbell, T.R. 2002. *Field tests of diffusion samplers for inorganic constituents in wells and at a ground-water-discharge zone*. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 02-4031. 24 p.
- Vroblesky, D.A., and Pravecek, T. 2002. *Evaluation of passive diffusion bag and dialysis samplers in selected wells at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, July 2001*. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 02-4159. 28 p.
- Wilde, F.D., Radtke, D.B., Gibbs, J., and Iwatsubo, R.T., eds. 1998. *National field manual for collection of water-quality data: Chapter A2. Selection of equipment for water sampling*. U.S. Geological Survey Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations Book 9. 82 p.

## APPENDIX A: POINTS OF CONTACT

This project was a collaborative effort between the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Geological Survey, and State agencies. The principal persons involved for each organization are as follows:

| <b>Point of Contact</b>                           | <b>Organization</b>  | <b>Phone/FAX/email</b>                 |
|---|--|--|
| Principal Investigator                            | NFESC, 1100 23 <sup>rd</sup><br>Avenue, Port<br>Hueneme, CA<br>93043-4370                    | (805) 982-1258<br>(805) 982-4304 (FAX) |
| Co-Principal Investigator<br>and Field QA officer | USGS, 810 Bear<br>Tavern Rd, Suite<br>206 West Trenton,<br>NJ 08628                          | (609) 771-3914<br>(609) 771-3915 (FAX) |
| Tech Transfer                                     | NJDEP, PO Box<br>413, 401 East State<br>St, 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor West,<br>Trenton, NJ 08625 | (609) 984-6565<br>(609) 292-0848 (FAX) |
| Site Support<br>and Tech Transfer                 | US Navy, EFANE,<br>10 Industrial<br>Highway, MS 82,<br>code 1822, Lester,<br>PA 19113        | (215) 897-4914                         |

## **APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL SAMPLING METHOD INFORMATION**

### **B-1. Analytical Calibration Procedures and Quality Control Checks**

The YSI multiparameter instruments used to measure field parameters were calibrated for field use each day using commercially prepared standards for specific conductance, pH, and turbidity according to the manufacturer's calibration procedures. Dissolved oxygen was calibrated using air saturated with water vapor for the high end and a saturated sodium bisulfate solution as a zero DO standard for the low end. The sonde temperature probe was compared with a calibrated laboratory thermometer. Calibration data were recorded on the field forms each day.

### **B-2. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Procedures**

Equipment wash blanks, and duplicate analyses were collected during the field demonstrations to meet the data-quality objectives. One duplicate RCDM sample and one duplicate low-flow purge sample were collected during each field demonstration (approximately 10% of the samples). One equipment wash blank was collected from the low-flow purge pump during the sampling event at each field site. One RCDM sampler were suspended in deionized water for a week and was sampled as RCDM equipment blanks at each field demonstration site. Replicates and blanks were analyzed for the same set of chemical constituents at the laboratory as the other samples in the same set. All analyses for the same chemical constituent were completed by the same laboratory.

The general accuracy of the results were checked by comparing the concentrations from the field demonstration samples to concentrations obtained in the pre-demonstration sampling or to concentrations from previous consultant sampling in the same wells. Precision was checked by comparing the results from duplicate samples from both sampling methods in at least one well per site. The sampling and analytical variation in concentration of duplicate samples for inorganic constituents should typically be within +/- 10-15%. The sampling and analytical variation in concentration of duplicate samples for organic constituents should typically be within +/- 30%. Equipment wash blanks and trip blanks were collected and analyzed to check for any possible cross-contamination between wells or samples. If any cross-contamination was found, cleaning or sample-handling procedures were adjusted to eliminate the problem prior to the next sampling event.

### **B-3. Field Sample Handling Procedures and Notes**

Preprinted waterproof sample container labels were filled out by field personnel using a permanent marker at the time of sample collection and attached to all sample bottles. The sample labels included appropriate information, like date, time, site, well ID, field personnel initials, preservative, and type of sample. The field data from the field forms and the results of analyses of both field and laboratory samples were transferred to electronic data files prior to evaluation of results. Duplicate samples were given a unique sample ID and were handled by the same procedure as other samples collected in the field.

All samples were placed on ice while in the field. At the end of each day, samples were transported to the laboratory and stored in a refrigerator. Once the sampling was concluded, samples were repacked with fresh ice in coolers, standard chain-of-custody forms were filled out, and the samples were shipped by overnight courier to the analytical laboratory.



**B-4. Sampler Cleaning**

New clean RCDM samplers were used when sampling each well. New clean Teflon-lined polyethylene intake tubing was attached to the low-flow peristaltic pump before each new well was purged and sampled. The silicone tubing in the pump head was changed between wells also to avoid cross-contamination. Wells were sampled in the order from least contaminated to most contaminated at each site to further reduce potential cross-contamination.