REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
The public reporting burden for this collection of information is esti maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the co suggestions for reducing the burden, to the Department of Defen person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a co PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO TH	llection of information. Send comm se, Executive Service Directorate ollection of information if it does not	nents regarding thi (0704-0188). Res display a currently	s burden esti pondents sho	mate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including buld be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 2. REPO 25/03/2010 2. REPO	RT TYPE Final			3. DATES COVERED (From - To) October 2009 - March 2010
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE			5a. CON	I ITRACT NUMBER
				W912QR-08-D-0013
Final Geophysical Prove-Out Report for Environ			5h GR4	ANT NUMBER
Creek Disposal Road Landfill, RVAAP-03 Open Mustard Agent Burial Site	Demolition Area #1, and	RVAAP-28		N/A
			5c. PRC	OGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
				N/A
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PRC	DJECT NUMBER
				133616
Tim Deignan, Corby Schmalz, and Mark Kick			5. TAC	
			əe. 145	K NUMBER
				11002500
			5f. WOF	
				N/A
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AN	D ADDRESS(ES)			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION
Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.				REPORT NUMBER
100 Technology Center Drive				27/4
Stoughton, MA 02072				N/A
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Louisville District 600 Martin Luther King, Jr. Place				CELRL-ED-EE
Louisville, KY 40202			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT	
				NUMBER(S)
				N/A
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT				
Reference distribution page.				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
None				
14. ABSTRACT				
The purpose of this Geophysical Prove-Out Repo	ort is to provide a summary	of field activ	vities asso	ciated with the performance of the geophysical
prove-out (GPO) and present associated correlation				
basis for the selection of appropriate equipment to	o perform proposed geoph	ysical survey	s for sites	included under the scope of work of the task
order. Geophysical data will be collected using equipment selected from the GPO for the characterization of subsurface anomalies and to estimate				
the munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) density over approximately 2 acres at the RVAAP-34 Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill, 8.6				
acres at the RVAAP-03 Open Demolition Area #1 (ODA1) and 6000 square feet at the RVAAP-28 Mustard Agent Burial Site (MABS).				
Additionally, transect surveys will be performed to delineate the Sand Creek and ODA1 boundaries. The results of the surveys will be presented in				
subsequent geophysical summary reports.				
15. SUBJECT TERMS	alition Area #1 DVAAD?	9 Mustard A	gont Dur	al Sita DVAAD 24 Sand Creak Dignagel Daad
Geophysical Prove-Out, RVAAP-03, Open Demolition Area #1, RVAAP-28, Mustard Agent Burial Site, RVAAP-34, Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill				
Landin				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:	17. LIMITATION OF 1	8. NUMBER	19a. NAN	IE OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT b. ABSTRACT c. THIS PAGE	ABSTRACT	OF		1 Crispo
Unclassified Unclassified Unclassified	UL	PAGES 148	19b. TEL	EPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 617.589.8146
				Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8/98)

Reset

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SF 298

1. REPORT DATE. Full publication date, including day, month, if available. Must cite at least the year and be Year 2000 compliant, e.g. 30-06-1998; xx-06-1998; xx-xx-1998.

2. REPORT TYPE. State the type of report, such as final, technical, interim, memorandum, master's thesis, progress, quarterly, research, special, group study, etc.

3. DATES COVERED. Indicate the time during which the work was performed and the report was written, e.g., Jun 1997 - Jun 1998; 1-10 Jun 1996; May - Nov 1998; Nov 1998.

4. TITLE. Enter title and subtitle with volume number and part number, if applicable. On classified documents, enter the title classification in parentheses.

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER. Enter all contract numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. F33615-86-C-5169.

5b. GRANT NUMBER. Enter all grant numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. AFOSR-82-1234.

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER. Enter all program element numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. 61101A.

5d. PROJECT NUMBER. Enter all project numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. 1F665702D1257; ILIR.

5e. TASK NUMBER. Enter all task numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. 05; RF0330201; T4112.

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER. Enter all work unit numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. 001; AFAPL30480105.

6. AUTHOR(S). Enter name(s) of person(s) responsible for writing the report, performing the research, or credited with the content of the report. The form of entry is the last name, first name, middle initial, and additional qualifiers separated by commas, e.g. Smith, Richard, J, Jr.

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES). Self-explanatory.

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER. Enter all unique alphanumeric report numbers assigned by the performing organization, e.g. BRL-1234; AFWL-TR-85-4017-Vol-21-PT-2.

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES). Enter the name and address of the organization(s) financially responsible for and monitoring the work.

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S). Enter, if available, e.g. BRL, ARDEC, NADC.

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S). Enter report number as assigned by the sponsoring/ monitoring agency, if available, e.g. BRL-TR-829; -215.

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT. Use agency-mandated availability statements to indicate the public availability or distribution limitations of the report. If additional limitations/ restrictions or special markings are indicated, follow agency authorization procedures, e.g. RD/FRD, PROPIN, ITAR, etc. Include copyright information.

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES. Enter information not included elsewhere such as: prepared in cooperation with; translation of; report supersedes; old edition number, etc.

14. ABSTRACT. A brief (approximately 200 words) factual summary of the most significant information.

15. SUBJECT TERMS. Key words or phrases identifying major concepts in the report.

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION. Enter security classification in accordance with security classification regulations, e.g. U, C, S, etc. If this form contains classified information, stamp classification level on the top and bottom of this page.

17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT. This block must be completed to assign a distribution limitation to the abstract. Enter UU (Unclassified Unlimited) or SAR (Same as Report). An entry in this block is necessary if the abstract is to be limited.

Final Geophysical Prove-Out Report for Environmental Services at RVAAP-34 Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill, RVAAP-03 Open Demolition Area #1, and RVAAP-28 Mustard Agent Burial Site Version 1.0

Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant Ravenna, Ohio

Contract No. W912QR 08 D 0013 Delivery Order 0002

Prepared for:



US Army Corps of Engineers ® Louisville District

600 Martin Luther King, Jr. Place Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Prepared by:

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. 100 Technology Center Drive Stoughton, MA 02072

March 25, 2010

Name/Organization	Number of Printed Copies	Number of Electronic Copies
BRAC	1	1
NGB	0	1
OHARNG – Camp Ravenna	1	1
Ohio EPA Project Manager	2	2
RVAAP Facility Manager	2	2
USAEC Program Manager	0	1
USACE – Huntsville District	1	1
USACE – Louisville District	3	3
Shaw Project Manager	3	3

DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

NGB – National Guard Bureau

OHARNG - Ohio Army National Guard

Ohio EPA – Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

RVAAP – Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant

USAEC - U.S. Army Environmental Command

USACE – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Louisville District

Shaw – Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.

CONTRACTOR'S STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. has completed the *Final Geophysical Prove-Out Report for Environmental Services at RVAAP-34 Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill, RVAAP-03 Open Demolition Area 1, and RVAAP-28 Mustard Agent Burial Site* at the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio. Notice is hereby given that an independent technical review has been conducted that is appropriate to the level of risk and complexity inherent in the project. During the independent technical review, compliance with established policy, principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of data quality objectives; technical assumptions; methods, procedures and materials to be used; the appropriateness of data used and level of data obtained; and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets customer's needs consistent with law and existing Corps policy.

Reviewed/Approved by:	David Cobb Project/Program Manager	Date:	03/25/2010
Reviewed/Approved by:	Timothy Deignan Project Scientist	Date:	03/25/2010
Prepared by:	Corby Schmalz Environmental Scientist	Date:	_03/25/2010

Λ

Table of Contents_

List of	Figure	S	iii		
List of	Tables	5	iv		
List of	Appen	dices	iv		
Acrony	ins an	d Abbreviations	v		
-					
1.0	Introduction				
	1.1 Purpose and Scope				
	1.2	Geophysical Prove-Out Objectives			
	1.3	Site Description and Background	1-2		
		1.3.1 Sand Creek			
		1.3.2 Open Demolition Area #1	1-3		
		1.3.3 Mustard Agent Burial Site	1-3		
2.0	Geop	hysical Prove-Out Test Grid	2-1		
	2.1	GPO Test Plot	2-1		
	2.2	Background Survey	2-1		
	2.3	Seed Items	2-2		
	2.4	GPO Test Grid As-Built Map	2-3		
3.0	Instru	mentation	3-1		
	3.1	Geophysical Instruments	3-1		
		3.1.1 Geometrics G-858G	3-1		
		3.1.2 Geonics EM61-MK2	3-1		
	3.2	Navigation Equipment	3-2		
		3.2.1 Leica Robotic Total Station	3-2		
		3.2.2 Leica Real-Time Kinematic Global Positioning System	3-2		
4.0	Geophysical Prove-Out Procedures				
	4.1	Survey Modes	4-1		
	4.2	Calibration Tests	4-1		
	4.3	G858 Magnetic Survey	4-2		
	4.4	EM61-MK2 Electromagnetic Survey	4-2		
5.0	Geop	hysical Data Processing	5-1		
	5.1	G858 Data Processing and Target Selection	5-1		
		5.1.1 G858 Data Processing	5-1		
		5.1.2 G858 Target Selection	5-1		
	5.2	EM61-MK2 Data Processing and Target Selection	5-2		
		5.2.1 EM61-MK2 Data Processing	5-2		
		5.2.2 EM6-MK2 Target Selection	5-2		
6.0	Results				
	6.1	Data Quality Objectives	6-1		
		6.1.1 Background Noise	6-1		
		6.1.2 Mean Speed			
		6.1.3 Along Track Sampling	6-2		
		6.1.4 Across Track Sampling	6-2		
		6.1.5 Latency Correction	6-3		

Table of Contents (continued)

		6.1.6	Data Leveling	6-3
		6.1.7	Anomaly Selection	
		6.1.8	Known Location Calibration Positional Check	
		6.1.9	Dynamic Calibration Positional Check	
		6.1.10	Known Location QC Items	
		6.1.11	Reacquisition	6-4
		6.1.12	False Positives	
	6.2	G858 N	lagnetometer Results	
		6.2.1	Total Field Magnetic Data	6-5
		6.2.2	Magnetic Gradient Data	6-6
	6.3	EM61-N	MK2 Electromagnetic Results	6-6
7.0	Reco	mmenda	itions	7-1
	7.1	Selecte	7-1	
	7.2	Recom	mendations for DGM Survey Procedures	7-1
		7.2.1	Transect Surveys	7-1
		7.2.2	Grid Surveys	7-1
	7.3	Recom	mendations for DGM Data Processing and Target Selection	7-2
		7.3.1	Data Processing	7-2
		7.3.2	Target Selection	7-2
	7.4	Recom	mendations for Target Reacquisition	7-3
8.0	Refer	ences		8-1

ii

List of Figures

- Figure 1-1 Location Map
- Figure 1-2 RVAAP Facility Map
- Figure 1-3 RVAAP-34 Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill
- Figure 1-4 RVAAP-28 Mustard Agent Burial Site and RVAAP-03 Open Demolition Area #1
- Figure 2-1 Aerial Photo of Geophysical Prove-Out Area
- Figure 2-2 Soil Map and Geophysical Prove-Out Area
- Figure 2-3 Geologic Map Geophysical Prove-Out Area
- Figure 2-4 Geophysical Prove-Out Pre-Seeding Baseline Survey
- Figure 2-5 Geophysical Prove-Out Seed Locations
- Figure 6-1 Geophysical Prove-Out G858G Magnetometer, RTS Positioning System Total Field
- Figure 6-2 Geophysical Prove-Out G858G Magnetometer, RTS Positioning System Total Field Analytical Signal Bottom Sensor
- Figure 6-3 Geophysical Prove-Out G858G Magnetometer, RTS Positioning System Total Field Gradient
- Figure 6-4 Geophysical Prove-Out G858G Magnetometer, RTS Positioning System Gradient Analytic Signal
- Figure 6-5 Geophysical Prove-Out G858G Magnetometer, RTK GPS Positioning System Total Field
- Figure 6-6 Geophysical Prove-Out G858G Magnetometer, RTK Positioning System Total Field Analytic Signal
- Figure 6-7 Geophysical Prove-Out G858G Magnetometer, RTK GPS Positioning System Total Field -Gradient
- Figure 6-8 Geophysical Prove-Out G858G Magnetometer, RTK Positioning System Gradient Analytic Signal
- Figure 6-9 Geophysical Prove-Out EM61-MK2, RTK Positioning System Channel 2 Data
- Figure 6-10 Geophysical Prove-Out EM61-MK2, RTS Positioning System Sum4 Data
- Figure 6-11 Geophysical Prove-Out EM61-MK2, RTS GPS Positioning System Channel 2 Data
- Figure 6-12 Geophysical Prove-Out EM61-MK2, RTS GPS Positioning System Sum4 Data

List of Tables

- Table 2-1
 Size Comparison of Actual Items to Simulants
- Table 2-2Summary Table of GPO Field Items
- Table 2-3GPO Grid Corners
- Table 5-1
 G858 Anomaly Selection Thresholds and Background Noise Levels
- Table 5-2 EM61-MK2 Anomaly Selection Thresholds and Background Noise Levels
- Table 6-1 Calculated Background Noise Levels
- Table 6-2 GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTS Configuration Total Field
- Table 6-3 GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTK GPS Configuration Total Field
- Table 6-4
 GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTS Configuration Gradient
- Table 6-5 GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTK GPS Configuration Gradient
- Table 6-6
 GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTS Configuration Channel 2
- Table 6-7 GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTS Configuration Sum4
- Table 6-8
 GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTS GPS Configuration Channel 2
- Table 6-9
 GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTS GPS Configuration Sum4

List of Appendices

- Appendix A Photographs
- Appendix B Buried Seed Item Descriptions
- Appendix C Geophysical Data and Electronic Files
- Appendix D Quality Control Logs
- Appendix E Comment Response Table
- Appendix F Ohio EPA Approval Letter
- Note: The data in Appendix C is provided in electronic format on a separate compact disc. This data requires the Oasis Montaj UX Process program in order to open these files. The data provided in this appendix relates to the digitization of the information shown on Figures 6-1 through 6-12 in this report.

iv

Final

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AOC	Area of Concern
AS	analytic signal
cm	centimeter(s)
DGM	digital geophysical mapping
DID	Data Item Description
DQO	data quality objective
DO	Delivery Order
DoD	Department of Defense
EM	electromagnetic
EM61-MK2	Geonics EM61-MK2 TDEM metal detector
EQM	Environmental Quality Management
ESTCP	Environmental Security Technology Certification Program
G858	Geometrics G-858G cesium vapor magnetometer
GIP	Geophysical Investigation Plan
GPO	Geophysical Prove-Out
GPS	global positioning system
Hz	hertz
IRP	Installation Restoration Program
ITRC	Interstate Technology and Regulatory Cooperation
MABS	RVAAP-28 Mustard Agent Burial Site
MAG	magnetic
MEC	munitions and explosives of concern
MKM	MKM Engineers, Inc.
mm	millimeter(s)
MMRP	Military Munitions Response Program
mV	millivolts
mph	mile(s) per hour
NACA	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics
NAD83	North American Datum 1983
NMEA	National Marine Electronics Association
nT	nanoTesla(s)
nT/ft	nanoTesla(s) per foot
OB/OD	open burning/open detonation
ODA1	RVAAP-03 Open Demolition Area #1
OHARNG	Ohio Army National Guard
Ohio EPA	Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
QC	quality control
RI	remedial investigation
RTK	real-time kinematic
RTS	robotic total station
RVAAP	Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
SAIC	Science Applications International Corporation
SDZ	safety danger zone

SERDP	Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program
Shaw	Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
SNR	signal to noise ratio
Sum4	sum of the four leveled data channels
TDEM	time-domain electromagnetic
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
UXO	unexploded ordnance

1.0 Introduction

1.1 *Purpose and Scope*

This *Geophysical Prove-Out Report* (*GPO Report*) evaluates and documents the performance of the geophysical equipment and survey techniques that will best support the execution of digital geophysical mapping (DGM) at three Areas of Concern (AOCs) at the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant (RVAAP). The AOCs include RVAAP-34 Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill (Sand Creek), RVAAP-03 Open Demolition Area #1 (ODA1), and RVAAP-28 Mustard Agent Burial Site (MABS). This GPO was performed by Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. (Shaw) on behalf of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Louisville District under Delivery Order (DO) 0002 for Architectural and Engineering Services at RVAAP under the Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity Contract No. W912QR-08-D-0013. This DO was issued by USACE on September 22, 2008.

1.2 Geophysical Prove-Out Objectives

The GPO fieldwork was conducted at the RVAAP by Shaw from October 20 to 26, 2009 in accordance with the *Final Geophysical Prove-Out Plan* (GPO) included as Appendix A of the *Geophysical Investigation Plan for the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant* (GIP; Shaw, 2009). The GPO was performed to validate the electromagnetic (EM), magnetic (MAG), and positioning system instrumentation for DGM surveys for munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) and other suspected buried anomalies at the three AOCs. Additionally, this GPO serves as a tool for procedural and instrumentation quality control (QC). In accordance with the *Data Item Description (DID) MR-005-05A* (USACE, 2003b) requirements, this report provides the following information:

- As-built map of the GPO plot
- Photographs of seeded items
- Color maps of the geophysical data
- Summary of the GPO results
- Target lists for GPO site
- Proposed geophysical equipment, techniques, and methodologies
- Justification for recommendations

The accompanying compact discs contain:

- Electronic copy of this report and all appendices
- Raw and processed data
- Target lists in Excel format

1.3 Site Description and Background

The RVAAP is located in northeastern Ohio within Portage and Trumbull counties, approximately 1.6 km (1 mile) northwest of the city of Newton Falls and 4.8 km (3 miles) east-northeast of the city of Ravenna (**Figure 1-1**). The facility is a parcel of property approximately 17.7 kilometers (11 miles) long and 5.6 kilometers (3.5 miles) wide bounded by State Route 5, the Michael J. Kirwan Reservoir, and the CSX System Railroad on the south; Garret, McCormick, and Berry roads on the west; the Norfolk Southern Railroad on the north; and State Route 534 on the east (**Figure 1-2**).

As of February 2006, a total of 20,403 acres of the former 21,683-acre RVAAP have been transferred to the United States Property and Fiscal Officer for Ohio and subsequently licensed to the Ohio Army National Guard (OHARNG) for use as a training site. Currently, RVAAP consists of 1,280 acres in several distinct parcels scattered throughout the confines of the Camp Ravenna Joint Military Training center (Camp Ravenna). RVAAP's remaining parcels of land are located completely within Camp Ravenna. Camp Ravenna did not exist when RVAAP was operational, and the entire 21,683-acre parcel was a government-owned, contractor-operated industrial facility.

The RVAAP Installation Restoration Program (IRP) encompasses investigation and cleanup of past activities over the entire 21,683 acres of the former RVAAP. Therefore, references to the RVAAP in this document are considered to be inclusive of the historical extent of the RVAAP, which is inclusive of the combined acreages of the current Camp Ravenna and RVAAP, unless otherwise specifically stated. The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA) is the lead regulatory agency for the investigation and remediation conducted by the Army under the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) IRP.

1.3.1 Sand Creek

The Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill (**Figure 1-3**) is a former construction debris dump. Materials identified in the debris include transite, concrete and brick rubble, drywall, glass, scrap metal, and wood. Previous work included the removal of the surface debris. An empty 105 millimeter (mm) projectile was previously found downstream from the Sand Creek site. 75mm casings have also been discovered in the area (MKM, 2004). The site currently receives occasional foot traffic from military, security, and maintenance personnel as well as natural resource management activities. This site will be used as part of the Safety Danger Zone (SDZ) for the small arms range complex.

The full coverage DGM area for the Sand Creek site is approximately 2.2 acres. It ranges from heavily vegetated and wooded to flat open field. The site terrain includes steep sloped areas along the banks of Sand Creek (approximately 1 acre) to flat open areas above the creek

embankments (approximately 1 acre). Thick vegetation and trees less than 3 inches in diameter were removed along the banks and top of slope of the AOC in October 2009 to allow easier accessibility for the proposed DGM activities following the GPO.

1.3.2 Open Demolition Area #1

The ODA1 (**Figure 1-4**) full coverage for the proposed DGM investigation area is approximately 8.6 acres and extends beyond ODA1 into the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) Test Area (RVAAP-38). ODA1 was used during the 1940s for the open burning and open detonation (OB/OD) of munitions, explosives, and related debris. The material was brought to the site and burned or detonated for demolition purposes, with the resulting scrap and debris pushed to the sides. Because of these activities and the potential for munitions kick out, there is a potential for the boundaries of the ODA1 to extend beyond the current delineation into the NACA Test Area. The ODA1 site is currently not being used for training because it has been designated as a limited access area due to the potential risk for MEC. Future proposed military training activities at this site will include dismounted training and field bivouac activities.

ODA1 is relatively flat and covered with grass. Previously, fragmentation from a 90mm shell was found at ODA1. An interim removal action to remove surface and subsurface MEC scrap and debris was conducted in 2000 to address issues identified in the previous *Phase I Remedial Investigation (RI)* (SAIC, 2001). The *Phase I RI* was focused on the OB/OD area of ODA 1. Currently an approximately 1-foot-high earthen berm within the site surrounds the 1.5-acre former OB/OD area. The full coverage DGM area is bounded on three sides by woods and is bisected by an access road. Geophysical transect survey data will be used as an aid in determining the extent of the debris. The transect surveys will extend into the woods.

1.3.3 Mustard Agent Burial Site

The suspected MABS area to be investigated under this task order is open and flat (**Figure 1-4**). The full coverage DGM area is approximately 6,000 square feet and is located south of the former operations building. Two strips, one north and one south of the concrete crash strip, comprise the investigation site. It has been reported that steel shipping cylinders (also known as PIGs), paint cans, and 55 gallon drums may have been buried west of the current study area, although actual physical confirmation has yet to be achieved (EQM, 2008). The proposed investigation area is currently being used for military training. Future proposed military training activities will include dismounted training and field bivouac activities.

This page intentionally left blank.

2.0 Geophysical Prove-Out Test Grid

2.1 GPO Test Plot

Shaw constructed the GPO test grid at a centrally located area (Load Line #7) within the RVAAP (**Figure 2-1**). The GPO plot was placed in an open area approximately 300 feet north of the south entrance gate to Load Line #7. The GPO measured 100 by 100 feet to accommodate the spatial requirements for the seed item grid. The GPO area was provided by Mr. Mark Patterson, RVAAP Facility Manager, and is considered to be representative of the major types of geologic, soil, and surface terrain conditions present at the RVAAP to support the execution of DGM work at the three AOCs.

Based on our past project experience at sites with similar environmental characteristics to those at RVAAP, Shaw proposes to survey the Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill with a G858 magnetometer and robotic total station (RTS) positioning system, as the area consists of extremely rugged terrain and large trees. The ODA1 and MABS sites can be successfully mapped with an EM61-MK2 TDEM [time-domain EM] metal detector and real-time kinematic (RTK) global positioning system (GPS), as these AOCs are "open" and generally void of rugged terrain. The intent of this GPO is to prove-out each DGM system for its proposed application at the site.

The site geology at the RVAAP is sedimentary bedrock overlain by a thin veneer of glacial sediments (tills and outwash deposits). Bedrock at the RVAAP is predominantly covered by the Wisconsin age Hiram and Kent till and is overlain by the Lavery and Hiram tills with glacial outwash deposits covering the northern corner of the site. A soils map with the location of the GPO test grid is provided in **Figure 2-2**. The geologic map provided in **Figure 2-3** shows the local geology underlying the GPO site. The resolution of **Figure 2-2** and **Figure 2-3** indicate that the GPO site appears to fall within similar soil conditions and geological regimes as the sites of interest; ODA1, Sand Creek and MABS, for this project. To simulate actual site conditions, small trees (greater than 3 inches in diameter) located within the GPO site were not removed. Photographs of the GPO site are presented in **Appendix A**.

2.2 Background Survey

A background (pre-seeding) EM survey was performed over the GPO using the Geonics EM61-MK2 TDEM metal detector (hereafter referred to as EM61-MK2) to assess the preexisting site conditions and to locate existing ferrous and nonferrous anomalies prior to emplacing the GPO seed items. Existing subsurface anomalies were identified within the GPO site during the presed EM survey. In accordance with the *GPO Work Plan* (Shaw, 2009), no anomalies were removed after assessment of the background data. Therefore, in order to use the area provided

for the GPO, the existing subsurface anomalies were avoided during the placement of the seed items. The background EM61-MK2 survey map for the GPO is presented in **Figure 2-4**.

The existing anomalies are interpreted to be primarily due to metallic subsurface objects and range from approximately 20 millivolts (mV) to 500mV for the sum of the four leveled data channels (Sum4). A description regarding the use of the Sum4 is provided in **Section 3.1.2** of this report. The identification of the existing subsurface anomalies during the baseline survey resulted in having to reconfigure the GPO in the field from what was originally presented in the *GPO Work Plan* (Shaw, 2009). The GPO was reconfigured to maintain a 10-foot distance between all seed items to replicate the original design as closely as possible.

2.3 Seed Items

Inert "simulants" of the ordnance items and the PIG containers that may be encountered at the three AOCs were seeded in the GPO site test grid at varying depths and orientations. The test grid location, seed item coordinates, and survey navigation data are referenced to the North American Datum 1983 (NAD83), Ohio North State Plane coordinates, CS83 North Zone in U.S. survey feet. The seed items consisted of simulants due to the lack of availability or accessibility of inert ordnance items and PIG containers at the RVAAP, or at other similar installations from which Shaw requested them. The simulants were cut from heavy gauge (schedule 40) steel pipe with end caps (simulants with pipe diameters less than 4 inches) in an attempt to replicate the general dimensions of each ordnance type. For the simulants with pipe diameters greater than 4 inches (105mm, 155mm and PIGs), the pipe ends were welded. **Table 2-1** describes the actual size of the items and the corresponding sizes of the simulants that were buried.

The GPO contains 20 simulant seed items (three PIGs, five 90mm, two 105mm, three 155mm projectiles and seven 75mm shells) that were placed in 20 excavations. This information is presented in **Table 2-2**. The selected location for each seed item was marked with a numbered pin flag. Each location was then excavated in turn, and the appropriate seed item was placed in the excavation. Depths were confirmed with a carpenter's tape measure. Inclinations and azimuths of each item were then measured with a Brunton Pocket Transit (compass) adjusted to the local magnetic declination. The final location of each item was then acquired with the RTS. PIG items that were buried horizontal were location-surveyed at both ends of the item. Each item was then photographed in place, and the excavations were backfilled to grade. **Appendix B** contains photographs of each seed item and also presents information regarding the coordinates, depth, orientation, azimuth, and a description of each item.

2.4 GPO Test Grid As-Built Map

The as-built map for the GPO is provided in **Figure 2-5** and exhibits the GPO test grid corners, locations of each seed item and their azimuth, inclination, and depth. The seed items buried deeper than the performance metric of 11 times the diameter of the object are also indicated on the as-built map. The GPO control points are presented in **Table 2-3**.

This page intentionally left blank.

3.0 Instrumentation

The following sections describe the instruments used at the RVAAP during the GPO. The deployment strategies for these systems are described in more detail in **Section 4.0** of this report.

3.1 Geophysical Instruments

3.1.1 Geometrics G-858G

Gradiometer and total field MAG survey data were obtained using the Geometrics G-858G cesium vapor magnetometer (G858) carried with the shoulder-mounted harness system supplied with the instrument. The G858 is an optically pumped cesium vapor instrument that measures the intensity of the earth's magnetic field in nanoTeslas (nT). At the RVAAP, the total MAG intensity is approximately 55,700 nT, with an inclination of about 69 degrees down and a declination of about 7 degrees east.

The earth's magnetic field undergoes low-frequency diurnal variations associated with the earth's rotation, generally referred to as magnetic drift. A second stationary G858 was used to record and monitor the diurnal drift over the course of the magnetometer surveys. The MAG data recorded by the base station were used to correct the magnetic drift of the field magnetometer.

3.1.2 Geonics EM61-MK2

The EM61-MK2 was used to acquire EM data at the RVAAP GPO test grid. The EM61-MK2 is a four-channel, high-sensitivity TDEM sensor designed to detect shallow ferrous and nonferrous metallic objects with good spatial resolution and minimal interference from adjacent metallic features. The EM61-MK2 consists of two 1- by 0.5-meter rectangular coils stacked 40 centimeters (cm) apart with the source/receiver coil located below a second receiver coil. A square wave EM pulse is generated with "time on" (positive and negative) and "time off" cycles. This induces subsurface eddy currents with an associated secondary magnetic field. The decay of the secondary magnetic fields is measured during "time off" cycles and stored as a mV response. By measuring the decay at "late times" the system can distinguish between natural earth materials and buried metal (ferrous and nonferrous) because the secondary field in metallic objects decays at a much slower rate than earth materials. Although the EM61-MK2 is capable of measuring a differential, calculated as the voltage difference between the top and bottom coils, for this project, data were recorded at four time gates from the bottom coil. The time gate values are 216, 366, 600, and 1,266 microseconds for Channels 1 through Channel 4, respectively. The responses at these four specified time gates are recorded and displayed by an integrated system data logger. Unless otherwise specified, the EM61-MK2 results are presented in this report as Channel 2 and the Sum4 response, which is the sum of the four leveled data channels.

The utilization of the Sum4 response for the picking of MEC targets, rather than the standard of solely utilizing Channel 2, is primarily due to the increase in signal. The increase in signal from using the sum of the channels *may* provide better detection for some deeply buried targets (Bosnar, 2001).

3.2 Navigation Equipment

3.2.1 Leica Robotic Total Station

The Leica TPS1200 series total station is a motorized RTS that uses automatic target recognition to track the location of a 360-degree survey prism and has a distance/azimuth measurement system to produce accuracy within plus or minus 5 mm plus 2 parts per million for both lateral and vertical coordinates. Firmware used on the RTS base station to track the roving prism allows for rapid collection of data at rates up to 4 hertz (Hz) and serial output of solutions on both the base station and rover computing units. This firmware also enables the user to optimize the prism tracking parameters for rapid recovery of lock if obstructed by trees during a survey. The Leica RTS collected integrated real-time positioning data during the GPO surveys by streaming a "pseudo-NMEA [National Marine Electronics Association] data" string directly into the geophysical instrument's data logger. The data were collected using local coordinates that were subsequently converted to NAD83, Ohio State Plane, North Zone coordinates.

3.2.2 Leica Real-Time Kinematic Global Positioning System

The RTK GPS uses a base station that is set up based on a known position. Once the base station is established, it determines its location using satellites and then applies a correction based on the offset from the known coordinates at the location. This correction is then used by a rover that is in direct communication with the base station through a radio link. The rover is usually deployed within several miles of the base station. At longer distances, line of sight is required; at shorter distances (as in this survey) line of sight is not required. RTK GPS is capable of taking survey-grade measurements in real time and providing accuracies of approximately 4 cm (horizontal). The Leica 1200 series RTK GPS was used for data collection at the GPO.

4.0 Geophysical Prove-Out Procedures

4.1 Survey Modes

Site conditions at the GPO are representative of most of the field conditions that will be encountered during the large-scale field investigation, with the exception of the steep, rugged terrain and areas of vegetation over some portions of Sand Creek.

Full coverage (2 dimensional) and transect (1 dimensional) survey modes were originally planned for the GPO evaluation using the same plot. Full coverage was achieved through deploying the sensor systems and collecting sub-parallel survey lines spaced less than 3 feet apart. Although 2D DGM protocol was proven at the GPO, the same general protocol will be used to collect 1D data, given the only difference between 2D and 1D is the distance between adjacent acquisition lines.

Both the RTK GPS and RTS were used for navigation. Due to equipment issues associated with the RTK GPS (missing data cable) that was identified during the initial field equipment inspection, the GPO background survey was mapped using the RTS in local coordinates and later translated to NAD83, Ohio State Plane, North Zone coordinates once the missing data cable was received. This technique did not result in any decreased accuracy and both the RTK GPS and RTS were used for navigation after the survey control was established. Survey paint was used to mark the instrument line paths during data acquisition. Raw and processed instrument data are included in **Appendix C**.

4.2 Calibration Tests

An area determined to be representative of "background" was established outside of the GPO test grid and was used as a functional check area before and after data collection with both the G858 and EM61-MK2 geophysical instruments. As described in *DID MR-005-05* (USACE, 2003a), the following tests were performed:

- Static Background Test
- Static Spike Test
- Personnel Test
- Cable Shake Test
- Azimuthal Test (MAG only)
- Octant Test (MAG only)
- Height Optimization (MAG only)
- 6-Line Test

All instrumentation QC tests were performed as specified in Table 7-1 of the *GPO Work Plan* (Shaw, 2009). All metrics specified in the *GPO Work Plan* were achieved, although a higher standard deviation of measurements were observed for static measurements from the lower MAG sensor. One possible cause could be related to small movements of the lower sensor when it is proximal to the ground surface. **Appendix D** contains the results of the quality tests performed during the GPO.

4.3 G858 Magnetic Survey

The G858 was deployed in man-portable, vertical gradient mode using the shoulder-mounted harness system provided with the unit. The vertical sensor separation between the two sensors was 2 feet with the sensors mounted at 16 and 40 inches above the ground surface, respectively. A jig was constructed prior to mobilization to allow the GPS antenna and the RTS prism to mount directly above the MAG sensors; however, it was not stable enough to collect data, and it was necessary to wear the backpack with the GPS antenna or the RTS prism attached.

The offset between the positioning system and magnetometer sensors was measured and used during data processing. Measured offset equaled 1.5 feet for 'x' and 3.33 feet for 'y.' Data were collected with both sensors in the vertical position, with the bottom sensor approximately 16 inches above the ground surface and the top sensor 40 inches above the ground surface. Sensor measurements were collected every 0.1 seconds at a line spacing that did not exceed 3 feet, and the navigation data from the RTK GPS and RTS streamed directly into the G858 logger. The MAG and navigation data were downloaded to a field computer at the end of the day.

For the purpose of this study, the MAG and gradient data were collected concurrently. Rather than covering the grids twice, the data were collected in the vertical gradient configuration, and the lower MAG sensor data were used for the total field MAG analysis.

The direction of traverses in the GPO test grid was based on the surface conditions and obstructions present. Due to obstructions caused by relatively smaller trees (that did not create an actual tree "canopy") and the layout of the grid, it was more efficient to collect data with the traverses oriented north-south.

4.4 EM61-MK2 Electromagnetic Survey

EM61-MK2 data were collected with the GPS antenna or RTS prism centered above the coils using a non-metallic tripod supplied by Geonics. Data were collected along the same general traverses described for MAG data collection. EM61-MK2 measurements were collected every 0.1 seconds and the navigation data streamed from the RTK GPS and RTS directly into the EM61-MK2's data logger. The four channels of the EM61 data along with the navigation data were stored in the data logger and were downloaded to the field computer following the field activities.

5.0 Geophysical Data Processing

This section presents the data processing procedures and target selection criteria that were used to complete the GPO in accordance with the *GPO Work Plan* (Shaw, 2009).

It should be noted that the simulants (i.e., pipes) utilized for the GPO were used to ensure the proposed geophysical systems can collect data of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the project objectives, and that the field protocol and data processing systems produce representative and precise results. The anomaly selection criteria is considered preliminary, and will likely be developed further with the client based primarily on the results from the government sponsored sensor evaluations at Aberdeen and Yuma Proving Grounds and nationwide GPOs, for which large volumes of data exist for actual inert UXO items (ESTCP et al., 2006).

5.1 G858 Data Processing and Target Selection

5.1.1 G858 Data Processing

The G858 MAG data, including both the survey and base station data, were downloaded to a laptop computer in the field using Geometrics Magmap 2000[®] software. The data were verified and backed up prior to G858 system demobilization. Magmap 2000[®] was used to remove drop outs and to perform the sensor offset position corrections. Data for the GPO were collected in local coordinates using RTS navigation and then translated into NAD83 Ohio State Plane North Zone coordinates. RTK GPS data were collected in geographic coordinates and translated into state plane coordinates at a later time using a combination of both Magmap and Geosoft. Geosoft was also used for additional data processing, including spike removal, lag correction, and final data leveling using a 200-point median filter. A 5-point non-linear filter was applied to the top sensor data to smooth the data and remove small amplitude dropouts prior to calculation of the vertical gradient.

The total magnetic field and vertical gradient data were interpolated using the minimum curvature routine in Geosoft at a cell size of 0.5 foot and blanking distance of 2 feet. The line path was transposed onto the color coded image, and an appropriate color scale selected based on the data statistics.

The total magnetic field, analytic Signal (AS), and magnetic gradient data for each of the configurations (RTS and RTK GPS) used with the G858G are presented in **Figures 6-1** through **6-8**.

5.1.2 G858 Target Selection

Analysis of the GPO data indicates that geologic noise, background levels, and terrain responses at the GPO did not influence the anomaly selection criteria to a large degree. These parameters

were found to be best controlled through the use of picking thresholds at this early stage of the project.

Magnetic dipoles were auto-picked using UX-Process for all G858 datasets. Anomaly selection thresholds were established based on an evaluation of the noise levels and the detection of the known locations of the seed items in the GPO plot. This approach maximizes the detection ability while potentially minimizing high numbers of false positives. The total magnetic field and vertical magnetic gradient data proposed thresholds are provided in **Table 5-1**.

The results of the target lists and analyses for the total field and magnetic gradient data sets for the G858G are discussed in **Section 6.2**.

5.2 EM61-MK2 Data Processing and Target Selection

5.2.1 EM61-MK2 Data Processing

All EM61-MK2 data were downloaded to a laptop computer in the field; the data sets were reviewed for content and subsequently backed up prior to system demobilization. Data for the GPO were collected in local coordinates using RTS navigation and then translated into NAD83 Ohio State Plane North Zone coordinates. RTK GPS data were collected in geographic coordinates and translated into state plane coordinates at a later time using a combination of both Dat61MK2 and Geosoft. Geosoft was also used for additional data processing, including spike removal, lag correction, and final data leveling using a 200-point median filter.

The Channel 1, 2, and Sum4 data channels were interpolated using the minimum curvature routine in Geosoft at a cell size of 0.5 foot and blanking distance of 2 feet. The line path was transposed onto the color coded image, and an appropriate color scale selected based on the data statistics.

The response data for each of the configurations (RTS and RTK GPS) used with the EM61-MK2 in relation to the Channel 2 and Sum 4 data channels are presented in **Figures 6-9** through **6-12**.

5.2.2 EM6-MK2 Target Selection

The Sum4 along with the single time gate of Channel 2 were the primary data channels reviewed. Based on a review of the anomaly characteristics for the seed items and the background noise levels listed in **Table 5-2** a threshold value of approximately 3 mV for Channel 2 and a Sum4 threshold of 8 mV is proposed in order to detect all seed items. If seed items at or very near the 11X guideline are not of interest, the threshold should be increased to 8 mV and 16 mV for Channel 2 and the Sum4 channel, respectively. This approach maximizes the detection ability above the 11X guideline while potentially minimizing high numbers of false positives.

Target lists and analyses for the EM61-MK2 data sets are discussed in Section 6.3.

6.0 Results

The DGM Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) are discussed in Section 6.1, followed by the interpretative results for the G858 MAG and EM61-MK2 data in Section 6.2 and Section 6.3, respectively. Results of the instrument function tests as described in Section 4.2 are provided in Appendix D.

6.1 Data Quality Objectives

The following sections demonstrate that the data collected for the GPO meets the intent of the DQOs specified in the *GPO Work Plan* (Shaw, 2009). The DQOs for the GPO include the following metrics; background noise based on leveled survey data set, mean speed, along track sampling, across track sampling, latency correction, data leveling, anomaly selection, positioning errors, known location of QC items, and false positives. Reacquisition of anomalies will not be conducted under this DO.

6.1.1 Background Noise

The metric for background noise was determined based on the GPO data. **Table 6-1** provides the background noise levels, calculated as the standard deviation of measurements with the instrument in motion in a background area, observed during the GPO.

6.1.2 Mean Speed

Based on the results of the field GPO, a reasonable value for the mean speed metric (percent of measurements collected at less than 3 miles per hour [mph]) was determined to be a value greater than 95 percent for "wheel based" acquisition systems, such as the EM61-MK2, that is used in a flat terrain environment. A total of 97.79 percent of the measurements were acquired at a mean speed of less than 3 mph for the EM61-MK2 data using the RTS equipment, which exceeds the metric of 95 percent. A total of 96.9 percent of the measurements were acquired at a mean speed of less than 3 mph for the EM61-MK2 data using the RTK GPS equipment, which exceeds the metric of 95 percent. The velocity data for the EM61 surveys are presented in **Appendix D**.

Based on the results of the field GPO, a reasonable value for the mean speed metric (percent of measurements collected at less than 3 mph) was determined to be a value greater than 90 percent for systems where the sensor is hand carried in front of the operator in rugged terrain as will be the case for the G858 at the Sand Creek site. The velocity data for the G858 magnetometer surveys using both the RTS and RTK GPS indicate that greater than 95 percent of the measurements were acquired at a mean speed of less than 3 mph. The calculations were performed directly in Oasis Montaj using the sample to sample distance and the G858 sample rate of 0.1 seconds.

6.1.3 Along Track Sampling

The metric for along track sampling is less than 0.6 feet with cumulative gaps of less than 5 percent of the line distance. A total of 100 percent of the measurements were acquired at an along track sampling of less than 0.6 foot for the EM61-MK2 data using the RTS equipment, which exceeds the metric. A total of 100 percent of the measurements were acquired at an along track sampling of less than 0.6 foot for the EM61-MK2 data using the RTK GPS equipment, which exceeds the metric. The along track sampling data for the EM61 surveys are presented in **Appendix D**.

For the G858 data acquired with the RTS and RTK GPS greater than 98 percent of the measurements were acquired at an along track sampling of less than 0.6 foot, which achieves the metric. The calculations were performed directly in Oasis Montaj using the difference between successive measurements of the distance channel.

6.1.4 Across Track Sampling

The metric for across track sampling is that 90 percent of the measurements will be at a 3 foot line spacing or less, excluding data gaps due to trees or other obstacles that preclude the survey platform from providing complete coverage. This metric is intended to control data gaps associated with inconsistent track paths that are not associated with trees or other obstructions. Several trees present within the GPO area caused minor deviations within the path walked during data collection; however, both DGM systems achieved the cross-track spacing metric for the project. The across-track sampling metric achieved during the GPO was as follows:

- EM61 RTK GPS: 99.82 percent
 EM61 RTK GPS: 99.83 percent (accounting for trees with polygon)
- EM61 RTS: 99.67 percent EM61 – RTS: 99.79 percent (accounting for trees with polygon)
- MAG RTK GPS: 98.37 percent MAG – RTK GPS: 98.67 percent (accounting for trees with polygon)
- MAG RTS: 97.00 percent
 MAG RTS: 97.21 percent (accounting for trees with polygon)

Data track maps for the GPO for both the EM61-MK2 and G858 magnetometer surveys are provided in **Appendix D**.

6.1.5 Latency Correction

The metric for latency correction is no visible chevron effects in the final processed data sets used to create the color-coded images. Lag corrections were applied such that no chevron effects that could adversely affect the data interpretation are present in the processed data for the EM61-MK2 datasets. The G858 datasets were acquired with the positioning sensor located on the backpack of the instrument operator while the actual geophysical sensor was transported in front of the operator. The operator attempted to maintain a constant offset between the geophysical and position sensors during data collection; however, data artifacts resulting from small changes to the in-line and across-line offset distances are visible in the final processed MAG datasets. Based on the interpretation of the GPO data, this issue did not impact or compromise the capabilities of the G858 system to detect and accurately locate the seed items with the established performance criteria. The GPO is characterized by flat, level terrain that differs from the terrain present at the Sand Creek site which is largely steep and irregular. As a solution to maintain a constant offset between geophysical and position sensors in steep and irregular terrain, the positioning system sensor should be rigidly mounted at a fixed offset from the DGM sensor in order to provide the most accurate location of the geophysical sensor at all times. If the accurate distance and orientation between sensors is not maintained, the resulting data may not meet some of the performance metrics in steep and irregular terrain. Additional recommendations for the DGM survey procedures are presented in Section 7.2 of this report.

6.1.6 Data Leveling

The metric for data leveling consists of achieving consistent processing parameters and methods for all data sets. A median filter was used in Geosoft to level the GPO data, and noise spikes in the magnetic data were deleted in Magmap. This approach resulted in DGM datasets near a background value of 0.

6.1.7 Anomaly Selection

The metric for anomaly selection is that the anomaly selections for a given data set will be reasonable and should identify all MEC or MEC-like items. Overall, the site noise from the geology, soils, and external noise sources (e.g., power lines, etc.) is small or nonexistent, and the anomaly characteristics (signal intensity, footprint and shape) from the items of interest are generally unique when compared to the anomaly characteristics from the "noise."

There were several seed items that were not selected in the total field magnetic datasets using the automatic dipole selection routines in Geosoft. These items (11, 12, 13, and 14) are within 6 to 10 feet of other large seed items, and their response is effectively "shadowed" by the larger seed items in the total magnetic field data. In order to reliably interpret anomalies with these characteristics the vertical gradient magnetic data, as well as analysis of the 1D MAG profiles, were used to further assess these anomalies during the anomaly evaluation phase.

6.1.8 Known Location Calibration Positional Check

Static position data were collected at a known location to document the repeatability of the positioning system on a daily basis and the information was logged in the on-site geophysicist's field logbook. This data was also plotted on the Oasis Map at an appropriate scale of 2.5 feet at each grid corner location to ensure the grid corners were detected within the metric from the known locations. The metric for known location calibration positional check is less than 0.5 feet. Navigation control at known point calibration was performed on all RTS and RTK GPS setups. All were within 0.5 feet, which achieved the metric. Results for the positional check for known locations are presented in the Truth Tables in **Appendix D**.

6.1.9 Dynamic Calibration Positional Check

The metric for dynamic calibration positional check is based on cumulative errors not to exceed 2.5 feet. Related tests for this metric include the 6-Line and repeat line tests, which are summarized in **Appendix D**. Both of these tests exhibit that the metric was achieved. Interpreted anomaly "centroid" and/or peak position offsets to the mapped locations of the seed items averaged less than 2.5 feet.

6.1.10 Known Location QC Items

The metric for known location QC items is within 2.5 feet of their known locations. Assessment of the grid corner hubs anomaly pick locations at the GPO site indicates that the hubs are being located within 2.5 feet of their known location.

6.1.11 Reacquisition

The metrics for reacquisition are not applicable to this project; however, initial reacquisition recommendations based on the GPO results are discussed in **Section 7.5**. If performed during this project, anomaly reacquisition will be demonstrated and approved prior to the initiation of production surveys.

6.1.12 False Positives

The metric is for false positives to be kept to a minimum. The definition of a false positive in *DID MR-005-05* (USACE, 2003a) is "anomalies reacquired by the Contractor result(ing) in no detectable metallic material recovered during excavations, calculated as a running average for the sector." Prior to seeding the GPO plot, Shaw conducted a pre-seed survey to locate existing geophysical anomalies such that "background" locations could be selected for burial of the seed items. Numerous preexisting small to large anomalies detected by the EM61-MK2 were present as depicted on **Figure 2-4**. These anomalies were left in place during plot construction so that the plot is as representative as possible of site conditions that might be encountered during the large-scale field investigations at the three sites. A large percentage of the anomalies detected in the

pre-seed DGM survey are also identified in the post-seed DGM surveys, suggesting that a significant number of them are due to buried metal objects and are not false positives.

6.2 G858 Magnetometer Results

The G858 target selections for both the total magnetic field and vertical gradient correlate well with the known seed item locations. "Shadowing" of some of the seed item anomalies in close proximity occurred in the total magnetic field data; however, the gradient data and 1D profile analysis was used to minimize this effect. Fifteen (15) of the seed items were buried at a horizontal orientation, and 6 items were oriented at or near a perpendicular azimuth to magnetic north (i.e., generally east west). Both of these factors represent a worst-case scenario in terms of the signal response characteristics for a magnetometer.

Items that were not consistently interpreted in three of the magnetic datasets include the following seed items:

- Item Number 11 (75 mm simulant at 2.5 foot depth)
- Item Numbers 12 and 13 (90mm simulant at 4 foot depth)
- Item Number 14 (75mm simulant at 2 foot depth)

All of these items with the exception of Item Number 14 are very near or exceed the 11X guideline for detection depth.

Additional anomaly selections that are not attributed to any known seed items are exhibited on the MAG figures with appropriate symbols; however, these anomalies are not presented on the truth tables or target spreadsheets as their origin (size, weight, composition, etc.) is unknown.

The seed item evaluation results are provided in **Tables 6-2** through 6-5 and presented in **Figures 6-1** through 6-8. **Tables 6-2** and 6-3 list the targets and the locations to show the correlation with different seed items for the total magnetic field data. Summary target selection, analysis information, and target grading for magnetic gradient data sets are presented in **Tables 6-4** and 6-5.

6.2.1 Total Field Magnetic Data

The survey results are summarized as follows:

- 17 of the 20 seed items (85 percent) were interpreted using the RTS configuration (Figure 6-1)
- 16 of the 20 seed items (80 percent) were interpreted using the RTK GPS configuration (Figure 6-5)

6.2.1.1 Total Field Magnetic Data (Analytic Signal)

The survey results are summarized as follows:

- 16 of the 20 seed items (80 percent) were interpreted using the RTS configuration (Figure 6-2)
- 16 of the 20 seed items (80 percent) were interpreted using the RTK GPS configuration (Figure 6-6)
- The AS of the total (or gradient) magnetic field is a filtering process that creates a single, positive peak for each magnetic dipole pair. In areas of low to medium anomaly density the procedure does not necessarily improve the ability of the interpreter to select candidate anomalies. However, if areas of high anomaly density are present during the large-scale field investigation at the Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill the AS technique may be used as an additional interpretation methodology.

6.2.2 Magnetic Gradient Data

The survey results are summarized as follows:

- 16 of the 20 seed items (80 percent) were detected using the RTS configuration (Figure 6-3).
- 19 of the 20 seed items (95 percent) were detected using the RTK GPS configuration (Figure 6-7).

6.3 EM61-MK2 Electromagnetic Results

The EM61-MK2 target selections correlate well with the known seed item locations, even those that are at or exceed the 11X depth requirement for EM instrumentation. EM61 data are more successful at detecting closely-spaced items and delineating those items into their individual anomaly constituents compared to magnetic data, as the electromagnetic field diminishes at a higher rate.

Additional anomaly selections that are not attributed to any known seed items are exhibited on the EM61-MK2 figures with appropriate symbols; however, these anomalies are not presented on the truth tables or target spreadsheets as their origin (size, weight, composition, etc.) is unknown. These additional anomalies were detected during the background EM61-MK2 survey and are the result of metal objects.

The seed item evaluation results for the EM61-MK2 GPO data are provided in **Tables 6-6** through **6-9**, which list the EM61-MK2 data target pick results and their associations to the known seed items. The EM61-MK2 survey results are presented in **Figures 6-9** through **6-12** and are summarized as follows:

- 19 of the 20 (95 percent) seed items were detected with Channel 2 data using the RTS configuration (Figure 6-9).
- 19 of the 20 (95 percent) seed items were detected with the Sum4 data using the RTS configuration (Figure 6-10).
- 19 of the 20 seed items (95 percent) were detected with Channel 2 data using the RTK GPS configuration (Figure 6-11).
- 19 of the 20 seed items (95 percent) were detected with Sum4 data using the RTK GPS positioning system (Figure 6-12).
- The 11X detection depth for a 90mm is 3.3 feet. The only item that was either not detected and/or within a 3.3 foot radius of the seed item location is Item Number 13 (90mm simulant at 4 foot depth), which is located approximately 6 feet northeast of Item Number 18, a 105mm simulant at a 2 foot depth.

This page intentionally left blank.
7.0 Recommendations

7.1 Selected DGM Survey Equipment

For the DGM project at the RVAAP, an EM61-MK2 survey system integrated with the Leica RTK GPS in open areas (ODA1, MABS and level areas at the top of slope at Sand Creek) is recommended. For areas that contain trees or tree canopy (wooded tree line at ODA1 and portions of the Sand Creek) that may interfere with GPS equipment, the EM61-MK2 survey system integrated with the Leica RTS system is recommended. For the areas at the Sand Creek site where areas of steep and rugged terrain exist, the G858 magnetometer is proposed, as the steep terrain will limit the safe deployment of the EM61-MK2 system. All DGM systems will be deployed by experienced Shaw personnel with the skills, capabilities, and expertise with munitions response projects with similar DQOs. The following sections present additional elements that will be considered during project execution.

7.2 Recommendations for DGM Survey Procedures

DGM data will be collected on adjacent lines separated by 2.5 feet, and the sample rate of the geophysical sensors will be 10 Hz. Position data will be acquired at a minimum rate of 1 Hz.

7.2.1 Transect Surveys

The procedures utilized during the GPO are sufficient and appropriate for transect surveying for determining the boundaries of the ODA1 and MABS sites. For transect surveys, the RTK GPS or RTS will be used to place survey lathe at predetermined locations along each transect line, or the "stakeout" program in the Leica RTS or RTK GPS will be used to maintain parallel transects. If used, the distance between the survey lathe along each transect line will be no more than 100 feet in low visibility (e.g., dense vegetation) and 200 feet in "open" areas along each proposed transect line. The survey lathe "waypoints" will be used to guide the instrument operator during data acquisition, and the RTS or RTK GPS will be used to collect position data at 1 Hz along each transect.

7.2.2 Grid Surveys

Survey paint and/or polyvinyl chloride (non-metal) pin flags will be used to mark the data acquisition lines in the field in order to maintain the necessary data coverage. The line spacing in the field will be 2.5 feet with no adjacent lines separated by more than 3.3 feet. The instrument operator will collect DGM data a minimum of 5 feet outside each grid or survey area boundary prior to turning around and preparing for the next data acquisition line.

Prior to arriving in the field, Shaw will design a non-metallic mount for the RTS prism so that the prism is directly over, or at a constant lateral offset from the G858 magnetic sensor. This

procedure will eliminate changes in orientation and/or distance between the geophysical and positioning system sensors, and provide the highest quality DGM data for interpretation.

7.3 Recommendations for DGM Data Processing and Target Selection

7.3.1 Data Processing

The data processing used for the GPO effort for both DGM systems is sufficient to meet the project objectives. The quality metrics outlined in the GIP for the project will be adhered to during the processing of the data. Scripts will be used in Geosoft to process the data to minimize the occurrence of human error.

7.3.2 Target Selection

Shaw will work in conjunction with the Army and Ohio EPA to calculate anomaly density maps for each AOC based on the DGM interpretation. If requested, anomalies can be classified in terms of the likelihood of being equal to or larger than 75mm, and these data compared to the entire anomaly population.

As discussed in Sections 6.2 and 6.3 of this report, the percent detected for the seed items is primarily based on the use of the automatic picker routines in Oasis Montaj UX Process, which only use the signal intensity component to select anomalies. An automatic picker will be used as a quality tool to ensure the data interpreter accounts for all potential anomalies during the interpretation. The Channel 2 and Sum4 channels will be the primary channels evaluated for the EM61-MK2, and the total magnetic field, vertical gradient, and 1D magnetic profile data will be used to evaluate the magnetic data for the Sand Creek Disposal Site. After the automatic target selections are transposed onto the color coded image, other anomaly attributes (e.g., footprint and shape) will be used in conjunction with the signal intensity in order to refine the automatic picker selections, if necessary. This approach has the potential to decrease the number of anomalies selected that do not have similar anomaly characteristics to the items of interest (e.g., 75mm, 90mm, 155mm, PIGs) and are most likely the result of small metal cultural debris. Representative examples of these types of items are exhibited in the color coded images as anomalies with footprints less than the seed item footprints, as well as anomalies with sinuosity. The signal response selection criteria for the G858 magnetometer and the EM61-MK2 are presented in Table 5-1 and Table 5-2, respectively.

The footprint of the anomaly will also be considered during the interpretation in conjunction with the signal intensity and signal to noise ratio (SNR).

For the EM61-MK2 data, the items of interest at the site are represented by a minimum size of approximately 40 to 45 square feet for the isolated anomalies in the GPO. The minimum SNR that is anticipated for use is 3-5.

Final

For the magnetic data, the items of interest at the site are represented by a minimum size of approximately 35 to 40 square feet (dipole response) for the isolated anomalies in the GPO. The minimum SNR that is anticipated for use is 3-5.

Shaw will also use the EM61-MK2 decay information (time constants) in an attempt to further select anomalies that are the most similar to the MEC items of interest. Non-ferrous, or largely non-ferrous items have time constants less than 150-200 microseconds, while larger ferrous items will have time constants that are a minimum of several hundred microseconds.

The proposed interpretation approach is optimum for those areas where the anomalies are "isolated" from each other and their anomaly signatures do not overlap. In areas of higher anomaly density (i.e., "cluttered" areas), there is a much lower probability of accurately characterizing each anomaly due to the interference from adjacent anomalies. The use of the EM61-MK2 in areas of elevated anomaly density helps to mitigate interference from adjacent anomalies, as well as collecting data at close line spacing and with a high sample rate.

7.4 Recommendations for Target Reacquisition

Anomaly reacquisition was not performed during the GPO and is not required under this DO. If reacquisition is necessary as some time during the duration of this DO, anomalies will be reacquired using either the RTK GPS or RTS, depending on site conditions such as canopy. The EM61-MK2 (or G858 at the Sand Creek Disposal Site) will be used to locate the actual anomaly peak location in the field from the target coordinates. Any anomaly reacquisition will be demonstrated and approved prior to initiation of the production surveys.

Note that Shaw intends to use the seed items and results of this GPO in conjunction with additional work to be performed at the RVAAP by Shaw under the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP). Reacquisition of target anomalies is required under the MMRP. Following the completion of the MMRP activities, Shaw will remove all seed items prior to demobilization.

This page intentionally left blank.

8.0 References

Bosnar, M., 2001, *Technical Note TN-33: Why Did Geonics Limited Build the EM61-MK2?* Comparison Between EM61-MK2 and EM61, Technical Note, Geonics Ltd., Mississauga, Canada. March 2001.

Environmental Quality Management (EQM), 2008, Report on the Geophysical Investigation, Suspected Mustard Agent Burial Site, Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio, Final, May 21.

Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP), Interstate Technical and Regulatory Corporation (ITRC), and Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP), 2006, *Survey of Munitions Response Technologies*, June.

MKM Engineers, Inc. (MKM), 2004, *Remedial Design/Removal Action Plan for RVAAP-34 Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill, Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio*, March.

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), 2001, Final Phase I Remedial Investigation Report for Demolition Area 1 at the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio, December.

Shaw Environmental, Inc. (Shaw), 2009, *Final Geophysical Prove-Out Plan, for the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio, Version 1,* July 16.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), 2003a, *Data Item Description - Geophysical Investigation Plan - Munitions Response (MR)-005-05*, December 1.

USACE, 2003b, Data Item Description - Geophysical Prove-Out (GPO) Plan and Report - MR-005-05A, December 1.

USACE, 2007a, Military Munitions Response Action - EM1110-1-4089, June 15.

USACE, 2007b, Data Item Description - Geophysics - MR-005-05.01, December 20.

This page intentionally left blank.

FIGURES



Figure 1-1 Location Map Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant Ravenna, Ohio





: 2:\Figures\Environmental Services Contract\Fig 1-2_MABS site_plan.dwg Layout: L1-L4_site_plan User: david.crispo May 05, 2009



Project Number: 133616



133616







Fig2-3 File Path:F:\GISDATA2\MAMMS\Ravenna\GIS_Documents\Project_Maps\RVAAP_008_GPO_ 04/01/10 Date: Generated By: XXX

Project Number: 133616





H












































TABLES

Table 2-1Size Comparison of Actual Items to Simulants

	Actual	Size	Simulant Size			
Seed Item	Diameter (in)	Length (in)	Diameter¹ (in)	Length (in)		
75mm	2.93	12	2.375	12 ²		
90mm	3.54	16.25	3.5	16.25 ²		
105mm	4.10	19.29	4.5	19.29		
155mm	6.08	25	5.63	25		
PIG	6.75	40.25	6.625	40.25		

mm = millimeter

in = inches

¹ outside diameter

² length includes end cap

ltem Number	Easting (USSurvFt)	Northing (USSurvFt)	Depth (Inches)	Inclination (Degrees)	Azimuth (Degrees)	Buried Item	Simulated Projectile
1	2351980.67	554844.00	36	90	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	90mm
0	2352006.34	554833.48	54	0	0		PIG (South End)
2	2352007.01	554836.45	54	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	PIG (North End) "
3	2352019.24	554816.80	24	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	90mm
4	2352016.51	554808.27	24	0	90	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	155mm
5	2351963.14	554832.78	30	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	75mm
6	2351986.16	554817.15	36	90	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	155mm
7	2352008.01	554798.73	42	0	300	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	105mm
8	2352025.32	554783.54	12	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	75mm
•	2351945.29	554817.81	30	45	45		PIG (East End)
9	2351942.51	554817.81	- 30	45	40	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	PIG (West End)
10	2351994.85	554806.64	30	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	90mm
11	2351991.99	554796.88	30	0	90	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	75mm
12	2352014.67	554778.68	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	90mm
13	2351965.65	554788.15	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	90mm
14	2351955.77	554769.07	24	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	75mm
15	2352006.66	554776.75	48	0	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	155mm
	2351956.90	554762.37	40	0	0		PIG (North End)
16	2351958.09	554764.37	48	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	PIG (South End)
17	2351956.55	554789.66	18	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	75mm
18	2351960.01	554785.05	30	0	90	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	105mm
19	2351992.06	554751.52	36	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	75mm
20	2352016.37	554752.26	24	45	135	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	75mm

Table 2-2Summary Table of the GPO Seed Items

USSurvFT = United States Survey Feet

in = inches

mm = millimeter

Table 2-3 GPO Grid Corners

Grid Corner	Easting (US Survey Feet)	Northing (US Survey Feet)
NW	2351952.94	554859.99
NE	2352050.28	554837.69
SE	2352020.46	554739.47
SW	2351922.52	554764.04

North American Datum 1983 (NAD83), Ohio North State Plane coordinates, CS83 North Zone in U.S. survey feet

Table 5-1 **G858** Anomaly Selection Thresholds and Background Noise Levels

	G858G Magnetometer					
Total Field	Threshold (nT)	4				
	Background noise (nT)	1.5 (standard deviation)				
Vertical Gradient	Threshold (nT/ft)	3				
	Background noise (nT/ft)	1 (standard deviation)				

GPS = global positioning system nT/ft = nanoTesla(s) per foot. RTS = Robotic Total Station

RTK = real-time kinematic

Table 5-2EM61-MK2 Anomaly Selection Thresholds and Background Noise Levels

EM61-MK2	RTS/RTK GPS
EM61-MK2 Channel 2 Threshold (mV)	3
EM61-MK2 Sum4 Threshold (mV)	8
EM61-MK2 Channel 2 Background Noise (mV)	0.97
EM61-MK2 Sum4 Background Noise (mV)	3.21

GPS = global positioning system

mV = millivolt

RTS = Robotic Total Station

RTK = real-time kinematic

Table 6-1 **Calculated Background Noise Levels**

Instrument	Data	GPO	Units
EM (EM61-MK2)	Channel 1	1.81	mV
	Channel 2	0.97	mV
	Channel 3	0.52	mV
	Channel 4	0.27	mV
	Sum4	3.21	mV
MAG (G858)	Total Field	1.5	nT
	Vertical Gradient	1	nT/ft

EM = electromagnetic GPO = geophysical prove-out MAG = magnetic mV = millivolt nT/ft = nanoTesla(s) per foot.

Table 6-2	
GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTS Configuration - Total Field	

GPO Target Total Field	ts (G-858 w/RTS)											
Threshhold	<u>.</u>											
Seed Item #	Easting (Known) US Survey Ft	Northing (Known) US Survey Ft	Depth Inches	Inclination Degrees		ltem	Weight Lbs	Simulates	Target Pick Total Field (nT)	Easting (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Northing (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Target Number
1	2351980.67	554844.00	36	90	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	41.3	2351979.99	554844.46	108
2A	2352006.34	554833.48	54	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (South End)	578.9	2352007.84	554834.36	91
2B	2352007.01	554836.45	"	"	ш			PIG (CAIS) (North End)		"	"	
3	2352019.24	554816.80	24	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	72.3	2352019.27	554816.62	70
4	2352016.51	554808.27	24	0	90	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	168.4	2352015.60	554808.28	63
5	2351963.14	554832.78	30	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	13.3	2351961.45	554834.74	95
6	2351986.16	554817.15	36	90	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	398.9	2351985.84	554817.97	72
7	2352008.01	554798.73	42	0	300	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	36.6	2352008.67	554797.67	51
8	2352025.32	554783.54	12	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	53.0	2352025.46	554782.88	28
9A	2351945.29	554817.81	30	45	45	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (East End)	954.1	2351944.63	554818.24	74
9B	2351942.51	554818.37	"	"	u	"		PIG (CAIS) (West End)		"	"	
10	2351994.85	554806.64	30	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	56.0	2351996.18	554807.47	62
11	2351991.99	554796.88	30	0	90	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	9.7	2351994.74	554793.26	49
12	2352014.67	554778.68	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
13	2351965.65	554788.15	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
14	2351955.77	554769.07	24	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
15	2352006.66	554776.75	48	0	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	223.9	2352007.74	554776.63	26
16A	2351956.9	554762.37	48	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (North End)	426.4	2351956.87	554763.87	12
16B	2351958.09	554764.81	"	"	u	4		PIG (CAIS) (South End)		"		
17	2351956.55	554789.66	18	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	23.9	2351939.64	554771.99	23
18	2351960.01	554785.05	30	0	90	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	63.5	2351960.56	554786.69	40
19	2351992.06	554751.52	36	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	10.3	2351992.13	554751.96	2
20	2352016.37	554752.26	24	45	135	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	20.6	2352017.00	554752.50	3

Table 6-3
GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTK GPS Configuration - Total Field

	ts (G-858 w/RTK GF	<u>PS)</u>										
Total Field Threshhold	:											
Seed	-	Newthine (Known)	Danéh	Inclination	A = i	ltem	Weight	Simulates	Target Pick		Nonthine (Intermeded)	Target Number
Item #	US Survey Ft	Northing (Known) US Survey Ft	Inches	Degrees		item	Lbs	Simulates	Total Field (nT)	Easting (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Northing (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	larget Number
1	2351980.67	554844.00	36	90	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	69.2	2351980.01	554844.79	38
2A	2352006.34	554833.48	54	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (South End)	471.5	2352006.93	554833.27	33
2B	2352007.01	554836.45	"	"	u	64		PIG (CAIS) (North End)		"	"	"
3	2352019.24	554816.80	24	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	62.6	2352019.00	554815.50	24
4	2352016.51	554808.27	24	0	90	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	143.7	2352015.75	554807.66	21
5	2351963.14	554832.78	30	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	15.6	2351963.71	554834.29	35
6	2351986.16	554817.15	36	90	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	451.0	2351986.29	554818.35	26
7	2352008.01	554798.73	42	0	300	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	31.8	2352008.27	554798.47	17
8	2352025.32	554783.54	12	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	53.0	2352024.44	554783.78	10
9A	2351945.29	554817.81	30	45	45	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (East End)	1065.3	2351945.31	554818.38	27
9B	2351942.51	554818.37	"	"	ű	"		PIG (CAIS) (West End)		"	"	"
10	2351994.85	554806.64	30	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	55.8	2351995.56	554806.22	20
11	2351991.99	554796.88	30	0	90	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
12	2352014.67	554778.68	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
13	2351965.65	554788.15	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
14	2351955.77	554769.07	24	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
15	2352006.66	554776.75	48	0	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	237.5	2352007.00	554776.00	9
16A	2351956.9	554762.37	48	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (North End)	619.7	2351958.23	554762.69	4
16B	2351958.09	554764.81	ű	"	u	"		PIG (CAIS) (South End)		"	"	"
17	2351956.55	554789.66	18	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	21.6	2351939.59	554768.71	6
18	2351960.01	554785.05	30	0	90	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	66.7	2351960.77	554785.00	11
19	2351992.06	554751.52	36	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	4.2	2351990.32	554752.98	46
20	2352016.37	554752.26	24	45	135	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	11.5	2352016.36	554752.18	1

Table 6-4
GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTS Configuration - Gradient

GPO Target	s (G-858 w/RTS)											
Gradient												
Threshhold	<u>:</u>											
Seed		Northing (Known)				ltem	Weight	Simulates	Target Pick	Easting (Interpreted)	Northing (Interpreted)	Target Number
Item #	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	Inches	Degrees	Degrees		Lbs		Gradient (nT/ft)	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	
1	2351980.67	554844.00	36	90	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	20.4	2351980.77	554844.94	117
2A	2352006.34	554833.48	54	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (South End)	174.1	2352006.47	554833.62	97
2B	2352007.01	554836.45	"	"	ű	64		PIG (CAIS) (North End)		"	"	"
3	2352019.24	554816.80	24	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	21.2	2352019.27	554816.62	72
4	2352016.51	554808.27	24	0	90	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	52.9	2352015.61	554808.06	66
5	2351963.14	554832.78	30	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	4.7	2351962.08	554834.61	99
6	2351986.16	554817.15	36	90	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	118.0	2351986.13	554817.74	74
7	2352008.01	554798.73	42	0	300	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	12.9	2352008.89	554797.92	53
8	2352025.32	554783.54	12	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	23.0	2352025.46	554782.88	33
9A	2351945.29	554817.81	30	45	45	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (East End)	311.7	2351944.65	554817.29	75
9B	2351942.51	554818.37	"	"	"	"		PIG (CAIS) (West End)	-		•	
10	2351994.85	554806.64	30	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	16.34	2351996.14	554806.45	65
11	2351991.99	554796.88	30	0	90	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
12	2352014.67	554778.68	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
13	2351965.65	554788.15	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
14	2351955.77	554769.07	24	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
15	2352006.66	554776.75	48	0	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	69.6	2352008.13	554776.71	30
16A	2351956.9	554762.37	48	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (North End)	193.1	2351959.54	554762.38	15
16B	2351958.09	554764.81	"	"	"	"		PIG (CAIS) (South End)		"	"	"
17	2351956.55	554789.66	18	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	8.4	2351940.14	554771.79	26
18	2351960.01	554785.05	30	0	90	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	18.9	2351960.45	554786.51	42
19	2351992.06	554751.52	36	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	3.6	2351992.24	554751.94	2
20	2352016.37	554752.26	24	45	135	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	8.8	2352016.96	554752.50	3

Table 6-5
GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTS Configuration - Gradient

GPO Target Gradient	ts (G-858 w/RTK)											
Threshhold	<u>.</u>											
Seed Item #	Easting (Known) US Survey Ft	Northing (Known) US Survey Ft	Depth Inches	Inclination Degrees		ltem	Weight Lbs	Simulates	Target Pick Gradient (nT/ft)	Easting (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Northing (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Target Number
1	2351980.67	554844.00	36	90	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	22.4	2351980.02	554844.93	103
2A	2352006.34	554833.48	54	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (South End)	132.0	2352006.92	554833.77	92
2B	2352007.01	554836.45	"	"	u	64		PIG (CAIS) (North End)		"	"	"
3	2352019.24	554816.80	24	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	15.8	2352019.00	554815.50	77
4	2352016.51	554808.27	24	0	90	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	47.8	2352015.50	554807.52	72
5	2351963.14	554832.78	30	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	4.7	2351963.62	554834.58	95
6	2351986.16	554817.15	36	90	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	140.3	2351986.27	554818.36	79
7	2352008.01	554798.73	42	0	300	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	10.5	2352008.22	554798.44	64
8	2352025.32	554783.54	12	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	32.6	2352024.29	554783.86	39
9A	2351945.29	554817.81	30	45	45	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (East End)	347.9	2351943.89	554817.56	80
9B	2351942.51	554818.37	"	"	"	"		PIG (CAIS) (West End)		"	"	"
10	2351994.85	554806.64	30	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	20.3	2351995.56	554806.22	70
11	2351991.99	554796.88	30	0	90	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	3.9	2351994.92	554796.84	60
12	2352014.67	554778.68	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	6.8	2352013.57	554778.64	38
13	2351965.65	554788.15	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	2.6	2351968.87	554785.92	42
14	2351955.77	554769.07	24	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	N/A	N/A	N/A	NOT DETECTED
15	2352006.66	554776.75	48	0	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	76.1	2352007.00	554776.00	33
16A	2351956.9	554762.37	48	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (North End)	183.0	2351958.09	554762.73	26
16B	2351958.09	554764.81	"	"	"	4		PIG (CAIS) (South End)		"		
17	2351956.55	554789.66	18	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	7.9	2351939.75	554768.27	27
18	2351960.01	554785.05	30	0	90	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	20.2	2351960.36	554784.59	41
19	2351992.06	554751.52	36	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	3.2	2351990.84	554751.44	5
20	2352016.37	554752.26	24	45	135	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	4.8	2352016.44	554752.22	6

Table 6-6
GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTS Configuration - Channel 2

<u>GPO Targe</u> <u>Channel 2</u> <u>Threshhold</u>	ts (EM61-MK2 w/RT <u>I:</u>	<u>-S)</u>										
Seed Item #	Easting (Known) US Survey Ft	Northing (Known) US Survey Ft	Depth Inches	Inclination Degrees	Azimuth Degrees	ltem	Weight Lbs	Simulates	Target Pick Channel 2 (mV)	Easting (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Northing (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Target Number
1	2351980.67	554844.00	36	90	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	12.7	2351981.51	554844.12	1
2A	2352006.34	554833.48	54	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (South End)	16.4	2352007.85	554835.05	2
2B	2352007.01	554836.45	"	"	ш	66		PIG (CAIS) (North End)				
3	2352019.24	554816.80	24	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	30.2	2352019.61	554816.61	3
4	2352016.51	554808.27	24	0	90	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	135.0	2352017.08	554807.82	4
5	2351963.14	554832.78	30	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	10.3	2351963.61	554833.78	5
6	2351986.16	554817.15	36	90	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	35.3	2351986.39	554816.87	6
7	2352008.01	554798.73	42	0	300	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	15.7	2352007.62	554798.49	7
8	2352025.32	554783.54	12	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	205.1	2352025.78	554784.28	8
9A	2351945.29	554817.81	30	45	45	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (East End)	142.8	2351943.83	554818.77	9
9B	2351942.51	554818.37	"	"	ű	44		PIG (CAIS) (West End)				
10	2351994.85	554806.64	30	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	16.3	2351995.35	554807.21	10
11	2351991.99	554796.88	30	0	90	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	5.7	2351991.46	554797.03	11
12	2352014.67	554778.68	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	3.5	2352014.51	554779.26	12
13	2351965.65	554788.15	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	3.2	2351968.70	554785.85	13
14	2351955.77	554769.07	24	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	17.9	2351955.79	554769.85	14
15	2352006.66	554776.75	48	0	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	20.8	2352007.13	554776.50	15
16A	2351956.90	554762.37	48	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (North End)	28.4	2351957.46	554764.94	16
16B	2351958.09	554764.81	"	u	u	44		PIG (CAIS) (South End)				
17	2351956.55	554789.66	18	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	36.9	2351939.19	554769.42	17
18	2351960.01	554785.05	30	0	90	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	18.8	2351960.41	554784.41	18
19	2351992.06	554751.52	36	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	9.9	2351992.38	554752.71	19
20	2352016.37	554752.26	24	45	135	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	62.9	2352016.71	554753.89	20

Table 6-7
GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTS Configuration - Sum4

GPO Target Sum4	ts (EM61-MK2 w/ R	TS)										
Threshhold	<u>.</u>											
Seed Item #	Easting (Known) US Survey Ft	Northing (Known) US Survey Ft	Depth Inches	Inclination Degrees		Item	Weight Lbs	Simulates	Target Pick Sum4 (mV)	Easting (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Northing (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Target Number
1	2351980.67	554844.00	36	90	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	23.3	2351981.51	554844.12	1
2A	2352006.34	554833.48	54	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (South End)	30.8	2352007.85	554835.05	2
2B	2352007.01	554836.45	"	"	ű	"	"	PIG (CAIS) (North End)				
3	2352019.24	554816.80	24	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	58.5	2352019.61	554816.61	3
4	2352016.51	554808.27	24	0	90	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	253.7	2352017.08	554807.82	4
5	2351963.14	554832.78	30	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	20.3	2351963.61	554833.78	5
6	2351986.16	554817.15	36	90	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	64.3	2351986.39	554816.87	6
7	2352008.01	554798.73	42	0	300	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	30.6	2352007.62	554798.49	7
8	2352025.32	554783.54	12	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	398.7	2352025.78	554784.28	8
9A	2351945.29	554817.81	30	45	45	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (East End)	263.0	2351943.83	554818.77	9
9B	2351942.51	554818.37	"	"	"	ű	"	PIG (CAIS) (West End)				
10	2351994.85	554806.64	30	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	32.5	2351995.35	554807.21	10
11	2351991.99	554796.88	30	0	90	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	11.3	2351991.46	554797.03	11
12	2352014.67	554778.68	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	6.2	2352014.51	554779.26	12
13	2351965.65	554788.15	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	6.4	2351968.70	554785.85	13
14	2351955.77	554769.07	24	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	35.6	2351955.79	554769.85	14
15	2352006.66	554776.75	48	0	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	39.0	2352007.13	554776.50	15
16A	2351956.90	554762.37	48	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (North End)	52.5	2351957.46	554764.94	16
16B	2351958.09	554764.81	"	"	u	u u	"	PIG (CAIS) (South End)				
17	2351956.55	554789.66	18	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	72.3	2351939.19	554769.42	17
18	2351960.01	554785.05	30	0	90	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	36.5	2351960.41	554784.41	18
19	2351992.06	554751.52	36	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	18.3	2351992.38	554752.71	19
20	2352016.37	554752.26	24	45	135	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	119.0	2352016.71	554753.89	20

Table 6-8
GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTK GPS Configuration - Channel 2

GPO Target Channel 2 Threshhold	ts (EM61-MK2 w/RT :	r <u>k gps)</u>										
Seed Item #	Easting (Known) US Survey Ft	Northing (Known) US Survey Ft	Depth Inches	Inclination Degrees	Azimuth Degrees	ltem	Weight Lbs	Simulates	Target Pick Channel 2 (mV)	Easting (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Northing (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Target Number
1	2351980.67	554844.00	36	90	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	14.5	2351981.03	554844.08	1
2A	2352006.34	554833.48	54	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (South End)	12.7	2352006.83	554836.01	2
2B	2352007.01	554836.45	"	"	ш			PIG (CAIS) (North End)				
3	2352019.24	554816.80	24	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	25.2	2352019.69	554816.24	3
4	2352016.51	554808.27	24	0	90	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	119.8	2352017.15	554808.61	4
5	2351963.14	554832.78	30	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	9.6	2351963.94	554833.83	5
6	2351986.16	554817.15	36	90	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	39.9	2351986.55	554817.04	6
7	2352008.01	554798.73	42	0	300	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	13.4	2352007.92	554798.36	7
8	2352025.32	554783.54	12	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	177.3	2352025.48	554784.41	8
9A	2351945.29	554817.81	30	45	45	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (East End)	149.1	2351944.42	554817.97	9
9B	2351942.51	554818.37	"	"	u	"		PIG (CAIS) (West End)				
10	2351994.85	554806.64	30	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	16.2	2351994.95	554806.38	10
11	2351991.99	554796.88	30	0	90	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	5.6	2351991.58	554797.31	11
12	2352014.67	554778.68	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	2.7	2352014.69	554778.87	12
13	2351965.65	554788.15	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	3.4	2351968.55	554785.34	13
14	2351955.77	554769.07	24	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	29.8	2351956.52	554768.38	14
15	2352006.66	554776.75	48	0	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	19.4	2352006.94	554777.23	15
16A	2351956.9	554762.37	48	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (North End)	30.5	2351958.44	554763.09	16
16B	2351958.09	554764.81	"	"	ű	"		PIG (CAIS) (South End)				
17	2351956.55	554789.66	18	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	53.0	2351939.34	554769.04	17
18	2351960.01	554785.05	30	0	90	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	16.6	2351960.75	554784.64	18
19	2351992.06	554751.52	36	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	8.5	2351992.48	554752.31	19
20	2352016.37	554752.26	24	45	135	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	46.5	2352016.63	554752.51	20

Table 6-9
GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTK GPS Configuration - Sum4

GPO Targe Sum4 Threshhold	ts (EM61-MK2 w/RT <u>:</u>	<u>"K GPS)</u>										
Seed Item #	Easting (Known) US Survey Ft	Northing (Known) US Survey Ft	Depth Inches	Inclination Degrees	Azimuth Degrees	ltem	Weight Lbs	Simulates	Target Pick Sum4 (mV)	Easting (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Northing (Interpreted) US Survey Ft	Target Number
1	2351980.67	554844.00	36	90	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	26.1	2351981.03	554844.08	1
2A	2352006.34	554833.48	54	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (South End)	23.0	2352006.83	554836.01	2
2B	2352007.01	554836.45	"	"	ш			PIG (CAIS) (North End)	"			
3	2352019.24	554816.80	24	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	48.5	2352019.69	554816.24	3
4	2352016.51	554808.27	24	0	90	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	226.0	2352017.15	554808.61	4
5	2351963.14	554832.78	30	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	19.2	2351963.94	554833.83	5
6	2351986.16	554817.15	36	90	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	72.7	2351986.55	554817.04	6
7	2352008.01	554798.73	42	0	300	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	27.6	2352007.92	554798.36	7
8	2352025.32	554783.54	12	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	345.5	2352025.48	554784.41	8
9A	2351945.29	554817.81	30	45	45	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (East End)	274.9	2351944.42	554817.97	9
9B	2351942.51	554818.37	"	"	ű			PIG (CAIS) (West End)	"			
10	2351994.85	554806.64	30	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	32.4	2351994.95	554806.38	10
11	2351991.99	554796.88	30	0	90	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	10.8	2351991.58	554797.31	11
12	2352014.67	554778.68	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	6.6	2352014.69	554778.87	12
13	2351965.65	554788.15	48	0	0	3.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	10	90mm	6.7	2351968.55	554785.34	13
14	2351955.77	554769.07	24	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	56.1	2351956.52	554768.38	14
15	2352006.66	554776.75	48	0	0	5.63-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	25	155mm	35.7	2352006.94	554777.23	15
16A	2351956.90	554762.37	48	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	85	PIG (CAIS) (North End)	56.8	2351958.44	554763.09	16
16B	2351958.09	554764.81	"	"	u	"		PIG (CAIS) (South End)	"			
17	2351956.55	554789.66	18	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	103.5	2351939.34	554769.04	17
18	2351960.01	554785.05	30	0	90	4.50-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	15	105mm	32.2	2351960.75	554784.64	18
19	2351992.06	554751.52	36	0	0	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	16.2	2351992.48	554752.31	19
20	2352016.37	554752.26	24	45	135	2.375-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	5	75mm	88.4	2352016.63	554752.51	20

APPENDIX A Photographs



DESCRIPTION OF BURIED SEED ITEMS IN THE GEOPHYSICAL PROVE - OUT PLOT

RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

Photograph: General site conditions of GPO area

DIGITAL IMAGE FILENAME: P1010029.JPG





DESCRIPTION OF BURIED SEED ITEMS IN THE GEOPHYSICAL PROVEOUT PLOT

RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

Photograph: Excavation of seed item location

DIGITAL IMAGE FILENAME: P1010027.JPG



APPENDIX B Buried Seed Item Descriptions


GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date			
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A	ROW NUMB	ER:	N/A			
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	NCELL: 90mm simul	ant					
CONDITION OF BU	CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):						
			M:				
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	el pipe			
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 10.0 lbs							
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:						
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	60"					
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554844.00 / E 2351980.67							
GENERAL INCLINATION: Vertical (90°)							
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: □ N-S □ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-SW ∎	N/A			
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 1						





RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	<u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date		
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A	ROW NUMB	ER:	N/A		
BURIED ITEM(S) IN CELL: PIG (CAIS) simulant						
CONDITION OF BU	IRIED ITEM(S) (cho	pose all that apply)):			
			M:			
		■ OTHER: hea	ivy gauge ste	eel pipe		
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL WEIGHT OF	BURIED ITEM(S):	85.	0 lbs		
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:					
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	54"				
NORTHING/EASTIN		2352007.01 (North En 2352006.34 (South E				
GENERAL INCLINATION: Horizontal (0°)						
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: ∎N-S □E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A		

DIGITAL IMAGE FILENAME: Item 2





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date		
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A	ROW NUMB	ER:	N/A		
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	N CELL: 90mm simula	ant				
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):						
			M:			
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	el pipe		
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 10.0 lbs						
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:					
DEPTH OF BURIAL	L (to top of item(s)):	24"				
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554816.80 / E 2352019.24						
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION: Horizontal (0°)				
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: ■ N-S □ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A		
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 3					





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A		ER:	N/A
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	I CELL: 155mm sim	ulant		
CONDITION OF BU	JRIED ITEM(S) (cho	oose all that apply)	:	
			M:	
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	eel pipe
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL WEIGHT OF	BURIED ITEM(S):	25.0	0 lbs
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:			
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	24"		
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554808.27 / E 2352016.51				
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: Horizontal (0	°)		
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: □ N-S ■ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 4			





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicis	st: <u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date		
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A	ROW NUM	BER:	N/A		
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	I CELL: 75mm sin	nulant				
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):						
			TEM:			
		■ OTHER: h	eavy gauge st	eel pipe		
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 5.0 lbs						
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:					
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)): 30"				
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554832.78 / E 2351963.14						
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: Horizontal	(0°)				
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: ∎N-S □E-V	V 🗆 NW-SE 🗆 I	NE-SW	N/A		
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 5	5				





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geophy	sicist: <u>Mark k</u> Signatur	Kick 10.22.2009 e Date	
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A		ROW N	UMBER:	N/A	
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	I CELL: 15	5mm simul	ant			
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):						
				Ð		
				AL ITEM:		
				R: heavy gau	ge steel pipe	
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 25.0 lbs						
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION	:				
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of i	tem(s)):	36"			
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554817.15 / E 2351986.16						
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION: Vert	ical (90°)				
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎ N-S	□ E-W (□ NW-SE	□ NE-SW	□ N/A	
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME:	Item 6				





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date		
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A		ER:	N/A		
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	NCELL: 105mm simu	lant				
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):						
			M:			
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	el pipe		
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 15.0 lbs						
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:					
DEPTH OF BURIAL	L (to top of item(s)):	42"				
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554798.73 / E 2352008.01						
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: Horizontal (0°))				
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: □N-S □E-W	■ NW-SE □ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A		
DIGITAL IMAGE FILENAME Item 7						





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	<u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date	
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A	ROW NUMBI	ER:	N/A	
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	NCELL: 75mm simu	lant			
CONDITION OF BU	JRIED ITEM(S) (cho	oose all that apply)	:		
			M:		
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	eel pipe	
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 5.0 lbs					
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:				
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	12"			
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554783.54 / E 2352025.32					
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION: Horizontal (0	°)			
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: ∎ N-S □ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A	
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 8				





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	<u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date		
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A	ROW NUMBE	ER:	N/A		
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	N CELL: PIG (CAIS)					
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):						
DENTED DENTED						
		■ OTHER: hear	vy gauge ste	eel pipe		
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 85.0 lbs						
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIPTION:					
DEPTH OF BURIAI	L (to top of item(s)):	30"				
NORTHING/EASTI	NG: N 554818.37 / E 2 N 554817.81 / E 2	351942.51 (West End 2351945.29 (East End				
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION: 45°					
GENERAL AZIMUT	「H: □N-S □E-W	□ NW-SE ■ NE-	SW 🗆	N/A		
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 9					
	Contraction of the second		Lar 2			
	9	5 Draw				



GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	10.22.2009 Date			
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A	ROW NUMB	ER:	N/A			
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	NCELL: 90mm simul	ant					
CONDITION OF BL	CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):						
			M:				
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	eel pipe			
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 10.0 lbs							
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIPTION:						
DEPTH OF BURIA	L (to top of item(s)):	30"					
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554806.64 / E 2351994.85							
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION: Horizontal (0°	")					
GENERAL AZIMUT	⁻ H: ■ N-S □ E-W		-SW	N/A			
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 10						





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date			
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A		ER:	N/A			
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	NCELL: 75mm simul	ant					
CONDITION OF BU	CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):						
			:M:				
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	eel pipe			
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 5.0 lbs							
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:						
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	30"					
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554796.88 / E 2351991.99							
GENERAL INCLINATION: Horizontal (0°)							
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: □N-S ■E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A			
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 11						





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	10.22.2009 Date		
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A	ROW NUMB	ER:	N/A		
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	I CELL: 90mm simul	ant				
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):						
			M:			
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	el pipe		
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 10.0 lbs						
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:					
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	48"				
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554778.68 / E 2352014.67						
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: Horizontal (0°)				
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: ∎ N-S □ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A		
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 12					





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	10.22.2009 Date				
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A		ER:	N/A				
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	I CELL: 90mm simul	ant						
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):								
			M:					
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	el pipe				
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 10.0 lbs								
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:							
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	48"						
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554788.15 / E 2351965.65								
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: Horizontal (0°	?)						
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: ■ N-S □ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A				
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 13							





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geo	physicist:	<u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	10.22.200	<u>)9</u> Date	
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N	I/A	ROV		ER:	N/A		
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	I CELL:	75mm simu	lant					
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):								
			□ RU	STED				
			D PA	RTIAL ITE	EM:			
			∎ OT	HER: hea	ivy gauge ste	eel pipe		
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 5.0 lbs								
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIPTI	ON:						
DEPTH OF BURIA	_ (to top	of item(s)):	24"					
NORTHING/EASTII	NG: N 55	4769.07 / E	2351955.77					
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION:	Horizontal (0	°)					
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎N	-S 🗆 E-W	□ NW-SE	□ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A		
DIGITAL IMAGE FI		E: Item 14						





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	10.22.2009 Date				
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A		ER:	N/A				
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	NCELL: 155mm simu	ılant						
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):								
			M:					
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	eel pipe				
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 25.0 lbs								
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:							
DEPTH OF BURIAL	L (to top of item(s)):	48"						
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554776.75 / E 2352006.66								
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: Horizontal (0°	?)						
GENERAL AZIMUT	⁻ H: ■ N-S □ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A				
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 15							





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Mark Kick 10.22.2009 Signature Date						
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/A	ROW NUMBE	E R: N/A						
BURIED ITEM(S) IN CELL: PIG (CAIS) simulant									
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
			M:						
		■ OTHER: hear	vy gauge steel pipe						
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL WEIGHT OF I	BURIED ITEM(S):	85.0 lbs						
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIPTION:								
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	48"							
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554762.37 / E 2351956.90 (North End) N 554764.81 / E 2351958.09 (South End)									
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: Horizontal (0°)							
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎ N-S □ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE-	-SW 🗆 N/A						
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 16								



GPO Location:	RVAAP	•	Site Geoph		rk Kick 10 ature).22.2009 Date			
COLUMN NUMBER	R:	N/A	ROW	NUMBER:	N/#	٩			
BURIED ITEM(S) IN CELL: 75mm simulant									
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
				ED					
				TIAL ITEM:					
				ER: heavy g	auge steel p	vipe			
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 5.0 lbs									
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIP	TION:							
DEPTH OF BURIAI	_ (to to	p of item(s)):	18"						
NORTHING/EASTII	NG: N	554789.66/E 2	351956.55						
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION:	Horizontal (0	°)						
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎	N-S 🗆 E-W	□ NW-SE	□ NE-SW	□ N/A	,			
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAN	IE: Item 17							





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geoph		rk Kick	10.22.2009	<u>9</u> Date		
COLUMN NUMBER	R: N/	A	ROW	NUMBER:	1	N/A			
BURIED ITEM(S) IN CELL: 105mm simulant									
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
				ſED					
				FIAL ITEM:					
				ER: heavy g	auge stee	el pipe			
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 15.0 lbs									
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIPTIC	ON:							
DEPTH OF BURIAI	_ (to top c	f item(s)):	30"						
NORTHING/EASTI	NG: N 554	1785.05/E 2	351960.01						
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION: H	lorizontal (0	°)						
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: □N-	S∎E-W	□ NW-SE	□ NE-SW	/ □ N	/ A			
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME	: Item 18							
			14.252	is the					





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geophy		Mark Kick Signature	10.22.200	9 Date	
COLUMN NUMBER	R:	N/A	ROW N	IUMBE	R:	N/A		
BURIED ITEM(S) IN		: 75mm simul	ant					
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):								
				ED				
				IAL ITEN	И:			
			■ OTHE	R: heav	y gauge ste	el pipe		
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 5.0 lbs								
SOIL PROFILE DESCRIPTION:								
DEPTH OF BURIA	_ (to top	o of item(s)):	36"					
NORTHING/EASTII	NG: N :	554751.52/E 23	351992.06					
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION:	Horizontal (0°)					
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎	N-S 🗆 E-W	□ NW-SE	□ NE-\$	SW 🗆	N/A		
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAN	IE: Item 19						
A REAL								





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geophysic	i st: <u>Mark Ki</u> Signature	<u>ck 10.22.2009</u> Date				
COLUMN NUMBER	R:	N/A	ROW NU	MBER:	N/A				
BURIED ITEM(S) IN		_: 75mm simu	lant						
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
				ITEM:					
			■ OTHER:	heavy gauge	e steel pipe				
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 5.0 lbs									
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIP	TION:							
DEPTH OF BURIAL (to top of item(s)): 24"									
NORTHING/EASTII	NG: N	554752.26/E 2	352016.37						
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION:	: 45°							
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: 🗆	N-S 🗆 E-W	■ NW-SE □	NE-SW	□ N/A				
DIGITAL IMAGE FILENAME Item 20									
	17								



APPENDIX C GEOPHYSICAL DATA AND ELECTRONIC FILES (submitted on compact disc)

APPENDIX D Quality Control Logs
































Site: Revenna **Dataset:** 10/21/2009

Location ID: GPO Survey Date 10/21/2009

QC Check by CS Date: 10/27/2009

Static Test

	Sensor #1	ensor #1											
			Pre Survey			Post Survey							
	CH 1	CH 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858	CH 1	CH 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858			
File Name:			102102A			102117A							
Line #:			L6			L6							
Min:	-1.91	-1.10	45	25		-1.91	-1.10	45	25				
Max:	1.21	.35	.32	.23		1.21	.35	.32	.23				
Mean	38	50	07	.01		38	50	07	.01				
Std:	.51	.19	.11	.07		.51	.19	.11	.07				

Comments:

Static Spike Test

	Sensor #1				-						
			Pre Survey			Post Survey					
	СН 1	CH 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858	CH 1	CH 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858	
File Name:			102102A			102117A					
Line #:	L7					L7					
Min:	123.53	72.25	36.87	15.31		123.53	72.25	36.87	15.31		
Max:	127.16	73.90	37.76	15.78		127.16	73.90	37.76	15.78		
Mean	124.78	72.92	37.17	15.55		124.78	72.92	37.17	15.55		
Std:	.41	.27	.12	.07		.41	.27	.12	.07		

Comments:______

Cable Shake Test

	Sensor #1	ensor #1										
			Pre Survey			Post Survey						
	СН 1	CH 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858	CH 1	CH 2	CH 3	СН 4	G858		
File Name:			102102A			102117A						
Line #:	L9					L9						
Min:	68	50	22	06		68	50	22	06			
Max:	.63	.21	.17	.24		.63	.21	.17	.24			
Mean	05	12	06	.05		05	12	06	.05			
Std:	.27	.14	.08	.06		.27	.14	.08	.06			

Comments:

Site: Revenna **Dataset:** 10/23/2009

Location ID: GPO Survey Date 10/23/2009

QC Check by CS Date: 10/27/2009

Static Test

	Sensor #1										
			Pre Survey			Post Survey					
	CH 1	СН 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858	CH 1	CH 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858	
File Name:			102310A			102316A					
Line #:	LOAM					LOPM					
Min:	-3.64	-1.90	72	40		-33.10	-22.44	-14.52	-6.96		
Max:	.05	.34	.16	.31		06	.28	.11	.16		
Mean	-1.99	72	18	.00		-16.18	-10.50	-6.64	-2.72		
Std:	.71	.36	.13	.09		9.52	6.59	4.21	2.09		

Comments:

Static Spike Test

	Sensor #1										
			Pre Survey			Post Survey					
	СН 1	CH 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858	CH 1	CH 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858	
File Name:			102310A			102316A					
Line #:	L1AM					L1PM					
Min:	138.59	79.11	37.28	14.52		125.62	69.52	30.49	10.67		
Max:	142.58	81.22	38.11	15.02		140.46	78.87	36.53	13.90		
Mean	140.24	79.91	37.68	14.76		134.58	74.85	33.85	12.40		
Std:	.72	.36	.14	.09		2.70	2.00	1.37	.86		

Comments:______

Cable Shake Test

	Sensor #1	ensor #1											
			Pre Survey			Post Survey							
	СН 1	CH 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858	CH 1	СН 2	СН 3	СН 4	G858			
File Name:			102310A			102316A							
Line #:			L3AM			L3PM							
Min:	-4.70	-3.38	-1.29	24		-34.58	-18.59	-9.56	-6.18				
Max:	.53	.29	.26	.30		19.07	17.95	14.90	11.23				
Mean	-1.09	72	20	.03		67	1.74	3.00	2.70				
Std:	1.43	1.02	.41	.11		13.77	10.07	7.70	5.51				

Comments:



Static Calibration	Test	
Project: RVAAP Equipment: EM-61 (1.0x0.5m) Grid/Location: GPO		Allowable failure (%): 20% AM test Outside range Operator: MK Acceptable limits Date: 10/20/2009
+20-Chan1	Expected value: 122 Acceptable range: 24 Failure points: 0%	+14 L1 Expected value: 70 +12 Chan2 Acceptable range: 14 +10 Failure points: 0% +8 - +6 - +4 -
Exp'd		+2- Exp'd - -2- -4- -6- -8- -10-
-20-		-12- -14
14:45:57.42 14:46:13.14 14:46:28.87 +6-L1 Chan3 +4-	14:46:44.60 Expected value: 32 Acceptable range: 6.4 Failure points: 0%	14:45:57.42 14:46:13.14 14:46:28.87 14:46:44.60 +2 L1 Expected value: 12 +2 Chan4 Acceptable range: 2.4 Failure points: 0% Failure points: 0%
+2- Exp'd		Exp'd
-2- -4-		
-6	<u></u>	-2-
14:45:57.42 14:46:13.14 14:46:28.87	14:46:44.60	14:45:57.42 14:46:13.14 14:46:28.87 14:46:44.60
Database: C:\Shaw Projects\RVAAF Line Name: L1	P\Field Data\102014	A.gdb Page: 1



S	tati	c Calik	oration	Test						
Equ	ject: R\ upmen d/Locat	VAAP t: EM-61 (1.0 ion: GPO	0x0.5m)		2	Allow	Outs	illure (%): 20 side range eptable limits		AM test Operator: MK Date: 10/21/2009
+20	L1 _Chan	1		Expected val Acceptable ra Failure poi	nge: 27	+14 +12 +10 +8 +6 +4 +2	-Chan	2		Expected value: 77 Acceptable range: 15 Failure points: 0%
Exp'd -20		~~~~		~~~~~		Exp'd -2 -4 -6 -8 -10	- - - -			•••••
		I			Time->	-12 -14		+		<u></u>
02:28	:45.87	02:29:21.52	02:29:57.18	02:30:32.83 Expected va		02:28	45.87	02:29:21.52	02:29:57.18	02:30:32.8302:31:08 Expected value: 14
+6	Chan	3		Acceptable ran Failure poi	nge: 7.2	+2	Chan	4		Acceptable range: 2.8 Failure points: 0%
+4	-									
+2	-									
Exp'd		- and the second second				Exp'd	-	- the state pro-	an yar beran yi	
-2	-									
-4	-					-2	-			
-6	-	•			Time->	-2				. Time->
02:28	:45.87	02:29:21.52	02:29:57.18	02:30:32.83		02:28	:45.87	02:29:21.52	02:29:57.18	02:30:32.8302:31:0
Dat Line	Database: C:\Shaw Projects\RVAAP\Field Data\102102A.gdb Line Name: L1 Page: 1									







S	tatic Calibrat	tion Test					
Equ	ject: RVAAP lipment: EM-61 (1.0x0.5n d/Location: GPO	n)	Allow	Outs	ilure (%): 20 side range eptable limits		AM test Operator: MK Date: 10/22/2009
+20 Evo'd	L1 Chan1 -	Expected value Acceptable rang Failure points	e: 165 +18 je: 33 +16 s: 0% +14 +12 +10 +8 +6 +4 +2 Exp'd	L1 Chan2 	2		Expected value: 95 Acceptable range: 19 Failure points: 0%
Exp'd -20	-	Ţ	-2 -4 -6 -8 -10 -12 -14 -16 <u>ime-></u> -18				Time->
09:21	:40.31 09:21:55.94 09:2	2:11.57 09:22:27.20	09:21	:40.31	09:21:55.94	09:22:11.57	09:22:27.20
+8 +6 +4	_L1 Chan3 - -	Expected valu Acceptable ran Failure points	ie: 45 ige: 9	L1 Chan4			Expected value: 16 Acceptable range: 3.2 Failure points: 0%
+2	-						
Exp'd -2 -4 -6 -8	-		Exp'd	-			<u>Time-></u>
09:21	:40.31 09:21:55.94 09:2	2:11.57 09:22:27.20	09:21	:40.31	09:21:55.94	09:22:11.57	09:22:27.20
Dat	abase: c:\shaw projects\F e Name: L1	RVAAP\field data\EM6	1 Data\10	22 2009	9\102209A_e	dit.gdb	Page: 1







Static Calibration	Test		
Project: RVAAP Equipment: EM-61 (1.0x0.5m) Grid/Location: GPO		Allowable failure (%): 20% Outside range Acceptable limits	AM test Operator: MK Date: 10/23/2009
+20- ^{L1} +20-	Expected value: 140 Acceptable range: 28 Failure points: 0%	+10 +14 +12 - Chan2 +10 +8 +6 +6 +4 +2	Expected value: 80 Acceptable range: 16 Failure points: 0%
Exp'd -20-	Time->	Exp'd -2- -4- -6- -8- -10- -12- -14- -16	, Time->
10:28:59.64 10:29:45.14 10:30:30.64	10:31:16.14	10:28:59.64 10:29:45.14 10:30:30.64	10:31:16.14
L1 +6-Chan3 +4- +2-	Expected value: 37 Acceptable range: 7.4 Failure points: 0%	+2 +2 +2	Expected value: 14 Acceptable range: 2.8 Failure points: 0%
Exp'd -2- -4- -6-	, Time->	Exp'd -2-	Time->_
10:28:59.64 10:29:45.14 10:30:30.64	10:31:16.14	10:28:59.64 10:29:45.14 10:30:30.64	10:31:16.14
Database: C:\Shaw Projects\RVAAF Line Name: L1	P\Field Data\102310	A.gdb	Page: 1

































APPENDIX E Comment Response Table

March 16, 2010

Page 1 of 7

Comment Number	Page or Sheet	New Page or Sheet	Comment	Recommendation	Response		
			Ohio EPA -	- Eileen Mohr (March 2, 2010)			
O-1	v/12		Acronym change.	Change EQ acronym to EQM.	The acronym EQ will be changed to EQM.		
	Also: 1- 3/29; 8-1/5						
0-2	2-1/24		The text indicates that the GPO site appears to fall within similar soil conditions and geological regimes.	Please clarify similar soil and geologic regimes aswhat? (There are several soil types and formations represented on the maps). Is the intent to indicate that the GPO soil and geologic characteristics are similar to ODA1, SC and MABS?	The text has been modified as follows; "The resolution of Figure 2-2 and Figure 2-3 indicate that the GPO site appears to fall within similar soil conditions and geological regimes as the sites of interest; ODA1, Sand Creek and MABS, for this project. "		
0-3	3-2/16-18		The text indicates that data was initially collected and then when location information became available, the data was converted to NAD83 State Planar coordinates.	Clarify what is meant by "location information" and why it wasn't available prior to data collection.	"Location information" refers to the state planar coordinates for a survey control point or monument. The reasoning behind why the location information was not initially available was that the Robotic Total Station (RTS) and real-time kinematic (RTK) global positioning system (GPS) equipment arrived on site late on the first day of field work. During inspection of the equipment it was discovered that a cable integral to the functioning of the RTK GPS system was missing. The digital geophysical mapping (DGM) data for the RTS were acquired in relative coordinates and translated in state planar coordinates when state planar survey control was available after the first day of field activities. This technique did not result in any decrease in accuracy or impacts to the project. In order to avoid further confusion and		

Revision 0

March 16, 2010

Comment Number	Page or Sheet	New Page or Sheet	Comment	Recommendation	Response
					concern regarding whether data or accuracy has been impacted, lines 16-18 will be revised to: "The data were collected using local coordinates that were subsequently converted to NAD83, Ohio State Plane, North Zone coordinates."
O-4	4-1/12-13		The text indicates that the survey control for the RTK GPS was not available prior to conducting the background survey.	Clarify why survey control was not available prior to conducting the background survey. Any project impact?	Please see the response to comment O-3 regarding the reasoning behind why the survey control was not available prior to conducting the background survey. This technique did not result in any decrease in accuracy or impacts to the project. Lines 12-13 will be revised and clarified as follows: "Both RTK GPS and RTS were used for navigation. Due to initial equipment issues associated with the RTK GPS, the GPO background survey was mapped using the RTS in local coordinates and later translated to NAD83, Ohio State Plane, North Zone coordinates once the RTK equipment issues were resolved. This technique did not result in any decrease in accuracy and both RTK GPS and RTS were used for navigation after the survey control was established."
O-5	4-1/31 to 4-2/2		The text indicates that a higher standard of deviation of measurement was observed for the static measurements from the lower MAG sensor.	a. any impact on the project performance objectives?b. on line 32 should the "and" be removed?	a) There is no impact to the project performance objectives as all performance requirements were achieved. The increased variance in the measurements from the lower sensor is greater than those measured with the higher sensor; the explanation in the text is warranted in order to explain the difference.

Page 2 of 7

Revision 0

March 16, 2010

Comment Number	Page or Sheet	New Page or Sheet	Comment	Recommendation	Response
					b) The word "and" will be removed. The sentence will be revised to state: "All metrics specified in the <i>GPO Work Plan</i> were achieved, although a higher standard deviation of measurements were observed for static measurements from the lower MAG sensor
O-6	5-1/7-10		The text indicates that the anomaly selection criteria should be considered preliminary and will likely be developed further based upon evaluations at Aberdeen and Yuma Proving Grounds.	Please explain. Shouldn't the anomaly selection criteria be "nailed down" prior to conducting the geophysical work here at RVAAP?	The objective of the GPO is to ensure that the geophysical sensors, positioning systems, data acquisition parameters, and data processing, interpretation, and information management systems are working properly and provide data that is of sufficient quantity and quality to meet the project objectives. In the production DGM surveys, all anomalies above the background "noise" will be selected during the interpretation and subsequently classified to the extent possible as being a small, medium, or large metal item. This classification scheme is largely based on our extensive munitions response project experience and data from Aberdeen and Yuma Proving Ground where actual MEC items were buried as opposed to simulants (i.e., pipes) whose anomaly characteristics (signal intensity, shape, etc.) can vary considerably compared to the anomaly characteristics from actual MEC items.
O-7	5-2/30; Also: 5- 2/3; 6-		The text references the 11x guideline.	Please clarify, as the last we were informed, less weight was being placed on the use of the 11x guideline.	The 11X guideline is used in the text for comparative purposes only as there are no specific detection metrics specified in the PWS.

Page 3 of 7

Revision 0

March 16, 2010

Comment Number	Page or Sheet	New Page or Sheet	Comment	Recommendation	Response
	5/10-11; 6- 6/15; 6-7/3				In addition, lines 29-33 on this page presents a methodology for potentially avoiding false positives associated with using the 11X guideline,
O-8	6-3/10		The text indicates that the issue of the in-line and across-line offset distances did not significantly impact the data interpretation of the seed items.	Please clarify what is meant by "significantly." How did it impact the data interpretation?	Lines 10-12 will be revised to state: "Based on the interpretation of the GPO data, this issue did not impact or compromise the capabilities of the G858 system to detect and accurately locate the seed items within the established performance criteria. The GPO site is characterized by flat, level terrain that differs from the terrain present at the Sand Creek disposal area which is largely steep and irregular. As a solution to maintain a constant offset between geophysical and position sensors in steep and irregular terrain, the positioning system sensor should be rigidly mounted at a fixed offset from the DGM sensor in order to provide the most accurate location of the geophysical sensor at all times. If the accurate distance and orientation between the sensors is not maintained the resulting data may not meet some of the performance metrics in steep and irregular terrain. Additional recommendations for DGM survey procedures are presented in Section 7.2 of this report."
O-9	7-1/7-9		The text indicates that the G858 magnetometer will be used at SC due to the "steep and rugged topography" that will limit the safe use of the EM61-MK2 system.	Clarification requested. Won't the EM61- MK2 also be used in the more level areas of the Sand Creek Dump?	Lines 3-4 will be revised to state: "For the DGM project at the RVAAP, an EM61-MK2 survey system integrated with the Leica RTK GPS in open areas (ODA1, MABS and level areas at the top of slope at Sand Creek Dump

Page 4 of 7

March 16, 2010

New Page Comment Page or Sheet or Sheet Number Comment Recommendation Response Site) is recommended." Lines 7-9 will be clarified to state the following: "For the areas at the Sand Creek Dump Site where areas of steep and rugged terrain exist, the G858 magnetometer is proposed, as the steep terrain will limit safe deployment of the EM61-MK2 system." O-10 7-2/6 Please define the first time it is used and Lines 14-16 on page 1-1 have been revised to The acronym GIP appears. state the following: "The GPO fieldwork was add it to the acronym list. conducted at the RVAAP by Shaw from October 20 to 26, 2009 in accordance with the Final Geophysical Prove-Out Plan (GPO) included as Appendix A of the Geophysical Investigation Plan for the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant (GIP; Shaw, 2009)." Since the acronym has now been defined on page 1-1, it will remain as is on page 7-2 and the acronym "GIP" will be added to the acronym list. 0-11 7-2/33-34, Are there any units associated with If yes, please add. The SNR (signal to noise ratio) is a ratio; Also: 7-3/3 the SNR? therefore, there are no units associated with it. O-12 7-3/9-11 The text indicates that in areas of Although this makes sense, please describe The following sentence will be added after line higher anomaly density that there is how this effect is minimized and the 11: "The use of the EM61-MK2 in areas of a much lower probability of potential impact upon the project elevated anomaly density helps to mitigate interference from adjacent anomalies, as well as accurately characterizing each objectives. collecting data at close line spacing and with a anomaly due to interference from adjacent anomalies. high sample rate." It should be noted that in areas of high anomaly

.

Revision 0

Page 5 of 7

March 16, 2010

		1			Fage 0 01 /
Comment Number	Page or Sheet	New Page or Sheet	Comment	Recommendation	Response
					density (>> several hundred anomalies per acre) or where there are overlapping anomaly signatures the ability to determine the relative size and material properties of the buried items becomes increasingly difficult or not possible at all. In this scenario more anomalies usually need to be investigated, and /or alternative anomaly sampling strategies need to be employed (e.g., trenching) which is not included in the scope of work under this task order.
O-13	Fig 1-2		The depiction of the interior of the RVAAP is not accurate. (Most of the features on the west side are not shown.)	Please present a more accurate depiction of the interior features of the RVAAP.	A revised figure will be provided that shows a more accurate depiction of the interior features of the RVAAP.
O-14	Fig 1-3		The inset map does not accurately depict the location of the Sand Creek Dump.	Please revise.	The inset of the map on Figure 1-3 will be revised to accurately depict the location of the Sand Creek Dump at RVAAP.
O-15	Fig 1-4		The inset map does not accurately depict the locations of the MABS and ODA1.	Please revise.	The inset of the map on Figure 1-4 will be revised to accurately depict the location of the MABS and ODA1.
O-16	Fig 2-2		Addition to the legend needed.	Add the soil type names to the legend.	The soil type names will be added to the legend on Figure 2-2.
O-17	Fig 2-3		Make changes to the map.	a. change HomeWood to Homewood. b. change Condomemberling to Conoquenessing. c. clarify what is the Blandon?	The following changes will be made to Figure 2-3: a. HomeWood will be changed to Homewood

Page 6 of 7

March 16, 2010

Page 7 of 7

Comment Number	Page or Sheet	New Page or Sheet	Comment	Recommendation	Response
					b. Condomemberling will be changed to Conoquenessingc. Blandon will be included in the legend
O-18	Fig 2-4		The tree location symbol in the legend does not match what is on the map.	Please rectify the disconnect.	The hatching on the tree symbols in these figures will be revised to be consistent with the legend.

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX F Ohio EPA Approval Letter

Note: This is a placeholder page. Shaw will supply a signed authorization page to be inserted into the final hard copy document as soon as it becomes available. Replacement CDs that include the signed authorization page will also be supplied.

This page intentionally left blank.