

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

CC: T. A. Foster

June 14, 1984

TO: J. A. Schmid

FROM: J. F. Doughty

J. F. Doughty

UPDATE on C-8 IN WATER SAMPLES

The attached table shows the C-8 in water data including the most recent data. I conclude the new data confirm the original data.

1. The Du Pont data shows that the test does not see C-8 up river and the sampling system does not contaminate the sample.
2. The second Washington sample had essentially the same C-8 content as the first.
3. The new Lubeck sample shows essentially the same concentration as the Washington sample. Thus the Washington sample is from the Lubeck Water System as I suspect or at least the Lubeck system has the same concentration.
4. The original Little Hocking sample was very close to the detection limit for the test. The concentration now appears to be below the detection limit.

I do not plan to do additional sampling unless further information is needed. The concentrations are very low and in my judgement are not cause for concern.

RJZ009215

EID079098

C-8 IN WATER (3/15/84) and (6/4/84)

LOCATION	DISTANCE (MILES)	SIDE	ppb C-8***
PARKERSEURG	7.5 up stream	WV	ND
DU PONT (3/15/84) (6/4/84)	0.5 up stream	WV	ND ND
DISTRIBUTION CENTER OF PARKERSBURG	0.25 down stream*	WV	ND
WASHINGTON (3/15/84) (6/4/84)	0.25 down stream	WV	1.2 ^{1.2} 1.0 ^{1.1}
LUBECK (6/4/84)	0.25 down stream	WV	1.5
LITTLE HOCKING (3/15/84) (6/4/84)	3 down stream	OHIO	0.6 ^{0.25} 0.8 ^{8/24/84} ND
BELLEVILLE	12 down stream	WV	ND
REEDSVILLE	14 down stream	OHIO	ND
RAVENSWOOD	29 down stream	WV	ND
RACINE	50 down stream	OHIO	ND
POINT PLEASANT	74 down stream	WV	ND
** CALLIPOLIS	79 down stream	OHIO	ND

*well is back from the river

**first community to take water directly from the river

***values obtained from Experimental Station multiplied by 1.5 to
convert to C-8 vs F content originally reported

ND = below the detection limit of 0.6 as C-8 (0.4 as F)

RJZ009216