#### **DISCLAIMER STATEMENT**

This report is a work prepared for the United States Government by Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. In no event shall either the United States Government or the United States Army Corps of Engineers have any responsibility or liability for any consequences of any use, misuse, inability to use, or reliance on the information contained herein, nor does either warrant or otherwise represent in any way the accuracy, adequacy, efficacy, or applicability of the contents hereof.

8

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to the Department of Defense, Executive Service Directorate (0704-0188). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 05/02/2010	2. REPC	DRT TYPE Draft			3. DATES COVERED (From - To) October 2009 - February 2010
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE		Diuit		5a. CON	NTRACT NUMBER
					W912QR-08-D-0013
Draft Geophysical Prove-Out Report for	or Enviror	mental Services at RVA	AP-34 Sand	5b. GRA	ANT NUMBER
Mustard Agent Burial Site	P-03 Open	Demolition Area #1, and	a RVAAP-28	and an an an an an	N/A
				5c. PRC	OGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
					N/A
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PRC	DJECT NUMBER
	a 10000a an				133616
Tim Deignan, Corby Schmalz, and Ma	rk Kick			5e. TAS	SK NUMBER
					11002400
				5f. WOF	RK UNIT NUMBER
					N/A
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NA	ME(S) AN	D ADDRESS(ES)			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION
Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure,	Inc.	ζ, γ			REPORT NUMBER
100 Technology Center Drive					DT/A
Stoughton, MA 02072					IN/A
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGE		E(S) AND ADDRESS(ES	)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Louis	ville Distr	ict	,		CELRI -ED-EE
600 Martin Luther King, Jr. Place					
Louisville, K.Y. 40202 11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)					
			N/A		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY ST	ATEMENT	Į.			
Reference distribution page.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
None					
<b>14. ABSTRACT</b> The purpose of this Geophysical Prove	-Out Ren	ort is to provide a summa	rv of field activ	vities asso	ciated with the performance of the geophysical
prove-out (GPO) and present associated correlation and quality control evaluations of the collected data. The results of the GPO will serve as the					
basis for the selection of appropriate equipment to perform proposed geophysical surveys 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					
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	(8 tai <sup>n</sup>	500 E 9		i Max a	
Geophysical Prove-Out, RVAAP-03, Open Demolition Area #1, RVAAP-28, Mustard Agent Burial Site, RVAAP-34, Sand Creek Disposal Road					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: 17. LIMITATION OF 18. NUMBER 19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON					
a. REPORT b. ABSTRACT c. TH	IS PAGE	ABSTRACT	OF PAGES	David	d Crispo
Unclassified Unclassified Unc	lassified	UL	154	19b. TEL	EPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 617.589.8146
		I	1	1	Reset Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8/90 Prescribed by ANSI Std 739

#### **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.

1 2	Draft Geophysical Prove-Out Report for Environmental Services at RVAAP-34 Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill_RVAAP-03
$\frac{2}{3}$	Onen Demolition Area #1, and RVAAP-28 Mustard Agent Burial Site
4	Version 1.0
5	
6	
7	
8	<b>Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant</b>
9	Ravenna, Ohio 44266-9297
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	<b>Contract No. W912QR 08 D 0013</b>
16	Delivery Order 0002
17	
18	Prepared for:
19	
	US Army Corps
•	of Engineers ®
20	Louisville District
$\frac{21}{22}$	L ouisville Kontucky 40202
22	Louisvine, Kentucky 40202
23 74	
2 <del>1</del> 25	
26	
27	
28	Prepared by:
29	
30	Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
31	100 Technology Center Drive
32	Stoughton, MA 02072
33	
34	<b>February 5, 2010</b>
35	

### **DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION**

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	2	2

2

1

- 3 BRAC Base Realignment and Closure
- 4 NGB National Guard Bureau
- 5 OHARNG Ohio Army National Guard
- 6 Ohio EPA Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
- 7 RVAAP Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
- 8 USAEC U.S. Army Environmental Command
- 9 USACE U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Louisville District
- 10 Shaw Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.

### CONTRACTOR'S STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW

.

3 Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. has completed the Draft Geophysical Prove-Out Report for Environmental Services at RVAAP-34 Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill, RVAAP-03 Open Demolition 4 5 Area 1, and RVAAP-28 Mustard Agent Burial Site at the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, 6 Ohio. Notice is hereby given that an independent technical review has been conducted that is appropriate 7 to the level of risk and complexity inherent in the project. During the independent technical review, 8 compliance with established policy, principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, 9 was verified. This included review of data quality objectives; technical assumptions; methods, procedures 10 and materials to be used; the appropriateness of data used and level of data obtained; and reasonableness 11 of the results, including whether the product meets customer's needs consistent with law and existing 12 Corps policy.

Reviewed/Approved by:	David Cobb Project/Program Manager	Date:	02/05/2010
Reviewed/Approved by:	Timothy Deignan Project Scientist	Date:	02/05/2010
Prepared by:	Corby Schmalz Environmental Scientist	Date:	02/05/2010

13

# 1 Table of Contents\_

2	List o	of Figure	es	iii		
3	List o	of Tables	S	iv		
4	List of Appendices					
5	Acro	nyms ar	nd Abbreviations	V		
6						
7	1.0	Introc	duction	1-1		
8		1.1	Purpose and Scope	1-1		
9		1.2	Geophysical Prove-Out Objectives	1-1		
10		1.3	Site Description and Background	1-2		
11			1.3.1 Sand Creek	1-2		
12			1.3.2 Open Demolition Area #1	1-3		
13			1.3.3 Mustard Agent Burial Site	1-3		
14	2.0	Geop	ohysical Prove-Out Test Grid	2-1		
15		2.1	GPO Test Plot	2-1		
16		2.2	Background Survey	2-1		
17		2.3	Seed Items	2-2		
18		2.4	GPO Test Grid As-Built Map	2-3		
19	3.0	Instru	umentation	3-1		
20		3.1	Geophysical Instruments	3-1		
21			3.1.1 Geometrics G-858G			
22			3.1.2 Geonics EM61-MK2	3-1		
23		3.2	Navigation Equipment			
24			3.2.1 Leica Robotic Total Station			
25			3.2.2 Leica Real-Time Kinematic Global Positioning System			
26	4.0	Geop	ohysical Prove-Out Procedures	4-1		
27		4.1	Survey Modes	4-1		
28		4.2	Calibration Tests	4-1		
29		4.3	G858 Magnetic Survey	4-2		
30		4.4	EM61-MK2 Electromagnetic Survey	4-2		
31	5.0	Geop	physical Data Processing	5-1		
32		5.1	G858 Data Processing and Target Selection	5-1		
33			5.1.1 G858 Data Processing	5-1		
34			5.1.2 G858 Target Selection	5-1		
35		5.2	EM61-MK2 Data Processing and Target Selection	5-2		
36			5.2.1 EM61-MK2 Data Processing	5-2		
37			5.2.2 EM6-MK2 Target Selection	5-2		
38	6.0	Resu	lts	6-1		
39		6.1	Data Quality Objectives	6-1		
40			6.1.1 Background Noise	6-1		
41			6.1.2 Mean Speed	6-1		
42			6.1.3 Along Track Sampling	6-2		
43			6.1.4 Across Track Sampling	6-2		
44			6.1.5 Latency Correction	6-3		

1			6.1.6 Data Leveling	6-3
2			6.1.7 Anomaly Selection	6-3
3			6.1.8 Known Location Calibration Positional Check	6-3
4			6.1.9 Dynamic Calibration Positional Check	6-4
5			6.1.10 Known Location QC Items	6-4
6			6.1.11 Reacquisition	6-4
7			6.1.12 False Positives	6-4
8		6.2	G858 Magnetometer Results	6-4
9			6.2.1 Total Field Magnetic Data	6-5
10			6.2.2 Magnetic Gradient Data	6-6
11		6.3	EM61-MK2 Electromagnetic Results	6-6
12	7.0	Reco	ommendations	7-1
13		7.1	Selected DGM Survey Equipment	7-1
14		7.2	Recommendations for DGM Survey Procedures	7-1
15			7.2.1 Transect Surveys	7-1
16			7.2.2 Grid Surveys	7-1
17		7.3	Recommendations for DGM Data Processing and Target Selection	7-2
18			7.3.1 Data Processing	7-2
19			7.3.2 Target Selection	7-2
20		7.4	Recommendations for Target Reacquisition	7-3
21	8.0	Refe	rences	8-1
22				

# 1 List of Figures

Figure 1-1	Location Map
Figure 1-2	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
	Figure 1-1 Figure 1-2 Figure 1-3 Figure 2-1 Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4 Figure 2-5 Figure 6-1 Figure 6-2 Figure 6-3 Figure 6-3 Figure 6-5 Figure 6-6 Figure 6-7 Figure 6-8 Figure 6-9 Figure 6-10 Figure 6-11 Figure 6-12

\_\_\_\_

# 1 List of Tables

- 2 Table 2-1 Size Comparison of Actual Items to Simulants
- 3 Table 2-2 Summary Table of GPO Field Items
- 4 Table 2-3 GPO Grid Corners
- 5 Table 5-1 G858 Anomaly Selection Thresholds and Background Noise Levels
- 6 Table 5-2 EM61-MK2 Anomaly Selection Thresholds and Background Noise Levels
- 7 Table 6-1 Calculated Background Noise Levels
- 8 Table 6-2 GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTS Configuration Total Field
- 9 Table 6-3 GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTK GPS Configuration Total Field
- 10 Table 6-4 GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTS Configuration Gradient
- 11 Table 6-5 GPO Targets from Magnetometer Data Using RTK GPS Configuration Gradient
- 12 Table 6-6 GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTS Configuration Channel 2
- 13 Table 6-7 GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTS Configuration Sum4
- 14 Table 6-8 GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTS GPS Configuration Channel 2
- 15 Table 6-9 GPO Targets from Electromagnetic Data Using RTS GPS Configuration Sum4
- 16

#### 17 18 List of Appendices

- 19 Appendix A Photographs
- 20 Appendix B Buried Seed Item Descriptions
- 21 Appendix C Geophysical Data and Electronic Files
- 22 Appendix D Quality Control Logs
- 23
- Note: The data in Appendix C are 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.

# 1 Acronyms and Abbreviations

2	AOC	Area of Concern
3	AS	analytic signal
4	cm	centimeter(s)
5	DGM	digital geophysical mapping
6	DID	Data Item Description
7	DQO	data quality objective
8	DO	Delivery Order
9	DoD	Department of Defense
10	EM	electromagnetic
11	EM61-MK2	Geonics EM61-MK2 TDEM metal detector
12	EQ	Environmental Quality Management
13	ESTCP	Environmental Security Technology Certification Program
14	G858	Geometrics G-858G cesium vapor magnetometer
15	GPO	Geophysical Prove-Out
16	GPS	global positioning system
17	Hz	hertz
18	IRP	Installation Restoration Program
19	ITRC	Interstate Technology and Regulatory Cooperation
20	MABS	RVAAP-28 Mustard Agent Burial Site
21	MAG	magnetic
22	MEC	munitions and explosives of concern
23	MKM	MKM Engineers, Inc.
24	mm	millimeter(s)
25	MMRP	Military Munitions Response Program
26	mV	millivolts
27	mph	mile(s) per hour
28	NACA	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics
29	NAD83	North American Datum 1983
30	NMEA	National Marine Electronics Association
31	nT	nanoTesla(s)
32	nT/ft	nanoTesla(s) per foot
33	OB/OD	open burning/open detonation
34	ODA1	RVAAP-03 Open Demolition Area #1
35	OHARNG	Ohio Army National Guard
36	Ohio EPA	Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
37	QC	quality control
38	RI	remedial investigation
39	RTK	real-time kinematic
40	RTS	robotic total station
41	RVAAP	Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
42	SAIC	Science Applications International Corporation
43	SDZ	safety danger zone
44	SERDP	Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program

1	Shaw	Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
2	SNR	signal to noise ratio
3	Sum4	sum of the four leveled data channels
4	TDEM	time-domain electromagnetic
5	USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
6	UXO	unexploded ordnance
7		

# 1 1.0 Introduction

### 2 **1.1** *Purpose and Scope*

3 This Geophysical Prove-Out Report (GPO Report) evaluates and documents the performance of 4 the geophysical equipment and survey techniques that will best support the execution of digital 5 geophysical mapping (DGM) at three Areas of Concern (AOCs) at the Ravenna Army 6 Ammunition Plant (RVAAP). The AOCs include RVAAP-34 Sand Creek Disposal Road 7 Landfill (Sand Creek), RVAAP-03 Open Demolition Area #1 (ODA1), and RVAAP-28 Mustard 8 Agent Burial Site (MABS). This GPO was performed by Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, 9 Inc. (Shaw) on behalf of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Louisville 10 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 11 was issued by USACE on September 22, 2008. 12

# 13 **1.2** Geophysical Prove-Out Objectives

14 The GPO fieldwork was conducted at the RVAAP by Shaw from October 20 to 26, 2009 in 15 accordance with the Final Geophysical Prove-Out Plan for the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant 16 (Shaw, 2009), hereafter referred to as the GPO Work Plan. The GPO was performed to validate 17 the electromagnetic (EM), magnetic (MAG), and positioning system instrumentation for DGM 18 surveys for munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) and other suspected buried anomalies at 19 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 20 21 (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

25

- Proposed geophysical equipment, techniques, and methodologies
  - Justification for recommendations
- 29 The accompanying compact discs contain:
- Electronic copy of this report and all appendices
- Raw and processed data
- Target lists in Excel format

# 1 **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**).

9 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

12 consists of 1,280 acres in several distinct parcels scattered throughout the confines of the Camp

13 Ravenna Joint Military Training center (Camp Ravenna). RVAAP's remaining parcels of land

14 are located completely within Camp Ravenna. Camp Ravenna did not exist when RVAAP was

15 operational, and the entire 21,683-acre parcel was a government-owned, contractor-operated

- 16 industrial facility.
- 17 The RVAAP Installation Restoration Program (IRP) encompasses investigation and cleanup of
- 18 past activities over the entire 21,683 acres of the former RVAAP. Therefore, references to the
- 19 RVAAP in this document are considered to be inclusive of the historical extent of the RVAAP,
- 20 which is inclusive of the combined acreages of the current Camp Ravenna and RVAAP, unless
- 21 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.
- 23 Department of Defense (DoD) IRP.

# 24 1.3.1 Sand Creek

25 The Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill (Figure 1-3) is a former construction debris dump. 26 Materials identified in the debris include transite, concrete and brick rubble, drywall, glass, scrap 27 metal, and wood. Previous work included the removal of the surface debris. An empty 105 28 millimeter (mm) projectile was previously found downstream from the Sand Creek site. 75mm 29 casings have also been discovered in the area (MKM, 2004). The site currently receives 30 occasional foot traffic from military, security, and maintenance personnel as well as natural 31 resource management activities. This site will be used as part of the Safety Danger Zone (SDZ) 32 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

1-2

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.

### 4 1.3.2 Open Demolition Area #1

5 The ODA1 (Figure 1-4) full coverage for the proposed DGM investigation area is approximately 6 8.6 acres and extends beyond ODA1 into the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics 7 (NACA) Test Area (RVAAP-38). ODA1 was used during the 1940s for the open burning and 8 open detonation (OB/OD) of munitions, explosives, and related debris. The material was brought 9 to the site and burned or detonated for demolition purposes, with the resulting scrap and debris 10 pushed to the sides. Because of these activities and the potential for munitions kickout, there is a 11 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 12 13 designated as a limited access area due to the potential risk for MEC. Future proposed military 14 training activities at this site will include dismounted training and field bivouac activities.

15 ODA1 is relatively flat and covered with grass. Previously, fragmentation from a 90mm shell 16 was found at ODA1. An interim removal action to remove surface and subsurface MEC scrap 17 and debris was conducted in 2000 to address issues identified in the previous Phase I Remedial 18 Investigation (RI) (SAIC, 2001). The Phase I RI was focused on the OB/OD area of ODA 1. 19 Currently an approximately 1-foot-high earthen berm within the site surrounds the 1.5-acre 20 former OB/OD area. The full coverage DGM area is bounded on three sides by woods and is 21 bisected by an access road. Geophysical transect survey data will be used as an aid in 22 determining the extent of the debris. The transect surveys will extend into the woods.

### 23 1.3.3 Mustard Agent Burial Site

24 The suspected MABS area to be investigated under this task order is open and flat (Figure 1-4). 25 The full coverage DGM area is approximately 6,000 square feet and is located south of the 26 former operations building. Two strips, one north and one south of the concrete crash strip, 27 comprise the investigation site. It has been reported that steel shipping cylinders (also known as 28 PIGs), paint cans, and 55 gallon drums may have been buried west of the current study area, 29 although actual physical confirmation has yet to be achieved (EQ, 2008). The proposed 30 investigation area is currently being used for military training. Future proposed military training 31 activities will include dismounted training and field bivouac activities.

This page intentionally left blank.

# 1 **2.0 Geophysical Prove-Out Test Grid**

### 2 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.

10 Based on our past project experience at sites with similar environmental characteristics to those 11 at RVAAP, Shaw proposes to survey the Sand Creek Disposal Road Landfill with a G858 12 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 13 14 mapped with an EM61-MK2 TDEM [time-domain EM] metal detector and real-time kinematic 15 (RTK) global positioning system (GPS), as these AOCs are "open" and generally void of rugged 16 terrain. The intent of this GPO is to prove-out each DGM system for its proposed application at 17 the site.

The site geology at the RVAAP is sedimentary bedrock overlain by a thin veneer of glacial 18 19 sediments (tills and outwash deposits). Bedrock at the RVAAP is predominantly covered by the 20 Wisconsin age Hiram and Kent till and is overlain by the Lavery and Hiram tills with glacial 21 outwash deposits covering the northern corner of the site. A soils map with the location of the 22 GPO test grid is provided in Figure 2-2. The geologic map provided in Figure 2-3 shows the 23 local geology underlying the GPO site. The resolution of Figure 2-2 and Figure 2-3 indicate that 24 the GPO site appears to fall within similar soil conditions and geological regimes. To simulate 25 actual site conditions, small trees (greater than 3 inches in diameter) located within the GPO site 26 were not removed. Photographs of the GPO site are presented in Appendix A.

# 27 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 preseed 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

- 1 for the GPO, the existing subsurface anomalies were avoided during the placement of the seed
- 2 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.

# 10 **2.3 Seed Items**

Inert "simulants" of the ordnance items and the PIG containers that may be encountered at the 11 12 three AOCs were seeded in the GPO site test grid at varying depths and orientations. The test 13 grid location, seed item coordinates, and survey navigation data are referenced to the North 14 American Datum 1983 (NAD83), Ohio North State Plane coordinates, CS83 North Zone in U.S. 15 survey feet. The seed items consisted of simulants due to the lack of availability or accessibility 16 of inert ordnance items and PIG containers at the RVAAP, or at other similar installations from 17 which Shaw requested them. The simulants were cut from heavy gauge (schedule 40) steel pipe 18 with end caps (simulants with pipe diameters less than 4 inches) in an attempt to replicate the 19 general dimensions of each ordnance type. For the simulants with pipe diameters greater than 4 20 inches (105mm, 155mm and PIGs), the pipe ends were welded. Table 2-1 describes the actual 21 size of the items and the corresponding sizes of the simulants that were buried.

22 The GPO contains 20 simulant seed items (three PIGs, five 90mm, two 105mm, three 155mm) 23 projectiles and seven 75mm shells) that were placed in 20 excavations. This information is 24 presented in Table 2-2. The selected location for each seed item was marked with a numbered 25 pin flag. Each location was then excavated in turn, and the appropriate seed item was placed in 26 the excavation. Depths were confirmed with a carpenter's tape measure. Inclinations and 27 azimuths of each item were then measured with a Brunton Pocket Transit (compass) adjusted to 28 the local magnetic declination. The final location of each item was then acquired with the RTS. 29 PIG items that were buried horizontal were location-surveyed at both ends of the item. Each item 30 was then photographed in place, and the excavations were backfilled to grade. Appendix B 31 contains photographs of each seed item and also presents information regarding the coordinates, 32 depth, orientation, azimuth, and a description of each item.

# 1 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

- 4 deeper than the performance metric of 11 times the diameter of the object are also indicated on
- 5 the as-built map. The GPO control points are presented in **Table 2-3**.

This page intentionally left blank.

# 1 3.0 Instrumentation

2 The following sections describe the instruments used at the RVAAP during the GPO. The 3 deployment strategies for these systems are described in more detail in **Section 4.0** of this report.

### 4 3.1 Geophysical Instruments

### 5 **3.1.1 Geometrics G-858G**

6 Gradiometer and total field MAG survey data were obtained using the Geometrics G-858G 7 cesium vapor magnetometer (G858) carried with the shoulder-mounted harness system supplied 8 with the instrument. The G858 is an optically pumped cesium vapor instrument that measures the 9 intensity of the earth's magnetic field in nanoTeslas (nT). At the RVAAP, the total MAG 10 intensity is approximately 55,700 nT, with an inclination of about 69 degrees down and a 11 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.

### 16 **3.1.2 Geonics EM61-MK2**

17 The EM61-MK2 was used to acquire EM data at the RVAAP GPO test grid. The EM61-MK2 is 18 a four-channel, high-sensitivity TDEM sensor designed to detect shallow ferrous and nonferrous 19 metallic objects with good spatial resolution and minimal interference from adjacent metallic 20 features. The EM61-MK2 consists of two 1- by 0.5-meter rectangular coils stacked 21 40 centimeters (cm) apart with the source/receiver coil located below a second receiver coil. A 22 square wave EM pulse is generated with "time on" (positive and negative) and "time off" cycles. 23 This induces subsurface eddy currents with an associated secondary magnetic field. The decay of 24 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 25 26 materials and buried metal (ferrous and nonferrous) because the secondary field in metallic 27 objects decays at a much slower rate than earth materials. Although the EM61-MK2 is capable of 28 measuring a differential, calculated as the voltage difference between the top and bottom coils, 29 for this project, data were recorded at four time gates from the bottom coil. The time gate values 30 are 216, 366, 600, and 1,266 microseconds for Channels 1 through Channel 4, respectively. The 31 responses at these four specified time gates are recorded and displayed by an integrated system 32 data logger. Unless otherwise specified, the EM61-MK2 results are presented in this report as 33 Channel 2 and the Sum4 response, which is the sum of the four leveled data channels.

1 The utilization of the Sum4 response for the picking of MEC targets, rather than the standard of 2 solely utilizing Channel 2, is primarily due to the increase in signal. The increase in signal from 3 using the sum of the channels may provide better detection for some deeply buried targets 4 (Bosnar, 2001).

3.2 Navigation Equipment 5

#### 6 3.2.1 Leica Robotic Total Station

7 The Leica TPS1200 series total station is a motorized RTS that uses automatic target recognition 8 to track the location of a 360-degree survey prism and has a distance/azimuth measurement 9 system to produce accuracy within plus or minus 5 mm plus 2 parts per million for both lateral 10 and vertical coordinates. Firmware used on the RTS base station to track the roving prism allows 11 for rapid collection of data at rates up to 4 hertz (Hz) and serial output of solutions on both the 12 base station and rover computing units. This firmware also enables the user to optimize the prism 13 tracking parameters for rapid recovery of lock if obstructed by trees during a survey. The Leica 14 RTS collected integrated real-time positioning data during the GPO surveys by streaming a 15 "pseudo-NMEA [National Marine Electronics Association] data" string directly into the 16 geophysical instrument's data logger. The data were collected using local coordinates and 17 subsequently converted to NAD83, Ohio State Plane, North Zone coordinates when the location 18 information became available.

#### 19 Leica Real-Time Kinematic Global Positioning System 3.2.2

20 The RTK GPS uses a base station that is set up based on a known position. Once the base station 21 is established, it determines its location using satellites and then applies a correction based on the 22 offset from the known coordinates at the location. This correction is then used by a rover that is 23 in direct communication with the base station through a radio link. The rover is usually deployed 24 within several miles of the base station. At longer distances, line of sight is required; at shorter 25 distances (as in this survey) line of sight is not required. RTK GPS is capable of taking survey-26 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. 27

3-2

# 1 **4.0** Geophysical Prove-Out Procedures

### 2 4.1 Survey Modes

3 Site conditions at the GPO are representative of most of the field conditions that will be 4 encountered during the large-scale field investigation, with the exception of the steep, rugged 5 terrain and areas of vegetation over some portions of Sand Creek.

6 Full coverage (2 dimensional) and transect (1 dimensional) survey modes were originally 7 planned for the GPO evaluation using the same plot. Full coverage was achieved through 8 deploying the sensor systems and collecting sub-parallel survey lines spaced less than 3 feet 9 apart. Although 2D DGM protocol was proven at the GPO, the same general protocol will be 10 used to collect 1D data, given the only difference between 2D and 1D is the distance between 11 adjacent acquisition lines.

Both RTK GPS and RTS were used for navigation. Because survey control for the RTK GPS was not initially available, the GPO background survey was mapped using the RTS in local coordinates. Both RTK GPS and RTS were used for navigation after survey control was established. Survey paint was used to mark the instrument line paths during data acquisition.

16 Raw and processed instrument data are included in **Appendix C**.

### 17 **4.2** Calibration Tests

18 An area determined to be representative of "background" was established outside of the GPO test 19 grid and was used as a functional check area before and after data collection with both the G858

20 and EM61-MK2 geophysical instruments. As described in DID MR-005-05 (USACE, 2003a),

- 21 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

30 All instrumentation QC tests were performed as specified in Table 7-1 of the GPO Work Plan

31 (Shaw, 2009). All metrics specified in the GPO Work Plan were achieved, although a higher

32 standard deviation of measurements and were observed for static measurements from the lower

Draft

1 MAG sensor. One possible cause could be related to small movements of the lower sensor when

- 2 it is proximal to the ground surface. Appendix D contains the results of the quality tests
- 3 performed during the GPO.

# 4 4.3 G858 Magnetic Survey

5 The G858 was deployed in man-portable, vertical gradient mode using the shoulder-mounted 6 harness system provided with the G858 unit. The vertical sensor separation between the two 7 sensors was 2 feet with the sensors mounted at 16 and 40 inches above the ground surface, 8 respectively. A jig was constructed prior to mobilization to allow the GPS antenna and the RTS 9 prism to mount directly above the MAG sensors; however, it was not stable enough to collect 10 data, and it was necessary to wear the backpack with the GPS antenna or the RTS prism 11 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.

# 26 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.

# 1 **5.0 Geophysical Data Processing**

2 This section presents the data processing procedures and target selection criteria that were used 3 to complete the GPO in accordance with the *GPO Work Plan* (Shaw, 2009).

4 It should be noted that the simulants (i.e., pipes) utilized for the GPO were used to ensure the 5 proposed geophysical systems can collect data of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the 6 project objectives, and that the field protocol and data processing systems produce representative 7 and precise results. The anomaly selection criteria is considered preliminary, and will likely be 8 developed further with the client based primarily on the results from the government sponsored 9 sensor evaluations at Aberdeen and Yuma Proving Grounds and nationwide GPOs, for which 10 large volumes of data exist for actual inert UXO items (ESTCP et al., 2006).

# 11 5.1 G858 Data Processing and Target Selection

### 12 **5.1.1 G858 Data Processing**

The G858 MAG data, including both the survey and base station data, were downloaded to a 13 laptop computer in the field using Geometrics Magmap 2000<sup>®</sup> software. The data were verified 14 and backed up prior to G858 system demobilization. Magmap 2000<sup>®</sup> was used to remove drop 15 16 outs and to perform the sensor offset position corrections. Data for the GPO were collected in 17 local coordinates using RTS navigation and then translated into NAD83 Ohio State Plane North 18 Zone coordinates. RTK GPS data were collected in geographic coordinates and translated into 19 state plane coordinates at a later time using a combination of both Magmap and Geosoft. Geosoft 20 was also used for additional data processing, including spike removal, lag correction, and final 21 data leveling using a 200-point median filter. A 5-point non-linear filter was applied to the top 22 sensor data to smooth the data and remove small amplitude dropouts prior to calculation of the 23 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**.

### 31 5.1.2 G858 Target Selection

32 Analysis of the GPO data indicates that geologic noise, background levels, and terrain responses

33 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
- 7 vertical magnetic gradient data proposed thresholds are provided in **Table 5-1**.

8 The results of the target lists and analyses for the total field and magnetic gradient data sets for 9 the G858G are discussed in **Section 6.2**.

# 10 5.2 EM61-MK2 Data Processing and Target Selection

### 11 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.

19 The Channel 1, 2, and Sum4 data channels were interpolated using the minimum curvature 20 routine in Geosoft at a cell size of 0.5 foot and blanking distance of 2 feet. The line path was 21 transposed onto the color coded image, and an appropriate color scale selected based on the data 22 statistics.

23 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.

# 25 5.2.2 EM6-MK2 Target Selection

26 The Sum4 along with the single time gate of Channel 2 were the primary data channels 27 reviewed. Based on a review of the anomaly characteristics for the seed items and the 28 background noise levels listed in Table 5-2 a threshold value of approximately 3 mV for 29 Channel 2 and a Sum4 threshold of 8 mV is proposed in order to detect all seed items. If seed 30 items at or very near the 11X guideline are not of interest, the threshold should be increased to 8 31 mV and 16 mV for Channel 2 and the Sum4 channel, respectively. This approach maximizes the 32 detection ability above the 11X guideline while potentially minimizing high numbers of false 33 positives.

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

### 1 6.0 Results

Draft

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 6.1 Data Quality Objectives

7 The following sections demonstrate that the data collected for the GPO meets the intent of the 8 DQOs specified in the *GPO Work Plan* (Shaw, 2009). The DQOs for the GPO include the 9 following metrics; background noise based on leveled survey data set, mean speed, along track 10 sampling, across track sampling, latency correction, data leveling, anomaly selection, positioning 11 errors, known location of QC items, and false positives. Reacquisition of anomalies will not be 12 conducted under this DO.

#### 13 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.

#### 17 **6.1.2 Mean Speed**

18 Based on the results of the field GPO, a reasonable value for the mean speed metric (percent of 19 measurements collected at less than 3 miles per hour [mph]) was determined to be a value greater 20 than 95 percent for "wheel based" acquisition systems, such as the EM61-MK2, that is used in a 21 flat terrain environment. A total of 97.79 percent of the measurements were acquired at a mean 22 speed of less than 3 mph for the EM61-MK2 data using the RTS equipment, which exceeds the 23 metric of 95 percent. A total of 96.9 percent of the measurements were acquired at a mean speed 24 of less than 3 mph for the EM61-MK2 data using the RTK GPS equipment, which exceeds the 25 metric of 95 percent. The velocity data for the EM61 surveys are presented in Appendix D.

26 Based on the results of the field GPO, a reasonable value for the mean speed metric (percent of 27 measurements collected at less than 3 mph) was determined to be a value greater than 90 percent 28 for systems where the sensor is hand carried in front of the operator in rugged terrain as will be 29 the case for the G858 at the Sand Creek site. The velocity data for the G858 magnetometer 30 surveys using both the RTS and RTK GPS indicate that greater than 95 percent of the 31 measurements were acquired at a mean speed of less than 3 mph. The calculations were 32 performed directly in Oasis Montaj using the sample to sample distance and the G858 sample rate of 0.1 seconds. 33

### 1 6.1.3 Along Track Sampling

The metric for along track sampling is less than 0.6 feet with cumulative gaps of less than 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**.

9 For the G858 data acquired with the RTS and RTK GPS greater than 98 percent of the 10 measurements were acquired at an along track sampling of less than 0.6 foot, which achieves the 11 metric. The calculations were performed directly in Oasis Montaj using the difference between 12 successive measurements of the distance channel.

### 13 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
- 22 EM61 RTK GPS: 99.83 percent (accounting for trees with polygon)
- EM61 RTS: 99.67 percent
- 24 EM61 RTS: 99.79 percent (accounting for trees with polygon)
- MAG RTK GPS: 98.37 percent
- 26 MAG RTK GPS: 98.67 percent (accounting for trees with polygon)
- MAG RTS: 97.00 percent
- 28 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**.

### 1 6.1.5 Latency Correction

2 The metric for latency correction is no visible chevron effects in the final processed data sets 3 used to create the color-coded images. Lag corrections were applied such that no chevron effects 4 that could adversely affect the data interpretation are present in the processed data for the EM61-5 MK2 datasets. The G858 datasets were acquired with the positioning sensor located on the 6 backpack of the instrument operator while the actual geophysical sensor was transported in front 7 of the operator. The operator attempted to maintain a constant offset between the geophysical 8 and position sensors during data collection; however, data artifacts resulting from small changes 9 to the in-line and across-line offset distances are visible in the final processed MAG datasets. 10 While this issue did not significantly impact the data interpretation of the seed items, possible 11 solutions for this issue for the proposed survey at Sand Creek are provided in Section 7.2 of this 12 report.

### 13 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.

### 18 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.

### 30 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.

- 2 All were within 0.5 feet, which achieved the metric. Results for the positional check for known
- 3 locations are presented in the Truth Tables in **Appendix D**.

### 4 6.1.9 Dynamic Calibration Positional Check

5 The metric for dynamic calibration positional check is based on cumulative errors not to exceed 6 2.5 feet. Related tests for this metric include the 6-Line and repeat line tests, which are 7 summarized in **Appendix D**. Both of these tests exhibit that the metric was achieved. Interpreted 8 anomaly "centroid" and/or peak position offsets to the mapped locations of the seed items 9 averaged less than 2.5 feet.

### 10 6.1.10 Known Location QC Items

11 The metric for known location QC items is within 2.5 feet of their known locations. Assessment

12 of the grid corner hubs anomaly pick locations at the GPO site indicates that the hubs are being 12

13 located within 2.5 feet of their known location.

### 14 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

18 production surveys.

# 19 6.1.12 False Positives

20 The metric is for false positives to be kept to a minimum. The definition of a false positive in 21 DID MR-005-05 (USACE, 2003a) is "anomalies reacquired by the Contractor result(ing) in no 22 detectable metallic material recovered during excavations, calculated as a running average for 23 the sector." Prior to seeding the GPO plot, Shaw conducted a pre-seed survey to locate existing 24 geophysical anomalies such that "background" locations could be selected for burial of the seed 25 items. Numerous preexisting small to large anomalies detected by the EM61-MK2 were present 26 as depicted on Figure 2-4. These anomalies were left in place during plot construction so that the 27 plot is as representative as possible of site conditions that might be encountered during the largescale field investigations at the three sites. A large percentage of the anomalies detected in the 28 29 pre-seed DGM survey are also identified in the post-seed DGM surveys, suggesting that a 30 significant number of them are due to buried metal objects and are not false positives.

# 31 6.2 G858 Magnetometer Results

32 The G858 target selections for both the total magnetic field and vertical gradient correlate well

33 with the known seed item locations. "Shadowing" of some of the seed item anomalies in close

34 proximity occurred in the total magnetic field data; however, the gradient data and 1D profile

6-4

1 analysis was used to minimize this effect. Fifteen (15) of the seed items were buried at a

2 horizontal orientation, and 6 items were oriented at or near a perpendicular azimuth to magnetic

3 north (i.e., generally east west). Both of these factors represent a worst-case scenario in terms of

4 the signal response characteristics for a magnetometer.

5 Items that were not consistently interpreted in three of the magnetic datasets include the 6 following seed items:

- 7 Item Number 11 (75 mm simulant at 2.5 foot depth)
  - Item Numbers 12 and 13 (90mm simulant at 4 foot depth)
- 9 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 11Xguideline for detection depth.

12 Additional anomaly selections that are not attributed to any known seed items are exhibited on

13 the MAG figures with appropriate symbols; however, these anomalies are not presented on the

14 truth tables or target spreadsheets as their origin (size, weight, composition, etc.) is unknown.

15 The seed item evaluation results are provided in Tables 6-2 through 6-5 and presented in

16 Figures 6-1 through 6-8. Tables 6-2 and 6-3 list the targets and the locations to show the

17 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.

### 20 6.2.1 Total Field Magnetic Data

- 21 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)

### 26 **6.2.1.1** Total Field Magnetic Data (Analytic Signal)

- 27 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.

### 7 6.2.2 Magnetic Gradient Data

- 8 The survey results are summarized as follows:
- 9 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).

# 13 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).

1

2

3

4

5
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.

## 1 7.0 Recommendations

## 2 7.1 Selected DGM Survey Equipment

3 For the DGM project at the RVAAP, an EM61-MK2 survey system integrated with the Leica 4 RTK GPS in open areas (ODA1 and MABS) is recommended. For areas that contain trees or tree 5 canopy (wooded tree line at ODA1 and portions of the Sand Creek) that may interfere with GPS 6 equipment, the EM61-MK2 survey system integrated with the Leica RTS system is 7 recommended. Due to the extremely steep and rugged topography at the Sand Creek Disposal 8 Site, the G858 magnetometer is proposed, as the steep terrain will limit the safe deployment of 9 the EM61-MK2 system. All DGM systems will be deployed by experienced Shaw personnel 10 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 11 12 execution.

## 13 **7.2** Recommendations for DGM Survey Procedures

14 DGM data will be collected on adjacent lines separated by 2.5 feet, and the sample rate of the 15 geophysical sensors will be 10 Hz. Position data will be acquired at a minimum rate of 1 Hz.

## 16 **7.2.1 Transect Surveys**

17 The procedures utilized during the GPO are sufficient and appropriate for transect surveying for 18 determining the boundaries of the ODA1 and MABS sites. For transect surveys, the RTK GPS or 19 RTS will be used to place survey lathe at predetermined locations along each transect line, or the 20 "stakeout" program in the Leica RTS or RTK GPS will be used to maintain parallel transects. If 21 used, the distance between the survey lathe along each transect line will be no more than 100 feet 22 in low visibility (e.g., dense vegetation) and 200 feet in "open" areas along each proposed 23 transect line. The survey lathe "waypoints" will be used to guide the instrument operator during 24 data acquisition, and the RTS or RTK GPS will be used to collect position data at 1 Hz along 25 each transect.

## 26 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.

## 3 7.3 Recommendations for DGM Data Processing and Target Selection

## 4 7.3.1 Data Processing

5 The data processing used for the GPO effort for both DGM systems is sufficient to meet the 6 project objectives. The quality metrics outlined in the GIP for the project will be adhered to 7 during the processing of the data. Scripts will be used in Geosoft to process the data to minimize 8 the occurrence of human error.

## 9 7.3.2 Target Selection

10 Shaw will work in conjunction with the Army and Ohio EPA to calculate anomaly density maps

11 for each AOC based on the DGM interpretation. If requested, anomalies can be classified in 12 terms of the likelihood of being equal to or larger than 75mm, and these data compared to the

13 entire anomaly population.

14 As discussed in Sections 6.2 and 6.3 of this report, the percent detected for the seed items is 15 primarily based on the use of the automatic picker routines in Oasis Montaj UX Process, which 16 only use the signal intensity component to select anomalies. An automatic picker will be used as 17 a quality tool to ensure the data interpreter accounts for all potential anomalies during the 18 interpretation. The Channel 2 and Sum4 channels will be the primary channels evaluated for the 19 EM61-MK2, and the total magnetic field, vertical gradient, and 1D magnetic profile data will be 20 used to evaluate the magnetic data for the Sand Creek Disposal Site. After the automatic target 21 selections are transposed onto the color coded image, other anomaly attributes (e.g., footprint 22 and shape) will be used in conjunction with the signal intensity in order to refine the automatic 23 picker selections, if necessary. This approach has the potential to decrease the number of 24 anomalies selected that do not have similar anomaly characteristics to the items of interest (e.g., 25 75mm, 90mm, 155mm, PIGs) and are most likely the result of small metal cultural debris. 26 Representative examples of these types of items are exhibited in the color coded images as 27 anomalies with footprints less than the seed item footprints, as well as anomalies with sinuosity. 28 The signal response selection criteria for the G858 magnetometer and the EM61-MK2 are 29 presented in Table 5-1 and Table 5-2, respectively.

30 The footprint of the anomaly will also be considered during the interpretation in conjunction with 31 the signal intensity and signal to noise ratio (SNR).

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

1 For the magnetic data, the items of interest at the site are represented by a minimum size of

2 approximately 35 to 40 square feet (dipole response) for the isolated anomalies in the GPO. The

3 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.

8 The proposed interpretation approach is optimum for those areas where the anomalies are 9 "isolated" from each other and their anomaly signatures do not overlap. In areas of higher 10 anomaly density (i.e., "cluttered" areas), there is a much lower probability of accurately 11 characterizing each anomaly due to the interference from adjacent anomalies.

# 12 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.

19 Note that Shaw intends to use the seed items and results of this GPO in conjunction with 20 additional work to be performed at the RVAAP by Shaw under the Military Munitions Response 21 Program (MMRP). Reacquisition of target anomalies is required under the MMRP. Following 22 the completion of the MMRP activities, Shaw will remove all seed items prior to demobilization.

This page intentionally left blank.

## 1 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,
- 4 Canada. March 2001.
- 5 Environmental Quality Management (EQ), 2008, *Report on the Geophysical Investigation*,
  6 Suspected Mustard Agent Burial Site, Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio, Final,
  7 May 21.
- 8 Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP), Interstate Technical and 9 Regulatory Corporation (ITRC), and Strategic Environmental Research and Development 10 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.
- 13 Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), 2001, Final Phase I Remedial
- 14 Investigation Report for Demolition Area 1 at the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna,
- 15 Ohio, December.
- 16 Shaw Environmental, Inc. (Shaw), 2009, *Final Geophysical Prove-Out Plan, for the Ravenna* 17 *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.
- 22 USACE, 2007a, *Military Munitions Response Action* EM1110-1-4089, June 15.
- 23 USACE, 2007b, Data Item Description Geophysics MR-005-05.01, December 20.
- 24

This page intentionally left blank.

# **FIGURES**



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













Project Number: 133616







































IN US Army Corps of Engineers













# TABLES

### 1 **Table 2-1**

## 2 Size Comparison of Actual Items to Simulants

Seed Item	Actua	l Size	Simulant Size		
	Diameter (in)	Length (in)	Diameter <sup>1</sup> (in)	Length (in)	
75mm	2.93	12	2.375	122	
90mm	3.54	16.25	3.5	16.25 <sup>2</sup>	
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

<sup>1</sup> outside diameter

<sup>2</sup> length includes end cap

### 1 **Table 2-2**

2 Summary Table of the GPO Seed Items

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
2	2352006.34	554833.48	- 54	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	PIG (South End)
	2352007.01	554836.45					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
9	2351945.29	554817.81	- 30	45	45	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	PIG (East End)
	2351942.51	554817.81					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
16	2351956.90	554762.37	48	0	0	6.625-in Heavy Gauge Pipe	PIG (North End)
	2351958.09	554764.37					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

3 USSurvFT = United States Survey Feet

4 in = inches

5 mm = millimeter
# 1 Table 2-3

# 2 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

3 4

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

#### 1 Table 5-1

#### 2 **G858** Anomaly Selection Thresholds and Background Noise Levels

	<b>RTS/RTK GPS</b>	
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

#### 1 Table 5-2

#### 2 EM61-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

3456 789

#### 1 Table 6-1

#### 2 **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.

3 4 5 6 7

8 9

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

GPO Target Total Field	s (G-858 w/RTS)											
Threshhold:	<u>.</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 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	"	"	ű			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	"	"	ű	"		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	"	"	ű	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

GPO Target	s (G-858 w/RTK GI	<u>PS)</u>										
Threshhold:												
	-											
Seed	Easting (Known)	Northing (Known)	Depth	Inclination	Azimuth	ltem	Weight	Simulates	Target Pick	Easting (Interpreted)	Northing (Interpreted)	Target Number
ltem #	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	Inches	Degrees	Degrees		Lbs		Total Field (nT)	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	
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	"	"	"	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	ű	4		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		"	u	44		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	Easting (Known)	Northing (Known)	Depth	Inclination	Azimuth	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	"		"	44		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	"		"	4		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

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

GPO Target	s (G-858 w/RTK)											
Gradient												
Threshhold	<u>.</u>											
								<b>.</b>				
Seed	Easting (Known)	Northing (Known)	Depth	Inclination	Azimuth	Item	Weight	Simulates	Target Pick	Easting (Interpreted)	Northing (Interpreted)	Target Number
item #	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	Inches	Degrees	Degrees		LDS		Gradient (n1/ft)	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	
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	"	"	ű	4		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	"	"	ű	"		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	"		ű	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 Electromag	gnetic Data Using RTS	Configuration - Channel 2

<b>GPO Target</b>	s (EM61-MK2 w/RT	rs)										
Channel 2												
Threshhold:	<u>.</u>											
Seed	Easting (Known)	Northing (Known)	Depth	Inclination	Azimuth	Item	Weight	Simulates	Target Pick	Easting (Interpreted)	Northing (Interpreted)	Target Number
Item #	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	Inches	Degrees	Degrees		Lbs		Channel 2 (mV)	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	
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	*		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	"	"	"	"		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	"	"	щ	4		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 - S	Sum4

GPO Target	s (EM61-MK2 w/ R	TS)										
Sum4												
Threshhold:	<u>.</u>											
Seed	Easting (Known)	Northing (Known)	Depth	Inclination	Azimuth	Item	Weight	Simulates	Target Pick	Easting (Interpreted)	Northing (Interpreted)	Target Number
Item #	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	Inches	Degrees	Degrees		Lbs		Sum4 (mV)	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	
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	"	"	ű	"		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 - Channe	el 2

<b>GPO Target</b>	s (EM61-MK2 w/R1	rk gps)										
Channel 2												
Threshhold:	<u>.</u>											
Seed	Easting (Known)	Northing (Known)	Depth	Inclination	Azimuth	ltem	Weight	Simulates	Target Pick	Easting (Interpreted)	Northing (Interpreted)	Target Number
ltem #	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	Inches	Degrees	Degrees		Lbs		Channel 2 (mV)	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	
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	"	"	a	*		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	"	"	"	"		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	"	"	щ	4		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

<b>GPO Target</b>	s (EM61-MK2 w/RT	rk gps)										
Sum4												
Threshhold:	<u>L</u>											
Seed	Easting (Known)	Northing (Known)	Depth	Inclination	Azimuth	Item	Weight	Simulates	Target Pick	Easting (Interpreted)	Northing (Interpreted)	Target Number
Item #	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	Inches	Degrees	Degrees		Lbs		Sum4 (mV)	US Survey Ft	US Survey Ft	
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	"	"		<b>4</b>		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	"	"	щ	4		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

1	APPENDIX A	
2	<b>Photographs</b>	
3		



RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

Photograph: General site conditions of GPO area

DIGITAL IMAGE FILENAME: P1010029.JPG





RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

Photograph: Excavation of seed item location

DIGITAL IMAGE FILENAME: P1010027.JPG



1	Appendix <b>B</b>
2	<b>BURIED SEED ITEM DESCRIPTIONS</b>
3	



GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geophys	sicist: <u>N</u> Si	<u>//ark Kick</u> ignature	10.22.200	<u>)9</u> Date		
COLUMN NUMBER	R:	N/A	ROW N	UMBE	R:	N/A			
BURIED ITEM(S) IN		.: 90mm simu	lant						
CONDITION OF BU	IRIED I	TEM(S) (ch	oose all that a	apply):					
				Đ					
				AL ITEM	I:				
	<b>CRUSHED OTHER:</b> heavy gauge steel pipe								
APPROXIMATE TO	APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 10.0 lbs								
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIP	TION:							
DEPTH OF BURIAL	_ (to to	o of item(s)):	60"						
NORTHING/EASTI	NG: N	554844.00 / E	2351980.67						
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION:	Vertical (90°)	1						
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: □	N-S 🗆 E-W	□ NW-SE	□ NE-S	w =	N/A			
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAN	IE: Item 1							
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				6. <u>187</u> . 4	$\langle \langle \cdot \rangle \rangle$				





GPO Location:	RVAAP	)	Site Geor	ohysicist:	<u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	10.22.2	009 Date	
COLUMN NUMBER	R:	N/A	ROV		ER:	N/A		
BURIED ITEM(S) IN		.: PIG (CAI	S) simulant					
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):								
			□ RU	STED				
			□ <b>PA</b>	RTIAL ITE	EM:			
	□ CRUSHED ■ OTHER: heavy gauge steel pipe							
APPROXIMATE TO	DTAL V	VEIGHT O	F BURIED I	TEM(S):	85	5.0 lbs		
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIP	TION:						
DEPTH OF BURIA	L (to to	p of item(s	)): 54"					
NORTHING/EASTI	NG: N N	554836.44 / 554833.48 /	E 2352007.01 E 2352006.34	(North Er I (South E	nd) nd)			
GENERAL INCLIN	GENERAL INCLINATION: Horizontal (0°)							
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎	N-S 🗆 E-\	N 🗆 NW-SE	□ <b>NE</b>	-SW 🛛	□ <b>N/A</b>		
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENA	ME: Item 2						





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist: 1	Mark Kick 10.22.2009 Signature Date						
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> N/A	ROW NUMBE	R: N/A						
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	NCELL: 90mm simula	ant							
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
			Λ:						
		■ OTHER: heav	y gauge steel pipe						
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL WEIGHT OF E	BURIED ITEM(S):	10.0 lbs						
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:								
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	24"							
NORTHING/EASTIN	<b>NG:</b> N 554816.80 / E 2	352019.24							
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: Horizontal (0°	)							
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: ∎ N-S □ E-W	D NW-SE D NE-S	SW 🗆 N/A						
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 3								





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	10.22.2009 Date					
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> N/A		ER:	N/A					
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	I CELL: 155mm sim	ulant							
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose 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/EASTIN	<b>NG:</b> 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 Geophysic	cist: <u>M</u> Sig	ark Kick gnature	10.22.200	<u>)9</u> Date
COLUMN NUMBER	R:	N/A	ROW NU	MBEF	R:	N/A	
BURIED ITEM(S) IN		.: 75mm simul	ant				
CONDITION OF BL	IRIED I	TEM(S) (cho	oose all that ap	oply):			
				)			
			■ OTHER:	heavy	gauge ste	eel pipe	
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL W	EIGHT OF I		(S):	5.0	lbs	
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIP	TION:					
DEPTH OF BURIAI	_ (to top	o of item(s)):	30"				
NORTHING/EASTI	NG: N	554832.78 / E 2	2351963.14				
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION:	Horizontal (0°	")				
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎	N-S 🗆 E-W	□ NW-SE □	NE-S	<b>N</b> 🗆	N/A	
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAN	IE: Item 5					
					A LEAST		





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geophy	sicist: <u>Mark K</u> Signature	Kick 10.22.2009 e Date				
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> N/A		ROW N	UMBER:	N/A				
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	<b>I CELL:</b> 15	5mm simul	ant						
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
				ED					
				AL ITEM:					
				R: heavy gaug	ge steel pipe				
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL WEIG	HT OF B		M(S):	25.0 lbs				
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION	l:							
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of i	tem(s)):	36"						
NORTHING/EASTI	<b>NG:</b> N 5548 <sup>-</sup>	17.15 / E 2	351986.16						
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: Ver	tical (90°)							
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎ N-S	□ <b>E-W</b>	□ 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	<b>R:</b> N/A	ROW NUMB	ER:	N/A					
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	N CELL: 105mm simu	lant							
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
			M:						
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	el pipe					
APPROXIMATE TO	OTAL WEIGHT OF E	BURIED ITEM(S):	15.0	0 lbs					
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:								
DEPTH OF BURIAL	L (to top of item(s)):	42"							
NORTHING/EASTIN	<b>NG:</b> N 554798.73 / E 2	352008.01							
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: Horizontal (0°	)							
GENERAL AZIMUT	ſH: □N-S □E-W	■ NW-SE □ NE	-SW 🗆	N/A					
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME Item 7								





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	<u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> N/A	ROW NUMB	ER:	N/A
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	<b>I CELL:</b> 75mm simula	ant		
CONDITION OF BU	IRIED ITEM(S) (cho	ose all that apply)	):	
			:M:	
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	el pipe
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL WEIGHT OF E	BURIED ITEM(S):	5.0	lbs
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:			
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	12"		
NORTHING/EASTIN	<b>NG:</b> N 554783.54 / E 2	352025.32		
GENERAL INCLINA	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	)	S	ite Geophy	/sicist:	<u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	10.22.20	<u>)9</u> Date	
COLUMN NUMBER	R:	N/A		ROW	NUMBI	ER:	N/A		
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	N CELL	.: PIG (CA	AIS)						
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
					ED				
					IAL ITE	M:			
				■ OTHE	R: hea	vy gauge s	steel pipe		
APPROXIMATE TO	)TAL W	VEIGHT	OF BU		EM(S):	8	5.0 lbs		
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIP	TION:							
DEPTH OF BURIA	_ (to to	p of item	( <b>s</b> )): 3	0"					
NORTHING/EASTI	NG: N : N	554818.37 554817.81	/ E 235   / E 235	1942.51 (W 51945.29 (E	/est End East End	1) 1)			
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION:	45°							
GENERAL AZIMUT	<b>'H:</b> 🗆	N-S 🗆 E	-W 🗆	NW-SE	■ NE-	-SW [	□ <b>N/A</b>		
DIGITAL IMAGE FI		IE: Iten	n 9						





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	<u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date					
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> N/A	ROW NUMB	ER:	N/A					
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	ICELL: 90mm simu	lant							
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
			EM:						
		■ OTHER: hea	avy gauge ste	el pipe					
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL WEIGHT OF	BURIED ITEM(S):	10.0	) lbs					
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIPTION:								
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	30"							
NORTHING/EASTI	<b>NG:</b> N 554806.64 / E	2351994.85							
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION: Horizontal (0	°)							
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎N-S □E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-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	<b>R:</b> N/A	ROW NUMBI	ER:	N/A					
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	NCELL: 75mm simula	int							
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
			M:						
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	el pipe					
APPROXIMATE TO	OTAL WEIGHT OF B	URIED ITEM(S):	5.0	lbs					
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:								
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	30"							
NORTHING/EASTI	<b>NG:</b> N 554796.88 / E 2	351991.99							
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION: Horizontal (0°)	)							
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: □ N-S ■ E-W		SW 🗆	N/A					
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 11								





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geophy	sicist: <u>Mark k</u> Signatur	<u>Kick 10.22.2009</u> e Date				
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> N	/A	ROW N	IUMBER:	N/A				
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	I CELL:	90mm simul	ant						
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
				ED					
				AL ITEM:					
			■ OTHE	R: heavy gau	ge steel pipe				
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL WE	IGHT OF I	BURIED ITE	M(S):	10.0 lbs				
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIPTI	ON:							
DEPTH OF BURIAI	_ (to top o	of item(s)):	48"						
NORTHING/EASTI	<b>NG:</b> N 55	4778.68 / E 2	2352014.67						
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION: H	Horizontal (0°	<sup>^</sup> )						
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎ N	-S 🗆 E-W	□ NW-SE	□ NE-SW	□ <b>N/A</b>				
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME	Item 12							





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geo	ohysicist:	<u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	10.22.200	<u>)9</u> Date		
COLUMN NUMBER	R:	N/A	ROV		ER:	N/A			
BURIED ITEM(S) IN		.: 90mm sim	ulant						
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):									
			□ RU	STED					
			□ <b>PA</b>	RTIAL ITE	:M:				
			∎ OT	HER: hea	vy gauge ste	eel pipe			
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL W	EIGHT OF	BURIED I	TEM(S):	10.	0 lbs			
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIP	TION:							
DEPTH OF BURIAL	_ (to top	o of item(s)	): 48"						
NORTHING/EASTI	<b>NG:</b> N	554788.15 /	E 2351965.65						
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION:	Horizontal	(0°)						
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎	N-S 🗆 E-V	/ 🗆 NW-SE		-SW 🗆	N/A			
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAN	IE: Item 1	3						





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geophysicis	t: <u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	10.22.2009 Date
COLUMN NUMBER	R:	N/A	ROW NUME	BER:	N/A
BURIED ITEM(S) IN		: 75mm simula	ant		
CONDITION OF BU	IRIED I	TEM(S) (cho	ose all that apply	/):	
				EM:	
			<b>OTHER</b> : he	avy gauge s	teel pipe
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL W	EIGHT OF E		): 5.0	) lbs
SOIL PROFILE DE	SCRIPT	TION:			
DEPTH OF BURIAL	_ (to top	o of item(s)):	24"		
NORTHING/EASTI	NG: N 8	554769.07 / E 2	351955.77		
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION:	Horizontal (0°	)		
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: ∎	N-S 🗆 E-W	□ NW-SE □ N	E-SW □	N/A
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAN	<b>IE:</b> Item 14			
					× P





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	<u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date	
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> N/A	ROW NUMBI	ER:	N/A	
BURIED ITEM(S) IN CELL: 155mm simulant					
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):					
		PARTIAL ITEM:			
		■ OTHER: heavy gauge steel pipe			
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 25.0 lbs					
SOIL PROFILE DESCRIPTION:					
<b>DEPTH OF BURIAL</b> (to top of item(s)): 48"					
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554776.75 / E 2352006.66					
GENERAL INCLINATION: Horizontal (0°)					
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: ■ N-S □ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE·	-SW 🗆	N/A	
DIGITAL IMAGE FILENAME: Item 15					





GPO Location: F	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist	: <u>Mark Kick</u> Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date	
COLUMN NUMBER:	N/A	ROW NUME	BER:	N/A	
BURIED ITEM(S) IN CELL: PIG (CAIS) simulant					
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):					
	GOOD CONDITION				
		PARTIAL ITEM:			
		OTHER: heavy gauge steel pipe			
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 85.0 lbs					
SOIL PROFILE DESCRIPTION:					
DEPTH OF BURIAL (to top of item(s)): 48"					
NORTHING/EASTIN	ORTHING/EASTING: N 554762.37 / E 2351956.90 (North End) N 554764.81 / E 2351958.09 (South End)				
GENERAL INCLINATION: Horizontal (0°)					
GENERAL AZIMUTH	I: ■ N-S □ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	E-SW 🗆	N/A	
DIGITAL IMAGE FIL	ENAME: Item 16				





GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date	
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> N/A		ER:	N/A	
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	NCELL: 75mm simula	ant			
CONDITION OF BURIED ITEM(S) (choose all that apply):					
	■ GOOD CONDITION □ RUSTED				
		PARTIAL ITEM:			
		OTHER: heavy gauge steel pipe			
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 5.0 lbs					
SOIL PROFILE DESCRIPTION:					
<b>DEPTH OF BURIAL</b> (to top of item(s)): 18"					
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554789.66/E 2351956.55					
GENERAL INCLINATION: Horizontal (0°)					
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: ∎ N-S □ E-W	□ NW-SE □ NE	-SW	N/A	
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 17				





GPO Location:	RVAAP		Site Geophy	<b>vsicist:</b> <u>Mark</u> Signati	Kick 10.22.2009 ure Date
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> 1	N/A	ROW N	IUMBER:	N/A
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	I CELL:	105mm simu	ulant		
CONDITION OF BL	IRIED IT	<b>EM(S)</b> (cho	ose all that	apply):	
	NTED				
			■ OTHER: heavy gauge steel pipe		
APPROXIMATE TOTAL WEIGHT OF BURIED ITEM(S): 15.0 lbs					
SOIL PROFILE DESCRIPTION:					
<b>DEPTH OF BURIAL</b> (to top of item(s)): 30"					
NORTHING/EASTING: N 554785.05/E 2351960.01					
GENERAL INCLINATION: Horizontal (0°)					
GENERAL AZIMUT	'H: □N	I-S ∎E-W	□ NW-SE	□ NE-SW	□ <b>N/A</b>
DIGITAL IMAGE FILENAME: Item 18					
2					101-1




# DESCRIPTION OF BURIED SEED ITEMS IN THE GEOPHYSICAL PROVEOUT PLOT

### RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> N/A	ROW NUMBI	ER:	N/A
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	NCELL: 75mm simula	ant		
CONDITION OF BU	JRIED ITEM(S) (cho	ose all that apply)	:	
			M:	
		■ OTHER: hea	vy gauge ste	el pipe
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL WEIGHT OF E	BURIED ITEM(S):	5.0	lbs
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:			
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	36"		
NORTHING/EASTI	<b>NG:</b> N 554751.52/E 23	51992.06		
GENERAL INCLIN	ATION: Horizontal (0°	)		
GENERAL AZIMUT	"H: ■ N-S □ E-W		-SW 🗆	N/A
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME: Item 19			





## DESCRIPTION OF BURIED SEED ITEMS IN THE GEOPHYSICAL PROVEOUT PLOT

RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

GPO Location:	RVAAP	Site Geophysicist:	Mark Kick Signature	<u>10.22.2009</u> Date
COLUMN NUMBER	<b>R:</b> N/A	ROW NUMBE	R:	N/A
BURIED ITEM(S) IN	ICELL: 75mm simula	nt		
CONDITION OF BU	IRIED ITEM(S) (choo	ose all that apply):		
			M:	
		■ OTHER: heav	y gauge ste	el pipe
APPROXIMATE TO	TAL WEIGHT OF B	URIED ITEM(S):	5.0	bs
SOIL PROFILE DES	SCRIPTION:			
DEPTH OF BURIAL	(to top of item(s)):	24"		
NORTHING/EASTIN	NG: N 554752.26/E 23	52016.37		
GENERAL INCLINA	ATION: 45°			
GENERAL AZIMUT	Ή: □N-S □E-W	■ NW-SE □ NE-\$	SW 🗆 N	N/A
DIGITAL IMAGE FI	LENAME Item 20			



1	Appendix C
2	<b>GEOPHYSICAL DATA AND ELECTRONIC FILES</b>
3	(submitted on compact disc)
4	

1

1	APPENDIX D
2	<b>QUALITY CONTROL LOGS</b>
3	

1 2

































#### **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	sor #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	nsor #1										
			Pre Survey					Post Survey				
	CH 1	CH 2	СН 3	CH 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	nsor #1										
			Pre Survey					Post Survey				
	CH 1 CH 2 CH 3 CH 4 G858 (						СН 2	СН 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	sor #1										
			Pre Survey					Post Survey				
	СН 1 СН 2 СН 3 СН 4 G858 С					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	-1.997218 .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	ensor #1										
			Pre Survey					Post Survey				
	CH 1 CH 2 CH 3 CH 4 G858 CH					CH 1	СН 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	nsor #1										
			Pre Survey					Post Survey				
	CH 1 CH 2 CH 3 CH 4 G858 C					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	-1.097220 .03					67	1.74	3.00	2.70			
Std:	1.43	1.02	.41	.11		13.77	10.07	7.70	5.51			

Comments:



S	tatic Calib	oration	Test					
Proj Equ Gric	ject: RVAAP lipment: EM-61 (1.0 d/Location: GPO	x0.5m)		Allow	able fai Outs Acce	ilure (%): 20º ide range eptable limits	%	AM test Operator: MK Date: 10/20/2009
+20	L1 <sup>-</sup> Chan1		Expected value: 122 Acceptable range: 24 Failure points: 0%	+14 +12 +10 +8 +6 +4	L1 Chan2 - -	2		Expected value: 70 Acceptable range: 14 Failure points: 0%
Exp'd	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	~~~~~	~~~~~~	+2 Exp'd -2 -4 -6 -8 -10	-	~~~~~	~~~~~	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
-20	- 			-12 -14				Time->
14:45 +6 +4	:57.42 14:46:13.14 -L1 Chan3	14:46:28.87	14:46:44.60 Expected value: 32 Acceptable range: 6.4 Failure points: 0%	14:45 +2	:57.42 L1 -Chan4	14:46:13.14 	14:46:28.87	14:46:44.60 Expected value: 12 Acceptable range: 2.4 Failure points: 0%
+2	m	······			*****			
-2 -2 -4 -6	-			-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
Data Line	abase: C:\Shaw Pro e Name: L1	ojects\RVAAF	P\Field Data\102014	A.gdb				Page: 1



Sta	tic Cali	bration	Test						
Projec Equipr Grid/Lo	t: RVAAP nent: EM-61 (1. ocation: GPO	0x0.5m)		P.	Allow	able fa Outs Acce	ilure (%): 20 side range eptable limits	%	AM test Operator: MK Date: 10/21/2009
+20-C	1 han1		Expected value Acceptable ran Failure poin	e: 136 ge: 27 ts: 0%	+14 +12 +10 +8 +6 +4 +2 Exo'd	-L1 -Chan2 - - - -	2		Expected value: 77 Acceptable range: 15 Failure points: 0%
-20 <b>-</b>					-2 -4 -6 -8 -10 -12 -14				<u></u>
02:28:45	.87 02:29:21.52	02:29:57.18	02:30:32.83	02:31	02:28	45.87	02:29:21.52	02:29:57.18	02:30:32.8302:31:08
+6-C +4- +2-	1 han3		Expected val Acceptable rang Failure point	ue: 36 ge: 7.2 ts: 0%	+2	L1 _Chan4 _	1		Expected value: 14 Acceptable range: 2.8 Failure points: 0%
Exp'd	and the second sec	and the subscription of th		~	Exp'd		-		and the second se
-2- -4- -6-			T	ſime->	-2	-			Time->
02:28:45	.87 02:29:21.52	02:29:57.18	02:30:32.83	02:31	02:28	45.87	02:29:21.52	02:29:57.18	02:30:32.8302:31:0
Databa Line N	ase: C:\Shaw Pi ame: L1	rojects\RVAAF	P\Field Data\10	02102	A.gdb				Page: 1







Static Calibration Test									
Project: RVAAP Equipment: EM-61 (1.0x0.5m) Grid/Location: GPO			Allow	Allowable failure (%): 20% Outside range Acceptable 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	L1 Chan: 	2		Expected value: 95 Acceptable range: 19 Failure points: 0%		
-20	-	Ţ	-2 -4 -6 -8 -10 -12 -14 -16 <u>ime-&gt;</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	ue: 45 nge: 9 s: 0% +2	L1 Chan4	4		Expected value: 16 Acceptable range: 3.2 Failure points: 0%		
+2	-			- marine	- Anna				
Exp'd -2 -4 -6 -8	-	,ті	Exp'd	-			<u>Time-&gt;</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	Database: c:\shaw projects\RVAAP\field data\EM61 Data\10 22 2009\102209A_edit.gdb Line Name: L1 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 - Chan1	Expected value: 140 Acceptable range: 28 Failure points: 0%	+10 L1 +14 Chan2 +10 - +8 - +6 - +4 - +2 -	Expected value: 80 Acceptable range: 16 Failure points: 0%						
-20-		Exp'd -2- -4- -6- -8- -10- -12- -14- -16	Time->						
10:28:59.64 10:29:45.14 10:30:30.6	4 10:31:16.14	10:28:59.64 10:29:45.14 10:30:30.64	10:31:16.14						
+6 -Chan3 +4 - +2 - Exp'd -2 - -4 - -6 - 10:28:59.64 10:29:45.14 10:30:30.6	Expected value: 37 Acceptable range: 7.4 Failure points: 0%	L1 Chan4 = 2 -2 10:28:59.64 10:29:45.14 10:30:30.64	Expected value: 14 Acceptable range: 2.8 Failure points: 0%						
Database: C:\Shaw Projects\RVA Line Name: L1	AP\Field Data\102310	)A.gdb	Page: 1						






























