

**STATEMENT OF WORK
PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION AND
SITE INSPECTION
For the
PRICE FARM DUMP SITE,
SARATOGA NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

1.0 Introduction The National Park Service (NPS) has the responsibility under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) to determine if a release or threatened release of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants is occurring on lands under the bureau's jurisdiction, custody, or control. If a release or threatened release of hazardous substances is occurring or a release of pollutants or contaminants presents an imminent and substantial danger to the public health or welfare, the NPS shall initiate response activities designed to protect human health and the environment. CERCLA and the National Contingency Plan (NCP) provide a framework for investigating sites and selecting and implementing an appropriate response.

- 1.1 At this time, the NPS has determined that hazardous substances have been released at Price Farm Dump Site (PFD), located in the Saratoga National Historical Park (SARA), in Stillwater, Saratoga County, New York State.

A preliminary assessment (PA) for hazardous materials was performed at an abandoned dump located within the boundaries of SARA. The PA was conducted by staff of the National Park Service (NPS), Water Resource Division (WRD) between November 15 and November 19, 1993. This investigation was initiated under the authority of the NPS's Hazardous Waste Program following guidance set forth by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA).

The surrounding area and the adjacent water resources were carefully examined for evidence of hazardous substance release. No unequivocal sign of stressed vegetation was observed, but both Mr. Brightman and Mr. Schaberl of the North Atlantic Region and the Park, respectively, reported seeing an "oily discharge" to the nearby surface water during May of 1993 (H. Brightman, Personal Comm. 1994). Based on these criteria, it was hypothesized that a hazardous substance release has occurred.

Analytical results of soil samples collected in December 1994 at the PFD Site indicated the presence of tetrachloroethene (PCE), dichlorodifluoroethane (freon), mercury, and arsenic. Analytical results of surface water from an adjacent stream in April 1996 indicated no presence of any of the parameters tested for at that time (VOA 8010/8020, BNA 8270, Metals (Hg, As)).

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has had their contractor, Malcolm Pirnie Inc. review the PA. Based upon this review, the EPA has determined that a Site Inspection (SI) is needed for the facility so that the EPA can complete its evaluation of the site.

- 1.2 Contractor assistance is required to assess the extent of hazardous substances at the site and assist the NPS in selecting an appropriate response based upon the results of Contractor's assessment activities. In order to accomplish these goals, the Contractor's task assignments pursuant to this Statement of Work (SOW) will include the preparation and delivery of a Final SI Report.
- 1.3 The Price Farm Dump is an abandoned refuse pile located within the park boundary. All dumping at the PFD took place prior to acquisition of the land by the NPS in 1986. Details of specific activities on site prior to acquisition are not available. The site has not been used for any type of refuse disposal after federal acquisition, and general access by both park personnel and visitors is extremely limited. There are no current plans to develop the site; acquisition of the parcel is intended to provide prime interpretive locations within the park with a visual buffer.

2.0 Site Conditions: The Price Farm dump, an abandoned refuse pile within the park, is located on a cut bank of the North Fork of Devils Hollow Creek. Its geographic coordinates are latitude 42° 58' 45.0" and longitude 73° 38' 55.2". Most of the refuse is located on the stream bank but a portion is on the immediate floodplain.

The pile consists of visually apparent, miscellaneous domestic and farm wastes with a volume of approximately 40,000 ft³. This estimate placed the site into the low end of the intermediate tier of waste quantity for a pile, and resulted in a waste characteristic score of 32.

Analytical results of soil samples collected in December 1994 at the PFD site indicated the presence of tetrachloroethene (PCE), dichlorodifluoromethane (freon), mercury, and arsenic at the following maximum concentrations in surficial soils (i.e. 0-2 feet): PCE (41 parts per billion (ppb)), freon (16 ppb), mercury (34 ppb), and arsenic (15 parts per million (ppm)). In addition, analytical results of subsurface soil samples (i.e. 3-4.5 feet) indicated the presence of PCE (8 ppb), freon (18 ppb), mercury (34 ppb), and arsenic (8.1 ppm).

Analytical results of adjacent surface water samples collected in May 1996 at the PFD site indicated no detectable contamination (tests conducted: VOA 8010/8020, BNA 8270, Metals (Hg, As)).

Analytical results from water samples collected from a nearby abandoned well located on Park Service property in April 1995 indicated total coliform of 170.0 COL/100ml, fecal coliform of 23.0 COL/100ml. Tests were performed using standard methodologies SW 846 8240 and SW-846 Method 8270 Base/Neutrals. Acetone was detected at 12 ppm, carbon disulfide was detected at 110 ppm; all other tested parameters were reported as not detected.

In the Spring of 1995, the park submitted copies of the draft Preliminary Assessment (May 1994) and soil sample results (December 1994) to the New York State Department of Health and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation for their review. Based upon these documents both agencies concurred that the minimal level of contamination detected did not require any further action from their perspective. However, they both reiterated the recommendation made in the PA to conduct tests upon the adjacent surface waters and park wells located within the vicinity.

The draft PA performed by the Water Resource Division of the NPS (November 1993) concluded the following: "The four environmental threat scores were combined to establish a preliminary total site hazard score of 18.65. This score is primarily due to the presence of sensitive environments in the surface water pathway. The site score falls below the "no further remedial action" (NFRAP) benchmark of 28.5, and indicates that the site evaluation of the refuse pile and the surrounding area is complete, and that additional investigation or remediation is at the discretion of the National Park Service."

A review of the PA by a contractor for the EPA determined that a Site Inspection is needed for the facility so that EPA can complete its evaluation of the site. A letter (dated April 10, 1997) from the EPA to the park states the following: "According to your PA report, a release of contaminants is suspected to both the groundwater and surface water. The SI, which you prepare, should focus on the characterization of the waste pile, and the determination of whether a release to the surface water and groundwater pathways has actually occurred. In addition, soil samples indicated the presence of volatile organic compounds and inorganic constituents in both surficial and subsurface soils. However, the location of these samples and the quality of this data are unknown. The SI should examine suspected contamination to the soil pathway."

3.0 Statement of Contractor Services: Excepting government provided materials, the contractor shall furnish all services, labor, materials and equipment to carry out work specified herein. Services shall be performed to standards, qualities and schedules described in the following paragraphs.

4.0 Major Work Tasks:

4.1 (TASK 1) Project Conferences

4.1.1 **Tasking Conference:** Contractor shall meet with NPS to discuss the overall schedule and workplan in accordance with Section 6 **Schedule.**

4.1.2 **Review Conference:** A review conference (via telephone) will be held with the NPS to discuss the Final SI Report and Contractor's recommendation concerning further action and response alternatives. Submission of the Final SI Report in accordance with the provisions of this SOW and attendance at the Review Conference shall constitute satisfaction of Contractor's obligation under the contract with the NPS.

4.1.3 Weekly Updates: Contractor shall provide weekly project updates to the NPS by telephone and shall further provide written documentation of such conversations to NPS.

4.2 (TASK 2) Workplans and Schedules: Contractor shall submit a workplan and schedule detailing the specific activities and proposed timing to the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) for approval in accordance with Section 6.0. Changes in the work schedule involving fieldwork must be coordinated at least 24 hours in advance with the COTR and NPS.

4.2.1 Health and Safety Plan: A safety plan will be prepared and submitted for approval. The COTR must approve the plan before the Contractor undertakes any field investigations or response activity. The level of detail of the plan should be commensurate with the expected variety and severity of hazards to be encountered. Contractor shall comply with all applicable OSHA requirements and regulations. Notwithstanding the approval by the NPS of the safety plan, the Contractor shall be solely responsible for ensuring the safety of its workers at the Site and for ensuring that the plan, as drafted and as implemented, meets all OSHA and other applicable laws, regulations and requirements. NPS's approval of the plan shall not make the NPS liable for any worker claims arising out of the insufficiency of the plan to ensure safety.

4.2.2 Sampling Plan: Contractor shall prepare a sampling plan indicating the rationale for sampling, analytical methods, data quantification limits, and data quality objectives. The sampling plan must be approved by the NPS prior to implementation. Contractor will collect samples and analyze the samples for any possible contamination as identified in the PA. Sample collection should include approximately 22 samples of surface soils, subsurface soils, groundwater and surface water from the Price Farm Dump Site and vicinity. Samples should be analyzed according to approved USEPA methods, including, but not limited to: Total Arsenic, Total Mercury, EPA Method 8010, EPA Method 8020, TCL Base/Neutral Ext. by EPA 8270, TCL Pesticides/Aroclors by EPA 8080.

4.3 (TASK 3) Site Inspection: Contractor shall conduct a Site Inspection (SI), the objective of which is: (a) to determine the nature and extent of contamination present at the Site; (b) determine contaminant migration pathways; (c) identify and describe human and environmental targets; (d) prepare an HRS score; and (e) provide a recommendation on whether further action is warranted. Should further action be warranted, Contractor should recommend appropriate response activities. The SI shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the NCP and in accordance with Guidance for Performing Site Inspections under CERCLA, United States Environmental Protection Agency, September 1992 (OSWER Directive Number 9345.1-05).

4.3.1 Site and Vicinity Maps: Contractor shall prepare site and vicinity maps for inclusion in the Final SI Report. Maps shall be of an appropriate scale to show all pertinent features of the site and vicinity, including sample locations and contaminant levels measured.

4.3.2 HRS Scoring:

The Contractor shall prepare a HRS score using the data collected during the SI in addition to information presented in the PA report.

4.4 (TASK 4) SI Report: Contractor shall develop a draft and final SI Report based upon the information provided in the PA completed for this site (draft Preliminary Assessment for the Price Farm Dump, Saratoga National Historical Park, New York, November 1993) and the SI performed under this contract. The SI Report shall provide an overall assessment of the Site based upon data collection, site visit, and sampling results, and recommend if further action is warranted. If further action is warranted, the SI Report should provide a cost benefit analysis of alternate response actions and a recommendation as to what action is considered the appropriate response. Specifically, the Report should contain: Introduction and Objectives, Site Description (location, history, current site activities, geology, hydrogeology, hydrology, environmental settings), Pathway Analyses (waste characteristics, air migration pathway, groundwater migration pathway, surface water migration pathway, soil exposure pathway), HRS Scoring, Conclusions and Recommendations, References, and Appendices sections. The Report should also include the results and methods of the SI. Maps indicating the locations of features referenced in the text and samples collected are required. The inclusion of illustrations (photographs and diagrams) is encouraged if they clearly enhance the report.

4.4.1 Five (5) copies of the draft SI report shall be delivered to the NPS. Written comments shall be conveyed to the Contractor, and a final report shall be generated incorporating all NPS comments, with five (5) copies distributed to the NPS.

5.0 Administrative Conditions

5.1 Government-Furnished Materials: The SARA offices will provide, or when possible, assist the Contractor in obtaining; pertinent documentary materials, historical information, maps, photographs, site plans, forms and other material as available, including a copy of the PA (draft Preliminary Assessment for the Price Farm Dump, Saratoga National Historical Park, New York, November 1993).

5.2 Disposition of Materials and Information: All documentary or other materials (e.g. photographs) provided to the Contractor or generated by the Contractor in the course of investigations will remain or become the property of the U.S. Government, and must be returned to the NPS as a condition precedent to final payment.

5.3 Contractor Officer (CO), Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) and Program Manager (PM)

5.3.1 The CO for the contract is:

Ed Tofoya
National Park Service
Denver Service Center
Contracting
12795 West Alameda Parkway
PO Box 25287
Denver, Colorado 80225

Phone (303) 969-2116
Fax (303) 969-2040

5.3.2 The COTR for the contract is:

Fred Springer
Saratoga NHP
648 Rt. 32
Stillwater, NY 12170

Phone: (518) 664-9821 ext. 208
Fax: (518) 664-9830

5.3.4 The CO or COTR will provide authoritative contract interpretation with associate guidance and direction. It is the COTR's responsibility to seek timely progress of the work and a satisfactory outcome to the project. The COTR will also provide liaison between the contractor and the CO; supply or assist in obtaining government-furnished materials and documents; monitor Contractor's performance; and verify compliance with contract terms and schedules.

5.4 Contractor's Project Manager (CPM): Following award of the contract, the Contractor will nominate a CPM to be approved by the COTR. The CPM will be responsible for maintaining the necessary coordination and execution of the contract. The CPM shall have sufficient experience and capability to be considered responsible for the supervision of the work and overall product quality specified under the contract, and to serve as liaison between the Contractor and the COTR. The COTR must approve all changes in the CPM by the Contractor.

5.5 Extra Services: Nothing contained herein authorizes the Contractor to (a) incur costs in excess of the contract price or other limitation of funds or (b) to deviate from any other term of the performance of this contract, including, but not limited to delivery schedules, in response to the directions, suggestions or instructions (oral or written) given by representatives of the government, unless prior to commencing such extra work or making such change, the Contractor: (1) directly notifies the Contracting Officer; (2) requests a formal contract modification, and (3) receives the contract modification or written authorization to proceed signed by the Contracting

Officer.

6.0 Schedule: The Contractor shall furnish sufficient technical, supervisory, and administrative personnel to ensure completion of the contract in accordance with the Workplan\Schedule and Submittal Schedule (below). The Contractor shall keep the COTR fully advised concerning delays or difficulties, which may prohibit completion of any or all of the work according to the established schedule. The Contractor shall submit with any payment requests, a brief summary of the activities accomplished in the payment period and of the activities anticipated for the next payment period.

6.1 Submittals Schedule: The Contractor shall furnish sufficient technical, supervisory, and administrative personnel to ensure the execution of the work in accordance with the following submittal schedule:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Schedule</u>
6.2 Contract Award Date (CAD)	Begins Schedule
6.3 Tasking Conference	14 calendar days after CAD
6.4 Workplan\Schedule, Safety Plan, and Draft Sampling Plan	35 calendar days after CAD
6.5 Sample Plan	45 calendar days after CAD
6.6 Draft SI Report	75 calendar days after CAD
6.7 Final SI Report	85 calendar days after CAD
6.8 Review Conference	7 calendar days after submission of Final SI Report

File: Site Investigation Price Farm Dump.doc

Date: 7/28/98

Version: 1