

## **APPENDIX E**

### **EXCERPTS FROM BCT MEETING MINUTES GROUNDWATER TURBIDITY AND METALS**



August 8, 2000

H5-0014  
**IT Corporation**  
11560 Great Oaks Way, Suite 500  
Alpharetta, GA 30022-2424  
Tel. 770.475.8994  
Fax. 678.339.1728

A Member of The IT Group

IT-MC-CK05-0395  
Project No. 774645

Mr. Ellis Pope  
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Mobile District  
Attn: CESAM-EN-GE (Pope)  
P. O. Box 2288  
Mobile, AL 36628

Contract: DACA21-96-0018/CK05  
Ft. McClellan, AL

Subject: Minutes from BCT Meetings of May 17 - 18 in Atlanta, GA, and June 28  
- 29 at Ft. McClellan, AL

Dear Mr. Pope:

In accordance with our scope of work as described in Task Order CK05, I am forwarding the final minutes from our BCT meetings of May 17 - 18, 2000 at EPA offices in Atlanta, GA, and June 28 - 29 at Ft. McClellan, AL. These minutes reflect the BCT review and revisions as discussed during our August 1 - 2 meeting at Ft. McClellan. At your request, I have distributed these materials to the distribution indicated below via e-mail on August 8, 2000. If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at 770.663.1429.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Yacoub, P. E.  
Project Manager

Enclosures

Distribution: R. Levy, Ft. McClellan  
S. Moran, IT Group  
B. Reedy, EPA Region IV  
Valerie Clinkenbeard, CEHNC  
Project Files

L. Kingsbury, Ft. McClellan  
P. Stroud, ADEM  
D. Sanderson, Sanderson Consulting  
David Skridulis, CEHNC

★ Groundwater Turbidity - Phil's feels very strongly that IT can produce improved quality groundwater sample aliquots by using a low-flow sampling technique. He feels that if IT uses the Barcelona-Puls methodology, the sample results will indicate lower metals, and he can "rubber stamp" the SI reports where current analysis indicates high metals due to turbidity. The BCT engaged in a lively discussion on how to implement Phil's objectives, and decided that a new procedure would need to be written and reviewed prior to any further field work. Phil also wants to return to wells where we have high metals concentrations attributed to high turbidity and resample them using low-flow, slow purge techniques. Steve indicated that this would involve re-sampling 25% or roughly 100 wells. After further discussion, the group decided that re-sampling 5 wells would be adequate to evaluate if the modified sampling strategy would produce better results. The BCT would then extrapolate those findings to existing wells and sample results, and IT will employ the new procedure going forward on any new wells or further groundwater sampling efforts. The BCT decided to resample 1 well at parcel 151 GSA, 2 wells at parcel 145 Motor Pool 1800/1900, 1 well at parcel 501 Buildings South of Reilly Airfield, and 1 well at parcel 173 Print Plant at Building 2051.

Ron explicitly discussed the change in techniques for groundwater sampling and its acceptability to EPA since Bart was not available to provide his input on the issue. Ellis indicated that Bart had given his proxy to Phil via email, and that the revised procedures should be acceptable to EPA if they were acceptable to ADEM. The team also discussed that this action illustrates the team's pattern of behavior to go back and second-guess past decisions and practices in order to achieve incremental improvement to work product. IT will prepare a written procedure for Phil's consideration prior to field implementation.

UST Work Plan Comment Resolution - The BCT addressed and resolved comments on the UST work plan. Philip questioned why the work plan does not include all the ADEM UST protocols. The BCT indicated that this resulted from past input from Chris Johnson. All members agreed that IT should revise the work plan to comply with ADEM UST regulations for removal and closure.

Rad NFAs/Flyover - Lisa has Commodity Site Surveys for several sites that got a radiation survey. She needs a decision document for Building 3192 (Hot Cell) since it is a FOST priority. Eventually, she will need a decision document for Rideout Field. Ellis will amend an existing IT task order to include the fly-over and decision documents. IT will coordinate this activity with Range Control and possibly Anniston Army Depot. Lisa will work to nail down the area to be flown.

Training Needs - Rick wanted to know if the team felt it needs any partnering training, particularly since there is a new member on the team. Ron would like technical training. Since David Sa. provides some training at the BCT meetings, the team did not identify any immediate further requirements for training.

Phytoremediation Update - The Army asked IT to develop a cost estimate to perform phytoremediation on a 10-acre site (range 25). Ron indicated there are difficulties associated with using BRAC funds for a demonstration project. The Army will perform a TA/TE (Technical Assessment/Technical Evaluation) on the proposed phyto project. The AEC will perform the TA/TE and will recommend whether the demonstration project should go forward.

As a separate issue, Ron also indicated that FTMC will undergo an ITR (internal technical review) in March of the range cleanups and landfill projects.



August 7, 2000

**IT Corporation**

312 Directors Drive  
Knoxville, TN 37923-4799  
Tel. 865.690.3211  
Fax. 865.690.3626

*A Member of The IT Group*

IT-MC-CK05-0392  
Project No. 774645

Mr. Ellis Pope  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District  
Attn: CESAM-EN-GE (Pope)  
109 St. Joseph Street  
Mobile, Alabama 36602

Contract: Contract No. DACA21-96-D-0018/CK05  
Fort McClellan, Alabama

Subject: Groundwater Resampling Results

Dear Mr. Pope:

This letter report summarizes the results of the resampling effort conducted by IT Corporation to evaluate the effect of turbidity on metals concentrations in groundwater at Fort McClellan (FTMC).

At approximately 20 percent of the wells installed by IT at FTMC, the turbidity of the groundwater at the time of sample collection could not be reduced below 20 NTUs. In accordance with the installation-wide sampling and analysis plan (SAP), groundwater samples were collected for chemical analysis after five well volumes were removed from the well, regardless of the turbidity of the water. High turbidity is believed to have caused artificially high metals results in these groundwater samples due to suspended particulates. To determine whether high turbidity caused the elevated metals results, IT resampled five wells (four temporary wells and one permanent well) that previously had high turbidity at the time the original samples were collected. As shown in Table 1, the turbidities of the five wells originally sampled ranged from 211.4 nephelometric turbidity units (NTU) to greater than 1000 NTUs.

For the resampling effort, IT sampled the wells in accordance with procedures outlined in the SAP, however, at purge rates of between 0.1 and 0.5 liters per minute (i.e., low flow). IT used a peristaltic pump at three well locations and a Fultz in-line pump at two locations. The wells were purged until field parameters (pH, temperature, conductivity, and dissolved oxygen) stabilized and turbidity readings were below 10 NTUs.

The results of the low-flow resampling study are presented in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, the low turbidity samples had fewer metals detected and lower metals concentrations overall than the high turbidity groundwater samples. For most metals (except calcium, magnesium, potassium, sodium, and thallium), the concentrations in the low turbidity samples were significantly lower (1-2 orders of magnitude) than in the high turbidity samples. Several metals (beryllium, cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury, and selenium) that were detected in one or more of the high turbidity samples were not detected in the low turbidity samples. Certain metals (i.e., calcium, magnesium, potassium, and sodium), with a few exceptions, showed a slight decrease in the low turbidity samples; however, these metals results were generally within the same order of magnitude as the high turbidity samples.

— The low-flow sampling method resulted in fewer detected metals and overall lower metals concentrations. Most metals concentrations decreased significantly using the low-flow procedure. The

Table 1

**Metals Concentrations in Groundwater  
High Turbidity Samples vs. Low Turbidity Samples  
Fort McClellan, Calhoun County, Alabama**

Parcel	FTA-145	FTA-145	FTA-145	FTA-145	FTA-151	FTA-151	GSBP-501	GSBP-501	PPMP-173	PPMP-173											
Sample Location	FTA-145-GP06	FTA-145-GP06	FTA-145-GP12	FTA-145-GP12	FTA-151-GP05	FTA-151-GP05	GSBP-501-MW02	GSBP-501-MW02	PPMP-173-GP03	PPMP-173-GP03											
Sample Number	CY3005	CY3005R	CY3012	CY3012R	BJ3005	BJ3005R	BX3004	BX3004R	KF3004	KF3004R											
Sample Date	12-Jan-99	6-Jul-00	18-Dec-98	6-Jul-00	2-Dec-98	5-Jul-00	5-Jan-00	7-Jul-00	17-Feb-99	5-Jul-00											
Turbidity	>1000	3.72	612.40	5.42	309.00	2.82	>1000	8.47	211.40	8.64											
Metal	Units	Result	Qual	Result	Qual	Result	Qual	Result	Qual	Result	Qual										
Aluminum	mg/L	5.33E+01 J		1.09E-01		6.81E+01 J		2.95E-01		3.64E+01		1.17E-01		4.93E+01		6.24E-01		1.98E+01		3.08E-01	
Antimony	mg/L	ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND	
Arsenic	mg/L	1.06E-02 J		3.20E-03		1.12E-02		ND		1.12E-02		ND		4.51E-02		ND		5.09E-02		ND	
Barium	mg/L	4.15E-01 J		7.50E-02		5.13E-01		4.39E-02		5.16E-01		3.64E-01		2.40E-01		1.76E-02		2.08E-01		3.34E-02	
Beryllium	mg/L	2.80E-03 J		ND		2.90E-03 B		ND		2.20E-03 J		ND		9.20E-03		ND		5.80E-03		ND	
Cadmium	mg/L	ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		1.00E-03 J		ND		7.50E-03		ND	
Calcium	mg/L	1.12E+02 J		7.85E+01		1.86E+01		1.32E+01		6.87E+01		5.04E+01		4.97E+01		4.01E+01		3.61E+01		4.28E+01	
Chromium	mg/L	1.27E-01 J		ND		8.71E-02		ND		7.70E-02		ND		6.70E-02		ND		1.98E-02		ND	
Cobalt	mg/L	1.63E-02 J		2.70E-03		5.18E-02		4.40E-03		3.18E-02 J		ND		2.35E-02 J		ND		6.84E-02		ND	
Copper	mg/L	7.93E-02 J		2.40E-03		9.99E-02		ND		6.52E-02		ND		5.82E-02 J		9.50E-03		4.31E-02		ND	
Iron	mg/L	7.20E+01 J		3.99E+00		9.25E+01 J		1.47E-01		5.64E+01		3.59E-01		7.23E+01		5.62E-01		8.49E+01		6.42E-01	
Lead	mg/L	3.33E-02 J		ND		4.71E-02		ND		3.27E-02		ND		1.87E-01		ND		4.22E-02		ND	
Magnesium	mg/L	6.23E+01 J		3.80E+01		3.42E+01		1.25E+01		3.62E+01		1.47E+01		3.13E+01		2.28E+01		9.14E+00		7.30E+00	
Manganese	mg/L	1.34E+00 J		1.56E+00		1.62E+00		7.55E-01		7.10E-01		1.55E-01		3.67E+00		9.82E-02		1.78E+00		1.09E-02	
Mercury	mg/L	2.50E-04 J		ND		1.40E-04 B		ND		9.30E-05 J		ND		1.30E-03		ND		1.10E-04 J		ND	
Nickel	mg/L	1.08E-01 J		4.70E-03		1.29E-01		2.76E-02		8.12E-02		ND		5.34E-02		5.70E-03		4.37E-01		6.20E-03	
Potassium	mg/L	1.51E+01 J		1.87E+00		1.32E+01		2.45E+00		1.03E+01		1.93E+00		4.65E+00 J		4.72E-01		4.13E+00 J		3.70E-01	
Selenium	mg/L	ND		ND		5.40E-03		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND	
Silver	mg/L	ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND	
Sodium	mg/L	1.28E+01		1.16E+01		7.33E+00		6.58E+00		3.37E+01		2.93E+01		2.72E+00 J		2.75E+00		4.29E+00 J		3.48E+00	
Thallium	mg/L	5.00E-03 J		8.80E-03		6.50E-03 B		5.40E-03		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND	
Vanadium	mg/L	9.26E-02 J		ND		4.11E-02 J		ND		5.20E-02		ND		3.06E-01		3.90E-03		3.98E-02 J		ND	
Zinc	mg/L	2.03E-01 J		1.46E-02		3.12E-01		1.36E-02		1.25E-01		ND		2.90E-01		2.03E-02		1.06E+00		1.76E-02	
# of detected metals		19		14		20		12		18		8		19		12		19		10	

Shaded = resample results

B - Analyte detected in laboratory or field blank at concentration greater than the reporting limit (and greater than zero).

J - Result is greater than stated method detection limit but less than or equal to specified reporting limit.

mg/L - Milligrams per liter

ND - Not detected

Qual - Data validation qualifier



February 19, 2001

**IT Corporation**

11560 Great Oaks Way, Suite 500

Alpharetta, GA 30022-2424

Tel. 770.475.8994

Fax. 678.339.1728

A Member of The IT Group

A-5-0024

IT-MC-CK05-0486

Project No. 774645

Mr. Ellis Pope  
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Mobile District  
Attn: CESAM-EN-GE (Pope)  
P. O. Box 2288  
Mobile, AL 36628

Contract:     DACA21-96-0018/CK05  
                  Ft. McClellan, AL

Subject:       Final Minutes from BCT Meeting of January 10 – 11 at Ft. McClellan, AL

Dear Mr. Pope:

In accordance with our scope of work as described in Task Order CK05, I am forwarding the final minutes from our BCT meeting of January 10 - 11, 2001 at Ft. McClellan. These minutes reflect the BCT review and revisions as discussed during our February 13 - 14 meeting at Ft. McClellan. At your request, I have distributed these materials to the distribution indicated below via e-mail on February 19, 2001. If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at 770.663.1429.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Yacoub, P. E.  
Project Manager

Enclosures

Distribution: R. Levy, Ft. McClellan  
                  S. Moran, IT Group  
                  D. Brittain, EPA Region IV  
                  S. Murdock, CEHNC  
                  Project Files

L. Kingsbury, Ft. McClellan  
P. Stroud, ADEM  
D. Sanderson, Sanderson Consulting  
D. Copeland, CEHNC  
S. Golden, ADEM

- Miki informed the group that the JPA plans to transfer Bldg. 3181 to JSU by the end of the month. Lisa indicated that Bldg. 3181 is included in the E7 FOST. JSU plans to use the property for Continuing Education Training.
- Golf Course -- this parcel is tied up in the QST data issue involving the pesticide mix facility. Miki indicated that the Army should try to keep on schedule with this property, however the JPA has a contract on the property, and they may want it before the QST data is resolved. She indicated she may come back to the BCT in the future and request accelerated action for this property, ie., a separate FOST.
- Motor Pool 600 -- Miki asked if the JPA could have this property by the summer. Doyle explained that the Army is presenting optimistic dates, and that sometimes issues arise. The team cannot be bound by dates though they try to respect them.
- Gas Mask Test Chambers -- Miki will meet with the NGB again relative to discussions the JPA is having with the NGB on swapping properties with them.
- Miki reiterated her request that the BCT consider pulling Building 3185 out of the overall CWM parcel. Ron explained that there are complications associated with that type of action, and that it's not feasible for the Army to do that.
- Miki received a copy of ADEM's letter requesting Army funds to do UXO oversight. The Army has reviewed costs and taken some exceptions, but the overall decision to fund the effort will probably take place at the DA (Department of Army) level. ADEM has requested funds under the DSMOA program. The JPA will support ADEM's request to the Army.
- Miki indicated that the JPA is pursuing its discussions to privatize the cleanup at McClellan, and that they will be meeting with Army representatives in Washington in February.

Well Installation at CWM Sites - IT will meet with Huntsville and Ft. McClellan on Tuesday, January 16 to discuss the possibility of well installation on CWM sites before completion of the CWM investigation.

Well Sampling - Philip recapped the well sampling history for Doyle regarding high metals, turbidity, and sampling techniques. He explained that IT resampled several wells using low-flow sampling techniques, and was able to demonstrate to his and Bart's satisfaction that the high metals concentrations were associated with turbidity. IT prepared a technical memorandum and includes this memorandum by reference in each SI report. Doyle wants to include the technical memorandum as an appendix to the SI reports.

LUCIPs - The LUCAP ceremony took place on December 12, but Ft. McClellan does not have a signed copy yet. Karen Pinson is the installation lead on meeting LUCAP requirements including LUCIPs. Appendix A of the LUCAP requires a Land Use Control Site Listing. Karen is currently working on meeting this requirement. Appendix B of the LUCAP is Interim LUCIPs...if the Army is transferring property pre-remedy. Appendix C of the LUCAP addresses final LUCIPs, and Appendix D is agency points of contact.

The Site Listing is due 30 days after signing. Ron indicated that the Army will have the list available for review next week. Doyle indicated that he will be prepared/willing to talk about the listing during the on-board review meeting. Doyle also suggested that LUCIPs be a standing agenda item to be discussed and resolved at BCT meetings. Ron wants to get together with Karen, Lisa, and IT to discuss LUCIPs and Interim LUCIPs.

Old Incinerator Bldg. 5710 (Parcel 125) - The BCT revisited this site to review the site characteristics. The BCT decided that this site can go NFA with no restrictions. The BCT also decided to go straight to a final

**APPENDIX F**

**EXCERPTS FROM BCT MEETING MINUTES  
LANDFILL GROUNDWATER MONITORING**



September 23, 1998

IT-MC-CK05-0046  
Project No. 774645

Mr. Ellis Pope  
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Mobile District  
Attn: CESAM-EN-GE (Pope)  
P. O. Box 2288  
Mobile, AL 36628

Contract: DACA21-96-0018/CK05  
Ft. McClellan, AL

Subject: Minutes from August 5 – 6 Facilitated BCT Meeting at IT offices,  
Knoxville, TN

Dear Mr. Pope:

In accordance with our scope of work as described in Task Order CK05, I am forwarding the final minutes from our facilitated BCT meeting of August 5 – 6, 1998 at IT's offices in Knoxville, TN. These minutes reflect the BCT review and revisions as discussed during our September 16 – 17 meeting at Ft. McClellan. At your request, I have distributed these materials to the distribution indicated below via e-mail on September 23, 1998.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at (303) 793-5250.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Jeanne Yacoub'.

Jeanne Yacoub, P. E.  
Project Manager

Enclosures

Distribution: R. Levy, Ft. McClellan  
L. Kingsbury, Ft. McClellan  
D. Smith, Smith and Associates  
C. Johnson, ADEM  
B. Reedy, EPA Region IV  
Project Files

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF ATTENDEES  
PARTNERING SESSION #10  
KNOXVILLE, TN  
AUGUST 5 – 6, 1998

Ron Levy, Ft. McClellan

Lisa Kingsbury, Ft. McClellan

Ellis Pope, Mobile District Corps of Engineers

Chris Johnson, Alabama Department of Environmental Management

Bart Reedy, Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV

Jeanne Yacoub, Project Manager, IT Corporation

David Smith, Team Facilitator, Smith and Associates

Guests:

Ross McCollum (Mobile District)

Tim Frederick (Gannett Fleming)

Steve Moran (IT Corporation)

Jeff Tarr (IT Corporation)

Randy McBride (IT Corporation)

Paul Goetchius (IT Corporation)

Adrian Gonzalez (IT Corporation)

Ben Redmond (IT Corporation)

Jeff Hackworth (IT Corporation)

**the well in the data set, since the metals concentrations in the well were consistent with metals concentrations in all the other wells in the data set.**

Bart and Chris will provide their written comments on the Background Metals Report to Lisa and Ellis by August 21.

☆ { Landfill Report and Strategy – The BCT decided that no further groundwater monitoring would take place at Landfills 1 and 2 at this time, and engaged in extensive discussion over the course of action that IT has recommended at Landfill 3. IT will work with Ross, Bart, and Chris to propose a technical approach for consideration by the BCT. Ellis will issue an RFP to accomplish the proposed characterization at Landfill 3. Bart and Chris will issue a letter responding to IT's landfill report. **CONSENSUS: The draft report will be accepted with no further iterations.**

BCP – The BCT decided that comments on the BCP would be prepared prior to the October meeting to enable a real-time review of those comments with IT.

Success Stories – By the end of the meeting, the BCT recognized that several highlights marked this very successful meeting. Those events were:

- Real-Time resolution of Gannett Fleming's comments on IT's work plans,
- Acceptance of IT's Long-Term Landfill Monitoring Report after one iteration. Bart and Chris will provide brief letters clarifying stating their positions.
- Resolution of Soil-to-Skin Adherence Factor between Paul and Ted. This issue initially appeared to be an area where EPA would need time to revise policy and guidance; Paul and Ted were able to work out a mutually acceptable strategy without further delay of the Installation-Wide Work Plan.

Future Meetings – The next BCT meetings will take place September 16 – 17 at Ft. McClellan, October 21 – 22 in Orange Beach, AL, and tentatively November 30 – December 1 in Norcross, GA.

**APPENDIX G**

**COST CALCULATION SHEETS**  
**LANDFILL NO. 2, PARCEL 79(6), AND**  
**LANDFILL NO. 3, PARCEL 80(6)**

**APPENDIX G**

**COST CALCULATION SHEETS**  
**LANDFILL NO. 2, PARCEL 79(6)**

**Table G1-1A**

**Landfill No. 2, Parcel 79(6)  
Alternative 1 - No Action  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Activity (includes rough procurement)</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>	<b>Basis or Comments</b>	<b>Capital Cost</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M Cost</b>
Contracting	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$0	\$0
Administration	1	LS	5%	percent of total	\$0	\$0
Project Management	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$0	\$0
Plans/Specs	1	LS	\$10,000	Workplan/Permits etc.	\$0	\$0
Site Inspections	24	hours	\$100	\$100.00 / hour x 6 hrs. x 4	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Table G1-1B**

**Present Worth Analysis for Alternative 1  
Landfill No. 2, Parcel 79(6)  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Present Worth of O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Capital (\$)</b>	<b>Cumulative Present Worth (\$)</b>
0	0	0	0	0
1	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	-	-
3	-	-	-	-
4	-	-	-	-
5	-	-	-	-
6	-	-	-	-
7	-	-	-	-
8	-	-	-	-
9	-	-	-	-
10	-	-	-	-
11	-	-	-	-
12	-	-	-	-
13	-	-	-	-
14	-	-	-	-
15	-	-	-	-
16	-	-	-	-
17	-	-	-	-
18	-	-	-	-
19	-	-	-	-
20	-	-	-	-
21	-	-	-	-
22	-	-	-	-
23	-	-	-	-
24	-	-	-	-
25	-	-	-	-
26	-	-	-	-
27	-	-	-	-
28	-	-	-	-
29	-	-	-	-
30	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Table G1-2A**

**Landfill No. 2, Parcel 79(6)  
Alternative 2 - Land Use Control With 5-Year Reviews  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Activity (includes rough procurement)</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>	<b>Basis or Comments</b>	<b>Capital Cost</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M Cost</b>
Land Use Control/LUCIP	1	LS	\$100,000	Development, Army and regulatory reviews, approvals, and implementation	\$100,000	\$0
5-Year Reviews (6 over a 30-year duration)	6	ea	\$25,000	Development, Army and regulatory reviews, approvals, and implementation	\$0	\$150,000
					\$0	\$0
					\$0	\$0
					\$0	\$0
					\$0	\$0
					\$0	\$0
					\$0	\$0
					\$0	\$0
					\$0	\$0
					\$0	\$0
<b>SUB TOTALS</b>					\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>					\$100,000	\$150,000
<b>GRAND TOTAL (With 20% contingency factor)</b>					\$120,000	\$180,000

LUCIP - Land-Use Control Implementation Plan  
 LS - Lump Sum  
 ea - each

**Table G1-2B**

**Present Worth Analysis for Alternative 2  
Landfill No. 2, Parcel 79(6)  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Present Worth of O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Capital Cost (\$)</b>	<b>Cumulative Present Worth (\$)</b>
0	-	-	120,000	120,000
1		-	-	120,000
2		-	-	120,000
3		-	-	120,000
4		-	-	120,000
5	25,000	20,000	-	140,000
6		-	-	140,000
7		-	-	140,000
8		-	-	140,000
9		-	-	140,000
10	25,000	15,000	-	155,000
11		-	-	155,000
12		-	-	155,000
13		-	-	155,000
14		-	-	155,000
15	25,000	12,000	-	167,000
16		-	-	167,000
17		-	-	167,000
18		-	-	167,000
19		-	-	167,000
20	25,000	9,000	-	176,000
21		-	-	176,000
22		-	-	176,000
23		-	-	176,000
24		-	-	176,000
25	25,000	7,000	-	183,000
26		-	-	183,000
27		-	-	183,000
28		-	-	183,000
29		-	-	183,000
30	25,000	6,000	-	189,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$69,000</b>	<b>\$120,000</b>	<b>\$189,000</b>

**Table G1-3A**

**Landfill No. 2, Parcel 79(6)  
Alternative 3 - Soil Cover with Land-Use Controls  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Activity (includes rough procurement)</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>	<b>Basis or Comments</b>	<b>Capital Cost</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M Cost</b>
Contracting *	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$46,321	\$1,116
Administration *	1	LS	5%	percent of total	\$23,161	\$558
Project Management *	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$46,321	\$1,116
Plans/Specs	1	LS	\$40,000.00	Workplan/Permits/ Flood mitigation plan	\$40,000	\$0
Site Inspections *	20	hours	\$100.00	Annual inspections by 2 persons for 1 day	\$2,000	\$2,000
Annual Maintenance (Soil Cover) *	5.6	acres	\$1,000.00	\$1000 per acre per year	\$0	\$5,600
Site Clearing & Grubbing	5.6	acres	\$30,000.00	Thick Plant Coverage	\$168,000	\$0
Well Abandonment	70.5	linear feet	\$22.68	3 x 4" wells - average depth of 23.5 feet	\$1,599	\$0
Borrow Material	18,071	cubic yards	\$5.00	20% fluff factor	\$108,423	\$0
Hydroseeding	5.6	acres	\$2,500.00	Engineering Estimate	\$14,000	\$0
Concrete monuments	20	each	\$1,000.00	4-ft monuments on the perimeter	\$20,000	\$0
Compaction Testing	56	each	\$100.00	5 tests per acre per foot	\$5,600	\$0
Compaction/Placement w/mobs	18,071	cubic yards	\$0.26	Cat 950 Loader w/operator, compactor	\$5,638	\$0
Slopes protection from Flood	14,250	square feet	\$5.00	rip-rap and soil on the sloped areas	\$71,250	\$3,563
Survey (1-foot topographic)	1	each	\$6,700.00	Based on 30 points (all one lump sum)	\$6,700	\$0
Design/Engineering	1	each	12%	percent of total	\$55,585	\$0
Final Report	1	each	\$20,000.00	Engineering Estimate	\$20,000	\$0
<b>SUB TOTALS</b>					<b>\$463,210</b>	<b>\$11,163</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$634,598</b>	<b>\$13,953</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL (With 20% contingency factor)</b>					<b>\$761,518</b>	<b>\$16,744</b>

\* = To be calculated in 30 year projection

\*\* No long-term monitoring per ADEM

**Table G1-3B**

**Present Worth Analysis for Alternative 3  
Landfill No. 2, Parcel 79(6)  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Present Worth of O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Capital Cost (\$)</b>	<b>Cumulative Present Worth (\$)</b>
0	0	0	761,518	761,518
1	16,744	17,000	-	778,518
2	16,744	15,000	-	793,518
3	16,744	14,000	-	807,518
4	16,744	14,000	-	821,518
5	16,744	13,000	-	834,518
6	16,744	12,000	-	846,518
7	16,744	12,000	-	858,518
8	16,744	11,000	-	869,518
9	16,744	11,000	-	880,518
10	16,744	10,000	-	890,518
11	16,744	10,000	-	900,518
12	16,744	9,000	-	909,518
13	16,744	9,000	-	918,518
14	16,744	8,000	-	926,518
15	16,744	8,000	-	934,518
16	16,744	8,000	-	942,518
17	16,744	7,000	-	949,518
18	16,744	7,000	-	956,518
19	16,744	7,000	-	963,518
20	16,744	6,000	-	969,518
21	16,744	6,000	-	975,518
22	16,744	6,000	-	981,518
23	16,744	5,000	-	986,518
24	16,744	5,000	-	991,518
25	16,744	5,000	-	996,518
26	16,744	5,000	-	1,001,518
27	16,744	4,000	-	1,005,518
28	16,744	4,000	-	1,009,518
29	16,744	4,000	-	1,013,518
30	16,744	4,000	-	1,017,518
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$502,313</b>	<b>\$256,000</b>	<b>\$761,518</b>	<b>\$1,017,518</b>

**Table G2-4A**

**Landfill No. 3, Parcel 80(6)  
Alternative 4 - On-Site Disposal  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Activity (includes rough procurement)</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>	<b>Basis or Comments</b>	<b>Capital Cost</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M Cost</b>
Contracting *	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$650,878	\$0
Administration *	1	LS	5%	percent of total	\$325,439	\$0
Project Management *	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$650,878	\$0
Plans/Specs	1	LS	\$40,000.00	Workplan/Permits etc.	\$40,000	\$0
Access Roads	3000	square yards	\$3.91	3 roads - 500 feet long by 20 feet wide	\$11,730	\$0
Site Clearing & Grubbing	22.8	acre	\$8,000.00	Credit from Lumber Subcontractor	\$182,400	\$0
Well Abandonment	450	linear feet	\$22.68	9 x 4" wells - average depth of 49 feet	\$10,206	\$0
Site Inspections	20	hours	\$100.00	Final inspection by 2 persons for 1 day	\$2,000	\$0
<b>Landfill Preparation</b>						
Design/Engineering	1	each	12%	percent of total	\$781,054	\$0
Excavate and Remove Waste Cell	375,200	cubic yards	\$9.00	Engineering Estimate	\$3,376,800	\$0
Screening Sampling (includes full analytic sweep)	375	points	\$300.00	1 sample per 1000 cubic yards	\$112,500	\$0
<b>Site Restoration</b>						
Compaction/Placement w/mobs	450,240	cubic yards	\$0.26	Cat 950 Loader w/operator, compactor	\$117,062	\$0
Compaction Testing	1,938	each	\$100.00	5 tests per acre per foot	\$193,800	\$0
Borrow Material	450,240	cubic yards	\$5.00	20% fluff factor	\$2,251,200	\$0
Survey (data compilation and report)	1	each	\$6,700.00	Based on 30 points (all one lump sum)	\$6,700	\$0
Hydroseeding	22.8	acres	\$2,500.00	Engineering Estimate	\$57,000	\$0
Disposal of Hazardous Waste	450	tons	\$150.00	0.1% of excavate & remove volume x 1.2 ton/cy	\$67,536	\$0
Transportation of Hazardous Waste	200	miles	\$3.25	Waste disposed at Waste Mgt. in Emelle	\$650	\$0
Confirmation/Screening Sampling (includes full analytic sweep)	114	points	\$300.00	5 points per acre	\$34,200	\$0
Final Report	1	each	\$45,000.00	Engineering Estimate	\$45,000	\$0
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>					<b>\$6,508,784</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$8,917,035</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>TOTAL (With 20% contingency factor)</b>					<b>\$10,700,442</b>	<b>\$0</b>

\* = To be calculated in 30 year projection

LC - Lump sum

O&M - Operation and maintenance

**Table G1-4B**

**Landfill No. 2, Parcel 79(6)  
Present Worth Analysis for Alternative 4  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Present Worth of O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Capital Cost (\$)</b>	<b>Cumulative Present Worth (\$)</b>
0	0	0	1,914,628	1,914,628
1	-	-	-	1,914,628
2	-	-	-	1,914,628
3	-	-	-	1,914,628
4	-	-	-	1,914,628
5	-	-	-	1,914,628
6	-	-	-	1,914,628
7	-	-	-	1,914,628
8	-	-	-	1,914,628
9	-	-	-	1,914,628
10	-	-	-	1,914,628
11	-	-	-	1,914,628
12	-	-	-	1,914,628
13	-	-	-	1,914,628
14	-	-	-	1,914,628
15	-	-	-	1,914,628
16	-	-	-	1,914,628
17	-	-	-	1,914,628
18	-	-	-	1,914,628
19	-	-	-	1,914,628
20	-	-	-	1,914,628
21	-	-	-	1,914,628
22	-	-	-	1,914,628
23	-	-	-	1,914,628
24	-	-	-	1,914,628
25	-	-	-	1,914,628
26	-	-	-	1,914,628
27	-	-	-	1,914,628
28	-	-	-	1,914,628
29	-	-	-	1,914,628
30	-	-	-	1,914,628
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,914,628</b>	<b>\$1,914,628</b>

**APPENDIX G**

**COST CALCULATION SHEETS**  
**LANDFILL NO. 3, PARCEL 80(6)**

**Table G2-1A**

**Landfill No. 3, Parcel 80(6)  
Alternative 1 - No Action  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Activity (includes rough procurement)</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>	<b>Basis or Comments</b>	<b>Capital Cost</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M Cost</b>
Contracting	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$0	\$0
Administration	1	LS	5%	percent of total	\$0	\$0
Project Management	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$0	\$0
Plans/Specs	1	LS	\$10,000	Workplan/Permits etc.	\$0	\$0
Site Inspections	24	hours	\$100	\$100.00 / hour x 6 hrs. x 4	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

LS - Lump sum

O&M - Operation and maintenance.

**Table G2-1B**

**Landfill No. 3, Parcel 80(6)  
Present Worth Analysis for Alternative 1  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Present Worth of O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Capital (\$)</b>	<b>Cumulative Present Worth (\$)</b>
0	0	0	0	0
1	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	-	-
3	-	-	-	-
4	-	-	-	-
5	-	-	-	-
6	-	-	-	-
7	-	-	-	-
8	-	-	-	-
9	-	-	-	-
10	-	-	-	-
11	-	-	-	-
12	-	-	-	-
13	-	-	-	-
14	-	-	-	-
15	-	-	-	-
16	-	-	-	-
17	-	-	-	-
18	-	-	-	-
19	-	-	-	-
20	-	-	-	-
21	-	-	-	-
22	-	-	-	-
23	-	-	-	-
24	-	-	-	-
25	-	-	-	-
26	-	-	-	-
27	-	-	-	-
28	-	-	-	-
29	-	-	-	-
30	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Table G2-2A**

**Landfill No. 3, Parcel 80(6)  
Alternative 2 - Land-Use Controls  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Activity (includes rough procurement)</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>	<b>Basis or Comments</b>	<b>Capital Cost</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M Cost</b>
Contracting *	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$5,294	\$6,640
Administration *	1	LS	5%	percent of total	\$2,647	\$15,554
Project Management *	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$5,294	\$6,640
Plans/Specs	1	LS	\$20,000.00	Workplan/Permits etc.	\$20,000	\$0
Site Inspections *	20	hours	\$100.00	Annual inspections by 2 persons for 1 day	\$2,000	\$2,000
Access Roads	3000	square yards	\$3.91	3 roads - 500 feet long by 20 feet wide	\$11,730	\$0
Concrete monuments	9	each	\$1,000.00	4-ft tall monuments on the perimeter	\$9,000	\$0
Well Abandonment	450	linear feet	\$22.68	9 x 4" wells - average depth of 49 feet	\$10,206	\$0
<b>Long-term Groundwater Monitoring</b>						
Groundwater Sampling and Analysis *	2	semi-annual	\$2,225.00	8 wells semi-annually for 30 years	\$0	\$35,600
Data Management *	2	semi-annual	\$916.60	8 wells semi-annually for 30 years	\$0	\$14,666
Groundwater Reports *	2	semi-annual	\$883.33	8 wells semi-annually for 30 years	\$0	\$14,133
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>					\$52,936	\$66,399
<b>TOTAL</b>					\$66,170	\$95,232
<b>TOTAL (With 20% contingency factor)</b>					<b>\$79,404</b>	<b>\$114,279</b>

\* = To be calculated in 30 year projection

LS - Lump sum.

O&M - Operation and maintenance.

**Table G2-2B**

**Present Worth Analysis for Alternative 2  
Landfill No. 3, Parcel 80(6)  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Present Worth of O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Capital Cost (\$)</b>	<b>Cumulative Present Worth (\$)</b>
0	-	-	79,404	79,404
1	114,279	109,000	-	188,404
2	114,279	104,000	-	292,404
3	114,279	99,000	-	391,404
4	114,279	94,000	-	485,404
5	114,279	90,000	-	575,404
6	114,279	85,000	-	660,404
7	114,279	81,000	-	741,404
8	114,279	77,000	-	818,404
9	114,279	74,000	-	892,404
10	114,279	70,000	-	962,404
11	114,279	67,000	-	1,029,404
12	114,279	64,000	-	1,093,404
13	114,279	61,000	-	1,154,404
14	114,279	58,000	-	1,212,404
15	114,279	55,000	-	1,267,404
16	114,279	52,000	-	1,319,404
17	114,279	50,000	-	1,369,404
18	114,279	47,000	-	1,416,404
19	114,279	45,000	-	1,461,404
20	114,279	43,000	-	1,504,404
21	114,279	41,000	-	1,545,404
22	114,279	39,000	-	1,584,404
23	114,279	37,000	-	1,621,404
24	114,279	35,000	-	1,656,404
25	114,279	34,000	-	1,690,404
26	114,279	32,000	-	1,722,404
27	114,279	31,000	-	1,753,404
28	114,279	29,000	-	1,782,404
29	114,279	28,000	-	1,810,404
30	114,279	26,000	-	1,836,404
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,428,366</b>	<b>\$1,757,000</b>	<b>\$79,404</b>	<b>\$1,836,404</b>

Table G2-3A

**Landfill No. 3, Parcel 80(6)**  
**Alternative 3 - Soil Cover with Land-Use Controls**  
**Fort McClellan, Alabama**

Activity (includes rough procurement)	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Basis or Comments	Capital Cost	Annual O&M Cost
Contracting *	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$356,744	\$9,665
Administration *	1	LS	5%	percent of total	\$178,372	\$4,832
Project Management *	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$356,744	\$9,665
Plans/Specs	1	LS	\$50,000.00	Workplan/Permits/ Food zone impact plan	\$50,000	\$0
Site Inspections *	20	hours	\$100.00	Annual Inspections by 2 persons for 1 day	\$2,000	\$2,000
Annual Maintenance (Soil Cover) *	22.8	acres	\$1,000.00	\$1000 per acre per year	\$0	\$22,800
Site Clearing & Grubbing	22.8	acres	\$8,000	Credit from Lumber Subcontractor	\$182,400	\$0
Well Abandonment	450	linear feet	\$22.68	9 x 4" wells - average depth of 49 feet	\$10,206	\$0
Borrow Material	73,573	cubic yards	\$5.00	For backfill and topsoil with 20% fluff factor	\$441,438	\$0
High-strength Geotextile	993,168	square feet	\$2.00	Installed layer - vendor estimate	\$1,986,336	\$0
Impermeable Layer (geomembrane)	993,168	square feet	\$0.75	Assume annual O&M is 1% of capital cost	\$744,876	\$7,449
Hydroseeding	23	acres	\$2,500.00	Engineering Estimate	\$57,000	\$0
Access Roads	3000	square yards	\$3.91	3 roads - 500 feet long by 20 feet wide	\$11,730	\$0
Compaction/Placement w/mobs	73,573	cubic yards	\$0.26	Cat 950 Loader w/operator, compactor	\$22,955	\$0
Compaction Testing	228	each	\$100.00	5 tests per acre per foot	\$22,800	\$0
Concrete monuments	9	each	\$1,000.00	4-ft tall monuments on the perimeter	\$9,000	\$0
Survey (1-foot topographic)	1	each	\$6,700.00	Based on 30 points (all one lump sum)	\$6,700	\$0
Design/Engineering	1	each	12%	percent of total	\$428,093	\$0
Final Report	1	each	\$20,000.00	Engineering Estimate	\$20,000	\$0
<b>Long-term Groundwater Monitoring</b>						
Groundwater Sampling and Analysis *	2	semi- annual	\$2,225.00	8 wells semi-annually for 30 years	\$0	\$35,600
Data Management *	2	semi- annual	\$916.60	8 wells semi-annually for 30 years	\$0	\$14,666
Groundwater Reports *	2	semi- annual	\$883.33	8 wells semi-annually for 30 years	\$0	\$14,133
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>					<b>\$3,567,441</b>	<b>\$96,648</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$4,887,394</b>	<b>\$120,810</b>
<b>TOTAL (With 20% contingency factor)</b>					<b>\$5,864,873</b>	<b>\$144,971</b>

\* = To be calculated in 30 year projection

**Table G2-3B**

**Present Worth Analysis for Alternative 3,  
Landfill No. 3, Parcel 80(6)  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Present Worth of O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Capital Cost (\$)</b>	<b>Cumulative Present Worth (\$)</b>
0	-	-	5,864,873	5,864,873
1	144,971	138,000	-	6,002,873
2	144,971	131,000	-	6,133,873
3	144,971	125,000	-	6,258,873
4	144,971	119,000	-	6,377,873
5	144,971	114,000	-	6,491,873
6	144,971	108,000	-	6,599,873
7	144,971	103,000	-	6,702,873
8	144,971	98,000	-	6,800,873
9	144,971	93,000	-	6,893,873
10	144,971	89,000	-	6,982,873
11	144,971	85,000	-	7,067,873
12	144,971	81,000	-	7,148,873
13	144,971	77,000	-	7,225,873
14	144,971	73,000	-	7,298,873
15	144,971	70,000	-	7,368,873
16	144,971	66,000	-	7,434,873
17	144,971	63,000	-	7,497,873
18	144,971	60,000	-	7,557,873
19	144,971	57,000	-	7,614,873
20	144,971	55,000	-	7,669,873
21	144,971	52,000	-	7,721,873
22	144,971	50,000	-	7,771,873
23	144,971	47,000	-	7,818,873
24	144,971	45,000	-	7,863,873
25	144,971	43,000	-	7,906,873
26	144,971	41,000	-	7,947,873
27	144,971	39,000	-	7,986,873
28	144,971	37,000	-	8,023,873
29	144,971	35,000	-	8,058,873
30	144,971	34,000	-	8,092,873
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$4,349,144</b>	<b>\$2,228,000</b>	<b>\$5,864,873</b>	<b>\$8,092,873</b>

**Table G2-4A**

**Landfill No. 3, Parcel 80(6)  
Alternative 4 - On-Site Disposal  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Activity (includes rough procurement)</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>	<b>Basis or Comments</b>	<b>Capital Cost</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M Cost</b>
Contracting *	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$650,878	\$0
Administration *	1	LS	5%	percent of total	\$325,439	\$0
Project Management *	1	LS	10%	percent of total	\$650,878	\$0
Plans/Specs	1	LS	\$40,000.00	Workplan/Permits etc.	\$40,000	\$0
Access Roads	3000	square yards	\$3.91	3 roads - 500 feet long by 20 feet wide	\$11,730	\$0
Site Clearing & Grubbing	22.8	acre	\$8,000.00	Credit from Lumber Subcontractor	\$182,400	\$0
Well Abandonment	450	linear feet	\$22.68	9 x 4" wells - average depth of 49 feet	\$10,206	\$0
Site Inspections	20	hours	\$100.00	Final inspection by 2 persons for 1 day	\$2,000	\$0
<b>Landfill Preparation</b>						
Design/Engineering	1	each	12%	percent of total	\$781,054	\$0
Excavate and Remove Waste Cell	375,200	cubic yards	\$9.00	Engineering Estimate	\$3,376,800	\$0
Screening Sampling (includes full analytic sweep)	375	points	\$300.00	1 sample per 1000 cubic yards	\$112,500	\$0
<b>Site Restoration</b>						
Compaction/Placement w/mobs	450,240	cubic yards	\$0.26	Cat 950 Loader w/operator, compactor	\$117,062	\$0
Compaction Testing	1,938	each	\$100.00	5 tests per acre per foot	\$193,800	\$0
Borrow Material	450,240	cubic yards	\$5.00	20% fluff factor	\$2,251,200	\$0
Survey (data compilation and report)	1	each	\$6,700.00	Based on 30 points (all one lump sum)	\$6,700	\$0
Hydroseeding	22.8	acres	\$2,500.00	Engineering Estimate	\$57,000	\$0
Disposal of Hazardous Waste	450	tons	\$150.00	0.1% of excavate & remove volume x 1.2 ton/cy	\$67,536	\$0
Transportation of Hazardous Waste	200	miles	\$3.25	Waste disposed at Waste Mgt. in Emelle	\$650	\$0
Confirmation/Screening Sampling (includes full analytic sweep)	114	points	\$300.00	5 points per acre	\$34,200	\$0
Final Report	1	each	\$45,000.00	Engineering Estimate	\$45,000	\$0
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>					<b>\$6,508,784</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$8,917,035</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>TOTAL (With 20% contingency factor)</b>					<b>\$10,700,442</b>	<b>\$0</b>

\* = To be calculated in 30 year projection

LC - Lump sum

O&M - Operation and maintenance

**Table G2-4B**

**Present Worth Analysis for Alternative 4,  
Landfill No. 3, Parcel 80(6)  
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Annual O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Present Worth of O&amp;M (\$)</b>	<b>Capital Cost (\$)</b>	<b>Cumulative Present Worth (\$)</b>
0	0	0	10,700,442	10,700,442
1	-	-	-	10,700,442
2	-	-	-	10,700,442
3	-	-	-	10,700,442
4	-	-	-	10,700,442
5	-	-	-	10,700,442
6	-	-	-	10,700,442
7	-	-	-	10,700,442
8	-	-	-	10,700,442
9	-	-	-	10,700,442
10	-	-	-	10,700,442
11	-	-	-	10,700,442
12	-	-	-	10,700,442
13	-	-	-	10,700,442
14	-	-	-	10,700,442
15	-	-	-	10,700,442
16	-	-	-	10,700,442
17	-	-	-	10,700,442
18	-	-	-	10,700,442
19	-	-	-	10,700,442
20	-	-	-	10,700,442
21	-	-	-	10,700,442
22	-	-	-	10,700,442
23	-	-	-	10,700,442
24	-	-	-	10,700,442
25	-	-	-	10,700,442
26	-	-	-	10,700,442
27	-	-	-	10,700,442
28	-	-	-	10,700,442
29	-	-	-	10,700,442
30	-	-	-	10,700,442
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,700,442</b>	<b>\$10,700,442</b>