

DCC Summary of Comments – Collection of Landfill Monitoring Data Year 2005, FOX-4 Cape Hooper - Draft Report

PAGE/Paragraph	SECTION	OBSERVATIONS AND/OR COMMENTS
General Comments		
G-1	Report	1- Revise and resubmit the draft report in accordance to section 8.4 of the Terms Of Reference 2- Submit report hard copies in three-ring vinyl binders. 3-
G-2	Digital Photograph	Comply with Section 6.8.5, 8.4.4.5, 8.5.5 and 8.5.6
G-3	Drawings	In accordance to the general practices and the readability of the drawings the smallest acceptable drawing size is 11" X 17". In case that the drawing has many features and comments; the contractor has the write to submit the drawing in larger size to accommodate a reasonable level of readability or colouring the feature on the drawing.
Specific Comments		Please note that the following comments are an example showing the level of effort required to meet the criteria of a draft report as specified in the TOR. DCC comments on the draft report will be submitted to you as soon as we receive and review the revised draft report.
	Figure FOX 2.1	Figures could be more easily interpreted if they were 11" x 17" and in colour – at least 2005 observations.
7	3.1.2 Helipad Landfills – Visual Inspection Report	As per TOR Section 6.8.1.5 and 8.4.2, a visual inspection checklist (Annex B of TOR) is required for each landfill.
	Figure FOX 3.1	This figure is extremely difficult to read – please print on 11x17 with colour for 2005 observations.
	Figure FOX 3.2	Same comments as other figures.
23	3.3.6 Soil Sample Results	"The samples taken in the vicinity of the existing monitoring wells MW-8 and MW-?...Should be MW-9?"
27	3.4.1 Summary	No mention of thermal monitoring as indicated in Introduction Section. As per TOR Section 6.8.4.4 please include the distance of the thermistor cable above ground.
27/Para 6	3.4.1 Summary	Typo – "All the other wells were not sampled, as they were <u>file</u> or obstructed...Should be filled.
28	3.4.2 Visual Inspection Report – Staining	"Many spots of stains seen all over the upper site"...should this be lower site?
	Figure FOX 3.3	Same comments as other figures.
	Figure FOX 3.4	Same comments as other figures.

DCC Summary of Comments – Collection of Landfill Monitoring Data Year 2005, FOX-4 Cape Hooper - Draft Report

PAGE/Paragraph	SECTION	OBSERVATIONS AND/OR COMMENTS
	Table IX Tanner Bay Landfill	Table is out of place in the document.
	Figure FOX 3.5	Same comments as other figures.
45	Photo 38	Typo – “Tanner Bay Landfill, sol sampling location...Should be soil.
	Appendix A	Bodycote Page 12 of 12 is out of place in the document,
	Appendix C Field Notes	This entire section is missing. See TOR 8.4.7.
	Appendix D Photos	Photo numbers are all out of order and do not correspond to the numbering in the tables throughout the document.
	Appednix D Photos	Please refer to TOR Sections 6.8.5.1, 6.8.5.3 and 6.8.5.4. There should be panoramic views, photos of all monitoring wells and thermistors, and photos of all soil sampling locations respectively.
	Photo 12	Typo – “A fuel sheen can be observed in the distance between <u>WM</u> -15 and MW-16. Should be MW-15.
	Photo 16	This thermistor repair info should be in the body of the document, not just with the photo.
	Photo 30	“DCC tier II and <u>cover</u> site landfill...Should be lower site landfill?
	Appendix E Monitoring Wells	Missing MW-6.
REVISE DRAFT AND RE-SUBMIT FOR APPROVAL.		