

A.1 Technology Name

HydraSleeve™

A.1.1 Source

Krempa, Heather M. (USGS), 2013, Concentration Comparison of Selected Constituents between Groundwater Samples Collected within the Missouri River Alluvial Aquifer using Purge and Pump and Grab-Sampling Methods, near the City of Independence, Missouri, Prepared in cooperation with the City of Independence, Missouri, Water Department.

A.1.2 Summary

Media:	Groundwater
Study Type:	Side-by-side and comparison study
Technology:	HydraSleeve™
Peer Reviewed:	No
Publication Date:	2013

A.1.3 Site Description

The study area for this report consisted of 11 monitoring wells within a municipal well field comprised of monitoring and supply wells. The monitoring wells selected for the study had monitoring well-to-supply well groundwater travel times ranging from 0.5 to 10 years. The purpose of this study was to compare groundwater analytical results collected via conventional purge and pump methods ("pump method") and grab sampling methods via HydraSleeve™ ("grab method"). Concentration differences between the two sample methods were quantified by evaluating the variability between environmental and historical duplicate samples using root mean square error (RMSE) and relative percent difference (RPD).

Historically, groundwater samples were collected at the Site via the pump method. The select monitoring wells were sampled during September and October 2013 and concentrations of selected constituents (nutrients, major ions, trace elements, and fuel compounds) were compared.

Grab samples were collected after HydraSleeves were deployed for a calculated equilibrium period of 7 days. Pump samples were collected immediately after grab samples, following a conventional purging of the well ("generally at least three well casing volumes").

The report noted several benefits of using grab samplers, like the HydraSleeve™, versus conventional pump methods including lighter and less equipment (conducive to sampling at remote locations), less time required for deployment and collection, and the reduction of cross contamination via engine fumes from generators used during conventional pump sampling.

The report also noted limitations of using the HydraSleeve™, including sample volume limitations that may inhibit collection of quality control samples. The report stated that "Duplicate grab samples were collected by tethering two grab samplers together, because the amount of

water collected by each grab sampler is close to the amount necessary for analysis.” However, screened interval lengths of monitoring wells in the well field were “not conducive to collecting multiple grab samples by tethering samplers”.

A.1.4 Remedial Phase

Long Term Monitoring

A.1.5 Outcome

The report concluded that variability between pump and grab samples may have minimal effect on the ability to monitor temporal changes and groundwater contamination threats for the analyzed nutrients and major ions.

Certain trace element concentrations (barium, molybdenum, boron, and uranium) were generally higher in grab samples than pump samples. This was possibly attributed to the use of a larger pore sized filter for grab samples. Possible zinc contamination from the syringe or filter in zinc blank samples was also reported. The study concluded that variations between pump and grab samples in trace element concentrations should be considered when determining acceptable variation amounts.

None of the fuel compounds analyzed for each sample method were detected above the minimum detection limit. A determination in the comparison between sample methods could not be made.

Sample volume limitations may restrict the use of grab samplers (HydraSleeve™). However, the report suggests that if the required sample volume for analysis is reduced by the laboratory, then sufficient sample volume for both environmental and quality assurance samples may be met.

A.1.6 References

Childress, C.J.O., Foreman, W.T., Connor, B.F., and Maloney, T.J., 1999, New reporting procedures based on longterm method detection levels and some considerations for interpretations of water-quality data provided by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water-Quality Laboratory: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 99–193, 19 p.

Connor, B.F., Rose, D.L., Noriega, M.C., Murtagh, L.K., and Abney, S.R., 1998, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Determination of 86 volatile organic compounds in water by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry, including detections less than reporting limits: U.S. Geological Survey OpenFile Report 97-829, 78 p.

Fishman, M.J., and Friedman, L.C., 1989, Methods for determination of inorganic substances in water and fluvial sediments: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques of WaterResources Investigations, book 5, chap. A1, 545 p.

Fishman, M.J., ed., 1993, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Determination of inorganic and organic constituents in water and fluvial sediments: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 93–125, 217 p.

Garbarino, J.R., 1999, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Determination of dissolved arsenic, boron, lithium, selenium, strontium, thallium, and vanadium using inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 99–093, 31 p.

Garbarino, J.R., Kanagy, L.K., and Cree, M.E., 2005, Determination of elements in natural-water, biota, sediment and soil samples using collision/reaction cell inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques and Methods, book 5, sec. B, chap.1, 88 p.

GeolInsight, 2010, Standard operating procedure—Sampling ground water with a HydraSleeve: Las Cruces, N.M., GeolInsight, accessed February 11, 2015, at http://www.in-situeurope.com/files/product_pdf/HydraSleeve_SOP.pdf.

Helsel, D.R., 2006, Fabricating data—How substituting values for nondetects can ruin results, and what can be done about it: *Chemosphere*, v. 65, no. 11, p. 2434–2439.

Kelly, B.P., 1996, Design of a monitoring well network for the City of Independence, Missouri well field using simulated ground-water flow paths and travel times: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 96–4264, 27p.

Kelly, B.P., 2002a, Ground-water monitoring plan, water quality and variability of agricultural chemicals in the Missouri River alluvial aquifer near the City of Independence, Missouri, well field, 1998–2000: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 02–4096, 69p.

Kelly, B.P., 2002b, Ground-water flow simulation and chemical and isotopic mixing equation analysis to determine source contributions to the Missouri River alluvial aquifer in the vicinity of the Independence, Missouri, well field: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 02–4208, 53p.

Kelly, B.P., 2011, Contributing recharge areas, groundwater travel time and groundwater water quality of the Missouri River alluvial aquifer near the City of Independence, Missouri, well field, 1997–2008: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2010–5232, 133 p.

Kenney, J.F., and Keeping, E.S., 1962, Linear Regression and Correlation, chap. 15 of *Mathematics of Statistics* (3rd ed.): Princeton, N.J., Van Nostran, p. 252–285.

Missouri Department of Natural Resources, 2014, Census of Missouri public water systems 2014: Missouri Department of Natural Resources, 360 p., accessed February 11, 2015, at <http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/pdwb/docs/2014-census.pdf>.

Parker, L.V., and Clark, C.H., 2004, Study of five discrete interval-type ground water sampling devices: *Ground Water Monitoring and Remediation*, v. 24, no. 3, p. 111–123, at <https://info.ngwa.org/GWOL/pdf/041879379.pdf>.

Patton, C.J., and Kryskala, J.R., 2011, Colorimetric determination of nitrate plus nitrite in water by enzymatic reduction, automated discrete analyzer methods: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques and Methods, book 5, chap. B8. 48 p.