I:\data\18\1995\FOLIAGE.TXT

4 samples of these needles, which had been placed in sealed container at -10 degrees F, were washed 6/29, and the wash analyzed the results showed very modest levels of tcaa and essentially ND for so whatever caused the anomolous high reading was either gone, or not associated with the needles in the first place. The latter se the more logical explanation.

data from	m foliage	washings (1	15 ml.	wash water):		
			ug/l			
foliage	wt	tcaa blank	tcaa	tcaa in wash		
grams	vial #	(estimated)val	per g foliage	(calc'd	as ppb)
3.86	7	0.27	0.532	1.018		
6.7	8	0.27	0.512	0.541		
11.82	9	0.27	1.112	1.068		
13.31	10	0.27	0.504	0.263		

avg 0.723

so, looks like the amount of tcaa on the surface of needles w. can be by washing amounts to about 0.7 ppb (by wt) of the total; this is cons with the pair of samples from 3050 feet above, where the washed sampl about 1.2 ppb less tcaa than the unwashed sample

also of potential interest is the amount of water which fir foliage a hold. I took dry foliage samples, and spritzed water on with an atom the type used for windex. The average of three readings indicates th of needles can hold 0.6 grams of water.

Brunswick, NJ vels of a is that ass vials, d (tcaa) 14, 1994 and es. No et al ppb, foliage dcaa tcaa -3.57 6.183 -3.94 4.068 1.008 7.752 -5.14 5.548 -2.35 4.597 -4.49 2.245 380.3 1459. this value almost certainly result of error. 0.1

dles shown , and then multiply by

that, since

removed istent e had

ppears able to
izer of
at 1 gram