

United States Army

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

Underground Storage Tank Closure and Site Investigation Report

***Former Building 108
Main Post Area***

**NJDEP UST Registration No. 090010-7
NJDEP Closure Approval No. C-93-3901**

February 1996

Copy



**UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK
CLOSURE AND SITE INVESTIGATION REPORT**

FORMER BUILDING 108

**MAIN POST AREA
NJDEP UST REGISTRATION NO. 090010-7
NJDEP CLOSURE APPROVAL NO. C-93-3901**

FEBRUARY 1996

**PROJECT NO.: 09-5004-07
CONTRACT NO.: DACA51-94-D-0014**

PREPARED FOR:

**UNITED STATES ARMY, FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY
DIRECTORATE OF PUBLIC WORKS
BUILDING 167
FORT MONMOUTH, NJ 07703**

PREPARED BY:

**SMITH ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION
BROMLEY CORPORATE CENTER
THREE TERRI LANE
BURLINGTON, NEW JERSEY 08016**

108.DOC





DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
Headquarters, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Monmouth
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703 - 5101



12 FEB 1995

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

Directorate of Public Works

N.J. Dept of Environmental Protection
Division of Responsible Party Site Remediation
Bureau of Federal Case Management- CN029
401 East State Street - 5th Floor
Trenton, N.J. 08625-0028
Attn: Ian Curtis - Case Manager

Dear Mr. Curtis:

Enclosed please find UST Closure and Site Investigation Reports for the following Fort Monmouth Sites:

Building 108 - 0090010-7	Building 411 - 0090010-28	Building 682 - 0081533-106
Building 114 - 0081533-1	Building 423 - 0090010-39	Building 161 - 0090010-14
Building 443 - 0090010-49	Building 702 - 0081533-114	Building 167 - 0090010-18
Building 563 - 0081533-82	Building 789 - 0081533-126	Building 206 - 0081533-4
Building 608 - 0081533-86	Building 1106 - 0081533-166	Building 210 - 0081533-8
Building 620 - 0081533-93	Building 1122 - 0081533-199	Building 293 - 0081533-67
Building 625 - 0081533-96	Building 3027 - 0192486-28	Building 296 - 0081533-69
Building 659 - 0081533-101	Building 9002 - 0192468-1	Building 9017 - 0090029-6
Building 9049 - 0090029-20	Building 697 - 0081533-194	Building 2500 - 0081515-52
Building 9090 - 0090029-30	thru 196	thru 56

If the information provided in this enclosure is inadequate or you require further information with regard to these documents please contact Mr. Appleby at (908) 532-6224.

Sincerely,



James Ott
Director of Public Works



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
1.0 UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK DECOMMISSIONING ACTIVITIES	1
1.1 OVERVIEW	1
1.2 SITE DESCRIPTION	2
1.2.1 Geological/Hydrogeological Setting	2
1.3 HEALTH AND SAFETY	3
1.4 REMOVAL OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS	4
1.4.1 General Procedures	4
1.4.2 Underground Storage Tank Excavation and Cleaning	4
1.5 UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRANSPORTATION AND DISPOSAL	5
1.6 MANAGEMENT OF EXCAVATED SOILS	5
2.0 SITE INVESTIGATION ACTIVITIES	6
2.1 OVERVIEW	6
2.2 FIELD SCREENING/MONITORING	6
2.3 SOIL SAMPLING	7
3.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	8
3.1 SOIL SAMPLING RESULTS	8
3.2 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	8

Following Page No.

TABLES

Table 1	Summary of Post-Excavation Sampling Activities	7
Table 2	Post-Excavation Soil Sampling Results	8



TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Following Page No.

FIGURES

Figure 1	Site Location Map	1
Figure 2	Site Map	2
Figure 3	Soil Sampling Results	7

APPENDICES

Appendix A	NJDEP-BUST Closure Approval
Appendix B	Certifications
Appendix C	Waste Manifest
Appendix D	UST Disposal Certificate
Appendix E	Soil Analytical Data Package



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

UST Closure

On July 14, 1994, a steel underground storage tank (UST) was closed by removal in accordance with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Closure Approval No. C-93-3901 at U.S. Army Fort Monmouth, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. The UST, NJDEP Registration No. 090010-7, was located immediately adjacent to Former Building 108 in the Main Post area of U.S. Army, Fort Monmouth. UST No. 090010-7 was a 1,000-gallon No. 2 fuel oil UST. The UST fill port was located directly above the tank. The tank closure was performed by Cleaning Up The Environment Inc. (CUTE).

Site Assessment

The site assessment was performed by U.S. Army personnel in accordance with the NJDEP *Technical Requirements for Site Remediation* (N.J.A.C. 7:26E). Soils surrounding the tank were screened visually and with air monitoring instruments for evidence of contamination. Following removal, the UST was inspected for corrosion holes. One small hole was observed in the UST, however, no potentially contaminated soils were observed surrounding the tank.

On July 14, 1994, following removal of the UST, post-excavation soil samples A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H were collected from eight (8) locations along the sidewalls of the excavation immediately above groundwater. Groundwater was present at approximately 4.5 feet below ground surface (BGS). All samples were analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPHC). The piping length was less than 15 feet, therefore no piping samples were collected.

Findings

All post-excavation soil samples collected from the UST excavation at Building 108 contained TPHC concentrations below the NJDEP residential direct contact total organic contaminants soil cleanup criteria of 10,000 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) (N.J.A.C. 7:26D and revisions dated February 3, 1994). Samples B, C, E, F, G, and H contained levels of TPHC ranging in concentration from 26.2 mg/kg to 192.0 mg/kg. All other samples contained non-detectable concentrations of TPHC.

Site Restoration

Following receipt of all post-excavation soil sampling results, the excavation was backfilled to grade with a combination of uncontaminated excavated soil and certified clean fill. The excavation site was then restored to its original condition.



Site Assessment Quality Assurance

The sampling and laboratory analysis conducted during the site assessment were performed in accordance with Section 7:26E-2.1 of the *Technical Requirements*.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the post-excavation soil sampling results, soils with TPHC concentrations exceeding the NJDEP soil cleanup criteria for total organic contaminants of 10,000 mg/kg do not remain in the former location of the UST or associated piping.

No further action is proposed in regard to the closure and site assessment of UST No. 090010-7 at Former Building 108.



1.0 UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK DECOMMISSIONING ACTIVITIES

1.1 OVERVIEW


One underground storage tank (UST), New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Registration No. 090010-7, was closed at Former Building 108 at U.S. Army Fort Monmouth, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey on July 14, 1994. Refer to site location map on Figure 1. This report presents the results of the DPW's implementation of the UST Decommissioning/Closure Plan submitted to the NJDEP on July 26, 1993. The plan was approved on September 7, 1993 and assigned TMS No. C-93-3901. The UST was a steel, 1,000-gallon tank containing No. 2 fuel oil.

Decommissioning activities for UST No. 090010-7 complied with all applicable Federal, State and Local laws and ordinances in effect at the date of decommissioning. These laws included but were not limited to: N.J.A.C. 7:14B-1 et seq., N.J.A.C. 5:23-1 et seq., and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) 1910.146 & 1910.120. All permits including but not limited to the NJDEP-approved Decommissioning/Closure Plan were posted onsite for inspection. CUTE Inc., the contractor that conducted the decommissioning activities, is registered and certified by the NJDEP for performing UST closure activities. Closure of UST No. 090010-7 proceeded under the approval of the NJDEP Bureau of Underground Storage Tanks (NJDEP-BUST). The NJDEP-BUST closure approval and signed certifications for UST No. 090010-7 are included in Appendices A and B, respectively.

Based on an inspection of the UST, field screening of subsurface soils and analytical results of collected soil samples, the DPW has concluded that no significant historical discharges are associated with the UST or associated piping.

This UST Closure and Site Investigation Report has been prepared by Smith Environmental Technologies Corporation, to assist the United States Army Directorate of Public Works (DPW) in complying with the NJDEP-BUST regulations. The applicable NJDEP-BUST regulations at the date of closure were the *Interim Closure Requirements for Underground Storage Tank Systems* (N.J.A.C. 7:14B-1 et seq. September 1990 and revisions dated November 1, 1991).

This report was prepared using information required at the time of closure. Section 1 of this UST Closure and Site Investigation Report provides a summary of the UST decommissioning activities. Section 2 of this report describes the site investigation activities. Conclusions and recommendations, including the results of the soil sampling investigation, are presented in the final section of this report.



SCALE

0 2000 FT.

NEW
JERSEY



QUADRANGLE LOCATION

1.2 SITE DESCRIPTION

Former Building 108 was located in the eastern portion of the Main Post area of Fort Monmouth as shown on Figure 1. UST No. 090010-7 was located west of Former Building 108 and appurtenant piping ran less than 15 feet west from Former Building 108 to the fill port area. A site map is provided on Figure 2. The fill port area was located directly above the UST.

1.2.1 Geological/Hydrogeological Setting

The following is a description of the geological/hydrogeological setting of the area surrounding Former Building 108. Included is a description of the regional geology of the area surrounding Fort Monmouth as well as descriptions of the local geology and hydrogeology of the Main Post area.

Regional Geology

Monmouth County lies within the New Jersey Section of the Atlantic Coastal Plain physiographic province. The Main Post, Charles Wood, and the Evans areas are located in what may be referred to as the Outer Coastal Plain subprovince, or the Outer Lowlands.


In general, New Jersey Coastal Plain formations consist of a seaward-dipping wedge of unconsolidated deposits of clay, silt, and gravel. These formations typically strike northeast-southwest with a dip ranging from 10 to 60 feet per mile and were deposited on Precambrian and lower Paleozoic rocks (Zapeczka, 1989). These sediments, predominantly derived from deltaic, shallow marine, and continental shelf environments, date from Cretaceous through the Quaternary Periods. The mineralogy ranges from quartz to glauconite.

The formations record several major transgressive/regressive cycles and contain units which are generally thicker to the southeast and reflect a deeper water environment. Over 20 regional geologic units are present within the sediments of the Coastal Plain. Regressive, upward coarsening deposits are usually aquifers (e.g., Englishtown and Kirkwood Formations, and the Cohansey Sand) while the transgressive deposits act as confining units (e.g., the Merchantville, Marshalltown, and Navesink Formations). The individual thicknesses for these units vary greatly (i.e., from several feet to several hundred feet). The Coastal Plain deposits thicken to the southeast from the Fall Line to greater than 6,500 feet in Cape May County (Brown and Zapeczka, 1990).

Local Geology

Based on the regional geologic map (Jablonski, 1968), the Cretaceous age Red Bank and Tinton Sands outcrop at the Main Post area. The Red Bank sand conformably overlies the Navesink Formation and dips to the southeast at 35 feet per mile. The upper member (Shrewsbury) of the Red Bank sand is a yellowish-gray to reddish brown clayey, medium-to-coarse-grained sand that contains abundant rock fragments, minor mica and

Source: BCM/Smith Environmental Technologies Corporation (048)



glauconite (Jablonski). The lower member (Sandy Hook) is a dark gray to black, medium-to-fine grained sand with abundant clay, mica, and glauconite.

The Tinton sand conformably overlies the Red Bank Sand and ranges from a clayey medium to very coarse grained feldspathic quartz and glauconite sand to a glauconitic coarse sand. The color varies from dark yellowish orange or light brown to moderate brown and from light olive to grayish olive. Glauconite may constitute 60 to 80 percent of the sand fraction in the upper part of the unit (Minard, 1969). The upper part of the Tinton is often highly oxidized and iron oxide encrusted (Minard).

Hydrogeology

The water table aquifer in the Main Post area is identified as part of the "composite confining units," or minor aquifers. The minor aquifers include the Navesink formation, Red Bank Sand, Tinton Sand, Hornerstown Sand, Vincentown Formation, Manasquan Formation, Shark River Formation, Piney Point Formation, and the basal clay of the Kirkwood Formation.

Based on records of wells drilled in the Main Post area, water is typically encountered at depths of 2 to 9 feet below ground surface (BGS). According to Jablonski, wells drilled in the Red Bank and Tinton Sands may produce 2 to 25 gallons per minute (gpm). Some well owners have reported acidic water that requires treatment to remove iron.

Due to the proximity of the Atlantic Ocean to Fort Monmouth, shallow groundwater may be tidally influenced and may flow toward creeks and brooks as the tide goes out, and away from creeks and brooks as the tide comes in. However, an abundance of clay lenses and sand deposits were noted in borings installed throughout Fort Monmouth. Therefore the direction of shallow groundwater should be determined on a case by case basis.

1.3 HEALTH AND SAFETY

Before, during, and after all decommissioning activities, hazards at the work site which may have posed a threat to the Health and Safety of all personnel who were involved with, or were affected by, the decommissioning of the UST system were minimized. All areas which posed, or may have been suspected to pose a vapor hazard were monitored by a qualified individual utilizing a combustible gas indicator (CGI). The individual ascertained if the area was properly vented to render the area safe, as defined by OSHA.

1.4 REMOVAL OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS

1.4.1 General Procedures

- All underground obstructions (utilities, etc.) were marked out by the contractor performing the closure prior to excavation activities.
- All activities were carried out with the greatest regard to safety and health and the safeguarding of the environment.
- All excavated soils were visually examined and screened with an organic vapor analyzer (OVA) for evidence of contamination. Potentially contaminated soils were identified and logged during closure activities.
- Surface materials (i.e., asphalt, concrete, etc.) were excavated and staged separately from all soil and recycled in accordance with all applicable regulations and laws.
- A Sub-Surface Evaluator from the DPW was present during all closure activities.

1.4.2 Underground Storage Tank Excavation and Cleaning

Prior to UST decommissioning activities, surficial soil was removed to expose the UST and associated piping. All free product present in the piping was drained into the UST, and the UST was purged to remove vapors prior to cutting and removal of the piping. After removal of the associated piping, a manway was made in the UST to allow for proper cleaning. The UST was completely emptied of all liquids prior to removal from the ground. A total of 1,000 gallons of liquid were transported by Freehold Cartage Inc. to Lionetti Oil Recovery Co. Inc., a NJDEP-approved petroleum recycling and disposal facility located in Old Bridge, New Jersey. Refer to Appendix C for waste manifest (No. NJA-1603196).

The UST was cleaned prior to removal from the excavation in accordance with NJDEP-BUST regulations. After the UST was removed from the excavation, it was staged on polyethylene sheeting and examined for holes. One small hole was observed during the inspection by the Sub-Surface Evaluator. Soils surrounding the UST were screened visually and with an OVA for evidence of contamination. No evidence of contamination was noted.

Soil screening was also performed along the piping associated with the UST. No contamination was noted anywhere along the piping length.



1.5 UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRANSPORTATION AND DISPOSAL

The tank was transported by CUTE Inc., to Mazza and Sons Inc. for disposal in compliance with all applicable regulations and laws. See Appendix D for UST Disposal Certificate.

The Subsurface Evaluator labeled the UST prior to transport with the following information:

- site of origin
- contact person
- NJDEP UST Facility ID number
- name of transporter/contact person
- destination site/contact person

1.6 MANAGEMENT OF EXCAVATED SOILS

Based on OVA air monitoring and TPHC analysis results from the post-excavation soil samples, no soils exhibited signs of contamination. Therefore, the excavated soils were used as backfill following removal of the UST.

2.0 SITE INVESTIGATION ACTIVITIES

2.1 OVERVIEW

The Site Investigation was managed and carried out by U.S. Army DPW personnel. All analyses were performed and reported by U.S. Army, Fort Monmouth Environmental Laboratory, a NJDEP-certified testing laboratory. All sampling was performed under the direct supervision of a NJDEP Certified Sub-Surface Evaluator according to the methods described in the NJDEP *Field Sampling Procedures Manual* (1992). Sampling frequency and parameters analyzed complied with the NJDEP-BUST document *Interim Closure Requirements for Underground Storage Tank Systems* (September 1990 and revisions dated November 1, 1991) which was the applicable regulation at the date of the closure. All records of the Site Investigation activities are maintained by the Fort Monmouth DPW Environmental Office.

The following Parties participated in Closure and Site Investigation Activities:

- Closure Contractor: Cleaning Up The Environment Inc., (CUTE)
Contact Person: Nancy Williams
Phone Number: (201) 427-2881
NJDEP Company Certification No.: 0200128
- Subsurface Evaluator: Joseph M. Fallon
Employer: U.S. Army, Fort Monmouth
Phone Number: (908) 532-0989
NJDEP Certification No.: 0002442
- Analytical Laboratory: U.S. Army Fort Monmouth Environmental Laboratory
Contact Person: Brian K. McKee
Phone Number: (908) 532-4359
NJDEP Company Certification No.: 13461
- Hazardous Waste Hauler: Freehold Cartage Inc.
Contact Person: Barry Olsen
Phone Number: (908) 462-1001
NJDEP Hazardous Waste Hauler No.: 2265

2.2 FIELD SCREENING/MONITORING

Field screening was performed by a NJDEP certified Sub-Surface Evaluator using an OVA and visual observations to identify potentially contaminated material. Soil excavated from around the tank and appurtenant piping, as well as the UST excavation sidewalls and bottom, were found to be free of potential contamination.

2.3 SOIL SAMPLING

On July 14, 1994, post-excavation soil samples A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H, were collected from eight (8) locations along the sidewalls of the UST excavation immediately above groundwater. Groundwater was present at approximately 4.5 feet BGS. Samples were not collected along the piping trench due to the length being less than 15 feet. Refer to soil sampling location map on Figure 3. All samples were analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPHC). Because none of the post-excavation soil samples exhibited a TPHC concentration exceeding 1,000 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg), none were analyzed for volatile organic compounds with a forward library search for 10 tentatively identified compounds (VOCs).

The site assessment was performed by U.S. Army personnel in accordance with the NJDEP *Technical Requirements* and the NJDEP *Field Sampling Procedures Manual*. A summary of sampling activities including parameters analyzed is provided in Table 1. The post-excavation soil samples were collected using polystyrene scoops. Actual soil TPHC values may be higher than reported, due to sample utensil absorbency. If absorbency resulted in reducing the actual soil TPHC concentration by 50 %, the highest soil contaminant would have been 384.0 mg/kg, still below the applicable NJDEP soil cleanup standard for total organic contaminants of 10,000 mg/kg. Following soil sampling activities, the samples were chilled and delivered to U.S. Army Fort Monmouth Environmental Laboratory located in Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, for analysis.




TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF SAMPLING ACTIVITIES
BUILDING 108, MAIN POST
FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY

Sample ID	Date of Collection	Matrix	Sample Type	Analytical Parameters (and USEPA Methods) *	Sampling Method
A	07-14-94	Soil	Post-Excavation	TPHC	Polystyrene Scoop
B	07-14-94	Soil	Post-Excavation	TPHC	Polystyrene Scoop
C	07-14-94	Soil	Post-Excavation	TPHC	Polystyrene Scoop
D	07-14-94	Soil	Post-Excavation	TPHC	Polystyrene Scoop
E	07-14-94	Soil	Post-Excavation	TPHC	Polystyrene Scoop
F	07-14-94	Soil	Post-Excavation	TPHC	Polystyrene Scoop
G	07-14-94	Soil	Post-Excavation	TPHC	Polystyrene Scoop
H	07-14-94	Soil	Post-Excavation	TPHC	Polystyrene Scoop

*Note: TPHC Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (Method 418.1 / soil and aqueous)

3.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 SOIL SAMPLING RESULTS

To evaluate soil conditions following removal of the UST and associated piping, post-excavation soil samples were collected from a total of eight (8) locations on July 14, 1994. All samples were analyzed for TPHC. The post-excavation soil sample results were compared to the NJDEP residential direct contact total organic contaminants soil cleanup criteria of 10,000 mg/kg (N.J.A.C. 7:26D and revisions dated February 3, 1994). A summary of the analytical results and comparison to the NJDEP soil cleanup criteria is provided in Table 2 and the soil sampling results are shown on Figure 3. The analytical data package is provided in Appendix E.

All post-excavation soil samples collected on July 14, 1994, from the UST excavation and from below piping associated with the UST contained either non-detectable concentrations of TPHC or concentrations below the NJDEP soil cleanup criteria. Samples B, C, E, F, G, and H, contained levels of TPHC ranging in concentration from 26.2 mg/kg to 192.0 mg/kg. All other samples contained a non-detectable concentration of TPHC.

3.2 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The analytical results for all post-excavation soil samples collected from the UST closure excavation at Former Building 108 were below the NJDEP soil cleanup criteria for total organic contaminants.

Based on the post-excavation soil sampling results, soils with TPHC concentrations exceeding the NJDEP soil cleanup criteria of 10,000 mg/kg do not remain in the former location of the UST or associated piping.

No further action is proposed in regard to the closure and site assessment of UST No. 090010-7 at Former Building 108.

TABLE 2
POST-EXCAVATION SOIL SAMPLING RESULTS
BUILDING 108
FT. MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY

PAGE 1 OF 1

Sample ID/Depth	Sample Laboratory ID	Sample Date	Analysis Date	Compound Name	Sample Quantitation Limit (mg/kg)	Compound of Concern	Result (mg/kg)	NJDEP Soil Cleanup Criteria *	Exceeds Cleanup Criteria
A/4.0-4.5'	1565.1	07-14-94	07-18-94	Total Solid	--	--	87 %	--	--
				TPHC	6.6	yes	ND	10,000	--
B/4.0-4.5'	1565.2	07-14-94	07-18-94	Total Solid	--	--	85 %	--	--
				TPHC	6.6	yes	114.0	10,000	--
C/4.0-4.5'	1565.3	07-14-94	07-18-94	Total Solid	--	--	86 %	--	--
				TPHC	6.6	yes	192.0	10,000	--
D/4.0-4.5'	1565.4	07-14-94	07-18-94	Total Solid	--	--	85 %	--	--
				TPHC	6.6	yes	ND	10,000	--
E/4.0-4.5'	1565.5	07-14-94	07-18-94	Total Solid	--	--	85 %	--	--
				TPHC	6.6	yes	88.3	10,000	--
F/4.0-4.5'	1565.6	07-14-94	07-18-94	Total Solid	--	--	86 %	--	--
				TPHC	6.6	yes	75.9	10,000	--
G/4.0-4.5'	1565.7	07-14-94	07-18-94	Total Solid	--	--	83 %	--	--
				TPHC	6.6	yes	96.3	10,000	--
H/4.0-4.5'	1565.8	07-14-94	07-18-94	Total Solid	--	--	82 %	--	--
				TPHC	6.6	yes	26.2	10,000	--

Notes:

* Cleanup criteria for total organics

-- Not applicable / does not exceed criteria

TPHC Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons

Smith Environmental Technologies Corporation (Project No. 09-5004-07)

soil108.doc

SMITH

APPENDIX A

NJDEP BUST CLOSURE APPROVAL

UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SYSTEM CLOSURE APPROVAL

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AND ENERGY

DIVISION OF RESPONSIBLE PARTY SITE REMEDIATION
BUREAU OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS
CN-029, TRENTON, NJ 08625-0029

TMS #

UST #

C-93-3901

0090010

US Army
BLDG. 108
Ft. Monmouth, NJ

Monmouth

THE ABOVE LISTED FACILITY IS HEREBY GRANTED APPROVAL TO PERFORM
THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH N.J.A.C. 7:14B-1 et. seq.:

Removal of: one 1,000 gallon #2 diesel UST(s) and appurtenant piping.

SITE ASSESSMENT: Soil samples will be taken every five (5) feet along the center line of each tank and one (1) soil sample for every 15 feet along all associated piping. Two (2) additional samples will be taken from around the tank and biased to the areas of highest field screened readings. Samples will be analyzed for TPHC. If sample results are greater than 1,000ppm than 25% of the samples will be analyzed for VO+10.

ON-SITE MANAGER: C. Appleby

TELEPHONE: 808-532-1475

OWNER:

TELEPHONE:

EFFECTIVE DATE: SEP 07 1993

THIS FORM MUST BE DISPLAYED AT THE SITE DURING THE APPROVED
ACTIVITY AND MUST BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR INSPECTION AT ALL TIMES.



KEVIN F. KRATINA, BUREAU CHIEF
BUREAU OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS

SMITH

APPENDIX B
CERTIFICATIONS



FOR STATE USE ONLY

UST # _____
Date Rec'd _____
TMS # _____
Staff _____

State of New Jersey
Department of Environmental Protection and Energy
Division of Responsible Party Site Remediation
CN 029
Trenton, NJ 08625-0029
Tel. # 609-984-3156
Fax. # 609-292-5604

Scott A. Welner
Commissioner

Karl J. Delaney
Director

UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK
SITE ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

*Under the provisions of the Underground Storage
of Hazardous Substances Act
in accordance with N.J.A.C. 7:14B*

This Summary form shall be used by all owners and operators of Underground Storage Tank Systems (USTS) who have either reported a release and are subject to the site assessment requirements of N.J.A.C. 7:14B-8.2 or who have closed USTS pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:14B-9.1 et seq. and are subject to the site assessment requirements of N.J.A.C. 7:14B-9.2 and 9.3.

INSTRUCTIONS:

- Please print legibly or type.
- Fill in all applicable blanks. This form will require various attachments in order to complete the Summary. The technical guidance document, Interim Closure Requirements for USTs, explains the regulatory (and technical) requirements for closure and the Scope of Work, Investigation and Corrective Action Requirements for Discharges from Underground Storage Tanks and Piping Systems explains the regulatory (and technical) requirements for corrective action.
- Return one original of the form and all required attachments to the above address.
- Attach a scaled site diagram of the subject facility which shows the information specified in Item IV B of this form.
- Explain any "No" or "N/A" response on a separate sheet.

Date of Submission _____

Bldg. 108

090010-7
FACILITY REGISTRATION #

I. FACILITY NAME AND ADDRESS

U.S. Army, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey
Directorate of Engineering and Housing, Building 167
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey County Monmouth
Telephone No. (908) 532- _____

OWNER'S NAME AND ADDRESS, if different from above

Telephone No. _____

II. DISCHARGE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

- A. Was contamination found? ☐ Yes ☒ No If Yes, Case No. _____
(Note: All discharges must be reported to the Environmental Action Hotline (609) 292-7172)
- B. The substance(s) discharged was(were) N/A
- C. Have any vapor hazards been mitigated? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

III. DECOMMISSIONING OF TANK SYSTEMS

Closure Approval No. C-93-3901

The site assessment requirements associated with tank decommissioning are explained in the Technical Guidance Document, Interim Closure Requirements for UST's, Section V. A-D. Attach complete documentation of the methods used and the results obtained for each of the steps of tank decommissioning used. Please include a site map which shows the locations of all samples and borings, the location of all tanks and piping runs at the facility at the beginning of the tank closure operation and annotated to differentiate the status of all tanks and piping (e.g., removed, abandoned, temporarily closed, etc.). The same site map can be used to document other parts of the site assessment requirements, if it is properly and legibly annotated.

IV. SITE ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

A. Excavated Soil

Any evidence of contamination in excavated soil will require that the soil be classified as either Hazardous Waste or Non-Hazardous Waste. Please include all required documentation of compliance with the requirements for handling contaminated excavated soil (if any was present) as explained in the technical guidance documents for closure and corrective action. Describe amount of soil removed, its classification, and disposal location.

B. Scaled Site Diagrams

1. Scaled site diagrams must be attached which include the following information:

- North arrow and scale
- The locations of the ground water monitoring wells
- Location and depth of each soil sample and boring
- All major surface and sub-surface structures and utilities
- Approximate property boundaries
- All existing or closed underground storage tank systems, including appurtenant piping
- A cross-sectional view indicating depth of tank, stratigraphy and location of water table
- Locations of surface water bodies

C. Soil samples and borings (check appropriate answer)

- Were soil samples taken from the excavation as prescribed? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
- Were soil borings taken at the tank system closure site as prescribed? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A
- Attach the analytical results in tabular form and include the following information about each sample:
 - Customer sample number (keyed to the site map)
 - The depth of the soil sample
 - Soil boring logs
 - Method detection limit of the method used
 - QA/QC Information as required

D. Ground Water Monitoring

1. Number of ground water monitoring wells installed 0
2. Attach the analytical results of the ground water samples in tabular form. Include the following information for each sample from each well:
 - a. Site diagram number for each well installed
 - b. Depth of ground water surface
 - c. Depth of screened interval
 - d. Method detection limit of the method used
 - e. Well logs
 - f. Well permit numbers
 - g. QA/QC information as required

V. SOIL CONTAMINATION

- A. Was soil contamination found? Yes X No

If "Yes", please answer Question B-E

If "No", please answer Question B

- B. The highest soil contamination still remaining in the ground has been determined to be:

1. N/A ppb total BTEX, N/A ppb total non-targeted VOC
2. N/A ppb total B/N, N/A ppb total non-targeted B/N
3. 192.0 ppm TPHC
4. N/A ppb _____ (for non-petroleum substance)

- C. Remediation of free product contaminated soils N/A

1. All free product contaminated soil on the property boundaries and above the water table are believed to have been removed from the subsurface Yes No
2. Free product contaminated soils are suspected to exist below the water table Yes No
3. Free product contaminated soils are suspected to exist off the property boundaries. Yes No

- D. Was the vertical and horizontal extent of contamination determined? Yes No X N/A

- E. Does soil contamination intersect ground water? Yes No X N/A

VI. GROUND WATER CONTAMINATION N/A

- A. Was ground water contamination found? Yes No

If "Yes", please answer Questions B-G.

If "No", please answer only Question B.

- B. The highest ground water contamination at any 1 sampling location and at any 1 sampling event to date has been determined to be:

1. _____ ppb total BTEX, _____ ppb total non-targeted VOC
2. _____ ppb total B/N, _____ ppb total non-targeted B/N
3. _____ ppb total MTBE, _____ ppb total TBA
4. _____ ppb _____ (for non-petroleum substance)
5. greatest thickness of separate phase product found _____
6. separate phase product has been delineated Yes No N/A

- C. Result(s) of well search

1. A well search (including a review of manual well records) indicates that private, municipal or commercial wells do exist within the distances specified in the Scope of Work. Yes No N/A
2. The number of these wells identified is _____.

D. Proximity of wells and contaminant plume

1. The shallowest depth of any well noted in the well search which may be in the horizontal or vertical potential path(s) of the contaminant plume(s) is _____ feet below grade (consideration has been given for the effects of pumping, subsurface structures, etc. on the direction(s) of contaminant migration). This well is _____ feet from the source and its screening begins at a depth of _____ feet.
2. The shallowest depth to the top of the well screen for any well in the potential path of the plume(s) (as described in D1 above) is _____ feet below grade. This well is located _____ feet from the source.
3. The closest horizontal distance of a private, commercial or municipal well in the potential path of the plume (as determined in D1) is _____ feet from the source. This well is _____ feet deep and screening begins at a depth of _____ feet.

E. A plan for separate phase product recovery has been included. ____ Yes ____ No ____ N/A

F. A ground water contour map has been submitted which includes the ground water elevations for each well.
____ Yes ____ No ____ N/A

G. Delineation of contamination

1. The ground water contaminants have been delineated to MCLs or lower values at the property boundaries. ____ Yes ____ No
2. The plume is suspected to continue off the property at concentrations greater than MCLs.
____ Yes ____ No
3. Off property access (circle one): is being sought has been approved has been denied

VII. SITE ASSESSMENT CERTIFICATION [preparer of site assessment plan - N.J.A.C. 7:14B-6.3(b) & 9.5(a)3]

The person signing this certification as the "Qualified Ground Water Consultant" (as defined in N.J.A.C. 7:14B-1.6) responsible for the design and implementation of the site assessment plan as specified in N.J.A.C. 7:14B-8.3(a) & 9.2(b)2, must supply the name of the certifying organization and certification number.

"I certify under penalty of law that the information provided in this document is true, accurate, and complete and was obtained by procedures in compliance with N.J.A.C. 7:14B-8 and 9. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false, inaccurate, or incomplete information, including fines and/or imprisonment."

NAME (Print or Type) Joseph M. Fallon

SIGNATURE

Joseph M. Fallon
2/14/96

COMPANY NAME U.S. Army, Fort Monmouth

DATE

(Preparer of Site Assessment Plan)

CERTIFYING
ORGANIZATION NJDEP

CERTIFICATION
NUMBER 0002442

VIII. TANK DECOMMISSIONING CERTIFICATION [person performing tank decommissioning portion of closure plan - N.J.A.C. 7:14B-9.5(a)4]

"I certify under penalty of law that tank decommissioning activities were performed in compliance with N.J.A.C. 7:14B-9.2(b)3. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false, inaccurate, or incomplete information, including fines and/or imprisonment."

NAME (Print or Type) _____ SIGNATURE _____

COMPANY NAME _____ DATE _____
(Performer of Tank Decommissioning)

IX. CERTIFICATIONS BY THE RESPONSIBLE PARTY(IES) OF THE FACILITY

A. The following certification shall be signed by the highest ranking individual with overall responsibility for that facility [N.J.A.C. 7:14B-2.3(c)1].

"I certify under penalty of law that the information provided in this document is true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false, inaccurate, or incomplete information, including fines and/or imprisonment."

NAME (Print or Type) James Ott SIGNATURE *James Ott*

COMPANY NAME U.S. Army, Fort Monmouth DATE 2/14/94

B. The following certification shall be signed as follows [according to the requirements of N.J.A.C. 7:14B-2.3(C)2]:

1. For a corporation, by a principal executive officer of at least the level of vice president.
2. For a partnership or sole proprietorship, by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively; or
3. For a municipality, State, Federal or other public agency by either the principal executive officer or ranking elected official.
4. In cases where the highest ranking corporate partnership, governmental officer or official at the facility as required in A above is the same person as the official required to certify in B, only the certification in A need to be made. In all other cases, the certifications of A and B shall be made.

"I certify under penalty of law that I have personally examined and am familiar with the information submitted in this application and all attached documents, and that based on my inquiry of those individuals immediately responsible for obtaining the information, I believe that the submitted information is true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false, inaccurate, or incomplete information, including fines and/or imprisonment."

NAME (Print or Type) _____ SIGNATURE _____

COMPANY NAME _____ DATE _____

SMITH

APPENDIX C
WASTE MANIFEST



State of New Jersey
Department of Environmental Protection and
Hazardous Waste Regulation Program
Manifest Section
CN 028, Trenton, NJ 08625-0028

Bldg. 108

Please type or print in block letters. (Form designed for use on elite (12-pitch) typewriter.)

Form Approved, OMB No. 2050-0039, Expires 9-30-94

UNIFORM HAZARDOUS WASTE MANIFEST		1. Generator's US EPA ID No.	Manifest Document No.	2. Page 1 of 1	Information in the shaded areas is not required by Federal law.	
3. Generator's Name and Mailing Address Marx Post c/o US Army Communications Electronics Center A.H. SELF 2 DL - Bldg. 108, 2504 1908 1532-6223 Fort Monmouth NJ 07703		4. Generator's Phone		A. State Manifest Document Number NJA 1603196		
5. Transporter 1 Company Name Frederick Carter INC		6. US EPA ID Number NJ D0541126164		B. State Generator's ID		
7. Transporter 2 Company Name		8. US EPA ID Number		C. State Trans. ID NJDEPS 2265 *		
9. Designated Facility Name and Site Address Lanetti Oil Recovery Co. INC. Runyon + Chesapeake RD. 012 Bridge NJ 08857		10. US EPA ID Number NJ D084104140164		D. Transporter's Phone 908 1412-1001		
				E. State Trans. ID		
				F. Transporter's Phone ()		
				G. State Facility's ID		
				H. Facility's Phone 908 721-0900		
11. US DOT Description (Including Proper Shipping Name, Hazard Class, and ID Number) HM		12. Containers No. Type		13. Total Quantity		14. Unit WH/Vol
a. ☒ Petroleum oil, No class 3 (Petroleum oil) combustible liquid UN1270 PG III		001 TT 011000		G		X 7 2 2
b. ☒ Petroleum oil, No class 3 (Petroleum oil) combustible liquid UN1270 PG III		001 TT 00732		G		X 7 2 2
c. ☒ Petroleum oil, No class 3 (Petroleum oil) combustible liquid UN1270 PG III		001 TT 00922		G		X 7 2 2
d. ☒ Petroleum oil, No class 3 (Petroleum oil) combustible liquid UN1270 PG III		001 TT 00454		G		X 7 2 2
J. Additional Descriptions for Materials Listed Above oil 60% a. water 40% LIT		oil 60% c. water 40% LIT		K. Handling Codes for Wastes Listed Above To4 a. Filtration Filtration		
oil 60% b. water 40% LIT		oil 60% d. water 40% LIT		To4 b. Filtration Filtration		
15. Special Handling Instructions and Additional Information NOT EPA Regulated - NJ Hazardous 24 hr. Emerg # 201-429-2881 *DECEL # 55404		NJDEPS 009000-16		a) NJDEPS 009000-7 b) NJDEPS 009000-13A c) NJDEPS 009000-13B		
16. GENERATOR'S CERTIFICATION: I hereby declare that the contents of this consignment are fully and accurately described above by proper shipping name and are classified, packed, marked, and labeled, and are in all respects in proper condition for transport by highway according to applicable international and national government regulations. If I am a large quantity generator, I certify that I have a program in place to reduce the volume and toxicity of waste generated to the degree I have determined to be economically practicable and that I have selected the practicable method of treatment, storage, or disposal currently available to me which minimizes the present and future threat to human health and the environment; OR, if I am a small quantity generator, I have made a good faith effort to minimize my waste generation and select the best waste management method that is available to me and that I can afford.		Printed/Typed Name Joseph M. Fallon		Signature Joseph M. Fallon		Month Day Year 07/13/94
17. Transporter 1 Acknowledgement of Receipt of Materials Printed/Typed Name PAULO R. MEDEIROS		Signature [Signature]		Month Day Year 07/13/94		
18. Transporter 2 Acknowledgement of Receipt of Materials Printed/Typed Name		Signature		Month Day Year		
19. Discrepancy Indication Space						
20. Facility Owner or Operator; Certification of receipt of hazardous materials covered by this manifest except as noted in item 19. Printed/Typed Name		Signature		Month Day Year		

SIGNATURE AND INFORMATION MUST BE LEGIBLE ON ALL COPIES

SMITH

APPENDIX D

UST DISPOSAL CERTIFICATE

INC 108 - 0090010-7
LJG 423 - 0090010-49
1 DG 364 - 0081533-74

MAZZA & SONS, INC.

Metal Recyclers
Auto and Truck
3230 Shafto Rd.
Tinton Falls, NJ
(908) 922-9292

NO. _____

DATE 15 July 94

Customer's Name

Cute inc

Address

Make of
Autos


Tires

Tank

Price

43560 LB G
38740 LB G

4820



Weight Price

Cast Iron	
Steel	216.40
Lt. Iron	
Copper #1	
Copper #2	
Lt. Copper	
Brass	
Alum. Clean	
Lead	
Stainless	
Radiators	
Battery	
TOTAL AMOUNT	

Weighter

Ⓢ

Customer

[Signature]

SMITH

APPENDIX E
SOIL ANALYTICAL DATA PACKAGE

Report of Analysis
U.S. Army, Fort Monmouth Environmental Laboratory
NJDEPE Certification # 13461

Client: U.S. Army
DPW, SELFM-PW-EV
Bldg. 167
Ft. Monmouth, NJ 07703

Lab. ID #: 1565.1-.8
Sample Rec'd: 07/14/94
Analysis Start: 07/18/94
Analysis Comp: 07/19/94

Analysis: 418.1 (TPH)
Matrix: Soil
Analyst: B. McKee
Ext. Meth: Sonc.


NJDEPE UST Reg. #:
Closure #:
DICAR #:
Location #: Bldg. 108

Lab ID.	Description	%Solid	Result	MDL (mg/Kg)
1565.1	Sample A OVA= ND	87	ND	6.6
1565.2	Sample B OVA= ND	85	114.	6.6
1565.3	Sample C OVA= ND	86	192.	6.6
1565.4	Sample D OVA= ND	85	ND	6.6
1565.5	Sample E OVA= ND	85	88.3	6.6
1565.6	Sample F OVA= ND	86	75.9	6.6
1565.7	Sample G OVA= ND	83	96.3	6.6
1565.8	Sample H OVA= ND	82	26.2	6.6
M. Bl.	Method Blank	100	ND	3.3

Notes: ND = Not Detected, MDL = Method Detection Limit

* = Silica Gel Added, NA = Not Applicable

1565.8 dup= 100% 1565.8 s=99.7% 1565.8 sd=97.8% RPD= 1.9%



Brian K. McKee
Laboratory Director

Report of Analysis
U.S. Army, Fort Monmouth Environmental Laboratory
NJDEPE Certification # 13461

Client: U.S. Army
DPW, SELFM-PW-EV
Bldg. 167
Ft. Monmouth, NJ 07703

Lab. ID #: 1565.1-8
Sample Rec'd: 07/14/94
Analysis Start: 07/18/94
Analysis Comp: 07/18/94

Analysis: Munsel

[illegible]

B MK

Brian K. McKee
Laboratory Director

U.S. ARMY FORT MONMOUTH

P.O. #:

Chain of Custody

Project #:		Sampler: <i>Joe Fallon</i>		Date / Time: <i>7/14/93 2:25 PM</i>	Analysis Parameters		Start:	
Customer: <i>DPW</i>		Site Name: <i>Bldg 108</i>		<i>TPH</i> <i>H₂S</i> <i>Mussel</i>		Finish:		
Phone:						Preservation Method		
Lab Sample ID Number	Date/Time	Customer Sample Location/ID Number	Sample Matrix	# of Bottles	Remarks			
<i>1565.1</i>	<i>7/14 1:30</i>	<i>Sample A</i>	<i>Soil</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>ND OVA Reading</i>		
<i>.2</i>	<i>7/14 2:00</i>	<i>Sample B</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	<i>X</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	
<i>.3</i>	<i>7/14 2:05</i>	<i>Sample C</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	<i>X</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	
<i>.4</i>	<i>7/14 1:55</i>	<i>Sample D</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	<i>X</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	
<i>.5</i>	<i>7/14 1:50</i>	<i>Sample E</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	<i>X</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	
<i>.6</i>	<i>7/14 1:45</i>	<i>Sample F</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	<i>X</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	
<i>.7</i>	<i>7/14 1:40</i>	<i>Sample G</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	<i>X</i>	<i> </i>	<i> </i>	
<i>✓ .8</i>	<i>7/14 1:35</i>	<i>Sample H</i>	<i>↓</i>	<i>↓</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>↓</i>	<i>↓</i>	
	<i>PM</i>							
Relinquished By (signature): <i>Joe Fallon</i>		Date / Time: <i>7/14/93 2:25 PM</i>	Received By (signature): <i>Sarah Hubbard</i>		Shipped By:			
Relinquished By (signature):		Date / Time:	Received for Lab by (signature):		Date / Time:			

Note: A drawing depicting sample location should be attached or drawn on the reverse side of this chain of custody.

6970-00

7/19/94 B-7M4

2CM/M 500.8MV=3A1-0

40.75 108mV

81.5 244mV

163

442mV

1565.1 4mV

1565.2 44mV

1565.3 72mV

1565.4 - 6mV

1565.5 - 35mV

1565.6 31mV

1565.7 37mV

1565.8 13mV

1565.8D 13mV

83PK 105mV

850 103mV

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

No Yes

- ☒ ☐

-

-

- NA

-

-

B. McKee
Brian K. McKee
Laboratory Manager