

SoundEarth Strategies, Inc. 2811 Fairview Avenue East, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98102

PRELIMINARY PLANNING ASSESSMENT



Property:

Former Northern State Hospital Property 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington

Report Date:

October 25, 2017

Prepared for:

Pollution Liability Insurance Agency 300 Desmond Drive Southeast Lacey, Washington

Preliminary Planning Assessment

Prepared for:

Pollution Liability Insurance Agency 300 Desmond Drive Southeast Lacey, Washington 98370

Former Northern State Hospital Property 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington

Project No.: 1303-003-01

Prepared by:

Clare Tochilin, LG Project Hydrogeologist

Reviewed by:

John Funderburk Principal

October 25, 2017



Terry Montoya, PE Principal



P:\1303 WA PLIA Loan & Grant\1303-003 Port of Skagit\Deliverables\2017 PPA\1303-003_PPA_F.docx

ACRC	ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONSiv				
EXEC	υτιν	E SUMN	/IARY	E	S-i
1.0 IN	ITROI	DUCTION	N		1
	1.1	PROJEC	T OBJECTIVES.		1
200					
2.0 B/	ACKG	ROUND	•••••		1
	2.1	GENER	AL SITE INFOR	MATION	1
		2.1.1	UST System C	omponents	2
	2.2	SITE HI	STORY		2
		2.2.1	Surrounding F	Property Descriptions and History	2
	2.3	SITE US	Έ		3
	2.4	GEOLO	GIC AND HYDR	OLOGIC SETTING	3
3.0 FI	ELD I	NVESTIG	ATIONS		4
	3.1	PREVIC	US INVESTIGA	TIONS	4
		3.1.1	Data Gaps		5
	3.2	SITE CH	IARACTERIZAT	ION	6
		3.2.1	Utility Survey		7
		3.2.2	Soil Investigat	ion	7
		3.2.3	Reconnaissan	ce Groundwater Sampling	8
		3.2.4	Monitoring W	ell Installation and Groundwater Sampling	8
		3.2.5	Additional Soi	I Investigation, Monitoring Well Installation, and Groundwater	
			Sampling		9
		3.2.6	Vapor Intrusio	on Assessment	9
		3.2.7	Quality Assura	ance and Quality Control	.10
		3.2.8	Sampling and	Analytical Results	.10
			3.2.8.1	Soil	.10
			3.2.8.2	Reconnaissance Groundwater	.11
			3.2.8.3	Monitoring Well Groundwater Results	.12
			3.2.8.4	Vapor	.13
			3.2.8.3	Data Quality Review	.13
4.0 C	ONCE	PTUAL S	ITE MODEL		13
	4.1	CHEMI	CALS AND MEE	DIA OF CONCERN	13
	4.2	NATUR	E AND EXTENT	OF CONTAMINATION	13
	4.3	CONTA	MINANT FATE	AND TRANSPORT	14
		4.3.1	Environmenta	al Fate of Petroleum Hydrocarbons in the Subsurface	.14
		4.3.2	Transport Me	chanism Affecting the Distribution of Petroleum Hydrocarbons in	
			the Subsurfac	e	.14
	4.4	EXPOSU	JRE PATHWAY	ASSESSMENT	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

4.4.2 Groundwater 15 4.4.3 Vapor 16 4.5 TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGICAL EVALUATION 16 5.0 PROPOSED CLEANUP STANDARDS 16 5.1 APPLICABLE OR RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS 16 5.2 CLEANUP STANDARDS 18 5.2.1 Cleanup Levels 18 5.2.2 Points of Compliance 18 5.2.2 Point of Compliance for Groundwater 19 5.2.2.1 Point of Compliance for Vapor 19 5.2.2.2 Point of Compliance for Vapor 19 5.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES 20 6.1.1 POINTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVES 22<		4.4.1 Soil		15	
4.4.3 Vapor		4.4.2 Groundwater			
4.5 TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGICAL EVALUATION 16 5.0 PROPOSED CLEANUP STANDARDS 16 5.1 APPLICABLE OR RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS 16 5.2 CLEANUP STANDARDS 18 5.2.1 Cleanup Levels 18 5.2.2 Points of Compliance 18 5.2.2 Point of Compliance for Soil 18 5.2.2.1 Point of Compliance for Soil 18 5.2.2.2 Point of Compliance for Vapor 19 5.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION 19 6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES 20 6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPER		4.4.3 Vapor		16	
5.0 PROPOSED CLEANUP STANDARDS. 16 5.1 APPLICABLE OR RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS. 16 5.2 CLEANUP STANDARDS. 18 5.2.1 Cleanup Levels. 18 5.2.2 Points of Compliance 18 5.2.2 Point of Compliance for Soil 18 5.2.2 Point of Compliance for Vapor 19 5.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION. 19 6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY. 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES. 20 6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES. 20 6.3 IDEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES. 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES. 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA. 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVES. 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVES. 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS. 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24	4.5	TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGICAL EVALUATION1			
5.1 APPLICABLE OR RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS 16 5.2 CLEANUP STANDARDS 18 5.2.1 Cleanup Levels 18 5.2.2 Points of Compliance 18 5.2.2.1 Point of Compliance for Soil 18 5.2.2.2 Point of Compliance for Groundwater 19 5.3.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION 19 6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMINTATIONS 24	5.0 PROPC	SED CLEANUP STAND	ARDS	16	
5.2 CLEANUP STANDARDS. 18 5.2.1 Cleanup Levels. 18 5.2.2 Points of Compliance 18 5.2.2.1 Point of Compliance for Soil. 18 5.2.2.2 Point of Compliance for Groundwater 19 5.2.2.3 Point of Compliance for Vapor. 19 5.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION. 19 6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY. 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES. 19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES. 20 6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES. 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES. 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA. 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	5.1	APPLICABLE OR RELEY	VANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS	16	
5.2.1 Cleanup Levels. .18 5.2.2 Points of Compliance .18 5.2.2.1 Point of Compliance for Soil .18 5.2.2.2 Point of Compliance for Groundwater .19 5.2.2.3 Point of Compliance for Vapor .19 5.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION .19 6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY. .19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES .19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES .20 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES. .20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES .20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES. .20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives .20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES. .21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA. .21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline .22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE .22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL .23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS .23 10.0 RECOM	5.2	CLEANUP STANDARD	S		
5.2.2 Points of Compliance .18 S.2.2.1 Point of Compliance for Soil .18 S.2.2.2 Point of Compliance for Groundwater .19 S.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION. .19 6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY .19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES .19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES .20 6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies .20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES .20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives .20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES .21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA .21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE .21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline .22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE .22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL .23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS .23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS .24 11.0 LIMITATIONS .24 12.0 REFERENCES		5.2.1 Cleanup Leve	ls	18	
5.2.2.1 Point of Compliance for Soil 18 5.2.2.2 Point of Compliance for Groundwater 19 5.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION 19 6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES 20 6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24		5.2.2 Points of Com	npliance	18	
5.2.2.2 Point of Compliance for Groundwater 19 5.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION 19 6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES. 20 6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24		5.2.2.1	Point of Compliance for Soil	18	
5.2.2.3 Point of Compliance for Vapor 19 5.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION 19 6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES 20 6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24		5.2.2.2	Point of Compliance for Groundwater		
5.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION 19 6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVES 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24	F 2	5.2.2.3	Point of Compliance for Vapor		
6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY. 19 6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES. 20 6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 13.1 Property Location Map 24	5.3	AREAS REQUIRING RE	EMEDIATION	19	
6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES 19 6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES 20 6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 FIGURES 1 Property Location Map	6.0 FOCUS	ED FEASIBILITY STUDY	,	19	
6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES	6.1	REMEDIAL ACTION O	BJECTIVES	19	
6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies 20 6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 FIGURES 1 Property Location Map	6.2	IDENTIFICATION AND	EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES	20	
6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 20 6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 FIGURES 1 Property Location Map		6.2.1 Applicability	of Model Remedies	20	
6.3.1 Pilot Studies and Alternatives 20 6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 FIGURES 1 Property Location Map	6.3	DEVELOPMENT OF RE	EMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES		
6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES 21 6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA 21 6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE 21 6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 1 Property Location Map 24		6.3.1 Pilot Studies	and Alternatives	20	
6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA	6.4	EVALUATION OF REM	IEDIAL ALTERNATIVES	21	
6.6 RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE	6.5	DISPROPORTIONATE	COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA	21	
6.6.1 Remedial Action Costs and Timeline 22 7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 FIGURES 1 Property Location Map	6.6	RECOMMENDED REM	1EDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE	21	
7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE 22 8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 FIGURES 24		6.6.1 Remedial Act	ion Costs and Timeline	22	
8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL 23 9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 FIGURES 24 1 Property Location Map	7.0 PROPC	SED INFRASTURCTUR	E UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE	22	
9.0 CONCLUSIONS 23 10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 24 11.0 LIMITATIONS 24 12.0 REFERENCES 24 FIGURES 24 1 Property Location Map	8.0 PROPE	RTY APPRAISAL		23	
10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	9.0 CONCL	USIONS		23	
10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS					
11.0 LIMITATIONS	10.0 RECO	MMENDATIONS		24	
12.0 REFERENCES	11.0 LIMIT	ATIONS		24	
FIGURES	12.0 REFE	RENCES		24	
1 Property Location Map	FIGURES				
	1 Pron	erty Location Man			

- Property Location Map
 Exploration Location Plan
- 3 Soil Analytical Results
- 4 Groundwater Analytical Results
- 5 Soil Gas Analytical Results

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

- 6 Cross Section A–A'
- 7 Groundwater Elevation Contour Map (September 1, 2017)
- 8 Conceptual Site Model Exposure Assessment
- 9 Remedial Action Alternative Proposed Excavation Area

TABLES

- 1 Soil Analytical Results for TPH and BTEX
- 2 Groundwater Analytical Results for TPH and BTEX
- 3 Groundwater Analytical Results for Chlorinated VOCs
- 4 Groundwater Analytical Results for cPAHs
- 5 Sub-Slab Soil Vapor Analytical Results for APH and BTEX
- 6 Remedial Action Alternative Cost Estimate, Remedial Excavation of Soil

IMBEDDED TABLES

2-1	General Site Information	2
2-2	Site Use	3
5-1	Preliminary ARARs for the Site	17
5-2	Proposed Cleanup Levels for Soil	18
5-3	Proposed Cleanup Levels for Groundwater	18

PROPERTY PHOTOGRAPHS

APPENDICES

- A Survey
- B Laboratory Analytical Reports
 - Friedman & Bruya, Inc. #708500
 - Friedman & Bruya, Inc. #708538
 - Friedman & Bruya, Inc. #708539
 - Friedman & Bruya, Inc. #709034
- C Boring Logs

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

μg/L	micrograms per liter
AOC	area of concern
АРН	air-phase petroleum hydrocarbons
ARAR	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement
AS/SVE	air sparge and soil vapor extraction
AST	aboveground storage tank
bgs	below ground surface
BTEX	benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
СОС	chemical of concern
сРАН	carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
CSM	conceptual site model
CVOC	chlorinated volatile organic compound
Dragovich et al.	Dragovich, J.D., D.K. Norman, T.J. Lapen, and G. Anderson
DRPH	diesel-range petroleum hydrocarbons
Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
EEI	Environmental Excavation, Inc.
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
F&BI	Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
GRPH	gasoline-range petroleum hydrocarbons
LNAPL	light nonaqueous-phase liquid
Lone Rock	Lone Rock Resources
MFA	Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc.
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (CONTINUED)

MTCA	Washington State Model Toxics Control Act
NWTPH	Northwest Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon
ORPH	oil-range petroleum hydrocarbons
РАН	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PCE	tetrachloroethene
PID	photoionization detector
РРА	Preliminary Planning Assessment
ppm	parts per million
QA/QC	quality assurance/quality control
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
the Site	the Former Northern State Hospital Property located at 2070 Northern State Road in Sedro-Woolley, Washington
SoundEarth	SoundEarth Strategies, Inc.
TCE	trichloroethene
TEE	Terrestrial Ecological Evaluation
ТРН	total petroleum hydrocarbons
USC	United States Code
USCS	United Soil Classification System
UST	underground storage tank
WAC	Washington Administrative Code

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SoundEarth Strategies, Inc. has prepared this Preliminary Planning Assessment (PPA) for the Former Northern State Hospital property located at 2070 Northern State Road (formerly 7688 Northern State Road), in Sedro-Woolley, Washington (the Site). The PPA was conducted for the Pollution Liability Insurance Agency in accordance with the Statement of Work 175SES00-05 to Contract Number 17-005SES.

The Site is part of the larger Northern State Hospital Property. Based on information gathered to date, the Site includes soil and groundwater contaminated with gasoline-range petroleum hydrocarbons (GRPH) and benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes (BTEX) in the vicinity of the former gasoline underground storage tank (UST) south of the Maintenance Building.

This report only addresses impacts related to the former and current use of petroleum hydrocarbons on the Site. Potential impacts from other chemicals of concern are not discussed and will be addressed separately.

The 225-acre property was initially developed in 1909 and operated as a treatment and residence facility and hospital for people with mental illness until its closure in 1973. The facility included residential buildings, water supply reservoirs and an associated potable water treatment facility, a fueling station, maintenance and paint shops, and a laundry facility. Several of the original buildings have been demolished since the closure of the facility, and debris from some of these buildings was reportedly buried or disposed of on property. The Site is currently comprised of approximately 80 buildings and structures, some of which are leased by tenants, including the U.S. Department of Labor for Cascade Job Corps program, the Pioneer Center North, and the Washington Military Department National Guard. Many of the historical buildings are currently vacant.

Two former USTs were located to the west and south of the Maintenance Building: a 1,000-gallon UST located on the southwest side of the building and 2,000-gallon UST located west of the building. The USTs were utilized for fueling maintenance vehicles. The 2,000-gallon UST was reportedly installed in 1987 as a replacement for an older former gasoline storage tank that showed signs of past leakage. The two gasoline USTs were decommissioned in 1992.

Previous investigations conducted between 1993 and 2014 identified five areas of concern (AOC). AOC 1 was identified as the former Laundry Building, which had detections of chlorinated solvents exceeding the cleanup levels in soil and reconnaissance groundwater samples. AOC 2 was identified as the Power House Building, where heavy oils and carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons were detected in shallow soil. AOCs 3 through 5 were identified as lead, arsenic, and background metals, respectively. Metals have been detected in soil and groundwater samples exceeding applicable cleanup levels throughout the Site and may be area-wide or natural background conditions.

SoundEarth conducted a site characterization focused only on the AOCs that were associated with impacts from petroleum hydrocarbons. This included the Power House Building and the Maintenance Building areas. The site characterization identified concentrations of GRPH and benzene exceeding the applicable Washington State Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) Method A cleanup levels in soil and groundwater in the vicinity of the former gasoline UST at the southwestern corner of the Maintenance Building. Soil contamination in this area is present between approximately 7 and 12 feet below ground surface (bgs). Soil borings B09, B17, B18, and B19, located approximately 15 to 30 feet from the

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (CONTINUED)

contamination observed in boring B11 in the former UST footprint, did not contain detectable concentrations of GRPH or BTEX.

Concentrations of oil-range petroleum hydrocarbons (ORPH) exceeding the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level were identified in soil samples collected at a depth of 0.5 foot bgs in the vicinity of the Power House Building. The samples collected from 4 feet bgs in these borings did not contain detectable concentrations of ORPH. Based on field observations and laboratory analysis of the chromatograms, it was determined that these exceedances were caused by a high amount of asphalt in the samples, rather than a release of ORPH. Therefore, no remediation is warranted in this area.

Groundwater was encountered at depths ranging from 10 to 16 feet bgs during drilling activities. Groundwater elevation contouring indicated that groundwater flows in a northeasterly direction. Reconnaissance and monitoring well groundwater sampling results indicate that concentrations of GRPH and benzene are present at concentrations exceeding the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup levels in samples collected within the footprint of the former gasoline UST at the southwestern corner of the Maintenance Building. GRPH and benzene were not detected above applicable cleanup levels in other monitoring wells at the Site, indicating that groundwater contamination from petroleum hydrocarbons at the Site is limited to the vicinity of the former gasoline UST.

The purpose of the focused feasibility study is to develop and evaluate cleanup action alternatives to facilitate selection of a final cleanup action at the Site in accordance with Chapter 173-340-350(8) of the Washington Administrative Code. A feasibility study includes the development, screening, and evaluation process for numerous remedial alternatives.

SoundEarth evaluated the applicability of Model Remedies based on Washington State Department of Ecology's *Model Remedies for Sites with Petroleum Contaminated Soils* and *Model Remedies for Sites with Petroleum Impacts to Groundwater*. Based on the conceptual site model, the Site qualifies for a Model Remedy for sites with impacts to groundwater. Groundwater Model Remedy #1 has been selected for the Site.

The selected remedial action will be to excavate all soil exceeding the MTCA Method A cleanup levels from the Site. Groundwater impacts on the Site are limited to the area of soil contamination; therefore, all contaminated groundwater will be removed during the excavation activities. As such, at the conclusion of the remedial action, the soil and groundwater cleanup levels would be met. This remedial action is thereby consistent with the groundwater Model Remedy #1.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

SoundEarth Strategies, Inc. (SoundEarth) has prepared this Preliminary Planning Assessment (PPA) for the Former Northern State Hospital property located at 2070 Northern State Road (formerly 7688 Northern State Road), in Sedro-Woolley, Washington (the Site). The Site location is shown on Figure 1. The PPA was conducted for the Pollution Liability Insurance Agency in accordance with the Statement of Work 175SES00-05 to Contract Number 17-005SES for PPA.

The Site is part of the larger Northern State Hospital Property. Based on information gathered to date, the Site includes soil and groundwater contaminated with gasoline-range petroleum hydrocarbons (GRPH) and with benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes (BTEX) in the vicinity of the former gasoline underground storage tank (UST) south of the Maintenance Building.

This report only addresses impacts related to the former and current use of petroleum hydrocarbons on the Site. Potential impacts from other chemicals of concern (COCs) are not discussed and will be addressed separately.

1.1 **PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of the PPA is to provide a comprehensive conceptual understanding of the Site and to evaluate and develop cleanup action alternatives to facilitate selection of a final cleanup action for the Site in accordance with Chapter 173-340-350(8) of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC 173-340-350[8]).

The objective of the PPA is to complete an environmental review for the Site and perform the following tasks:

- Investigate the extent of the Site that could require contaminant remediation and select a preferred remedial action alternative to clean up the Site.
- Secure a property appraisal of the Site prior to improvements for which the owner has applied for financial assistance.
- Complete pre-construction planning for the system upgrades delineating both elapsed time and unit cost factors for the benefit of the owner who has applied for financial assistance.

2.0 BACKGROUND

This section provides a description of the general Site information; summary of current and historical uses of the Site and surrounding properties, and description of the Site environmental setting.

2.1 GENERAL SITE INFORMATION

The Site is located in Sedro-Woolley, Washington, as shown on Figure 1. Information regarding the Site location, description, and key features is provided in Table 2-1.

Site Name	Former Northern State Hospital Property
Street Address	2070 Northern State Road
Property Owner	Washington State Department of Enterprise Services
Parcel Number	Skagit County Parcel Nos. 38607, 39356, 100632, 100646
Parcel Shape and Size	2 square; 2 irregular
Facility/Site No.	Not Applicable
VCP No./Cleanup Site ID No.	Not Applicable

Table 2-1 General Site Information

2.1.1 UST System Components

Two former USTs were located to the west and south of the Maintenance Building: a 1,000gallon UST located on the southwest side of the building and a 2,000-gallon UST located west of the building. The USTs were utilized for fueling maintenance vehicles. The 2,000-gallon UST was reportedly installed in 1987 as a replacement for a former gasoline UST that showed signs of past leakage. The two gasoline USTs were decommissioned on December 1, 1992, by Environmental Excavation, Inc. (EEI; Lone Rock 1993).

During the decommissioning activities in 1992, EEI also decommissioned one 250-gallon heating oil UST located by the Denny Building and one 500-gallon No. 2 diesel fuel UST by the Douglas Building. The Denny Building heating oil UST was reportedly installed in the early 1960s, and the Douglas Building diesel UST was reportedly installed in the 1930s.

2.2 SITE HISTORY

The 225-acre Site was initially developed in 1909 and operated a treatment and residence facility and hospital for people with mental illness until its closure in 1973. The facility included residential buildings, water supply reservoirs and an associated potable water treatment facility, a fueling station, maintenance and paint shops, and a laundry facility. Several of the original buildings have been demolished since the closure of the facility, and debris from some of these buildings was reportedly buried or disposed of on Site. The Site is currently comprised of approximately 80 buildings and structures, some of which are leased by tenants, including the Cascade Job Corps, the Pioneer Center, and the National Guard. Many of the historical buildings are currently vacant.

2.2.1 <u>Surrounding Property Descriptions and History</u>

This section describes the current use of the parcels adjoining to and surrounding the Site:

- North, East, and South. The property to the north, east, and south is the 726-acre Northern State Recreational Area owned by Skagit County.
- West. The parcels to the west are occupied by single-family residences.

2.3 SITE USE

Structure(s) Description and Size	Over 80 buildings and structures
Current Use	U.S. Department of Labor for a Cascade Job Corps program, Washington Military Department National Guard, the Pioneer Center North, vacant buildings
Jurisdiction	Sedro-Woolley
	TH PTN CAMPUS SITE OF SURVEY REC AF#9011130061 LOC IN SE1/4 SD SEC EXC TH PTN LY SLY OF CO RD
	PORTION OF CAMPUS SITE OF SURVEY RECORDED AF#9011130061 BEING PORTION OF E1/2 NE1/4 TOGETHER WITH 5-ACRE PARCEL IN CAMPUS SITE
Legal Description	TH PTN CAMPUS SITE ON SURVEY REC AF#9011130061 LOCATED IN SW1/4 SEC 8
Quarter Section, Township, and Range	Section 8, T35N, R5E
Land Use/Zoning	Public
Future Use	Center for Innovation and Technology

Table 2-2 Site Use

2.4 GEOLOGIC AND HYDROLOGIC SETTING

According to the Geologic Map of the Sedro-Woolley North and Lyman 7.5-minute Quadrangles, the Site and vicinity are underlain by Quaternary glaciomarine drift (Dragovich et al. 1999). The glaciomarine deposits generally consist of "poorly sorted, poorly compacted diamicton consisting of silty, sandy, and gravelly clay to clayey gravel; moderately well- to well-sorted sandy silt, sandy clay, clayey silt, and clay."

Boring logs from previous investigations at the Site indicate that the geology is relatively consistent throughout, except at locations near Hansen Creek in the northwestern portion of the Site. Thick layers of soft to hard, non-plastic silt and clay with varying amounts of fine sand were encountered in most areas to depths of approximately 9 to 15 feet below ground surface (bgs). Thick deposits of bluish gray silty clay to clay with minor lenses of silty sand and silty or sandy gravel were observed to at least 25 feet bgs. Near Hansen Creek, sandy and gravelly soils were observed below the upper silt layer at depths of approximately 6 feet bgs. To the north of the Power House Building (Figure 2), fill material containing brick and woody debris has been observed to depths of up to 15 feet bgs.

Groundwater was encountered during previous investigations at depths ranging from 6 to 14 feet bgs. Several domestic water well logs from the Washington State Department of Ecology's (Ecology) online database indicate that shallow groundwater is present at depths ranging from less than 20 feet to greater than 80 feet bgs, suggesting that the local geology and groundwater conditions are variable.

Two surface water bodies, Hansen Creek and Brickyard Creek, intersect the Site. Hansen Creek flows through the north, east, and southeast portions of the Site, and Brickyard Creek is located along the western perimeter of the Site. Both creeks discharge to the Skagit River to the south.

3.0 FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

This section summarizes activities and results of field investigations conducted at the Site.

3.1 PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

In 1993, Lone Rock Resources conducted a soil evaluation associated with the removal or in-place closure of four USTs at the Site. One 1,000-gallon and one 2,000-gallon gasoline UST were removed from the vicinity of the Maintenance Building. GRPH concentrations of up to 7,000 parts per million (ppm), exceeding the applicable Washington State Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) Method A cleanup level, were detected in soil samples collected from the bottom and sidewalls of the tank beds. Groundwater was observed to be in contact with the impacted soil, but no groundwater samples were collected.

In the vicinity of the Denny Building, one 250-gallon heating oil UST was decommissioned and removed. Petroleum hydrocarbons were not detected above laboratory reporting limits in any of the soil samples collected from the bottom and sidewalls of the tank bed. In the vicinity of the Douglas Building, one 500-gallon diesel UST was decommissioned in place. Soil samples collected from beneath the decommissioned tank contained concentrations of diesel-range petroleum hydrocarbons (DRPH) below the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level. Groundwater was observed directly beneath the tank, but no groundwater samples were collected.

In August 2014, Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc. (MFA) conducted a limited subsurface investigation at the Site, which consisted of the collection of 8 soil samples and 2 reconnaissance groundwater samples from 10 soil borings advanced in the northeastern portion of the Site, where the greatest potential for environmental impacts was identified. Results from this investigation indicated that concentrations of heavy oils exceeding applicable MTCA Method A cleanup levels were present in shallow soil and groundwater near two diesel aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) and the coal storage area to the north of the Power House Building (MFA 2015a). Results also indicated that carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (cPAHs) were present above applicable cleanup levels in shallow soil near the Power House Building. Tetrachloroethene (PCE) was detected above the applicable cleanup level in groundwater near the former Laundry Building.

To address data gaps identified during the limited subsurface investigation, MFA conducted an additional investigation at the Site in April and June 2015. This investigation included the collection of soil and/or groundwater samples from 36 direct push soil borings and 14 hand auger soil borings, as well as the installation and collection of groundwater samples from 4 monitoring wells. One sub-slab soil vapor sample was also collected from beneath the former Laundry Building foundation. The supplemental investigation and associated Preliminary Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study prepared by MFA identified the following five areas of concern (AOCs) for the Site, based on the results from the limited and supplemental subsurface investigations (MFA 2015b):

AOC 1: Former Laundry Building. PCE was detected at a concentration exceeding the MTCA Method A cleanup level in a reconnaissance groundwater sample collected from boring GP8. PCE and trichloroethene (TCE) were detected in shallow soil samples from boring GP23 in the same area, and PCE was also detected in a soil vapor sample collected from beneath the foundation of the former Laundry Building. Soil and vapor concentrations were all below applicable MTCA Method A cleanup levels.

- AOC 2: Power House Building. Heavy oils and cPAHs were detected at concentrations exceeding the MTCA Method A cleanup level in shallow (0.5 foot bgs) soil samples from borings GP9 and GP10. Heavy oils were also detected above the cleanup level in one reconnaissance groundwater sample collected from boring GP2.
- AOC 3: Lead. Concentrations of lead exceeding the MTCA Method A cleanup level were detected in soil samples near some historical buildings and in the athletic field. Concentrations of lead in groundwater exceeding the cleanup level were detected north of the paint, planer, and carpentry buildings.
- AOC 4: Arsenic. Concentrations of arsenic exceeding the MTCA Method A cleanup level were detected in soil samples in the athletic field and near the former ward buildings. Arsenic was also detected above the cleanup level in groundwater samples collected from borings in the northeastern portion of the Site.
- AOC 5: Background Metals. Slightly elevated concentrations of metals, including barium, chromium, copper, selenium, and zinc, were detected at slightly elevated concentrations throughout the Site. These metals concentrations are suspected to be area-wide or natural background conditions, based on their distribution and consistency of concentrations.

3.1.1 Data Gaps

After review of previous investigations conducted at the Site, SoundEarth identified the following data gaps:

- Lateral and vertical extent of oil-range petroleum hydrocarbons (ORPH) impacts to soil and groundwater near two existing 8,000-gallon diesel ASTs north of the Power House Building at the Site. Previous investigations identified ORPH impacts to shallow soil and groundwater at concentrations above the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level, but the extent has not been delineated laterally or vertically.
- Lateral and vertical extent of GRPH impacts to soil and groundwater in the vicinity of two former gasoline USTs near the Maintenance Building. During the decommissioning of both tanks in 1992, GRPH concentrations above the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level were detected in soil samples collected from the sidewalls and bottom of the tank beds. Groundwater was observed to be in contact with impacted soil, but was not sampled.
- Site maintenance workers at the Power House Building indicated that drums containing Bunker C fuel oil were potentially left on the western portion of the Site over 20 years ago. The exact location of the drums and the total number are unknown.
- Extent of PCE impacts in groundwater near the former Laundry Building and possibility of commingled contaminant plumes for solvents and petroleum. Previous investigations identified a PCE concentration exceeding the applicable cleanup level in one reconnaissance groundwater sample, as well as PCE and TCE detections in soil at concentrations below the applicable cleanup levels. However, the extent has not been defined and the potential for commingled plumes needs to be determined.
- The vapor intrusion pathway in the vicinity of the petroleum impacts has not been assessed.

3.2 SITE CHARACTERIZATION

The following sections outline the field activities completed as part of the PPA on the Site between August and September 2017. SoundEarth focused only on the AOCs that were associated with impacts from petroleum hydrocarbons.

The scope of work included the following tasks:

- Reviewing of the contamination at the Site based on existing historical data and review of historical records for the Site.
- Preparing a Work Plan that met the substantive requirements of WAC 173-340-350(7)(8). The Work Plan summarized the Site history and investigation necessary to close the identified data gaps (SoundEarth 2017).
- Preparing a health and safety plan in accordance with MTCA and Part 1910.120 of Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations (29 CFR 1910.120) before initiating field activities.
- Completing public and private utility locates to identify the location of underground utilities.
- Advancing 19 direct-push soil borings to depths ranging from 16 to 20 feet bgs.
- Collecting soil samples every 4 feet in each soil boring.
- Collecting reconnaissance groundwater samples from borings B06 and B11.
- Completing borings B01, B05, B15, and B16 as monitoring wells MW05, MW06, MW07, and MW08, respectively.
- Collecting low-flow groundwater samples from monitoring wells MW01 and MW03 through MW08.
- Conducting a survey of the top of casing elevations in newly installed monitoring wells MW05 through MW08.
- Submitting select soil and groundwater samples for laboratory analysis of one or more of the following COCs:
 - GRPH by Northwest Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (NWTPH) Method NWTPH-Gx
 - DRPH and OPRH by NWTPH-Dx
 - BTEX by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 8021B
 - Chlorinated volatile organic compounds (CVOCs) by EPA Method 8260C
 - cPAHs by EPA Method 8270D SIM
- Collecting one sub-slab soil gas sample from beneath the concrete slab in the Maintenance Building and submitting the soil gas sample for laboratory analysis of the following COCs:
 - BTEX by Method TO-15
 - Air-phase petroleum hydrocarbons (APH) by Method MA-APH
- Preparing this PPA Report.

A detailed description of the investigation activities is provided in the following subsections. Boring locations and analytical results are depicted on Figures 2 through 6. Laboratory analytical results are presented in Tables 1 through 5.

3.2.1 <u>Utility Survey</u>

Prior to commencement of subsurface activities, SoundEarth conducted public and private utility locates to identify all subsurface features at the Site. The public utility locate was conducted by calling the one-call utility notification center to locate all public utilities. A private utility locate was conducted by CNI Locates Ltd.

Skagit Surveyors & Engineers completed a property boundary and utility survey prior to work conducted during PPA. The complete survey map is provided in Appendix A.

3.2.2 Soil Investigation

On August 28 and 29, 2017, Standard Environmental Probe, under the direction of a licensed SoundEarth geologist, advanced 14 direct-push soil borings (B01 through B14) at the Site at locations as described below (Figure 2):

- B01 through B04 were advanced in the vicinity of previous boring GP2, north of the Power House Building, where ORPH was detected in soil during a previous investigation.
- B05 was advanced in the area between the Maintenance Building and the former Laundry Building to confirm the lateral separation between petroleum and PCE impacts.
- B06 through B13 were advanced in the vicinity of the two former gasoline USTs near the Maintenance Building to characterize and determine the extent of impacts from the former USTs.
- Boring B14 was advanced within the eastern portion of the Power House Building to confirm the southern extent of soil impacts in that area.

Borings B01 through B13 were advanced to depths between 16 and 20 feet bgs using a truckmounted GeoProbe drill rig. Boring B14 was advanced to a depth of 2 feet bgs using a limited access hand-held rotary hammer. Discrete soil samples were collected from each boring at 5foot depth intervals. Soil samples were described in accordance with the United Soil Classification System (USCS) and were screened in the field for potential evidence of contamination using visual observations and notations of odor, and by conducting headspace analysis using a photoionization detector (PID) to detect the presence of volatile organic vapors.

Based on boring locations, screening results, sampling depths, and observed soil characteristics, soil samples were selected from each soil boring, placed on ice in a cooler, and delivered to Friedman & Bruya, Inc. (F&BI) of Seattle, Washington, under standard chain-of-custody protocol for chemical analysis of one or more of the following: GRPH, DRPH, ORPH, and BTEX.

Soil cuttings and decontamination water generated during all drilling activities were contained on the Site in labeled 16-gallon drums, pending waste profiling and proper disposal.

3.2.3 <u>Reconnaissance Groundwater Sampling</u>

Groundwater was encountered in borings B01 through B13 at depths ranging from approximately 10 to 16 feet bgs. Based on boring locations and observed soil and groundwater characteristics, reconnaissance groundwater samples were collected from borings B06 and B11, in the locations of the former gasoline USTs near the Maintenance Building. A temporary monitoring well consisting of 1-inch-diameter PVC casing with a 5-foot screened interval was installed in each boring. Prior to collecting the samples, groundwater was purged from each boring using a peristaltic pump until turbidity had decreased (approximately 1 to 2 gallons). Groundwater samples were placed on ice in a cooler and delivered to F&BI under standard chain-of-custody protocol for chemical analysis of one or more of the following: GRPH, DRPH, ORPH, BTEX, and CVOCs.

The well casing was removed from each boring after sample collection. Borings B06 and B11 were subsequently decommissioned by filling the boreholes with hydrated bentonite chips and sealing with concrete to grade, in accordance with procedures specified in the Minimum Standards for Construction and Maintenance of Wells (WAC 173-360). Purge water generated during reconnaissance groundwater sample collection was contained on the Site in labeled 16-gallon drums, pending waste profiling and proper disposal.

3.2.4 Monitoring Well Installation and Groundwater Sampling

Soil borings B01 and B05 were completed as permanent monitoring wells MW05 and MW06, respectively. The wells were constructed using 1-inch-diameter PVC casing with 0.010-inch slotted well screen from 10 to 20 feet bgs. The monitoring wells were developed after installation by purging with a peristaltic pump until low turbidity was achieved. Approximately 7 to 8 well volumes of groundwater were purged from each monitoring well during well development.

On September 1, 2017, newly installed monitoring wells MW05 and MW06 and existing monitoring MW01, MW03, and MW04 were sampled by SoundEarth in accordance with the EPA *Low-Flow (Minimal Drawdown) Ground-Water Sampling Procedures* (EPA 1996). MW02 did not contain a sufficient volume of water for sample collection. Prior to sampling, SoundEarth opened all monitoring wells to allow water levels to equilibrate with atmospheric pressure for a minimum of 30 minutes before obtaining groundwater level measurements. Groundwater levels were measured to an accuracy of 0.01 foot using an electronic water level meter.

Purging and sampling of groundwater were performed using a peristaltic pump and dedicated polyethylene tubing. During purging, water quality was monitored using a YSI water-quality meter equipped with a flow-through cell. The six water quality parameters that were monitored and recorded during well purging included temperature, pH, specific conductivity, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and oxidation-reduction potential. At the time of sampling, depths to groundwater ranged from 7.70 (MW05) to 18.88 (MW02) feet bgs.

After collection, groundwater samples were labeled, placed on ice in a cooler, and delivered to F&BI under standard chain-of-custody protocols. Samples were submitted for laboratory analysis of GRPH, DRPH, ORPH, and BTEX. The sample collected from monitoring well MW06 was also submitted for analysis of CVOCs to confirm the lateral separation between petroleum and PCE impacts in groundwater. The groundwater sample from well MW05 was also submitted

for analysis of cPAHs, based on the historical detection of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in soil in the vicinity of the monitoring well.

Purge water generated during well development and groundwater sample collection was contained on the Site in labeled 16-gallon drums, pending waste profiling and proper disposal.

3.2.5 Additional Soil Investigation, Monitoring Well Installation, and Groundwater Sampling

Based on the results of the soil and groundwater sampling between August 28 and September 1, 2017, SoundEarth returned to the Site to advance additional soil borings and install two additional monitoring wells. On September 19, 2017, Standard Environmental Probe, under the direction of a licensed SoundEarth geologist, advanced five additional direct-push soil borings (B15 through B19) to the north, south, and east of boring B01 (Figure 2). These borings were advanced to further define the extent of GRPH impacts in soil exceeding the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level in a sample collected from boring B11, south of the Maintenance Building. Borings B15 through B19 were advanced to depths of 15 to 20 feet bgs using a truck-mounted GeoProbe drill rig. Discrete soil samples were collected from each boring at 5-foot depth intervals. Soil samples were described in accordance with the USCS and were screened in the field for potential evidence of contamination using visual observations and notations of odor, and by conducting headspace analysis using a PID. Soil samples were selected from each direct-push boring, placed on ice in a cooler, and delivered to F&BI for chemical analysis of GRPH and BTEX.

Borings B15 and B16, located at and approximately 50 feet east (downgradient) from previous boring B11, were completed as permanent monitoring wells MW07 and MW08, respectively, to further characterize the nature of GRPH impacts in groundwater at boring B11 and to define the downgradient extent of groundwater impacts. The wells were constructed using 1-inchdiameter PVC casing with 0.010-inch slotted well screen from 10 to 20 feet bgs. The monitoring wells were developed after installation by purging with a peristaltic pump until low turbidity was achieved. Approximately 7 to 8 well volumes of groundwater were purged from each monitoring well during well development.

On September 20, 2017, newly installed monitoring wells MW07 and MW08 were sampled by SoundEarth in accordance with EPA 1996 guidance. At the time of sampling, depths to groundwater ranged from 10.16 (MW07) to 12.62 (MW08) feet bgs.

After collection, groundwater samples were labeled, placed on ice in a cooler, and delivered to F&BI under standard chain-of-custody protocols. Samples were submitted for laboratory analysis of GRPH and BTEX.

Soil cuttings, decontamination water, and purge water generated during all drilling and sampling activities were contained on the Site in labeled 16-gallon drums, pending waste profiling and proper disposal.

3.2.6 Vapor Intrusion Assessment

On September 19, 2017, SoundEarth advanced sub-slab soil gas point SG01 beneath the concrete slab in the southwestern corner of the Maintenance Building (Figure 2). The sub-slab soil gas point was constructed by drilling a hole though the 4-inch-thick slab using a rotary hammer and installing a stainless steel Vapor Pin, according to the manufacturer's instructions. A leak test was performed to ensure that the sub-slab soil gas point and sample tubing was

adequately sealed to prevent atmospheric air from reaching the subsurface. Water was placed within the sample point and 0.25 liter was purged from the sample train to confirm no leaks.

After purging, an F&BI-provided 1-liter SUMMA canister fitted with a 200-milliliter-per-minute flow controller was used to pull air through a TO-17 sorbent tube to collect a sample from the sub-slab soil gas point. The TO-17 sorbent tube was delivered to F&BI under standard chain-of-custody protocols. The sample was analyzed for total naphthalenes by EPA Method TO-15 and APH by EPA Method MA-APH.

Soil boring SG01 was completed with a flush-mount stainless steel cap and left in place in the event that additional sub-slab sampling is necessary.

3.2.7 Quality Assurance and Quality Control

SoundEarth conducted a quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) review of all laboratory analytical reports in order to evaluate the usability of analytical results to meet the objectives of the PPA. The following QA/QC criteria were reviewed:

- The laboratory data package for completeness.
- Sample chain-of-custody forms, including a comparison of the requested analyses against laboratory reported information, signatures, sample condition upon receipt by the laboratory, and sample preservation.
- Holding times for each analysis.
- Laboratory QA/QC, including recoveries for surrogate, matrix spike, matrix spike duplicates, laboratory control standards, and relative percent differences for duplicate sample analysis and matrix spike/matrix spike duplicates and laboratory control standards/laboratory control duplicates.

3.2.8 Sampling and Analytical Results

Soil, groundwater, and vapor analytical results are depicted on Figures 3 through 5, and presented in Tables 1 through 5. A geologic cross section of the Site is depicted on Figure 6. Copies of the laboratory analytical reports are included in Appendix B.

3.2.8.1 Soil

Boring logs for borings B01 through B19 are presented in Appendix C. Analytical results for soil samples are presented on Figure 3 and in Table 1, and are discussed in the following section:

Power House Building Area

- Shallow soil conditions in the vicinity of the Power House Building generally consisted of loose to medium dense fill material consisting of silty or sandy gravel with variable amounts of asphalt, brick, and wood fragments to approximately 2 to 6 feet bgs. In some locations, the fill material consisted primarily of anthropogenic material. Underlying the fill material in this area, soil conditions consisted of tan to dark brown silt with variable amounts of fine sand and organic material, including wood and roots to the maximum depth of exploration (20 feet bgs).
- Concentrations of ORPH exceeding the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level were detected in soil samples collected at a depth of 0.5 foot bgs in borings B01,

B02, and B03 near the Power House Building. ORPH concentrations in these samples ranged from 2,300 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) to 4,300 mg/kg. The samples collected from 4 feet bgs in these borings did not contain detectable concentrations of ORPH. Based on field observations and analysis of the chromatograms by F&BI, it was determined that these exceedances were caused by a high amount of asphalt in the samples, rather than a release of ORPH.

 A concentration of DRPH below the applicable cleanup level was detected in the soil sample collected from boring B02 at a depth of 0.5 foot bgs. However, the DRPH detection in this sample was flagged by the laboratory as not representative of the standard used for quantitation.

Maintenance Building Area

- Shallow soil conditions in the vicinity of the Maintenance Building generally consisted of 0.5 to 1 foot of fill material consisting of sandy gravel or crushed concrete and asphalt, underlain by tan to brown silt with variable amounts of sand to approximately 10 to 12 feet bgs. From approximately 12 feet bgs to the maximum depth of exploration (20 feet bgs), soils consisted of gray silt to clayey silt with intermittent fine sand lenses.
- A faint hydrocarbon odor was observed in boring B06, located within the footprint of the former gasoline UST to the west of the Maintenance Building, at a depth of approximately 11.5 to 13 feet bgs. The highest PID reading observed in this boring was 3.0 ppm. A moderate hydrocarbon odor was observed in boring B11, located within the footprint of the former gasoline UST at the southwest corner of the Maintenance Building, at a depth of approximately 7 to 9 feet bgs. PID readings of up to 548.2 ppm were observed in boring B11.
- A concentration of GRPH (620 mg/kg) exceeding the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level was detected in the soil sample collected at a depth of 8 feet bgs in boring B11, located within the footprint of the former gasoline UST at the southwest corner of the Maintenance Building. GRPH was not detected above the laboratory reporting limit in any other soil samples submitted for analysis.
- Toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes were detected at concentrations below the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup levels in the soil sample collected at 8 feet bgs in boring B11. BTEX concentrations were not detected above laboratory reporting limits in any of the other samples submitted for analysis.

3.2.8.2 Reconnaissance Groundwater

Groundwater was encountered in borings B01 through B19 at depths ranging from 10 to 16 feet bgs, except for borings B14 and B17 where groundwater was not encountered. Analytical results for groundwater samples are presented on Figures 4 and in Tables 2 and 3, and are discussed in the following section:

Maintenance Building Area

 Petroleum Hydrocarbons. A concentration of GRPH (5,300 micrograms per liter [μg/L]) exceeding the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level was detected in the reconnaissance groundwater sample collected from borings B11 in the footprint of the former gasoline UST at the southwest corner of the Maintenance Building. GRPH was detected at a concentration below the applicable cleanup level (270 μ g/L) in the reconnaissance groundwater sample collected from boring B06 in the footprint of the former gasoline UST to the west of the Maintenance Building.

A DRPH concentration below the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level was also detected in the reconnaissance groundwater sample collected from boring B06. However, this sample was flagged by the laboratory as not representative of the standard used for quantitation. ORPH was not detected above the laboratory reporting limit in this sample.

- BTEX. Benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes were detected at concentrations below the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup levels in the reconnaissance groundwater sample collected from boring B11.
- CVOCs. CVOCs were not detected at concentrations exceeding the applicable MTCA cleanup levels in the reconnaissance groundwater sample collected from boring B06.

3.2.8.3 Monitoring Well Groundwater Results

Groundwater samples were collected from the permanent monitoring wells across the Site. Analytical results for the groundwater samples are presented on Figure 4, and the groundwater contour map is depicted on Figure 7. Analytical results are presented in Tables 2 through 4, and are discussed below:

- Petroleum Hydrocarbons. A concentration of GRPH below the MTCA Method A cleanup level was detected in monitoring well MW07. DRPH concentrations below the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level were detected in the groundwater samples collected from monitoring wells MW05 and MW07. However, these samples were flagged by the laboratory as not representative of the standard used for quantitation. ORPH was not detected above the laboratory reporting limits in any of the groundwater samples submitted for analysis.
- BTEX. A concentration of benzene exceeding the MTCA Method A cleanup level was detected in monitoring well MW07. Concentrations of toluene and ethylbenzene below the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup levels were also detected in monitoring well MW07. Toluene was detected at a concentration below the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level in the groundwater sample collected from monitoring well MW01. BTEX constituents were not detected above laboratory reporting limits in any other groundwater samples submitted for analysis.
- **CVOCs.** CVOCs were not detected at concentrations exceeding the applicable MTCA cleanup levels in the groundwater sample collected from monitoring well MW06.
- **cPAHs.** cPAHs were not detected at concentrations exceeding the applicable MTCA cleanup levels in the groundwater sample collected from monitoring well MW05.

3.2.8.4 Vapor

Soil gas laboratory analytical results were compared to applicable Method B sub-slab soil gas screening levels. Soil gas analytical results are presented on Figure 5 and in Table 5.

 Soil gas collected from SG01 did not exhibit concentrations of APHs or BTEX in excess of laboratory reporting limits.

3.2.8.5 Data Quality Review

The results of QA/QC review indicated that the following criteria were acceptable:

- All data packages/laboratory reports were complete and all samples were received properly preserved and in good condition.
- Recoveries for surrogates, matrix spikes, matrix spike duplicates, laboratory control standards, and duplicates and relative percent differences for matrix spike/matrix spike duplicates were within the method limits.
- The GRPH and BTEX analyses of soil samples B01-15 and B06-15 were performed outside the method holding time requirement.

The analytical results for the soil and soil gas samples are considered to be usable to meet the objectives of the PPA. Copies of the laboratory analytical reports are provided as Appendix B.

4.0 CONCEPTUAL SITE MODEL

A preliminary conceptual site model (CSM) has been developed to identify confirmed and suspected source areas of COCs to the media of concern, potential migration pathways, potential receptors, and exposure pathways at the Site. The CSM is discussed below.

4.1 CHEMICALS AND MEDIA OF CONCERN

The chemical and media of concerns for the Site are GRPH and BTEX in soil and groundwater.

Although concentrations of ORPH were detected above the MTCA Method A cleanup level, the detections are associated with asphalt debris.

Based on previous investigations, metals and chlorinated solvents may be COCs on other portions of the Site. This report is only focused on Site-related impacts from a release from the former USTs.

4.2 NATURE AND EXTENT OF CONTAMINATION

Based on the available analytical data, there is one confirmed source area on the Site. The primary source area is from the former gasoline UST at the southwestern corner of the Maintenance Building. Soil contamination is present from approximately 7 to 9 feet bgs in this location. GRPH impacts in soil do not extend greater than 15 feet in any direction from the source area. Groundwater contamination is present in the immediate vicinity of the former UST and extends less than 30 feet to the east (downgradient) from the source area.

4.3 CONTAMINANT FATE AND TRANSPORT

The fate and transport of the contaminants in the environment affect their migration, mobility, and persistence. Within the media of concern, petroleum hydrocarbons may exist in four phases. The four phases include soil vapor (soil gas), solid phase (adsorption on to soil particles), aqueous phase (dissolved in groundwater and soil pore water), and light nonaqueous-phase liquids (LNAPL; within the soil and on the groundwater). The transport of petroleum hydrocarbons in the media of concern is dependent on the texture of the soil and hydrologic properties of the aquifer. The fate of the petroleum hydrocarbons is dependent on their chemical properties (solubility and volatility) and biological and abiological processes in the media of concern.

4.3.1 Environmental Fate of Petroleum Hydrocarbons in the Subsurface

The most significant fate process for petroleum hydrocarbons is biodegradation (i.e., natural attenuation). Once petroleum hydrocarbons enter the subsurface, natural attenuation of the compound begins. The natural attenuation processes include intrinsic abiotic and biotic degradation in the groundwater and soil, and adsorption onto soil particles. Both abiotic and biotic processes degrade petroleum hydrocarbons to carbon dioxide, assuming the appropriate geochemical conditions are present in soil and groundwater. Adsorption onto soil particles retards the vertical and lateral migration of petroleum hydrocarbons, and the residual saturation capacity of soil affects the vertical migration of LNAPL. In addition, advection and dispersion dilute the concentration of petroleum hydrocarbons in the groundwater as the compounds migrate downgradient from the source release areas. Evidence for natural attenuation processes in soil and groundwater would include the presence of aerobic to slightly anaerobic conditions in the groundwater, significant shrinking in the magnitude and extent of the petroleum contaminant plumes, degradation products for the COCs in the groundwater and soil, and the absence of petroleum hydrocarbons in groundwater at or below the source area or at downgradient monitoring wells.

4.3.2 <u>Transport Mechanism Affecting the Distribution of Petroleum Hydrocarbons in the</u> <u>Subsurface</u>

The transportation and distribution of petroleum hydrocarbons in the vadose zone beneath the Site is controlled by a number of factors, including the following:

- The mass of contamination released from each source area.
- Adsorption and desorption of contaminants from soil particles and organic matter. Adsorption is a function of moisture content of the soil, the organic carbon partitioning coefficient for the contaminants, and the concentration of organic matter in the soil.
- The diffusive transport of contaminated vapors from areas of high to low concentrations.
- Advective transport of vapors due to changes in pressure and temperature gradients.
- Natural mechanisms, including temperature, groundwater, and barometric pressure fluctuations, may result in the volatilization of total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) in soil and groundwater to soil vapor via soil and/or groundwater to air partitioning.

Soil vapor with concentrations of TPH may transport to the surface with barometric pressure fluctuations.

The transportation and distribution of petroleum hydrocarbons in the groundwater controls the lateral and vertical migration of petroleum hydrocarbons by advection and dispersion transport mechanisms. Advection is a function of hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer material and the hydraulic gradient of the groundwater. Under advective transport, dissolved contaminants follow the direction of groundwater flow, sometimes referred to as the advection front. Dispersive mixing causes some contaminant molecules to move ahead (longitudinal) of the average advective velocity along the hydraulic gradient and some molecules to move laterally (transverse) to the hydraulic gradient. The net effect is to spread (disperse) the contaminant plume about the advective front. The amount of spreading is related to the dispersivity of the soil, microscopic velocities through the pore spaces in the soil, the advective velocity of groundwater flow, and the molecular diffusion of the contaminant in the water within the pore spaces.

4.4 EXPOSURE PATHWAY ASSESSMENT

The exposure assessment identifies potential receptors for exposure pathways for environmental media of potential concern from contaminant fate and transport mechanisms. Potential receptors at risk from exposure associated with the presence of COCs at the Site are human and ecological receptors. The objective of the preliminary exposure assessment is to assess the completeness of exposure pathways from environmental media of potential concern and associated contaminant fate and transport mechanisms for the potential receptors for the Site. The results from the preliminary exposure assessment will assist with the evaluation of potential feasible cleanup alternatives that are protective of the potential receptors identified as complete. The preliminary exposure assessment for each exposure pathway and associated environmental media of potential concern is summarized below by affected environmental media. The exposure pathway assessment is illustrated on Figure 8.

4.4.1 <u>Soil</u>

Soil with concentrations of COCs above the preliminary cleanup levels may present a potential exposure pathway to human and/or ecological receptors. The potential exposure pathways for soil at the Site include direct contact (dermal contact and ingestion), leaching to groundwater, direct contact to surface water, and inhalation of soil vapors. The exposure pathways for subsurface soil via dermal contact or ingestion and the exposure pathway via leaching to groundwater are considered complete for the COCs at the Site. The standard point of compliance for the direct contact exposure pathway for soil is 15 feet bgs for human health and 6 feet bgs for terrestrial receptors. A depth of 15 feet bgs is a reasonable depth that could be excavated during normal redevelopment activities and distributed at the ground surface (WAC 173-340-[6][d] and WAC 173-340-7490[4][b]).

This pathway is considered complete due to possible exposure by workers during redevelopment activities. The area is unpaved; therefore, the terrestrial direct contact is also considered complete.

4.4.2 <u>Groundwater</u>

Potential exposure pathways for groundwater contamination include the pathway to surface water, volatilization into soil vapor, or via the direct contact pathway, which comprises both the

dermal contact and ingestion pathways. There are no groundwater supply wells at or in the vicinity of the Site that are used for potable water supply. Shallow groundwater at the Site is not used as a drinking water source and is likely a non-potable resource as defined in WAC 173-340-720[2][b][i].

This pathway is considered complete for direct contact due to possible exposure by workers during redevelopment activities and for terrestrial receptors.

4.4.3 <u>Vapor</u>

The exposure pathway for inhalation of volatile COCs from soil gas or groundwater is considered incomplete. The air-filled pore space between soil grains in the unsaturated zone, or partially saturated zone, is referred to as soil gas or soil vapor. Based on the sub-slab soil gas sample collected from beneath the concrete slab of the existing building, concentrations of volatile petroleum constituents are not present above their respective Method B sub-slab soil gas screening levels, and the vapor exposure pathway is considered incomplete for human exposure.

The vapor pathway may be complete for possible exposure by workers during remedial or redevelopment activities.

4.5 TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGICAL EVALUATION

A Terrestrial Ecological Evaluation (TEE) is required by WAC 173-340-7940 at locations where a release of a hazardous substance to soil has occurred. The TEE is intended to assess potential risk to plants and animals that live entirely or primarily on affected land. The Site will qualify for a TEE exclusion based on WAC 173-340-7491(a). All soil with GRPH contamination will be removed from the Site, and any remaining contamination will be located below the standard point of compliance of 15 feet bgs. No further consideration of ecological impacts is required under MTCA.

5.0 PROPOSED CLEANUP STANDARDS

The proposed cleanup standards selected for the Site located within the Site boundary and for the greater Site are consistent with applicable regulatory standards and local, state, or federal laws. The relevant requirements and the associated media-specific cleanup levels for the identified COCs are summarized in the following sections.

5.1 APPLICABLE OR RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS

Under WAC 173-340-350 and 173-340-710, applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) include regulatory cleanup standards, standards of control, and other environmental requirements, criteria, or limitations established under state or federal law that specifically address a contaminant, remedial action, location, or other circumstances at a site.

MTCA defines relevant and appropriate requirements as follows:

...those cleanup action standards, standards of control, and other human health and environmental requirements, criteria or limitations established under state and federal law that, while not legally applicable to the hazardous substance, cleanup action, location, or other circumstances at a site, address problems or situations sufficiently similar to those encountered at the site that their use is well suited to the particular site. The criteria specified in WAC 173-340-710(3) shall be used to determine if a requirement is relevant and appropriate.

Remedial actions conducted under MTCA must comply with the substantive requirements of the ARARs but are exempt from their procedural requirements (WAC 173-340-710[9]). Specifically, this exemption applies to state and local permitting requirements under the Washington State Water Pollution Control Act, Solid Waste Management Act, Hazardous Waste Management Act, Clean Air Act, State Fisheries Code, and Shoreline Management Act. ARARs were screened to assess their applicability to the Site. The following table summarizes the preliminary ARARs for the Site.

Preliminary ARAR	Citation or Source
ΜΤΓΔ	Chapter 70.105 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW)
MTCA Cleanup Regulation	WAC 173-340
Ecology, Toxics Cleanup Program–	Guidance for Evaluating Soil Vapor Intrusion in Washington State: Investigation and Remedial Action, Review DRAFT, October 2009,
Guidance To Be Considered	Publication No. 09-09-047
State Environmental Policy Act	RCW 43.21C
Washington State Shoreline Management Act	RCW 90.58; WAC 173-18, 173-22, and 173-27
The Clean Water Act	33 United States Code (USC) 1251 et seq.
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980	42 USC 9601 et seq. and 40 CFR 300
The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act	16 USC 661-667e; the Act of March 10, 1934; Ch. 55; 48 Stat. 401
Endangered Species Act	16 USC 1531 et seq.; 50 CFR 17, 225, and 402
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act	25 USC 3001 through 3013; 43 CFR 10 and Washington's Indian Graves and Records Law (RCW 27.44)
Archaeological Resources Protection Act	16 USC 470aa et seq.; 43 CFR 7
Washington Dangerous Waste Regulations	WAC 173-303
Solid Waste Management Act	RCW 70.95; WAC 173-304 and 173-351
Occupational Safety and Health Administration Regulations	29 CFR 1910, 1926
Washington Department of Labor and Industries Regulations	WAC 296
Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Washington	RCW 90.48 and 90.54; WAC 173-201A
Water Quality Standards for Ground Water	WAC 173-200
Department of Transportation Hazardous Materials Regulations	40 CFR 100 through 185
Washington State Water Well Construction Act	RCW 18.104; WAC 173-160

Table 5-1 Prelimina	y ARARs for the Site
---------------------	----------------------

Preliminary ARAR	Citation or Source
Washington Administrative Code for Landfilling Standards	WAC 173-304-460
Skagit County regulations, codes, and standards	All applicable or relevant and appropriate regulations, codes, and standards.
City of Sedro-Woolley	All applicable or relevant and appropriate regulations, codes, and standards.

5.2 CLEANUP STANDARDS

The selected cleanup alternative must comply with the MTCA cleanup regulations specified in WAC 173-340 and with applicable state and federal laws. The associated media-specific cleanup levels for the identified COCs are summarized in the following sections.

5.2.1 Cleanup Levels

Table 5-2 Pro	posed Cleanup	Levels for Soil
	posca cicanap	Levels for Son

	Cleanup Level	
COC	(mg/kg)	Source
GRPH	30	
Benzene	0.03	MTCA Method A Soil Cleanup Lougle for Uprestricted
Toluene	7	Land Lise (WAC 172 240 740(2)/b)(i))
Ethylbenzene	6	Lanu Use (WAC 175-540-740(2)(b)(1))
Total Xylenes	9	

NOTES:

COC = chemical of concern

GRPH = gasoline-range petroleum hydrocarbons

mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram

MTCA = Washington State Model Toxics Control Act

WAC = Washington Administrative Code

Table 5-3 Proposed Cleanup Levels for Groundwater

	Cleanup Level	
COC	(µg/L)	Source
GRPH	800	
Benzene	5	
Toluene	1,000	MTCA Method A, Table Value; WAC 173-340-720(3)(b)(i)
Ethylbenzene	700	
Total Xylenes	1,000	

NOTES:

μg/L = micrograms per liter COC = chemical of concern GRPH = gasoline-range petroleum hydrocarbons MTCA = Washington State Model Toxics Control Act WAC = Washington Administrative Code

5.2.2 Points of Compliance

5.2.2.1 Point of Compliance for Soil

In accordance with WAC 173-340-740(6)(b-d), the point of compliance for direct contact exposure is throughout the Site from the ground surface to 15 feet bgs. Soil on the south

portion of the Site in boring B11 and UST performance samples contained concentrations of GRPH and BTEX above the MTCA Method A cleanup level. Any residual soil beneath the building will require an environmental covenant be recorded for the Site to ensure no direct contact with the contaminated soil under alternative land use scenarios.

5.2.2.2 Point of Compliance for Groundwater

In accordance with WAC 173-340-720(8)(a)(b), the standard point of compliance for groundwater is defined as the uppermost level of the saturated zone extending vertically to the lowest depth that potentially could be impacted by the COCs throughout the Site.

Monitoring wells MW07 and MW08 will be used to evaluate whether compliance at the Site has been achieved.

5.2.2.3 Point of Compliance for Vapor

No point of compliance is applicable based on exposure pathway assessment.

5.3 AREAS REQUIRING REMEDIATION

Impacts to soil and groundwater are located southwest of the Maintenance Building. The area is limited to between 6 and 11 feet bgs and extends laterally approximately 30 by 30 feet.

Soil between 0 and 1 foot bgs containing concentrations of ORPH exceeding the cleanup level have been detected north of the Power House Building. However, based on visual observations and laboratory analysis, these detections are associated with asphalt debris and fill material. This PPA report focuses only on petroleum-related contamination; therefore, the asphalt debris is not discussed as an area requiring remediation in this report. The asphalt debris and fill material may require additional characterization.

6.0 FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY

The purpose of this focused feasibility study is to develop and evaluate cleanup action alternatives to facilitate selection of a final cleanup action at the Site in accordance with WAC 173-340-350(8). A feasibility study includes the development, screening, and evaluation process for numerous remedial alternatives.

Based on the CSM, and in accordance with Ecology's *Model Remedies for Sites with Petroleum Impacts to Groundwater* (Ecology 2016), a complete feasibility study is not required because the Site qualifies for a Model Remedy. Based on the available data for the Site and the selected remedial alternative, the Site will utilize Model Remedy #1 for sites with petroleum impacts to groundwater.

6.1 REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES

The remedial action objective for the Site is to achieve Site closure or a No Further Action determination from Ecology. The Site qualifies for Model Remedies and will seek closure through the Model Remedies program. Details on the Model Remedies program and selected remedy are presented below in Section 6.2.1.

6.2 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES

Identification and evaluation of technologies are not applicable based on the applicability of Model Remedies.

6.2.1 Applicability of Model Remedies

SoundEarth evaluated the applicability of Model Remedies based on Ecology's *Model Remedies for Sites with Petroleum Contaminated Soils* (Ecology 2015) and *Model Remedies for Sites with Petroleum Impacts to Groundwater* (Ecology 2016). Ecology developed Model Remedies to streamline and accelerate the pace of petroleum cleanups. Model Remedies are applicable for routine petroleum cleanup projects, on sites with no impacts to surface water, sediments, or water supply wells, and sites where soil and groundwater impacts do not exceed the source property boundary. Based on the CSM, the Site qualifies for a Model Remedy for sites with impacts to groundwater. Groundwater Model Remedy #1 has been selected for the Site. The selected remedial action will be to excavate all soil exceeding the MTCA Method A cleanup levels from the Site. Groundwater impacts on the Site are limited to the area of soil contamination; therefore, contaminated groundwater will be removed during the excavation activities. As such, at the conclusion of the remedial action, the soil and groundwater cleanup levels would be met. This remedial action is thereby consistent with the groundwater Model Remedy #1.

It is possible that contaminated soil is present beneath the existing building or that all contaminated soil may not be practicable to remove due to structural concerns. It has been determined that excavation under the building, removal of the building, or relocation of the building is not practicable. Therefore, if contaminated soil is encountered beneath the building or in other inaccessible locations due to utilities, roadways, or safety concern, Site closure will be sought through groundwater Model Remedy #2.

6.3 DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

Remedial excavation is the most cost effective remedial alternative that complies with future land use and goals of the Site owner. Remedial alternatives that were assessed and not selected for implementation include, but are not limited to, the alternatives shown below:

- Air Sparge and Soil Vapor Extraction (AS/SVE) was not selected due to reduced efficacy. AS/SVE also would have a multi-year timeline.
- Groundwater Removal and Treatment was not selected due to the soil contamination in the vadose zone.
- Chemical injections were not selected due to the soil contamination in the vadose zone.
- Monitored natural attenuation is a viable remedial alternative for long-term cleanup of soil and groundwater contamination, but was not considered as permanent and was not consistent with long-term property plans.

6.3.1 <u>Pilot Studies and Alternatives</u>

This section is not applicable.

6.4 EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

This section is not applicable due to the Site qualifying for groundwater Model Remedies. Groundwater Model Remedy #1 has been selected.

6.5 DISPROPORTIONATE COST ANALYSIS AND RANKING CRITERIA

Due to utilizing groundwater Model Remedy #1, a complete disproportionate cost analysis is not necessary for the Site. The estimated remedial costs and timeline are outlined in the following subsection.

6.6 **RECOMMENDED REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

The Model Remedy cleanup action involves the removal of soil from the confirmed source area, which would result in the removal of TPH-impacted soil and groundwater to the greatest degree practicable from the Site (Figure 9). Impacts to groundwater appear to be limited to the area of soil contamination. With the removal of the TPH-contaminated soil and groundwater, the Site would meet the points of compliance for soil and groundwater.

Key assumptions for this alternative include the following:

- All soil removed from the Site would be properly characterized for proper off-site disposal at a permitted landfill.
- Monitoring well MW07 located within the proposed excavation area would be decommissioned.
- SoundEarth assumes an excavation area of approximately 15 feet by 20 feet to a maximum depth of 12 feet bgs, with sloping on the north, east, and west limits of the excavation.
- Pin pilings may need to be installed beneath the southern boundary of the Maintenance Building to ensure the structural integrity of the building during excavation activities. The pin pile system would be designed by a licensed geotechnical engineer.
- Approximately 140 tons of TPH-impacted soil are anticipated to be generated during the remedial excavation. Five feet of non-impacted overburden is anticipated within the limits of the remedial excavation, totaling approximately 110 tons. A soil disposal profile would be developed for the Site prior to excavation activities.
- SoundEarth assumes the 110 tons of non-impacted overburden would be disposed of as Class 1 or Class 2 material. Additional stockpile testing may be required for disposal at a Class 1 facility.
- Soil would be laid back at a 1-foot horizontal to 1-foot vertical slope along the south, east, and west limits of the excavation. Approximately 280 tons of non-impacted soil would be generated to reach the depth of excavation. The soil generated from the lay back area would be segregated and disposed of off site. Additional soil samples may be necessary for disposal of the non-petroleum-impacted material.
- Any contaminated soil that does not comply with the requirements of Class 2 or Class 3 would be properly disposed of to an appropriate facility.
- Depth to water is assumed to be 10 to 12 feet across the Site for this estimate. Due to the
 anticipated depth of the excavation to a depth of 12 feet, dewatering is anticipated. Recovered

groundwater is assumed to be collected by a construction dewatering system, and then removed from the Site by a wastewater disposal contractor.

- Porosity of the soil is assumed to be 30 percent, and dewatering activities are assumed to require one pore volume of groundwater to be removed. Disposal of up to 6,000 gallons of contaminated groundwater is assumed.
- The excavation activities would be completed during the summer, when groundwater elevations are assumed to be lowest.
- The mass of imported fill would be equivalent to the contaminated soil hauled off site (520 tons), unless soil is deemed suitable for backfill.
- The estimated time frame for field work, including the pin pile installation, excavation, backfill, compaction, and site restoration, is approximately 2 weeks.
- Up to 12 compliance soil samples would be collected across the remedial excavation area to document the removal of TPH-contaminated soil.
- Two monitoring wells would be installed post-excavation for compliance groundwater monitoring.
- If contaminated groundwater or soil remains on the Site after the remedial excavation, an environmental covenant will be recorded for the Site to ensure no direct contact with the contaminated soil or groundwater under alternative land use scenarios.
- Quarterly groundwater monitoring would be performed for a minimum of 1 year following completion of the excavation and backfilling activities in order to confirm the effectiveness of the remediation. The results of the groundwater monitoring would be presented in Groundwater Monitoring Reports and a Cleanup Action Report.

6.6.1 <u>Remedial Action Costs and Timeline</u>

The present worth cost estimate to complete the selected remedial action is approximately \$187,000 (Table 6). This cost represents the cost to design, permit, and conduct an excavation at the Site. The cost will increase if more than 1 year of groundwater monitoring is required.

Once authorization to proceed has been given, the expected time frame for the design and coordination is 2 to 3 months. This timeline would include request and review of bids, permitting, and shoring specifications, as well as final planning and contractor scheduling. The excavation is expected to take 2 weeks in the field. This timeline could be extended if the permitting and/or scheduling of contractors exceed the expected time frame. Once the remedial action is complete, SoundEarth anticipates 1 year of groundwater monitoring may be required to determine groundwater compliance.

The project timeline will be contingent upon Site access and coordination with the various project stakeholders.

7.0 PROPOSED INFRASTURCTURE UPGRADES COSTS AND TIMELINE

No new infrastructure is proposed for the Site.

8.0 PROPERTY APPRAISAL

A property appraisal was not conducted. The Site is part of the larger Northern State Hospital Property, which was appraised in 2014/2015 as part of the redevelopment planning.

9.0 CONCLUSIONS

Previous investigations and the site characterization have identified concentrations of GRPH and benzene exceeding the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup levels in soil and groundwater in the vicinity of the former gasoline UST at the southwestern corner of the Maintenance Building. Soil contamination in this area is present between approximately 7 and 12 feet bgs and has been delineated laterally. Soil borings B09, B17, B18, and B19, located approximately 15 to 30 feet from the contamination observed in boring B11, did not contain detectable concentrations of GRPH or BTEX.

Concentrations of ORPH exceeding the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup level were identified in soil samples collected at a depth of 0.5 foot bgs in the vicinity of the Power House Building. The samples collected from 4 feet bgs in these borings did not contain detectable concentrations of ORPH. Based on field observations and laboratory analysis of the chromatograms, it was determined that these exceedances were caused by a high amount of asphalt in the samples, rather than a release of ORPH. Therefore, no remediation is warranted in this area. Concentrations of cPAHs exceeding the applicable cleanup level were also detected in samples collected in previous investigations. Additional investigation of the fill material in the vicinity of the Power House Building may be warranted.

Groundwater was encountered at depths ranging from 10 to 16 feet bgs during drilling activities. Groundwater measured in completed monitoring wells was encountered between 10.16 and 12.62 feet bgs at the time of groundwater sample collection. Groundwater elevation contouring indicated that groundwater flows in a northeasterly direction. Reconnaissance and monitoring well groundwater sampling results indicate that concentrations of GRPH and benzene are present at concentrations exceeding the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup levels in samples collected within the footprint of the former gasoline UST at the southwestern corner of the Maintenance Building. GRPH and benzene were not detected above applicable cleanup levels in other monitoring wells at the Site, indicating that groundwater contamination from petroleum hydrocarbons at the Site is limited to the vicinity of the former gasoline UST.

Groundwater data from previous investigations conducted in the vicinity of the former Laundry Building at the Site indicated that CVOCs are present in groundwater at concentrations exceeding the applicable MTCA Method A cleanup levels. CVOCs were not detected in the monitoring well installed between the Maintenance Building and the former Laundry Building or in other monitoring wells at the Site, indicating that CVOC impacts and petroleum hydrocarbon impacts in groundwater are not commingled.

A sub-slab soil gas sample was collected from beneath the southwestern corner of the Maintenance Building, adjacent to the former gasoline UST, to assess the vapor intrusion pathway. The vapor sample did not contain detectable concentrations of volatile petroleum constituents. No additional vapor intrusion assessment is necessary, and the vapor exposure pathway is considered incomplete for human exposure.

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

SoundEarth recommends conducting a remedial excavation to remove all soil and groundwater exceeding the MTCA Method A cleanup levels in the vicinity of the Maintenance Building. SoundEarth assumes a remedial excavation extent of 15 feet by 20 feet to a maximum depth of 12 feet bgs. Based on the site characterization and proposed remedial excavation, the Site will quality for groundwater Model Remedy #1. Additional details for the proposed remedial excavation are provided in Section 6.6. If soil contamination is found beneath the existing building or it is deemed cost prohibitive to remove all soil contamination, then Model Remedy #2 would be followed.

Remedial excavation of soil in the vicinity of the Power House Building does not appear to be warranted based on field observations and laboratory analyses indicating that the observed ORPH impacts are the result of asphalt and fill in the samples, rather than a release of oil-range hydrocarbons.

11.0 LIMITATIONS

The services described in this report were performed consistent with generally accepted professional consulting principles and practices. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made. These services were performed consistent with our agreement with our client. This report is solely for the use and information of our client unless otherwise noted. Any reliance on this report by a third party is at such party's sole risk.

Opinions and recommendations contained in this report are derived, in part, from data gathered by others, and from conditions evaluated when services were performed, and are intended only for the client, purposes, locations, time frames, and project parameters indicated. We do not warrant and are not responsible for the accuracy or validity of work performed by others, nor from the impacts of changes in environmental standards, practices, or regulations subsequent to performance of services. We do not warrant the use of segregated portions of this report.

12.0 REFERENCES

- Dragovich, J.D., D.K. Norman, T.J. Lapen, and G. Anderson (Dragovich et al.). 1999. *Geologic map of the Sedro-Woolley North and Lyman 7.5-Minute Quadrangles, Western Skagit County, Washington.* Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources Open File Report 99-3.
- Lone Rock Resources (Lone Rock). 1993. Underground Storage Tank Removal Sites No. 3 and No. 4, Northern State Multi-Service Center, Sedro Woolley, Washington. April 8.
- Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc. (MFA). 2015a. Focused Site Assessment Report, Northern State Hospital Property, Sedro-Woolley, Washington. January 19.

______. 2015b. Preliminary Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study, Northern State Hospital Property, Sedro-Woolley, Washington. June 30.

SoundEarth Strategies, Inc. (SoundEarth). 2017. Work Plan for PLIA Preliminary Planning Assessment, Port of Skagit, 7682 Northern State Road, Sedro-Woolley, Washington. August 16.

- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1996. Low-Flow (Minimal Drawdown) Ground-Water Sampling Procedures. Publication EPA/540/S-95/504. April.
- Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology). 2009. *Guidance for Evaluating Soil Vapor Intrusion in Washington State: Investigation and Remedial Action*. Publication No. 09-09-047. October. Review Draft Revised February 2016.

______. 2015. *Model Remedies for Sites with Petroleum Contaminated Soils*. Toxics Cleanup Program. Publication No. 15-09-043. Originally published September. Revised draft for comment August 2017.

_____. 2016. *Model Remedies for Sites with Petroleum Impacts to Groundwater*. Toxics Cleanup Program. Publication No. 16-09-057. Originally published August. Revised draft for comment August 2017.

FIGURES








LEGEND SUB-SLAB SOIL GAS POINT (SOUNDEARTH 2017) O SS01 B05/MW06 MONITORING WELL (SOUNDEARTH 2017) SOIL BORING 🗄 В14 (SOUNDEARTH 2017) MONITORING WELL (MFA 2015) + MW04 ⊕ GP48 SOIL BORING (MFA 2015) PROPERTY BOUNDARY PARCEL BOUNDARY 7 GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTION UST UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK AST ABOVEGROUND STORAGE TANK MFA MAUL FOSTER & ALONGI, INC. GRPH GASOLINE-RANGE PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS DRPH DIESEL-RANGE PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS ORPH OIL-RANGE PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS NOT ANALYZED RESULT BELOW LABORATORY < REPORTING LIMIT WASHINGTON STATE MODEL MTCA TOXICS CONTROL ACT BGS BELOW GROUND SURFACE DENOTES CONCENTRATION EXCEEDS MTCA CLEANUP LEVEL DENOTES EXCEEDANCES ASSOCIATED WITH ASPHALT DEBRIS



FORMER NORTHERN STATE HOSPITAL PROPERTY 2070 NORTHERN STATE ROAD SEDRO-WOOLLEY, WASHINGTON SOUNDEARTH PROJECT #1303-003

FIGURE 3 SOIL ANALYTICAL RESULTS







SEDRO-WOOLLEY, WASHINGTON SOUNDEARTH PROJECT #1303-003





Soundear Strategies WWW.SOUNDEARTHINC.COM

FORMER NORTHERN STATE HOSPITAL PROPERTY 2070 NORTHERN STATE ROAD SEDRO-WOOLLEY, WASHINGTON SOUNDEARTH PROJECT #1303-003

FIGURE 8 CONCEPTUAL SITE MODEL EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT



POWER HOUSE

N 20 40 APPROXIMATE SCALE IN FEET

1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	and the second sec
	LEGEND
O SS01	SUB-SLAB SOIL GAS POINT (SOUNDEARTH 2017)
🔶 B16/MW08	MONITORING WELL (SOUNDEARTH 2017)
⊕ B18	SOIL BORING (SOUNDEARTH 2017)
⊕ GP11	SOIL BORING (MFA 2015)
	PROPERTY BOUNDARY
	PARCEL BOUNDARY
1	GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTION
UST	UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK
MFA	MAUL FOSTER & ALONGI, INC.
GRPH	GASOLINE-RANGE PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS
DRPH	DIESEL-RANGE PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS
ORPH	OIL-RANGE PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS
	NOT ANALYZED
<	RESULT BELOW LABORATORY REPORTING LIMIT
MTCA	WASHINGTON STATE MODEL TOXICS CONTROL ACT
BGS	BELOW GROUND SURFACE
RED	DENOTES CONCENTRATION EXCEEDS MTCA CLEANUP LEVEL
	PROPOSED REMEDIAL EXCAVATION AREA



FORMER NORTHERN STATE HOSPITAL PROPERTY 2070 NORTHERN STATE ROAD SEDRO-WOOLLEY, WASHINGTON SOUNDEARTH PROJECT #1303-003

FIGURE 9 REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE PROPOSED EXCAVATION AREA TABLES



Table 1 Soil Analytical Results for TPH and BTEX Former Northern State Hospital Property 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington

				Analytical Results (milligrams per kilogram)						
		Date	Depth							Total
Boring/Well ID	Sample ID	Sampled	(feet bgs)	GRPH ⁽¹⁾	DRPH ⁽²⁾	ORPH ⁽²⁾	Benzene ⁽³⁾	Toluene ⁽³⁾	Ethylbenzene ⁽³⁾	Xylenes ⁽³⁾
B01/MW/05	B01-0.5	08/28/17	0.5		<500	4,300				
501/14/405	B01-04	08/28/17	4		<50	<250				
B02	B02-0.5	08/28/17	0.5		120 [×]	2,300				
502	B02-04	08/28/17	4		<50	<250				
B02	B03-0.5	08/28/17	0.5		<500	3,700				
603	B03-04	08/28/17	4		<50 ^{ht}	<250 ^{ht}				
B04	B04-0.5	08/28/17	0.5		<50	920				
ROG	B06-12	09/29/17	12	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
500	B06-16	08/28/17	16	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
B07	B07-12	08/29/17	12	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
B08	B08-12	08/29/17	12	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
POO	B09-08	08/20/17	8	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
809	B09-12	08/29/17	12	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
P10	B10-08	08/20/17	8	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
510	B10-12	08/23/17	12	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
	B11-04		4	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
B11	B11-08	08/29/17	8	620			<0.02	1.8	3.7	7.7
	B11-12		12	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
B12	B12-08	08/29/17	8	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
B13	B13-08	08/29/17	8	<2			<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	<0.06
B14	B14-0.5	08/29/17	0.5		<50	<250				
B17	B17-08	09/19/17	8	<5						
B18	B18-08	09/19/17	8	<5						
B19	B19-08	09/19/17	8	<5						
MTCA Cleanup Lev	vel for Soil ⁽⁴⁾			30	2,000	2,000	0.03	7	6	9

NOTES:

Red denotes concentration exceeds MTCA cleanup level for soil.

Sample analyses conducted by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. of Seattle, Washington.

- ⁽¹⁾Analyzed by Method NWTPH-Gx.
- ⁽²⁾Analyzed by Method NWTPH-Dx.
- ⁽³⁾Analyzed by EPA Method 8021B.

⁽⁴⁾MTCA Cleanup Regulation, Chapter 173-340-900 of WAC, Table 740-1 Method A Cleanup Levels for Soil, Unrestricted Land Uses, revised November 2007.

Laboratory Note:

^xThe sample chromatographic pattern does not resemble the fuel standard used for quantitation.
^{ht}The analysis was performed outside the method or client-specified holding time requirement.

-- = not analyzed

< = not detected at a concentration exceeding the laboratory reporting limit

bgs = below ground surface

BTEX = benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes

- DRPH = diesel-range petroleum hydrocarbons
- EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

GRPH = gasoline-range petroleum hydrocarbons

MTCA = Washington State Model Toxics Control Act

- NWTPH = Northwest Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons
- ORPH = oil-range petroleum hydrocarbons TPH = total petroleum hydrocarbons
- WAC = Washington Administrative Code



Table 2Groundwater Analytical Results for TPH and BTEXFormer Northern State Hospital Property2070 Northern State RoadSedro-Woolley, Washington

				Analytical Results (micrograms per liter)						
Well/Boring ID	Sample ID	Date Sampled	GRPH ⁽¹⁾	DRPH ⁽²⁾	ORPH ⁽²⁾	Benzene ⁽³⁾	Toluene ⁽³⁾	Ethylbenzene ⁽³⁾	Total Xylenes ⁽³⁾	
Reconnaissance Groundwater Samples										
B06	B06-20170828	08/28/17	270	160 [×]	<220					
B11	B11-20170829	08/29/17	5,300			2.7	32	19	25	
Monitoring Well Groundwater Samples										
MW01	MW01-20170901		<100	<70	<350	<1	1.5	<1	<3	
MW03	MW03-20170901		<100	<60	<300	<1	<1	<1	<3	
MW04	MW04-20170901	09/01/17	<100	<60	<300	<1	<1	<1	<3	
MW05/B01	MW05-20170901		<100	72 [×]	<300	<1	<1	<1	<3	
MW06/B05	MW06-20170901		<100	<60	<300	<1	<1	<1	<3	
MW07/B15	MW07-20170920	00/20/17	790	290 [×]	<250	12	10	4.1	5.0	
MW08/B16	MW08-20170920	09/20/17	<100	<65	<320	<1	<1	<1	<3	
MTCA Cleanup Lev	el for Groundwater ⁽⁴⁾		800	500	500	5	1000	700	1000	

NOTES:

Red denotes concentration exceeds MTCA cleanup level for groundwater.

Sample analyses conducted by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. of Seattle, Washington.

⁽¹⁾Analyzed by Method NWTPH-Gx.

⁽²⁾Analyzed by Method NWTPH-Dx.

⁽³⁾Analyzed by EPA Method 8021B.

⁽⁴⁾MTCA Cleanup Regulation, Chapter 173-340-900 of WAC, Table 720-1 Method A Cleanup Levels for Groundwater, revised November 2007.

Laboratory Note:

^xThe sample chromatographic pattern does not resemble the fuel standard used for quantitation.

-- = not analyzed

< = not detected at a concentration exceeding the laboratory reporting limit

BTEX = benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes

- DRPH = diesel-range petroleum hydrocarbons
- EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- GRPH = gasoline-range petroleum hydrocarbons
- MTCA = Washington State Model Toxics Control Act
- NWTPH = Northwest Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon
- ORPH = oil-range petroleum hydrocarbons
- TPH = total petroleum hydrocarbons
- WAC = Washington Administrative Code



Table 3 Groundwater Analytical Results for Chlorinated VOCs Former Northern State Hospital Property 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington

				Analytical Results ⁽¹⁾ (micrograms per liter)						
		Date			Cis-1,2-	Trans-1,2-	1,1-			
Well/Boring ID	Sample ID	Sampled	Tetrachloroethene	Trichloroethene	Dichloroethene	Dichloroethene	Dichloroethene	Vinyl Chloride		
Reconnaissance Groundwater Samples										
B06	B06-20170828	08/28/17	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<0.2		
	Monitoring Well Groundwater Samples									
MW06/B05	MW06-20170901	09/01/17	<1	<1 <1 <1 <1 <0.2						
MTCA Cleanup Lev	vel for Groundwate	r	5 ⁽²⁾	5 ⁽²⁾	16 ⁽³⁾	160 ⁽³⁾	400 ⁽³⁾	0.2 ⁽²⁾		

NOTES:

Sample analyses conducted by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. of Seattle, Washington.

⁽¹⁾Samples analyzed by EPA Method 8260C.

⁽²⁾MTCA Cleanup Regulation, Chapter 173-340-900 of WAC, Table 720-1 Method A Cleanup Levels for Groundwater, revised November 2007.

⁽³⁾MTCA Cleanup Regulation, Chapter 173-340 of WAC, CLARC, Groundwater, Method B, Non cancer, CLARC Website https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/clarc/CLARCHome.aspx. < = not detected at a concentration exceeding the laboratory reporting limit

CLARC = Cleanup Levels and Risk Calculations

EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

MTCA = Washington State Model Toxics Control Act

VOC = volatile organic compound

WAC = Washington Administrative Code



Table 4 Groundwater Analytical Results for cPAHs Former Northern State Hospital Property 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington

				cPAHs Toxicity Equivalency ⁽¹⁾ (micrograms per liter)								
Well ID	Sample ID	Sampled By	Date Sampled	Benzo(a)- anthracene TEF: 0.1	Chrysene TEF: 0.01	Benzo(a)pyrene TEF: 1	Benzo(b)- fluoranthene TEF: 0.1	Benzo(k)- fluoranthene TEF: 0.1	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)- pyrene TEF: 0.1	Dibenz(a,h)- anthracene TEF: 0.1	TEQ ⁽¹⁾ (micrograms per liter	
MW-5	MW05-20170901	SoundEarth	09/01/17	< 0.075	< 0.075	< 0.075	< 0.075	< 0.075	< 0.075	< 0.075	<0.075	
MTCA Cleanup Lev	el for Groundwater			NE	NE	0.1 ⁽²⁾	NE	NE	NE	NE	0.1 ⁽²⁾	

NOTES:

Samples analyzed by EPA Method 8270D SIM.

Sample analyses conducted by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. of Seattle, Washington.

⁽¹⁾Analytical result for each individual cPAH is multiplied by the TEF and all seven cPAH values are added. When analytical results are reported as less than the LRL, the LRL is listed as the TEQ.

(2) MTCA Cleanup Regulation, Chapter 173-340-900 of WAC, Table 720-1 Method A Cleanup Levels for Groundwater, revised November 2007.

< = not detected at a concentration exceeding the laboratory reporting limit

cPAH = carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon

EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

LRL = lower reporting limit

MTCA = Washington State Model Toxics Control Act

NE = not established

SoundEarth = SoundEarth Strategies, Inc.

TEF = toxicity equivalency factor

TEQ = toxicity equivalent

WAC = Washington Administrative Code



Table 5Sub-Slab Soil Vapor Analytical Results for APH and BTEXFormer Northern State Hospital Property2070 Northern State RoadSedro-Woolley, Washington

				Analytical Results (micrograms per cubic meter)						
Sample ID	Sample Location	Date Sampled	Benzene ⁽¹⁾	Toluene ⁽¹⁾	Ethylbenzene ⁽¹⁾	m,p-Xylene ⁽¹⁾	o-Xylene ⁽¹⁾	APH EC5-8 aliphatics ⁽²⁾	APH EC9-12 aliphatics ⁽²⁾	APH EC9-10 aromatics ⁽²⁾
	Southwest corner of									
SS01-20170919	maintenance building	09/19/17	<8	<9.4	<11	<22	<11	<1,100	<1,700	<1,200
MTCA Method B Soil Gas	Screening Level		10.7 ⁽³⁾	76,200 ⁽⁴⁾	15,200 ⁽⁴⁾	310 ⁽⁴⁾	440 ⁽⁴⁾	90,000 ⁽⁴⁾	4,700 ⁽⁴⁾	6,000 ⁽⁴⁾

NOTES:

Sample analyses performed by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. of Seattle, Washington.

⁽¹⁾Analyzed by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Method TO-15.

⁽²⁾Analyzed by Method MA-APH.

⁽³⁾MTCA Method B Sub-Slab Soil Gas Screening Level, Cancer, CLARC Master Spreadsheet, February 2015 revisions of Table B-1 from Ecology's Draft Guidance for Evaluating Soil Vapor Intrusion in Washington State, October 2009.

⁽⁴⁾MTCA Method B Sub-Slab Soil Gas Screening Level, Noncancer, CLARC Master Spreadsheet, February 2015 revisions of Table B-1 from Ecology's Draft Guidance for Evaluating Soil Vapor Intrusion in Washington State, October 2009. < = not detected at concentration exceeding the laboratory reporting limit

APH = air-phase petroleum hydrocarbons

BTEX = benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes

CLARC = Cleanup Levels and Risk Calculation

- Ecology = Washington State Department of Ecology
- MTCA = Washington State Model Toxics Control Act



Table 6 Remedial Action Alternative Cost Estimate Remedial Excavation of Soil Former Northern State Hospital Property Sedro-Wooley, Washington

	ΟΤΥ	LINIT		UNIT		T200		TOTALS
Direct Capital	QIT		<u> </u>	PRICE		031		IUTALS
Permitting								
Grading/SEPA Permit	1	per permit	Ś	9 000	Ś	9 000		
Rental Dewatering System	1	each	Ś	7 000	Ś	7 000		
Water Disposal	1	lumn sum	Ś	5 000	Ś	5 000		
Subtotal Permitting	-	iump sum	Ŷ	5,000	Ŷ	5,000	Ś	21.000
Remedial Excavation							*	,
Monitoring Well Decommissioning	1	each	\$	500	\$	500		
Excavation, Handling, Segregation to 12 feet bgs	240	ton	Ś	10	Ś	2.400		
Transportation and Disposal of PCS Impacted Soil (Class 2)	110	ton	Ś	45	Ś	4.950		
Transportation and Disposal of PCS Contaminated Soil (Class 3)	140	ton	\$	75	, \$	10,500		
Excavation, Handling, Segregation of slope back	280	ton	\$	10	\$	2,800		
Transportation and Disposal of Non-Impacted Soil (Class 1)	280	each	\$	30	\$	8,400		
Shoring Costs For Excavation to 15 feet bgs	0	facing sf	\$	80	\$	-		
Geotechnical Design and Oversight	1	lump sum	\$	12,000	\$	12,000		
Pin Pile Installation	1	lump sum	\$	15,000	\$	15,000		
Import, Place and Compaction of Clean Backfill	280	ton	\$	32	\$	8,960		
Subtotal Remedial Excavation							\$	65,510
Compliance Monitoring								
Well Installation for Compliance Groundwater Monitoring	2	each	\$	2,500	\$	5,000		
Subtotal Compliance Monitoring							\$	5,000
Subtotal Direct Capital							\$	91,500
Indirect Capital								
Design, Permitting, and Work Plans	11%				\$	10,065		
Mobilization/Demobilization	8%				\$	7,320		
Professional Labor for Construction Oversight (1 week)	14%				\$	12,810		
Field Equipment and Laboratory Testing	8%				\$	7,320		
Environmental Covenant		each	\$	7,500	\$	-		
Regulatory Reporting	14%				\$	12,810		
Subtotal Indirect Capital							\$	50,300
TOTAL CAPITAL COST							\$	142,000
FUTURE O&M AND OTHER DIRECT COST ITEMS ⁽¹⁾	AN	INUAL COST ⁽²⁾	PRE	SENT WORTH OF A	NNI	UAL AND FUTUR	E CA	PITAL COST
			1			n = 1 year		
Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring and Quarterly Reporting (1 years)		\$ 45,000	Disc	ount Rate = 0.5%	\$	44,732		
TOTAL PRESENT WORTH MONITORING COST							Ś	44,700
TOTAL PRESENT WORTH COST OF CLEANUP ACTION ALTERNATIVE 1							Ś	187.000

NOTES:

Excavation is assumed to be roughly 15 feet by 20 feet with a final depth of 12 feet. Slope back is assumed to be roughly 1 Horizontal:1 Vertical

Unit rates for excavation and disposal are inclusive of costs associated with trucking and disposal fees.

This feasibility level cost should not be considered a guaranteed cost.

Unit rates for excavation and disposal assume that the property owner pays these costs directly. If not a mark-up will apply. Please note that disposal rates are subject to annual inflation.

This estimate assumes 50% of soils from the excavation area pass requirements for disposal as Class 3 and 50% of soils pass requirements for disposal as Class 2 soil. If the requirements are not met, soil will be disposed of as appropriate. Soil from the slope back is assumed to be non-impacted, including passing toxicity characteristic leaching procedure for metals.

Cost rounded up to nearest \$1,000.

⁽¹⁾Additional direct costs such as project management, regulatory communications and reporting, and other technical support services not specifically listed are not included in any future annual costs.

⁽²⁾Annual cost is Year 2017 cost.

% = percentage bgs = below ground surface n = number of years of compliance monitoring and O&M O&M = operation and maintenance PCS = petroleum-contaminated soil QTY = quantity SEPA = State Environmental Policy Act sf = square feet ton = number of bank cubic yards x 1.8 ton/bank cubic yard

PROPERTY PHOTOGRAPHS



PROPERTY PHOTOGRAPHS Former Northern State Hospital Property 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington

Project No.:	1303-003
Date:	9/28/17
Drawn By:	CJT
Chk Bv:	JRF



Photograph 1. View of the Power House Building area, looking southeast.



Photograph 3. Drilling boring B01, north of the Power House Building.



Photograph 5. Collecting sub-slab soil vapor sample SS01, inside the Maintenance Building.



Photograph 2. View of the Maintenance Building area, looking northwest.



Photograph 4. Drilling boring B11, south of the Maintenance Building.



Photograph 6. Collecting groundwater sample from MW07, south of the Maintenance Building.

APPENDIX A SURVEY



APPENDIX B LABORATORY ANALYTICAL REPORTS

Friedman & Bruya, Inc. #708500

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D. Yelena Aravkina, M.S. Michael Erdahl, B.S. Arina Podnozova, B.S. Eric Young, B.S. 3012 16th Avenue West Seattle, WA 98119-2029 (206) 285-8282 fbi@isomedia.com www.friedmanandbruya.com

September 5, 2017

Liz Forbes, Project Manager SoundEarth Strategies 2811 Fairview Ave. East, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98102

Dear Ms Forbes:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on August 29, 2017 from the SOU_1303-003_ 20170829, F&BI 708500 project. There are 9 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days. If you would like us to return your samples or arrange for long term storage at our offices, please contact us as soon as possible.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service to you and hope you will call if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

Michael Erdahl Project Manager

Enclosures c: Clare Tochilin SOU0905R.DOC

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on August 29, 2017 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the SoundEarth Strategies SOU_1303-003_ 20170829, F&BI 708500 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

Laboratory ID	SoundEarth Strategies
708500 -01	B06-20170828

All quality control requirements were acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/05/17 Date Received: 08/29/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170829, F&BI 708500 Date Extracted: 08/29/17 Date Analyzed: 08/29/17

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS AS GASOLINE USING METHOD NWTPH-Gx

Results Reported as ug/L (ppb)

Sample ID Laboratory ID	Gasoline Range	Surrogate (<u>% Recovery)</u> (Limit 51-134)
B06-20170828 708500-01	270	113
Method Blank 07-1833 MB	<100	109

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/05/17 Date Received: 08/29/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170829, F&BI 708500 Date Extracted: 08/31/17 Date Analyzed: 08/31/17

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS AS DIESEL AND MOTOR OIL USING METHOD NWTPH-Dx

Results Reported as ug/L (ppb)

<u>Sample ID</u> Laboratory ID	Diesel Range (C10-C25)	<u>Motor Oil Range</u> (C ₂₅ -C ₃₆)	Surrogate <u>(% Recovery)</u> (Limit 47-140)
B06-20170828 708500-01 1/0.9	160 x	<220	77
Method Blank 07-1885 MB	<50	<250	97

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Analysis For Volatile Compounds By EPA Method 8260C

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix:	B06-201708 08/29/17 08/29/17 08/30/17 Water	328	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument:	SoundEarth Strategies SOU_1303-003_ 20170829, F&BI 708500 708500-01 083005.D GCMS4
Units:	ug/L (ppb)		Operator:	JS
Surrogates: 1,2-Dichloroethane Toluene-d8	-d4	% Recovery: 102 101	Lower Limit: 57 63	Upper Limit: 121 127
4-Bromofluorobenz	ene	101	60	133
Compounds:		Concentration ug/L (ppb)		
Vinyl chloride		< 0.2		
Chloroethane		<1		
1,1-Dichloroethene		<1		
Methylene chloride	•	<5		
trans-1,2-Dichloroe	ethene	<1		
1,1-Dichloroethane		<1		
cis-1,2-Dichloroeth	ene	<1		
1,2-Dichloroethane	(EDC)	<1		
1,1,1-Trichloroetha	ine	<1		
Trichloroethene		<1		
Tetrachloroethene		<1		

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Analysis For Volatile Compounds By EPA Method 8260C

Client Sample ID:	Method Bla	nk	Client:	SoundEarth Strategies
Date Received.	Not Applica	ible	Lab ID:	500_1303-005_20170629, F&B1706300
Date Extracted.	08/20/17		Lau ID. Data Filo:	085037 D
Matrix:	Water		Data Pile.	002934.D CCMS4
Units:	ug/L (ppb)		Operator:	JS
	0		Lower	Unner
Surrogates.		% Recovery:	Limit	L imit [.]
1 2-Dichloroethane	-d4	100	57	121
Toluene-d8		102	63	127
4-Bromofluorobenzene		102	60	133
		Concentration		
Compounds:		ug/L (ppb)		
Vinyl chloride		< 0.2		
Chloroethane		<1		
1,1-Dichloroethene	9	<1		
Methylene chlorid	e	<5		
trans-1,2-Dichloro	ethene	<1		
1,1-Dichloroethane		<1		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene		<1		
1,2-Dichloroethane	e (EDC)	<1		
1,1,1-Trichloroetha	ane	<1		
Trichloroethene		<1		
Tetrachloroethene		<1		

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/05/17 Date Received: 08/29/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_ 20170829, F&BI 708500

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TPH AS GASOLINE USING METHOD NWTPH-Gx

Laboratory Code: 7	08473-01 (Duplic	cate)						
	Reporting	Sample	e Dup	olicate	RPD			
Analyte	Units	Result	t Re	esult	(Limit 20)			
Gasoline	ug/L (ppb)	<100	<	100	nm			
Laboratory Code: L	aboratory Contro	ol Sample						
		Percent						
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Acceptance				
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	Criteria	_			
Gasoline	ug/L (ppb)	1,000	87	69-134	-			

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/05/17 Date Received: 08/29/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170829, F&BI 708500

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS AS DIESEL EXTENDED USING METHOD NWTPH-Dx

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

			Percent	Percent		
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	LCSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Diesel Extended	ug/L (ppb)	2,500	80	88	61-133	10

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/05/17 Date Received: 08/29/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_ 20170829, F&BI 708500

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR VOLATILES BY EPA METHOD 8260C

Laboratory Code: 708471-02 (Matrix Spike)

-	_			Percent	
	Reporting	Spike	Sample	Recovery	Acceptance
Analyte	Units	Level	Result	MS	Criteria
Vinyl chloride	ug/L (ppb)	50	< 0.2	90	36-166
Chloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	91	46-160
1,1-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	99	60-136
Methylene chloride	ug/L (ppb)	50	<5	106	67-132
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	100	72-129
1,1-Dichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	104	70-128
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	102	71-127
1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	101	69-133
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	103	60-146
Trichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	99	66-135
Tetrachloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	94	10-226

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	r r r r r					
			Percent	Percent		
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	LCSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Vinyl chloride	ug/L (ppb)	50	94	94	50-154	0
Chloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	97	97	58-146	0
1,1-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	102	104	67-136	2
Methylene chloride	ug/L (ppb)	50	108	108	39-148	0
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	101	101	68-128	0
1,1-Dichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	106	105	79-121	1
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	104	103	80-123	1
1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	ug/L (ppb)	50	101	101	73-132	0
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	107	105	83-130	2
Trichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	104	103	80-120	1
Tetrachloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	97	97	76-121	0

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Data Qualifiers & Definitions

a - The analyte was detected at a level less than five times the reporting limit. The RPD results may not provide reliable information on the variability of the analysis.

 ${\bf b}$ - The analyte was spiked at a level that was less than five times that present in the sample. Matrix spike recoveries may not be meaningful.

ca - The calibration results for the analyte were outside of acceptance criteria. The value reported is an estimate.

c - The presence of the analyte may be due to carryover from previous sample injections.

cf - The sample was centrifuged prior to analysis.

 ${\rm d}$ - The sample was diluted. Detection limits were raised and surrogate recoveries may not be meaningful.

dv - Insufficient sample volume was available to achieve normal reporting limits.

f - The sample was laboratory filtered prior to analysis.

fb - The analyte was detected in the method blank.

fc - The compound is a common laboratory and field contaminant.

hr - The sample and duplicate were reextracted and reanalyzed. RPD results were still outside of control limits. Variability is attributed to sample inhomogeneity.

hs - Headspace was present in the container used for analysis.

ht – The analysis was performed outside the method or client-specified holding time requirement.

ip - Recovery fell outside of control limits. Compounds in the sample matrix interfered with the quantitation of the analyte.

j - The analyte concentration is reported below the lowest calibration standard. The value reported is an estimate.

J - The internal standard associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration is an estimate.

jl - The laboratory control sample(s) percent recovery and/or RPD were out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.

js - The surrogate associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.

lc - The presence of the analyte is likely due to laboratory contamination.

L - The reported concentration was generated from a library search.

nm - The analyte was not detected in one or more of the duplicate analyses. Therefore, calculation of the RPD is not applicable.

pc - The sample was received with incorrect preservation or in a container not approved by the method. The value reported should be considered an estimate.

ve - The analyte response exceeded the valid instrument calibration range. The value reported is an estimate.

vo - The value reported fell outside the control limits established for this analyte.

x - The sample chromatographic pattern does not resemble the fuel standard used for quantitation.







Send Report to <u>Liz</u>	Forbes, Clar	e Tochili	n		SAMP	LERS (s	ignatu	^{re)} (J	an	Tor	6			<u>г</u>	ge#	Contemporation of Contemporati
Company SoundEarth Strategies, Inc.				PROJECT NAME/NO.				PO #			Standard (2 Weeks) RUSH J-Day					
Address 2811 Fairview Avenue E, Suite 2000 City, State, ZIP Seattle, Washington 98102 Phone #206-306-1900 Fax #206-306-1907			-	Port of Skagit				130	1303-003		Rush charges authorized by:					
			REMARKS							SAMPLE DISPOSAL Dispose after 30 days Return samples Will call with instructions						
					· · · · ·						A	VALYSE	S REQ	UESTEI)	
Sample ID	Sample Location	Sample ⁻ Depth	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Matrix	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	ÅTEX by 8021B	CVOCs by 8260	SVOCs by 8270				Notes
BOL-ZONTORZE	BOLe	فتستحد	01 A-D	8/28/17	1650	HZD	4	X	X		*					
		-	-								~~~			1		
· · · ·									· ·		· · ·					
					0	Fr		<u> </u>			····			· · · ·		
	,						1281	7								1
-																Sile 1 Sector
. .	36.															
		·	, .							2						
· · ·		×								•						
																••• ••
Friedman & Bruya, I. 3012 16th Auenua Wa	nc. Relinqui	SIC shed by://	NAT	URE		DA.	PRI	NT NA	ME			<u>CO1</u>	MPAN	<u>Y</u>	D.	ATE TIME
Seattle WA 98119.90	29 Received	the contraction of the second	Carly Den	$\frac{\psi}{\rho}$			1 10	11	1		$-\frac{5}{2}$	aner	Bart	r	8/2	111 0100
Ph. (206) 285-8282	Relinqui	shed by:		¥		Mic	11001 5	rclah	(ť	- 4 K~	<u>~</u>			* 1
116. (200) 200-0202 Received by:			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·													

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.	SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
3012 16th Avenue West	Relinquished by:	Cloretacha	Sunekarth-	8/29/7-	0750
Seattle, WA 98119-2029	Received by Lew	Michael Erchahl	FGR	t.	
Ph. (206) 285-8282	Relinquished by:	· · ·			
Fax (206) 283-5044	Received by:	······································	Samples receiv	ved at	C
FORMS\COC\COC.DOC		· .	ł		
) 2	•	

Friedman & Bruya, Inc. #708538
ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D. Yelena Aravkina, M.S. Michael Erdahl, B.S. Arina Podnozova, B.S. Eric Young, B.S. 3012 16th Avenue West Seattle, WA 98119-2029 (206) 285-8282 fbi@isomedia.com www.friedmanandbruya.com

September 7, 2017

Liz Forbes, Project Manager SoundEarth Strategies 2811 Fairview Ave. East, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98102

Dear Ms Forbes:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on August 30, 2017 from the SOU_1303-003_20170830, F&BI 708538 project. There are 4 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days. If you would like us to return your samples or arrange for long term storage at our offices, please contact us as soon as possible.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service to you and hope you will call if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

Michael Erdahl Project Manager

Enclosures c: Clare Tochilin SOU0907R.DOC

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on August 30, 2017 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the SoundEarth Strategies SOU_1303-003_ 20170830, F&BI 708538 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

Laboratory ID	SoundEarth Strategies
708538 -01	B11-20170829

All quality control requirements were acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/07/17 Date Received: 08/30/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170830, F&BI 708538 Date Extracted: 09/05/17 Date Analyzed: 09/05/17

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR BENZENE, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES AND TPH AS GASOLINE USING METHODS 8021B AND NWTPH-Gx

Sample ID Laboratory ID	<u>Benzene</u> <u>Toluene</u>		Ethyl <u>Benzene</u>	Total <u>Xylenes</u>	Gasoline <u>Range</u>	Surrogate (<u>% Recovery</u>) (Limit 50-150)		
B11-20170829 708538-01	2.7	32	19	25	5,300	105		
Method Blank ^{07-1931 MB}	<1	<1	<1	<3	<100	97		

Results Reported as ug/L (ppb)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/07/17 Date Received: 08/30/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_ 20170830, F&BI 708538

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR BENZENE, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, AND TPH AS GASOLINE USING EPA METHOD 8021B AND NWTPH-Gx

			Percent	Percent		
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	LCSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Benzene	ug/L (ppb)	25	99	85	72-119	15
Toluene	ug/L (ppb)	25	95	84	71-113	12
Ethylbenzene	ug/L (ppb)	25	94	83	72-114	12
Xylenes	ug/L (ppb)	75	93	83	72-113	11
Gasoline	ug/L (ppb)	500	83	80	70-119	4

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Data Qualifiers & Definitions

a - The analyte was detected at a level less than five times the reporting limit. The RPD results may not provide reliable information on the variability of the analysis.

 ${\bf b}$ - The analyte was spiked at a level that was less than five times that present in the sample. Matrix spike recoveries may not be meaningful.

ca - The calibration results for the analyte were outside of acceptance criteria. The value reported is an estimate.

c - The presence of the analyte may be due to carryover from previous sample injections.

cf - The sample was centrifuged prior to analysis.

 ${\rm d}$ - The sample was diluted. Detection limits were raised and surrogate recoveries may not be meaningful.

dv - Insufficient sample volume was available to achieve normal reporting limits.

f - The sample was laboratory filtered prior to analysis.

fb - The analyte was detected in the method blank.

fc - The compound is a common laboratory and field contaminant.

hr - The sample and duplicate were reextracted and reanalyzed. RPD results were still outside of control limits. Variability is attributed to sample inhomogeneity.

hs - Headspace was present in the container used for analysis.

ht – The analysis was performed outside the method or client-specified holding time requirement.

ip - Recovery fell outside of control limits. Compounds in the sample matrix interfered with the quantitation of the analyte.

j - The analyte concentration is reported below the lowest calibration standard. The value reported is an estimate.

J - The internal standard associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration is an estimate.

jl - The laboratory control sample(s) percent recovery and/or RPD were out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.

js - The surrogate associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.

lc - The presence of the analyte is likely due to laboratory contamination.

L - The reported concentration was generated from a library search.

nm - The analyte was not detected in one or more of the duplicate analyses. Therefore, calculation of the RPD is not applicable.

pc - The sample was received with incorrect preservation or in a container not approved by the method. The value reported should be considered an estimate.

ve - The analyte response exceeded the valid instrument calibration range. The value reported is an estimate.

vo - The value reported fell outside the control limits established for this analyte.

x - The sample chromatographic pattern does not resemble the fuel standard used for quantitation.

			-																
7085	538	;			SAMPLE (CHAIN OI	F CUS	TOL	ργ		÷.,	ME	 7	0.8	/ 30		2	A	3/
Send Report To	U2	Forder	Gare	Tocholm	SAMPL	ERS (signatu	ure)	lai	L /	la	L	<u></u>] [P T	URNA	ROUND	of TIME		JUNI
~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	te the	Radu	21-21	······································	PROJE	CT NAME/N	0.				PO #	¢		Stan	dard (2 H	Weeks)	Y		and an income the second
Company	RIL Four		D F			303-003							F	tush cl	narges	authori	zed by:		ч
Address <u>4</u>		a tro	<u></u> 64	λ 🤈	REMAR	RKS				-				Dien	SAMPI	E DISP	OSAL		
City, State, ZII		<u>y wa</u>	101	<u>ur</u>										. Retu	rn san	ples			
Phone #0	~ 300- 141	<u>D_</u> Fax #_		*		<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>				<u> </u>				_ Will		th instru	ACTIONS		
	7 6									í	ANAL T	YSES	S REG	UES'	FED				
Sample ID	Sample Location	Sample Depth	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Matrix	# ol jars	NWTPH-D _x	NWTPH-Gx	3TEX by 8021B	VOC's by 8260	SVOC's by 8270	RCRA-B Metals		*		Notes		
B11-20170829	81		O/ A-D	8thsm	170	Heb	4		×	X							·····		
						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		 											
					- th	1												{	
				<u> </u>		1 con													
													-						. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
								 				~~~		2		۲ <u>.</u>	<u></u>	{	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							 											
	·											. <u></u>						{	
							1					¢		2					4
	₹.		······									4		Sa	mple	s rece	ived a	t	°C
Friedman & Br	uya, Inc.	······································	SIG	NATURE	. 1	PR	INTN	AME				СОЙ	PAN	{		DATE	TIM	Ē	
3012 16th Aven	ue West	Relingvishe	d by	r I	<u></u>	Clar	Toch	the			Sou	At	[ant	h		NAT -	0.900		
Seattle, WA 981	19-2029	Received by	M	4/int		Nhan	P	NAV)		FL	B	<u> </u>		<u> 8/-</u>	sult	<u> //:/</u>	5	
Ph. (206) 285-85	282	Relinquishe	d by:	1		· • • •			میں میں میں اور		-					· .			
Fax (206) 283-5	044 · [Received by:																	

50 V

Friedman & Bruya, Inc. #708539

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D. Yelena Aravkina, M.S. Michael Erdahl, B.S. Arina Podnozova, B.S. Eric Young, B.S. 3012 16th Avenue West Seattle, WA 98119-2029 (206) 285-8282 fbi@isomedia.com www.friedmanandbruya.com

September 8, 2017

Liz Forbes, Project Manager SoundEarth Strategies 2811 Fairview Ave. East, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98102

Dear Ms Forbes:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on August 30, 2017 from the SOU_1303-003_20170830, F&BI 708539 project. There are 7 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days. If you would like us to return your samples or arrange for long term storage at our offices, please contact us as soon as possible.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service to you and hope you will call if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

Michael Erdahl Project Manager

Enclosures c: Clare Tochilin SOU0908R.DOC

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on August 30, 2017 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the SoundEarth Strategies SOU_1303-003_ 20170830, F&BI 708539 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

<u>Laboratory ID</u>	<u>SoundEarth Strategies</u>
708539 -01	B07-04
708539 -02	B07-08
708539 -03	B07-12
708539 -04	B07-16
708539 -05	B08-04
708539 -06	B08-08
708539 -07	B08-12
708539 -08	B08-16
708539 -09	B09-04
708539 -10	B09-08
708539 -11	B09-12
708539 -12	B09-16
708539 -13	B10-04
708539 -14	B10-08
708539 -15	B10-12
708539 -16	B10-16
708539 -17	B11-04
708539 -18	B11-08
708539 -19	B11-12
708539 -20	B11-16
708539 -21	B12-04
708539 -22	B12-08
708539 -23	B12-12
708539 -24	B12-16
708539 -25	B13-04
708539 -26	B13-08
708539 -27	B13-12
708539 -28	B13-16
708539 -29	B14-0.5

All quality control requirements were acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/08/17 Date Received: 08/30/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170830, F&BI 708539 Date Extracted: 08/31/17 Date Analyzed: 08/31/17 and 09/01/17

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF SOIL SAMPLES FOR BENZENE, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES AND TPH AS GASOLINE USING METHODS 8021B AND NWTPH-Gx

Results Reported on a Dry Weight Basis Results Reported as mg/kg (ppm)

Sample ID	<u>Benzene</u>	<u>Toluene</u>	Ethyl <u>Benzene</u>	Total <u>Xylenes</u>	Gasoline <u>Range</u>	Surrogate (% Recovery)
B07-12 708539-03	<0.02	< 0.02	<0.02	< 0.06	<2	(Linit 30-130) 95
B08-12 708539-07	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.06	<2	95
B09-08 708539-10	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.06	<2	95
B09-12 708539-11	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.06	<2	82
B10-08 708539-14	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.06	<2	95
B10-12 708539-15	< 0.02	< 0.02	<0.02	< 0.06	<2	94
B11-04 708539-17	< 0.02	< 0.02	<0.02	< 0.06	<2	82
B11-08 708539-18	< 0.02	1.8	3.7	7.7	620	ip
B11-12 708539-19	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.06	<2	85
B12-08 708539-22	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.06	<2	96

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/08/17 Date Received: 08/30/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170830, F&BI 708539 Date Extracted: 08/31/17 Date Analyzed: 08/31/17 and 09/01/17

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF SOIL SAMPLES FOR BENZENE, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES AND TPH AS GASOLINE USING METHODS 8021B AND NWTPH-Gx

Results Reported on a Dry Weight Basis Results Reported as mg/kg (ppm)

Sample ID Laboratory ID	<u>Benzene</u>	<u>Toluene</u>	Ethyl <u>Benzene</u>	Total <u>Xylenes</u>	Gasoline <u>Range</u>	Surrogate (<u>% Recovery)</u> (Limit 50-150)
B13-08 708539-26	<0.02	<0.02	<0.02	< 0.06	<2	93
Method Blank 07-1867 MB	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.02	< 0.06	<2	106

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/08/17 Date Received: 08/30/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170830, F&BI 708539 Date Extracted: 09/06/17 Date Analyzed: 09/06/17

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF SOIL SAMPLES FOR TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS AS DIESEL AND MOTOR OIL USING METHOD NWTPH-Dx

Results Reported on a Dry Weight Basis Results Reported as mg/kg (ppm)

<u>Sample ID</u> Laboratory ID	Diesel Range (C10-C25)	<u>Motor Oil Range</u> (C ₂₅ -C ₃₆)	Surrogate <u>(% Recovery)</u> (Limit 53-144)
B14-0.5 708539-29	<50	<250	75
Method Blank 07-1948 MB2	<50	<250	89

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/08/17 Date Received: 08/30/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170830, F&BI 708539

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF SOIL SAMPLES FOR BENZENE, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, AND TPH AS GASOLINE USING EPA METHOD 8021B AND NWTPH-Gx

Laboratory Code: 708539-03 (Duplicate)

		Sample	Duplicate	
	Reporting	Result	Result	RPD
Analyte	Units	(Wet Wt)	(Wet Wt)	(Limit 20)
Benzene	mg/kg (ppm)	< 0.02	< 0.02	nm
Toluene	mg/kg (ppm)	< 0.02	< 0.02	nm
Ethylbenzene	mg/kg (ppm)	< 0.02	< 0.02	nm
Xylenes	mg/kg (ppm)	< 0.06	< 0.06	nm
Gasoline	mg/kg (ppm)	<2	<2	nm

			Percent	
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Acceptance
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	Criteria
Benzene	mg/kg (ppm)	0.5	95	66-121
Toluene	mg/kg (ppm)	0.5	95	72-128
Ethylbenzene	mg/kg (ppm)	0.5	99	69-132
Xylenes	mg/kg (ppm)	1.5	96	69-131
Gasoline	mg/kg (ppm)	20	90	61-153

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/08/17 Date Received: 08/30/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170830, F&BI 708539

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF SOIL SAMPLES FOR TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS AS DIESEL EXTENDED USING METHOD NWTPH-Dx

Laboratory Code:	708474-01 (Matrix	x Spike S	Silica Gel)				
			Sample	Percent	Percent		
	Reporting	Spike	Result	Recovery	Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	(Wet Wt)	MS	MSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Diesel Extended	mg/kg (ppm)	5,000	62	85	93	64-133	9
Laboratory Code:	Laboratory Contr	ol Samp	le Silica Gel	l			
			Percent				
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	y Accep	tance		
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	Crite	eria		
Diesel Extended	mg/kg (ppm)	5,000	96	58-1	47		

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Data Qualifiers & Definitions

a - The analyte was detected at a level less than five times the reporting limit. The RPD results may not provide reliable information on the variability of the analysis.

 ${\bf b}$ - The analyte was spiked at a level that was less than five times that present in the sample. Matrix spike recoveries may not be meaningful.

ca - The calibration results for the analyte were outside of acceptance criteria. The value reported is an estimate.

c - The presence of the analyte may be due to carryover from previous sample injections.

cf - The sample was centrifuged prior to analysis.

 ${\rm d}$ - The sample was diluted. Detection limits were raised and surrogate recoveries may not be meaningful.

dv - Insufficient sample volume was available to achieve normal reporting limits.

f - The sample was laboratory filtered prior to analysis.

fb - The analyte was detected in the method blank.

fc - The compound is a common laboratory and field contaminant.

hr - The sample and duplicate were reextracted and reanalyzed. RPD results were still outside of control limits. Variability is attributed to sample inhomogeneity.

hs - Headspace was present in the container used for analysis.

ht – The analysis was performed outside the method or client-specified holding time requirement.

ip - Recovery fell outside of control limits. Compounds in the sample matrix interfered with the quantitation of the analyte.

j - The analyte concentration is reported below the lowest calibration standard. The value reported is an estimate.

J - The internal standard associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration is an estimate.

jl - The laboratory control sample(s) percent recovery and/or RPD were out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.

js - The surrogate associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.

lc - The presence of the analyte is likely due to laboratory contamination.

L - The reported concentration was generated from a library search.

nm - The analyte was not detected in one or more of the duplicate analyses. Therefore, calculation of the RPD is not applicable.

pc - The sample was received with incorrect preservation or in a container not approved by the method. The value reported should be considered an estimate.

ve - The analyte response exceeded the valid instrument calibration range. The value reported is an estimate.

vo - The value reported fell outside the control limits established for this analyte.

x - The sample chromatographic pattern does not resemble the fuel standard used for quantitation.







Send Report to <u>Li</u>	iz Forbes, Clar	<u>e Tochili</u>	n		SAMF	LERS (signatu	la	· To	\geq	3			Page # TURNA	AROUN	_ _{of} D TIME
CompanyS	SoundEarth St	rategies,	Inc.		PROJ	ECT NA	ME/NČ	Í.	/]	PO #	S	tandard (USH/ - S	2 Weeks	s)
Address 28	11 Fairview A	venue E.	Suite	2000		I	Port of S	kagit			13	03-003	Rus	sh charges	s author	ized by:
City, State, ZIP <u>S</u> Phone # <u>206-300</u>	Seattle, Washi 6-1900 Fa:	ngton 98 x #2(102)6-306	-1907		arks -Hb	G LD						D R W	SAMP Spose aff eturn sau fill call w	LE DISI ter 30 da nples ith instr	POSAL iys uctions
-				1		1					A	NALYSE	S REQUEST	ED		
Sample ID	Sample Location	Sample Depth	Lab ID	Date Sample	Time I Sampled	Matrix	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	。算作氏X by 8021B	VOCs by 8260	SVOCs by 8270				Notes
B07-04	807	4	OIE	[[125/1	1 0820	Soil	5								·	
B07-08		8	02	(0825		1				>					
B07-12		12	03		0830				X	X						· · ·
B07-16		16	ъч		043											
BO8- 04	BOR	4	05		0900							¢				
BD2-08		8 .	06		0905											
808-12		12	07		OGID				X	K						
808-16		16	28		0915											
B09-04	Bog	4	64		0935				· ·						Š	
809-08		8	10	1-	0940				$\left \times\right $							• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
						-				```			Sample	s receive	d at	<u>ц_</u> °С
Friedman & Bruya	, Inc. Relingu	SJ ished by	GNAI Aa a	URE	,	600	PRI	NT NA	ME			COI	APANY	E	ATE	TIME
South WA DOLLO	Receive	d by:	M/	In	>	$\frac{\sqrt{u}}{12}$	n 1	oun	~		·	SULVE	Eesth	× 8/3	<u>~~~~</u>	0/00
Ph. (206) 285-8282	Relinqu	ished by:	<u>7-рл</u> Л	, /)		<u> </u>	JKE	, 			1-0	dex	(SDC	2)30	<u>(Jung 17</u>	100
Fax (206) 283-5044	Receive	d by:	1	14.1		MA	i A	DA	(1.40		7	E, R	7	8	12nti	5 11/1

	Forbes, Clar	e Tochili	n		SAMP	LERS (s	signatu	re)								of
ompany S	oundEarth St	rotonios	Inc		PROJ	ECT NA	ME/NC).			Ē	PO #		Stan	dard (2 V	JUND TIME Leeks)
ddress 28	11 Fairwiew A	vonue F	Suito		-	F	ort of S	kagit			130)3-003		Rush c.	harges au	thorized by:
ity, State, ZIP <u>S</u> hone # <u>206-306</u>	eattle, Washi -1900 Fa	ngton 98: x #20	102 16-306-	1907	- REMA	REMARKS			<u>.</u>				SAMPLE DISPOSAL Dispose after 30 days Return samples Will call with instructions			
									1		Ał	VALYSI	ES REQ	UESTED		····
Sample ID	Sample Location	Sample Depth	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Matrix	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	BTEX by 8021B	VOCs by 8260	SVOCs by 8270				Notes
809-12	B09	12	IIA-	8129M	OPSO	501	5		X	X		· .				
809-16	1	16	/2		0955	1							<u> </u>			
810-04	BID	Y .	13		1015										·····	<u></u>
310-08	(8	14		1020				X	X						
310-12		R	15		1036				\times	\times						····
B10-16	^	16	16	÷	1035							·····			-	
B)1-04	Bll	4	P		055				X	Х						
BII-OF		8	18		JUD				X	X			e ve fan fiske kenker en de ve			
311-12		12	19		1105				X	X		*				
BI-16)6	30 V	_	0111		4									
	-					***							Sa	mples r	eceived	at_ <u></u> °C
riedman & Bruya, 012 16th Avenue V	Inc. Relinqu	SI(<u> 3NAT</u> h	URE		CI.	PRII	NT NA	ME				<u>MPAN</u> مرکز بر	Y ett.	DAT	E TIME
eattle. WA 98119-2	029 Received	l by:	K				10	ochi	M	····		<u>1911</u>	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}$	1/m	8/301	1 080
h. (206) 285-8282	Relinqu	ished by:	1 mg			<u> </u>	Jr-C				<u> /-e</u>	<u>aex</u>	<u>L 2 1</u>		30Hig	1+100 j
(90.0) 000 50 (4	Received	1 by: /	+				·	n l			+	~ ~ ~			12	

end Report to <u>Li</u> company <u>S</u>	r z Forbes, Clar SoundEarth St	<u>e Tochili</u> rategies,	n Inc.		SAMP PROJ	LERS (signatur ME/NC	<u>Cla</u>	× 7	Tort		?0 #		T Stan RUS	Page# URNA dard-(2 H	S ROUNI ? Weeks - Day	_ of <u>3</u> D TIME
ddress28 ity, State, ZIPS hone #206-300	<u>11 Fairview A</u> Seattle, Washin S-1900 Fa:	venue E, ngton 98 x #2(<u>Suite</u> 102 06-306-	2000 1907	- REMA		Port of S	kagit			. 130	03-003		Rush c Disp Retu Will	harges SAMPI ose afte irn sam call wit	author E DISI er 30 da ples th instr	ized by: POSAL tys uctions
					E	1	1				A	NALYSI	ES REQ	UESTED	-		
Sample ID	Sample Location	Sample Depth	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Matrix	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	BTEX by 8021B	VOCs by 8260	SVOCs by 8270					Notes
B12-04	BIZ	4	al A'	STAN	1145	56.7	5			÷				-			
B12-08		8	22		1150	1	1		X	X							
B12-12		12	23		1155												
812-16		16	24		1200						·····		1			<u>+</u>	*****
B13-04	BIJ	4	25		1220								1				
813-08		8	26	r II.	1225				×	X						+	
B13-12		12	27		1230											1	
B13-16	L.	16	281		1235												
B14-015	B14	0,5	24		1335		SX1	X									
**************************************						6F1	\$725	17							L	<u></u>	
history & Dama	The last	CIT	ONIAM	1107	T		יזממ	TINATA	ME				Sam	ples re	ceived		<u>1 °c</u>
neuman & bruyd, 012 16th Avenue V	Vest Relingu	ished yy	W- (To to		(lor		NI INA	INTE			<u> </u>	MPAN	X	<u> </u>	ATE	TIME NRD
eattle, WA 98119-2	2029 Receive	¹ by:	1_			ĸ	DKP				Fa	nd pu	./ <)	~)	0000 201	1.17	10300
h. (206) 285-8282	Relinqu	ished by	Λ.				1. J. T. J.	ì			10	ULA			190	<u>4917</u> 1	1901
Fax (206) 283-5044	Receive	1 by:	1 1	110 1		KALA	in f	A GA	IA		I	TA	T		18/3	30/1-	11:15

Friedman & Bruya, Inc. #709034

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D. Yelena Aravkina, M.S. Michael Erdahl, B.S. Arina Podnozova, B.S. Eric Young, B.S. 3012 16th Avenue West Seattle, WA 98119-2029 (206) 285-8282 fbi@isomedia.com www.friedmanandbruya.com

September 14, 2017

Liz Forbes, Project Manager SoundEarth Strategies 2811 Fairview Ave. East, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98102

Dear Ms Forbes:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on September 1, 2017 from the SOU_ 1303-003_ 20170901, F&BI 709034 project. There are 12 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days. If you would like us to return your samples or arrange for long term storage at our offices, please contact us as soon as possible.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service to you and hope you will call if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

Michael Erdahl Project Manager

Enclosures c: Clare Tochilin SOU0914R.DOC

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on September 1, 2017 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the SoundEarth Strategies 1303-003 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

Laboratory ID	SoundEarth Strategies
709034 -01	MW01-20170901
709034 -02	MW06-20170901
709034 -03	MW03-20170901
709034 -04	MW04-20170901
709034 -05	MW05-20170901

All quality control requirements were acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/14/17 Date Received: 09/01/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170901, F&BI 709034 Date Extracted: 09/06/17 Date Analyzed: 09/06/17

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR BENZENE, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES AND TPH AS GASOLINE USING METHODS 8021B AND NWTPH-Gx

<u>Sample ID</u> Laboratory ID	<u>Benzene</u>	<u>Toluene</u>	Ethyl <u>Benzene</u>	Total <u>Xylenes</u>	Gasoline <u>Range</u>	Surrogate (<u>% Recovery</u>) (Limit 50-150)
MW01-20170901 709034-01	<1	1.5	<1	<3	<100	89
MW06-20170901 709034-02	<1	<1	<1	<3	<100	77
MW03-20170901 ⁷⁰⁹⁰³⁴⁻⁰³	<1	<1	<1	<3	<100	88
MW04-20170901 709034-04	<1	<1	<1	<3	<100	87
MW05-20170901 ⁷⁰⁹⁰³⁴⁻⁰⁵	<1	<1	<1	<3	<100	74
Method Blank ^{07-1949 MB}	<1	<1	<1	<3	<100	88

Results Reported as ug/L (ppb)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/14/17 Date Received: 09/01/17 Project: SOU_1303-003_20170901, F&BI 709034 Date Extracted: 09/05/17 Date Analyzed: 09/05/17

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS AS DIESEL AND MOTOR OIL USING METHOD NWTPH-Dx

Results Reported as ug/L (ppb)

Sample ID	<u>Diesel Range</u>	<u>Motor Oil Range</u>	Surrogate <u>(% Recovery)</u>
Laboratory ID	$(C_{10}-C_{25})$	(C ₂₅ -C ₃₆)	(Limit 51-134)
MW01-20170901 709034-01 1/1.4	<70	<350	92
MW06-20170901 709034-02 1/1.2	<60	<300	86
MW03-20170901 709034-03 1/1.2	<60	<300	81
MW04-20170901 709034-04 1/1.2	<60	<300	77
MW05-20170901 709034-05 1/1.2	72 x	<300	105
Method Blank 07-1947 MB	<50	<250	76

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270D SIM

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	MW05-2017 09/01/17 09/08/17 09/11/17 Water ug/L (ppb)	70901	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	SoundEarth Strategies SOU_ 1303-003_ 20170901 709034-05 1/2.5 091108.D GCMS6 ya
Surrogates: Anthracene-d10 Benzo(a)anthracene	e-d12	% Recovery: 100 121	Lower Limit: 31 25	Upper Limit: 160 165
Compounds:		Concentration ug/L (ppb)		
Benz(a)anthracene		< 0.075		
Chrysene		< 0.075		
Benzo(a)pyrene		< 0.075		
Benzo(b)fluor anthe	ne	< 0.075		
Benzo(k)fluoranthe	ne	< 0.075		
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyr	ene	< 0.075		
Dibenz(a,h)anthrac	ene	< 0.075		

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270D SIM

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	Method Bla: Not Applica 09/08/17 09/11/17 Water ug/L (ppb)	nk ble	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	SoundEarth Strategies SOU_ 1303-003_ 20170901 07-1969 mb 091107.D GCMS6 ya
Surrogates: Anthracene-d10 Benzo(a)anthracene	e-d12	% Recovery: 90 99	Lower Limit: 31 25	Upper Limit: 160 165
Compounds:		Concentration ug/L (ppb)		
Benz(a)anthracene		< 0.03		
Chrysene		< 0.03		
Benzo(a)pyrene		< 0.03		
Benzo(b)fluoranthe	ne	< 0.03		
Benzo(k)fluoranthe	ne	< 0.03		
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyr	ene	< 0.03		
Dibenz(a,h)anthrac	ene	< 0.03		

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Analysis For Volatile Compounds By EPA Method 8260C

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	MW06-2017 09/01/17 09/05/17 09/05/17 Water ug/L (ppb)	0901	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	SoundEarth Strategies SOU_ 1303-003_ 20170901 709034-02 090542.D GCMS9 JS
Surrogates: 1,2-Dichloroethane- Toluene-d8 4-Bromofluorobenze	d4 ene	% Recovery: 101 98 101	Lower Limit: 85 91 76	Upper Limit: 117 108 126
Compounds:		Concentration ug/L (ppb)		
Vinyl chloride Chloroethane 1,1-Dichloroethene Methylene chloride trans-1,2-Dichloroe 1,1-Dichloroethane cis-1,2-Dichloroethane 1,2-Dichloroethane 1,1,1-Trichloroethane Trichloroethene Tetrachloroethene	thene ene (EDC) ne	<0.2 <1 <1 <5 <1 <1 <1 <1 <1 <1 <1 <1 <1 <1		

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Analysis For Volatile Compounds By EPA Method 8260C

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted:	Method Bla Not Applica 09/05/17	nk ble	Client: Project: Lab ID:	SoundEarth Strategies SOU_ 1303-003_ 20170901 07-1901 mb
Date Analyzed:	09/05/17		Data File:	090535.D
Matrix:	Water		Instrument:	GCMS9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)		Operator:	JS
			Lower	Lippor
Sumagatage		0/ Decovery	Lower	Upper Limiti
Surrogates.	14	% Recovery:		
1,2-Dichloroethane-	d4	100	85	117
Toluene-d8		98	91	108
4-Bromofluorobenze	ene	102	76	126
		Concentration		
Compounds:		ug/L (ppb)		
Vinyl chloride		< 0.2		
Chloroethane		<1		
1,1-Dichloroethene		<1		
Methylene chloride		<5		
trans-1,2-Dichloroe	thene	<1		
1,1-Dichloroethane		<1		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethe	ene	<1		
1,2-Dichloroethane	(EDC)	<1		
1,1,1-Trichloroetha	ne	<1		
Trichloroethene		<1		
Tetrachloroethene		<1		

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/14/17 Date Received: 09/01/17 Project: SOU_ 1303-003_ 20170901, F&BI 709034

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR BENZENE, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, AND TPH AS GASOLINE USING EPA METHOD 8021B AND NWTPH-Gx

Laboratory Code:	709034-01 (Dupli	cate)		
	Reporting	Sample	Duplicate	RPD
Analyte	Units	Result	Result	(Limit 20)
Benzene	ug/L (ppb)	<1	<1	nm
Toluene	ug/L (ppb)	1.5	1.2	22 a
Ethylbenzene	ug/L (ppb)	<1	<1	nm
Xylenes	ug/L (ppb)	<3	<3	nm
Gasoline	ug/L (ppb)	<100	<100	nm

	Percent					
Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Acceptance			
Units	Level	LCS	Criteria			
ug/L (ppb)	50	86	72-119			
ug/L (ppb)	50	90	71-113			
ug/L (ppb)	50	89	72-114			
ug/L (ppb)	150	83	72-113			
ug/L (ppb)	1,000	108	70-119			
	Reporting Units ug/L (ppb) ug/L (ppb) ug/L (ppb) ug/L (ppb) ug/L (ppb)	Reporting Units Spike Level ug/L (ppb) 50 ug/L (ppb) 50 ug/L (ppb) 50 ug/L (ppb) 150 ug/L (ppb) 1,000	Reporting Units Spike Level Recovery LCS ug/L (ppb) 50 86 ug/L (ppb) 50 90 ug/L (ppb) 50 89 ug/L (ppb) 150 83 ug/L (ppb) 1,000 108			

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/14/17 Date Received: 09/01/17 Project: SOU_ 1303-003_ 20170901, F&BI 709034

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS AS DIESEL EXTENDED USING METHOD NWTPH-Dx

			Percent	Percent		
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	LCSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Diesel Extended	ug/L (ppb)	2,500	72	72	58-134	0

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/14/17 Date Received: 09/01/17 Project: SOU_ 1303-003_ 20170901, F&BI 709034

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR PAHS BY EPA METHOD 8270D SIM

,	J	I.	Percent	Percent		
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	LCSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Benz(a)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	1	93	99	60-118	6
Chrysene	ug/L (ppb)	1	95	96	66-125	1
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	1	88	95	55-135	8
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	1	93	97	62-125	4
Benzo(a)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	1	90	94	58-127	4
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	1	102	89	36-142	14
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	1	102	93	37-133	9

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 09/14/17 Date Received: 09/01/17 Project: SOU_ 1303-003_ 20170901, F&BI 709034

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR VOLATILES BY EPA METHOD 8260C

Laboratory Code: 709033-01 (Matrix Spike)

-	-			Percent	
	Reporting	Spike	Sample	Recovery	Acceptance
Analyte	Units	Level	Result	MS	Criteria
Vinyl chloride	ug/L (ppb)	50	0.40	105	61-139
Chloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	119	55-149
1,1-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	97	71-123
Methylene chloride	ug/L (ppb)	50	<5	105	61-126
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	94	72-122
1,1-Dichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	95	79-113
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	93	63-126
1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	92	70-119
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	95	75-121
Trichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	91	73-122
Tetrachloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	<1	89	72-113

5	1					
			Percent	Percent		
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	LCSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Vinyl chloride	ug/L (ppb)	50	107	107	70-128	0
Chloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	121	115	66-149	5
1,1-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	95	99	75-119	4
Methylene chloride	ug/L (ppb)	50	95	96	63-132	1
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	94	96	76-118	2
1,1-Dichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	94	95	77-119	1
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	95	94	76-119	1
1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	ug/L (ppb)	50	92	93	78-114	1
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	50	97	98	80-116	1
Trichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	94	94	72-119	0
Tetrachloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	50	90	92	78-109	2

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Data Qualifiers & Definitions

a - The analyte was detected at a level less than five times the reporting limit. The RPD results may not provide reliable information on the variability of the analysis.

 ${\bf b}$ - The analyte was spiked at a level that was less than five times that present in the sample. Matrix spike recoveries may not be meaningful.

ca - The calibration results for the analyte were outside of acceptance criteria. The value reported is an estimate.

c - The presence of the analyte may be due to carryover from previous sample injections.

cf - The sample was centrifuged prior to analysis.

 ${\rm d}$ - The sample was diluted. Detection limits were raised and surrogate recoveries may not be meaningful.

dv - Insufficient sample volume was available to achieve normal reporting limits.

f - The sample was laboratory filtered prior to analysis.

fb - The analyte was detected in the method blank.

fc - The compound is a common laboratory and field contaminant.

hr - The sample and duplicate were reextracted and reanalyzed. RPD results were still outside of control limits. Variability is attributed to sample inhomogeneity.

hs - Headspace was present in the container used for analysis.

ht – The analysis was performed outside the method or client-specified holding time requirement.

ip - Recovery fell outside of control limits. Compounds in the sample matrix interfered with the quantitation of the analyte.

j - The analyte concentration is reported below the lowest calibration standard. The value reported is an estimate.

J - The internal standard associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration is an estimate.

jl - The laboratory control sample(s) percent recovery and/or RPD were out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.

js - The surrogate associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.

lc - The presence of the analyte is likely due to laboratory contamination.

L - The reported concentration was generated from a library search.

nm - The analyte was not detected in one or more of the duplicate analyses. Therefore, calculation of the RPD is not applicable.

pc - The sample was received with incorrect preservation or in a container not approved by the method. The value reported should be considered an estimate.

ve - The analyte response exceeded the valid instrument calibration range. The value reported is an estimate.

vo - The value reported fell outside the control limits established for this analyte.

x - The sample chromatographic pattern does not resemble the fuel standard used for quantitation.














Send Report to <u>Liz</u>	Forbes, Clar	e Tochili	<u>n</u>		SAMP	LERS (s	ignatu	re)	and	Tor	-z		ſ	P T	age # URNAF	OUND TIME
Companý Sou	undEarth Stu	ategies,	Inc.		PROJI	ECT NA	ME/NC).	*		P	0#		Stan RUS	dard (2 H S	Weeks) Day
Address 2811	Fairview Av	venue E.	Suite	2000		P	'ort of S	kagit			130	3-003		Rush cl	arges a	authorized by:
City, State, ZIP <u>Se</u> Phone # <u>206-306-1</u>	attle <u>, Washir</u> 1900 Fax	ngton 98 : #2(102)6-306-	-1907	REMA	RKS			Abay-2012 & Same Association & Same Science & Same					Dispo Retu Will	SAMPL ose afte rn samp call wit	E DISPOSAL r 30 days ples h instructions
	<u> </u>								r	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	AN	IALYSI	S REQU	JESTED		
Sample ID	Sample Location	Sample Depth	Lab . ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Matrix	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	BTEX by 8021B	🗲 VOCs by 8260	SVOCs by 8270	CIANS			Notes Xrer CT ML 9/8/1
MUDI-20170901	Awai		0.2-6	9/117	0831	Hzo	γ	\times	\times	\times						
MW06-20170901	MWOG	··	02 T		0934			X	人	X	$\left \times\right $				1	
MU03-20170901	MWSB		d3		1021			\times	$\left \times\right $	\times						
MW04-2017070)	Musole		04		8			X	X	$ \times $						
MW05-20170901	Anwas -	tammayori	05		1209			\times	\times	\times			¥			
					ð	7 9,	2/17									·
			1	İ								***	Sa	nples	recer	ved at

				, ,	
Friedman & Bruya, Inc.	SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE TIM	E
3012 16th Avenue West	Relinquished by la File	Clare Tayolin	Sandtenh	9/1/17 1505	
Seattle, WA 98119-2029	Received by	1000	FEBT	9-1-17 15	205
Ph. (206) 285-8282	Relinquished by:			,,,,_,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
Fax (206) 283-5044	Received by:	·····			
FORMS\COC\COC.DOC	E			l	

APPENDIX C BORING LOGS

Sc	SoundEarth Strategies				oject: oject Number ogged by:	Port o r: 1303 CJT	of Skagit -003		BORING LOG	B01 MW05	5
30	Ju	St	rateq	ies Su	ate Started: Irface Conditi	/8/28 i ons: Asph	'17 ialt	S	ite Address: 2070 Sedr	Northern Sta o-Woolley,	te Road Washington
			5	W W Re Di	ell Location N ell Location E eviewed by: ate Completed	I/S: 8'N o E/W: 23'W EBF d: 8/28/	of NE tank ro of NE tank	om corner room corner	Water Depti Time of Drill Water Depti	n At ling 11 n letion	feet bgs feet bgs
- îs	/al	unt	٩Ŋ		Comple		. <u>o</u>				
Depth (feet bg:	Interv	Blow Co	% Recove	PID (ppm)	ID	Class	Graph	Lithologic I	Description		Well Detail/ Water Depth
0	\bigvee			0.1	B01-0.5	GP		Asphalt Dry GRAVEL with sand, tra dark brown to black, no hy 75) (fill).	ice silt, asphalt drocarbon odor	pieces, (5-20-	
_	\bigwedge		100	0.0		ML		Moist SILT, trace clay and gray, no hydrocarbon odor	very fine sand, 1 [•] (95-5-0).	an to	
5	$\left\langle \right\rangle$			0.0	B01-04	SM		Moist SAND with gravel an gray/black/brown, no hydro 15).	d silt, ocarbon odor (1	5-70-	
_	X		75			ML		Moist, clayey SILT, trace ve wood, tan to gray, no hydro	ery fine sand, tra ocarbon odor (9	ace /5-5-0).	
_	$\left\langle \right\rangle$			0.0	B01-08	ML		Moist SILT with fine sand, dark brown, moderate orga	trace wood and inic odor, no	roots,	
10 —			100	0.2				hydrocarbon odor (80-20-0).		
	$\left(\right)$			0.2	B01-12	SM SM-ML		Wet, silty SAND, dark brow hydrocarbon odor (20-80-0 Moist to wet SILT and fine pieces, dark brown/gray, w hydrocarbon odor (50-50-0	n to black, no). SAND, some wo ery faint possib	ood le	
-			100	0.0					<i>,</i>		
- 15	$\left(\right)$			0.3	B01-16	ML SM-ML		Moist to wet SILT, trace fin possible hydrocarbon odo Moist to wet interbedded S	e sand, gray, ve r (95-5-0). ILT with fine sa	ery faint nd and	
-	\bigvee		100	0.2				SILTY SAND, gray, no hydr 0).	ocarbon odor (50-50-	
20	$\left \right $			0.2	B01-20			Boring terminated at 20 fee monitoring well MW05, scr feet bgs.	et bgs. Complete eened from 10 t	ed as o 20	
Drillin	ig Co	./Drille	r: S	itandard Probe/	Russell W	ell/Auger D	iameter:	1/2 inches	Notes/Comm	ents:	
Samp	ler Ty	/pe:	C	iner	So	creen Slot S	Size:	0.010 inches			
Hamm	ner Ty	/pe/We	ight:		lbs Fi	Iter Pack U	sed:	Colorado silica sand			
Total	Borin	g Dept	:h: 2	0	feet bgs Su	urface Seal:	:	Concrete			
State	Total Boring Depth: 20 Fotal Well Depth: 20 State Well ID No.: BJP 714				20reet bgsSu20feet bgsAnBJP 714Ma			Bentonite Flush mount Page: 1 0			of 1

So	DU	nd Str	art	Pr Pr Lc Da Su W W	oject: oject Number ogged by: ate Started: urface Condition ell Location N/ ell Location E/	Port of 1303 CJT 8/28/ ons: Asph /S: 1' N of /W: 18.5'	of Skagit -003 (17 halt of NE tank ro W of NE tar	BORING LOG B02 Site Address: 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington Som corner nk room corner Water Depth At Time of Drilling 10 feet bgs
				Re Da	eviewed by: ate Completed	EBF I: 8/28/	/17	Water Depth After Completion 10.50 feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	USCS Class	Graphic	Lithologic Description Well Detail/ Water Depth
0			50	0.0	B02-0.5	GP		Asphalt Dry GRAVEL with sand, some asphalt pieces, brown to black, no hydrocarbon odor (5-35-60) (fill).
_	\bigwedge		50	0.0		ML		Moist, sandy SILT with wood and roots, dark brown to tan, no hydrocarbon odor (60-40-0).
5	\bigvee			0.1	B02-04	ML		Moist, clayey SILT with sand, trace fine gravel, tan, no hydrocarbon odor (80-15-5).
_	\mathbb{A}		60	0.3		SM		Moist, silty SAND with gravel, dark brown, faint possible hydrocarbon/organic odor (30-55-15).
-	\bigvee			0.4	802-08	ML		Moist to wet SILT with wood and roots, trace sand, dark brown, no hydrocarbon odor (95-5-0).
-	\bigwedge		100	0.5	B02-12			
_			100	0.1		ML		Wet to moist SILT with sand, some wood and roots, dark brown to black, organic odor, no hydrocarbon odor (75-25-0).
15 —	/			0.1	B02-16			
-								Boring terminated at 16 feet bgs, backfilled with bentonite.
20 Drillin		Drille	r. Cł	andard Probe/			iameter:	inches Notes/Comments
Drillin	ig Eq	uipmer	it: G	eoProbe Truck	We	ell Screene	d Interval	: feet bgs
Samp Hamn	ler Ty her Ty	ype: vpe/We	Li iaht:	ner	lbs Filt	reen Slot S ter Pack U	Size: sed:	inches
Total	Borir	ng Dept	h: 16	5	feet bgs Su	rface Seal:	:	
Total State	Well Well	Depth: ID No.:			feet bgs An Mo	nular Seal	: ype:	 Page: 1 of 1

Sc		nd	art	Pi Pi La	roject: roject Number ogged by:	Port o r: 1303 CJT	of Skagit -003	BORING B03 LOG	
30	Ju	St	rateg	ies s w	ate Started: urface Conditi /ell Location N	8/28/ ions: Asph I/S: 9' N o	17 alt f NE tank ro	Site Address: 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washin nom corner Water Depth At	ngton
				W R D	/ell Location E eviewed by: ate Completed	2/W: 45'W EBF d: 8/28/	of NE tank	Water Depth After Completion fee	et bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	USCS Class	Graphic	Lithologic Description Well Wate	Detail/ er Depth
0 -			90	0.3	B03-0.5	SP/GP ML		Asphalt Dry GRAVEL and SAND, trace silt, some asphalt, dark brown to black, no hydrocarbon odor (5-45- 50) (fill). Moist SILT with fine sand, trace wood and roots, tan to gray, no hydrocarbon odor (80-20-0)	
_	$\left \right $			0.3					
5	\bigvee		100	0.4	B03-04	ML		Moist SILT with fine sand, tan to gray, trace wood and roots, no to very faint possible hydrocarbon/organic odor (90-10-0).	
-	$\left\langle \right\rangle$		100	0.5	B03-08	SM		Moist SAND with silt, trace gravel, trace roots,	
- 10 —			100	0.4		ML		Moist SILT with fine sand, tan to gray, no hydrocarbon odor (90-10-0).	
-	$\left(\right)$			0.5	B03-12				\checkmark
-			100	0.4		ML		hydrocarbon odor (100-0-0).	
15 —	/			0.4	B03-16				
								Boring terminated at 16 feet bgs, backfilled with bentonite.	
20 Drillin	ng Co	o./Drille	r: St	andard Probe/	/Russell W	ell/Auger D	iameter:	inches Notes/Comments:	
Drillin Samp	g Eq ler T	uipmer vpe:	nt: Ge Lii	eoProbe Truck ner	w W	ell Screene creen Slot S	d Interval: Size:	feet bgs inches	
Hamn	ner T	ype/We	ight:		lbs Fil	Iter Pack U	sed:	-	
Total	Borir Well	ig Dept Depth:	n: 16 	,	feet bgs Ar	urtace Seal: nnular Seal:	:		
State	Well	ID No.:			M	onument Ty	/pe:	Page: 1 of 1	

So)U	nd Str	art	P P L D D S S W W R	roject: roject Numbe ogged by: ate Started: urface Condi /ell Location /ell Location eviewed by:	Port c er: 1303 CJT 8/28/ itions: Asph N/S: 10' N E/W: 12' E EBF	of Skagit -003 17 alt of NE tank r of NE tank r	BORING LOG B04 Site Address: 2070 Northern S Sedro-Woolle room corner Water Depth At Time of Drilling 1 Water Depth 1	State Road y, Washington 4 feet bgs
				D	ate Complete	ed: 8/28/	/17	After Completion -	feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	e USCS Class	Graphic	Lithologic Description	Well Detail/ Water Depth
0			75	0.1	B04-0.5	SP/GP		Asphalt Dry GRAVEL and SAND, trace silt, intervals of crushed brick and asphalt, brown to black, no hydrocarbon odor (5-50-45) (fill).	
5—	$\langle \rangle$			0.0	B04-04			Dry GRAVEL and SAND, trace silt, intervals of crushed wood, concrete, and sawdust, tan to pink, no hydrocarbon odor (5-50-45) (fill).	
_	$\left \right $		50	0.3		SM		Moist silty SAND, trace gravel, orange, no hydrocarbon odor (35-60-5).	
- - 10 —			20	0.2	B04-08	SM		Moist silty SAND, trace gravel, orange to tan, no hydrocarbon odor (35-60-5).	
- - - 15			100	0.4	B04-12 B04-16	SM		Moist to wet silty fine SAND, some wood and roots, dark brown to black, no hydrocarbon odor (15-85-0).	V
								Boring terminated at 16 feet bgs, backfilled with bentonite.	
Drillin Drillin Samp Hamn Total	ng Co ng Eq ler Ty ner Ty Borir Well	./Drillen uipmer ype: ype/We ng Dept Depth:	r: St ht: G Li ight: h: ¹⁶	i andard Probe, eoProbe Truck ner	/Russell V (Russell V S Ibs F feet bgs S feet bgs A	Vell/Auger Di Nell Screene Screen Slot S Filter Pack Us Surface Seal: Annular Seal:	iameter: d Interval: Size: sed:	inches Notes/Comments: feet bgs inches 	1
State	Well	ID No.:			N	Monument Ty	/pe:	Page: /	1 of 1

S		nd	Cart	Pr Pr La	oject: oject Number ogged by:	Port o r: 1303 CJT	of Skagi -003	it		BORING LOG	B05 MW06	6
J	Ju	St	raten	Da Da	ate Started: urface Conditi	8/28/ ions: Conc	17 rete		S	ite Address: 2070 I Sedro	Northern Sta -Woolley,	ate Road Washington
		0.01	utog	We We Re Da	ell Location N ell Location E eviewed by: ate Completed	I/S: 3'So E/W: 41'W EBF d: 8/28/	f SW load of SW lo	ding badi	g dock corner ing dock corner	Water Depth Time of Drill Water Depth After Comple	ing ¹⁶ ing ¹⁶ i	feet bgs feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	USCS Class	Graphic		Lithologic [Description		Well Detail/ Water Depth
-			75	0.3		SM-ML			Concrete Crushed asphalt Moist SILT and fine SAND, mottled tan/gray, no hydrod	trace organics, carbon odor (50	-50-0).	
5			100	0.3	B05-04	ML			Moist SILT with fine sand, t organics, mottled tan/gray, (85-15-0).	race clay, trace no hydrocarbol	n odor	
- - 10			100	0.4	B05-08							
- - - 15 —			100	0.3	B05-12	ML			Moist SILT with clay, gray, (100-0-0).	no hydrocarbor	ı odor	
-			100	0.2	B05-16	SM ML			Wet, silty SAND, gray, no h 60-0). Wet SILT and CLAY, trace s hydrocarbon odor (95-5-0).	ydrocarbon odc sand, gray, no	or (40-	
				0.2	B05-20	SM			Wet, silty SAND, gray, no h 60-0).	ydrocarbon odd	or (40-	
Drillin Drillin Samp Hamr Total Total	ng Co ng Eq bler Ty ner Ty Borir Well	./Drille uipmer ype: ype/We ng Dept Depth:	r: S nt: G Li sight: th: 20 20	itandard Probe/l eoProbe Truck iner 0 0	Russell W W Ibs Fi feet bgs Su feet bgs Au	ell/Auger Di ell Screene creen Slot S Iter Pack Us urface Seal: nnular Seal:	iameter d Interv Size: sed:	r: /al:	1/2inches10-20feet bgs0.010inchesColorado silica sandConcreteBentoniteImage: Second se	Notes/Comme Boring terminated as monitoring we to 20 feet bgs.	ents: d at 20 feet II MW06, s	bgs. Completed creened from 10
State	Well	ID No.:	В	JP 715	M	onument Ty	/pe:		Flush mount	Page:	1	of 1

Sc		nd	art	Pr Pr Lo	oject: oject Numbe ogged by:	Port o r: 1303 CJT	of S -00	Skag 3	it		BORING LOG	B06	
30	Ju	Sti	rateg	Da I C S W W Re	ate Started: urface Condit ell Location N ell Location E eviewed by:	8/28/ ions: Conc N/S: 20' N E/W: 24' W EBF	/17 crete of S	e SW n SW ı	nain mair	tenance building corner tenance building corner	Site Address: 2070 Sedre Water Depti Time of Drill Water Depti	Northern Sta p-Woolley, n At ling 13 n	ate Road Washington feet bgs
				Da	ate Complete	d: 8/28/	/17			l	After Compl	etion 12	.70 feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	e USCS Class		Graphic		Lithologic	Description		Well Detail/ Water Depth
0	\bigvee			0.2		GP	JN/N			Concrete Dry, sandy GRAVEL, som no hydrocarbon odor (5-4 Moist SILT with sand, mo	e asphalt pieces, 0-55) (fill). ttled tan/gray, no	black,	
_	\bigwedge		75	0.7	DOC 04					hydrocarbon odor (80-20-	0).		
5	\bigvee			0.7	800-04	ML				Moist SILT with sand, trac tan/gray, no hydrocarbon	ce clay, mottled odor (85-15-0).		
-	\bigwedge		100	0.6	B06-08								
- 10 —			100	0.4									
-	$\left(\right)$			3.0	B06-12	SM				Moist, silty SAND, gray, fa (35-65-0).	aint hydrocarbon	odor	-
_			100	0.6		ML				Wet SILT with sand, trace odor (70-30-0).	clay, no hydroca	ırbon	
15 —	/ \			0.5	B06-16								
-										Boring terminated at 16 fe Reconnaissance groundw 20170828 collected. Borin bentonite.	eet bgs. vater sample B06 g backfilled with	-	
20							<u> </u>						
Drillin	ng Co	./Drille	r: St	andard Probe/	Russell W	/ell/Auger D	iam	nete	r: vəl·	inches	Notes/Comm	ents:	
Samp	יש ⊏יµ ler T∖	/pe:	n. Go Lii	ner	S	creen Slot S	Size	nter):	val:	inches			
Hamn	ner Ty	ype/We	ight:		Ibs F	ilter Pack U	sec	I:					
Total	Borin	ig Dept	h: 16	i	feet bgs S	urface Seal:	:						
Total State	Well Well	Depth: ID No.:			feet bgs A	nnular Seal	: ype	:			Page:	1	of 1

So	JU	nd	Cart		Project: Project Numbe Logged by: Date Started: Surface Condit Vell Location N Vell Location N Reviewed by: Date Complete	Port 4 r: 1303 CJT 8/29, tions: Cond V/S: 14' S E/W: 23' W EBF d: 8/29	of Skagit 3-003 /17 crete of NW main / of NW main /17	BORING LOG B07 Site Address: 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington tenance building corner Water Depth At Time of Drilling 13 Water Depth After Completion feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	e USCS Class	Graphic	Lithologic Description Well Detail/ Water Depth
0 -			100	0.0		ML		Concrete Moist SILT with fine sand, wood pieces and asphalt in upper 1', mottled gray/tan, no hydrocarbon odor (90-10-0) (fill).
5	$\langle \rangle$		100	0.0	B07-04	ML		Moist SILT with sand, mottled brown/gray, no hydrocarbon odor (90-10-0).
_	$\left\langle \right\rangle$		100	0.0	B07-08	ML SM		Moist, clayey SILT, trace sand, mottled brown/gray, no hydrocarbon odor (90-10-0). Moist, silty SAND with gravel, dark brown, no hydrocarbon odor (20-60-20). Moist clayey SILT with fine sand trace roots
- 10 — -	$\left \right\rangle$		100	0.1		me		motal, elayey off i with fine sand, frace roots, mottled brown/gray, no hydrocarbon odor (90-10- 0).
			75	0.1	B07-12	ML		Moist to wet, clayey SILT, gray, no hydrocarbon odor (100-0-0).
-				0.1	B07-16			Boring terminated at 16 feet bgs, backfilled with bentonite.
20 Drillin Drillin Samp Hamm Total I Total V State	ig Co g Eq ler Ty ner Ty Borir Well Well	o./Driller uipmer ype: ype/We ng Dept Depth: ID No.:	r: St ht: Go Lin ight: h: 16 	andard Probe eoProbe Truc ner	/Russell W k S Ibs F feet bgs S feet bgs A M	/ell/Auger D /ell Screene creen Slot S ilter Pack U urface Seal nnular Seal lonument T)iameter: ed Interval: Size: sed: : : : ype:	inches feet bgs inches inches Page: 1 of 1

Sc		nd	Cort	Pro Pro Lo	oject: oject Number: gged by:	Port o 1303 CJT	of Skagit -003	BORING B08 LOG
30	JU	St	Id	Da Da	te Started: rface Conditio	8/29/	′17 crete	Site Address: 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington
		U CI	utog	We We Re Da	ell Location N/ ell Location E/ viewed by: te Completed	S: 17' N W: 36' W EBF : 8/29/	of SW main of SW ma	intenance building corner intenance building corner Water Depth At Time of Drilling Water Depth After Completion feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	USCS Class	Graphic	Lithologic Description Well Detail/ Water Depth
0 -	V		75	0.1		ML		Concrete Crushed concrete/asphalt/brick Moist SILT with fine sand, trace roots, mottled brown/gray, no hydrocarbon odor (85-15-0).
-	\bigwedge		10	0.1	B08-04			
5	\bigvee		400	0.1		ML		Moist SILT with fine sand, mottled brown/gray, no hydrocarbon odor (85-15-0).
-	\bigwedge		100	0.2	B08-08			
- 10 —			100	0.1		ML		no hydrocarbon odor (100-0-0).
-	$\left\langle \right\rangle$			0.2	B08-12	ML		Wet SILT with clay, gray, no hydrocarbon odor
-			100	0.1				(100-0-0).
15 —	$\left \right\rangle$			0.1	B08-16			
_								Boring terminated at 16 feet bgs, backfilled with bentonite.
20								
Drillin	ig Co	./Drille	r: St	andard Probe/F	Russell We	II/Auger D	iameter:	inches Notes/Comments:
Drillin Samp	g Eq ler Tv	uipmer /pe:	nt: Ge Lii	eoProbe Truck	We Sci	II Screene	d Interva Size:	I: feet bgs inches
Hamn	ner T	ype/We	ight:		lbs Filt	er Pack U	sed:	
Total	Borir	ig Dept	h: 16	i	feet bgs Su	rface Seal:	:	
State	Well	ID No.:			nument Ty	ype:	Page: 1 of 1	

So)U	nd	Eart	Pr Pr Lo Da	oject: oject Number: ogged by: ate Started:	Port o : 1303- CJT 8/29/	of Skagit -003 '17		BORING BO LOG Site Address: 2070 Northerr	9 State Road
		Sti	ateg	ies su W	urface Condition	ons: Conc /S: 26' N	crete of SW main	enance building corner	Sedro-Wooll	ey, Washington
				W Re	ell Location E/ eviewed by:	W: 1'W o EBF	of SW maint	enance building corner	— Time of Drilling Water Depth	13 feet bgs
	_	Ħ	~	Da	ate Completed	: 8/29/	/17		After Completion	feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interva	Blow Cour	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	USCS Class	Graphio	Lithologic	Description	Well Detail/ Water Depth
0			50	0.3		ML		Concrete Crushed concrete/asphal Moist SILT with fine sand hydrocarbon odor (85-15-	t , mottled brown/gray, n 0).	0
_	\bigwedge			0.2	D00.04					
5	V		100	0.2	D03-04	ML		Moist SILT with fine sand hydrocarbon odor (90-10-	, mottled brown/gray, n 0).	o
_	$\left\langle \right\rangle$			0.3	B09-08	SP-SM		Dry to moist SAND with s no hydrocarbon odor (10-	ilt and fine gravel, gray 70-20).	,
10			100	0.2		ML		Moist SILT with clay, trace gray mottling, no hydroca	e fine sand, brown with Irbon odor (95-5-0).	
-	$\left\langle \right\rangle$			0.3	B09-12					$\mathbf{\nabla}$
- 15	\bigwedge		100			SM		Wet, silty fine SAND with hydrocarbon odor (25-50-	gravel, gray/brown, no 25).	
	$/ \setminus$			0.4	B09-16	ML		Wet SILT with clay, trace hydrocarbon odor (90-10-	fine sand, gray, no 0).	
_								Boring terminated at 16 fe bentonite.	eet bgs, backfilled with	
20										
20 Drillin Drillin	ng Co ng Eq	./Drilleı uipmen	r: St nt: Ge	l andard Probe/l eoProbe Truck	I Russell We We	ell/Auger Di ell Screene	iameter: d Interval:	inches feet bgs	Notes/Comments:	
Samp	ler Ty her Ty	/pe: /pe/We	Liı 	ner	lbs File	reen Slot S ter Pack II	Size: sed:	inches		
Total	Borin	g Dept	h: 16		feet bgs Su	rface Seal:				
Total State	Well Well	Depth: ID No.:			feet bgs An Mo	nular Seal: nument Ty	: /pe:		Page:	1 of 1

C		nd	Cart	Pi Pi	roject: roject Numl ogged by:	Po ber: 13 Cu	ort of 803-0 JT	Ska 003	agit			BORING LOG	B10	
20	JU	St.			ate Started: urface Cond	8/	29/1 oncr	7 ete				Site Address: 207 Sec	0 Northern \$ Iro-Woolle	State Road y, Washington
		U	accy	W W R	Vell Location	n N/S: 1' n E/W: 22 : El	N of W c BF	SW of SV	main V ma	ntena ainte	ance building corner enance building corner	Water Dep Time of Dr Water Dep	oth At illing ¹ oth	2 feet bgs
	_			D	ate Comple	ted: 8/	29/1	7		_		After Com	pletion -	- feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interva	Blow Cour	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Samp ID	ole USC Clas	S s		Glapillo		Lithologic	Description		Well Detail/ Water Depth
0			100	0.4		SM ML		Ť			Concrete Moist, silty SAND with or dark brown, no hydrocar Moist SILT with fine sand hydrocarbon odor (85-15	ganics, trace gra bon odor (35-60- I, mottled gray/b -0).	avel, 5). rown, no	,
-	$\left(\right)$			0.3	B10-04									
5	\bigvee		100	0.3										
-	\bigwedge		100	0.4	B10-08									
- 10			100	0.4		ML				9	Moist SILT with fine sand gray mottling, no hydroca	l, trace clay, bro arbon odor (80-2	wn with 20-0).	
-	$\left\langle \right\rangle$			0.3	B10-12							fine and aver		$\mathbf{\nabla}$
-			100	0.2						I	hydrocarbon odor (95-5-0)).	10	
15 —	$\left \right $			0.3	B10-16									_
-										1	Boring terminated at 16 f	eet bgs, backfill	ed with	
20														
Drillin	ig Co	./Drille	r: St	andard Probe	Russell	Well/Auge	r Dia	ame Inte	ter:	: al·	inches	Notes/Comr	nents:	
Samp	ler Ty	/pe:	n. G	ner	·	Screen Slo	ot Si	ze:	ai va	aı.	inches	,		
Hamn	ner T	ype/We	ight:		lbs	Filter Pack	Us	ed:						
Total	воrir Well	ig Dept Depth:	n: 16)	feet bas	Surface Se Annular Se	eal: eal:							
State	Well	ID No.:				Monument	тур	be:				Page:		1 of 1

Sc		nd	Fart	Pr Pr Lo	oject: oject Number gged by:	Port c : 1303- CJT	of Skagit -003	BORING B11 LOG	
50	u	St	rateo	ies Su	ite Started: irface Conditi	8/29/ ons: Grass	17 s	Site Address: 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washin	igton
			5	Wa Wa Re	ell Location N ell Location E eviewed by:	/S: 7' S of /W: 4.5' E EBF	f SW mainte of SW mair	enance building corner Intenance building corner Water Depth At Time of Drilling Water Depth	et bgs
	_	L.		Da	te Completed	l: 8/29/	17	After Completion fee	t bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interva	Blow Coun	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	USCS Class	Graphic	Lithologic Description Well Wate	Detail/ r Depth
0	\bigvee			0.3		SM		Topsoil Moist, silty SAND, trace gravel, brown, no hydrocarbon odor (30-65-5).	
-	\bigwedge		75	0.2	B11-04				
5	\bigvee		100	0.4		SM		Moist, silty SAND, brown, no hydrocarbon odor (40-60-0).	
-	\bigwedge		100	548.2	B11-08	SM		Moist, medium to coarse SAND with silt, gray, moderate hydrocarbon odor (20-80-0).	
- 10	\bigvee			7.5		SP ML		Moist to wet, medium to coarse SAND, trace silt, gray, moderate hydrocarbon odor (5-95-0). Moist SILT with fine sand, brown with gray mottling, no hydrocarbon odor (85-15-0).	
-	\bigwedge		100	1.5	B11-12				
-	V		100	0.6		ML		Wet SILT with fine sand, brown with gray mottling, very faint possible hydrocarbon odor (85-15-0). Wet SILT with clay, gray, no hydrocarbon odor (100-0-0).	_
15 —	/			0.4	B11-16				
								Boring terminated at 16 feet bgs. Reconnaissance groundwater sample B11- 20170829 collected. Boring backfilled with bentonite.	
Drillin	ig Co	./Drille	r: St	andard Probe/I	Russell We	ell/Auger Di	iameter:	inches Notes/Comments:	
Drillin	g Eq ler Tv	uipmen /pe:	nt: Ge	eoProbe Truck	We	ell Screene reen Slot S	d Interval: Size:	: feet bgs inches	
Hamn	ner Ty	ype/We	ight:		lbs Fil	ter Pack Us	sed:		
Total	Borin	ig Dept	h: 16	i	feet bgs Su	Irface Seal:			
State	well Well	Depth: ID No.:			reet bgs An	vpe:	 Page: 1 of 1		

Se		nd	Cort	Pr Pr Lo	oject: oject Numbe ogged by:	Port o r: 1303 CJT	of Skagit -003	BORING B12 LOG
30	Ju	Sti	rateg	Da i e S Wa Re	te Started: Inface Condit I Location N I Location E Eviewed by:	8/29/ tions: Conc N/S: 2'So E/W: 5'W o EBF	(17 crete of SE mainte of SE mainte	site Address: 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington water Depth At Time of Drilling 13 feet bgs Water Depth After Completion
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample	e USCS Class	Graphic	Lithologic Description Well Detai Water Dep
0			50	0.3	B12-04	SM ML		Concrete Moist, silty SAND with gravel, dark gray, no hydrocarbon odor (30-55-15). Moist SILT with fine sand, mottled brown/gray, no hydrocarbon odor (85-15-0).
5			100	1.6 2.5	B12-08	ML		Moist SILT with fine sand, mottled brown/gray, no hydrocarbon odor (90-10-0).
			100	1.4	B12-12	ML		Moist SILT with fine sand, 6" lense of sandy gravel at 9 feet, mottled brown/gray, no hydrocarbon odor (90-10-0).
- 15 —			100	0.6	B12-16	SM ML		Moist, silty SAND with gravel, gray, no hydrocarbon odor (20-65-15). Wet SILT with clay, gray, no hydrocarbon odor (100-0-0).
								Boring terminated at 16 feet bgs, backfilled with bentonite.
Drillin Drillin Samp Hamn Total Total	ng Co ng Equ ler Ty ner Ty Borin Well I Well	./Driller uipmer /pe: ype/We ng Dept Depth: ID No.:	r: St ht: G Li ight: h: 16 	tandard Probe/f eoProbe Truck ner	Russell W S Ibs F feet bgs S feet bgs A M	/ell/Auger Di /ell Screene creen Slot S ilter Pack Us urface Seal: nnular Seal: lonument Ty	iameter: d Interval Size: sed: : : ype:	inches Notes/Comments: I: feet bgs inches -

So	DU	nd Sti	Cart	ies Pr Lc Da Su W W Re Da	oject: oject Number: ogged by: nte Started: urface Conditio ell Location N/ ell Location E/ eviewed by: ate Completed	Port of 1303 CJT 8/29/ DODS: Asph (S: 35' S W: 5' E o EBF : 8/29/	of Skagit -003 17 alt of SW corn f SW corn	ner of maintenance bui er of maintenance build	r of maintenance building of maintenance building			te Road Washington feet bgs feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	USCS Class	Graphic	L	ithologic	Description		Well Detail/ Water Depth
0			60	0.2		SP/GP SM-ML		Asphalt Dry SAND and (trace silt, gray, Moist SILT and no hydrocarbon	GRAVEL w no hydroc fine SAND odor (50-	rith asphalt piece arbon odor (5-45 , trace gravel, br 45-5).	es, -50). own,	
5			100	0.2	B13-04	ML		Moist, sandy Sli gray mottling, n	LT, trace fi o hydroca	ine gravel, browr Irbon odor (75-20	ı with -5).	
			100	0.3	B13-08	ML		Moist SILT with gray mottling, n	clay, trace o hydroca	e fine sand, brow Irbon odor (95-5-	n with 0).	
-	$\left(\right)$		100	0.5	B13-12	ML		Wet SILT with c gray mottling, n Wet clayey SIL	lay, trace f o hydroca E gray, po	fine sand, brown Irbon odor (95-5-	with 0).	\bigtriangledown
- 15 — -			100	0.4	B13-16			(100-0-0).	, yray, no			
-								Boring terminat bentonite.	ed at 16 fe	et bgs, backfilled	d with	
20 Drillin Samp Hamm Total State	ng Co Ig Eq Ier T Ier T Borir Well Well	o./Drille uipmer ype: ype/We ng Dept Depth: ID No.:	r: Si ht: G Li ight: h: 16 	tandard Probe/l eoProbe Truck ner	Russell We We Sci Ibs Filt feet bgs Su feet bgs An Mo	IVAuger D Il Screene reen Slot S ter Pack U rface Seal nular Seal onument Ty	iameter: d Interva Size: sed: ype:	 	inches feet bgs inches	Notes/Comm	ents:	of 1

So	DU	nd Sti	Cart	ies PP L D S W W R D	roject: roject Numb ogged by: ate Started: urface Cond /ell Location /ell Location eviewed by: ate Complet	Po er: 13 GJ 8/2 itions: Cc N/S: 8 % E/W: 19" EE ed: 8/2	rt of Skag 03-003 T 29/17 oncrete S of E side E of E side BF 29/17	jit of do e of d	orway oorway	BORING LOG Site Address: 2070 Sedre Water Depti Time of Drill Water Depti After Compl	B14 Northern Sta o-Woolley, n At n ling n n	te Road Washington feet bgs feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Samp ID	le USC Clas	s o Graphic		Lithologic	Description		Well Detail/ Water Depth
0 -			50	0.1	B14-0.5	ML			Concrete slab Moist SILT with fine sand fragments, tan with brown hydrocarbon odor (85-15-	, trace asphalt n mottling, no 0).		
_									Boring terminated at 2 fee bentonite.	et bgs, backfilled	with	
5—												
-												
- 10												
-												
_												
45												
Drillin	ng Co	./Drille	r: St	andard Probe	/Russell	Well/Auger	Diamete	r:	inches	Notes/Comm	ents:	
Drillin Samp	g Eq ler Ty	uipmer vpe [.]	nt: Ge	eoProbe Trucł ner	c]	Well Scree Screen Slo	ned Inter t Size:	val:	feet bgs			
Hamn	ner T	ype/We	ight:		lbs	Filter Pack	Used:					
Total	Borir	ng Dept	h: 2		feet bgs	Surface Se	al:	-				
Total State	Well Well	Depth: ID No.:			feet bgs	Annular Se Monument	al: Type:			Page:	1	of 1

So)UI	nd Stu		h)	Project: Project Num Logged by: Date Started Surface Cor	Port hber: 1303 GCF 1: 9/19 hditions: Gras	of Skagit 3-003 : /17 ss		BORING LOG Site Address: 7682 Sedre	B15 MW07 Northern State Road
		511	latey	105	Well Location Well Location Reviewed by Date Completion	on N/S: 6'S c on E/W: 6'E c y: EBF eted: 9/19	of SW mainte of SW mainte : : :/17	enance building corner enance building corner	Water Depth Time of Drill Water Depth After Compl	n At ling 15 feet bgs n etion 10.16 feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm	י ו) Sam וD	ple USCS Class	Graphic	Lithologi	c Description	Well Detail/ Water Depth
0 -			95	0.0		SM		Moist, silty SAND, trace hydrocarbon odor (30-65	gravel, brown, no ⊱5).	
-			100	16.3	B15-7	SM		Moist, silty fine SAND, g odor (40-60-0).	ray, faint hydrocar	bon
- 10 — -			90	0.4		ML		Moist SILT with fine san streaks, no hydrocarbor	d, brown with gray odor (80-20-0).	
			90	1.1	B15-12	SM ML		Moist, silty fine SAND, g odor (40-60-0). Moist to wet SILT with fi hydrocarbon odor (90-10	ray, no hydrocarbo ne sand, gray, no)-0).	on
-			0	0.2	B15-16			No recovery.		
20	$/ \setminus$							Boring terminated at 20 monitoring well MW07, s	feet bgs. Complete creened from 10 to	ed as o 20
Drilling Co./Driller: Drilling Equipment: Sampler Type: Hammer Type/Weight: Total Boring Depth: Total Well Depth: State Well ID No.:		r: 9 ht: 0 light: - h: 2 E	Standard Probe/Russell GeoProbe Truck Liner Ibs 20 feet bgs 20 feet bgs BJP 716		Well/Auger D Well Screene Screen Slot S Filter Pack U Surface Seal Annular Seal Monument T	Diameter: ed Interval Size: Ised: I: I: I: Ype:	1/2 inches 10-20 feet bg 0.010 inches Colorado silica sand Concrete Bentonite Flush mount	s Page:	ents:	

Sc		hd	Fort	Pr Pr Lc	oject: oject Numb ogged by:	Port of er: 1303 GCF	of Skagit -003		BORING LOG	B16 MW08
J	Ju	Sti	Lai L	ies Su	ate Started: urface Cond	9/19/ itions: Asph	17 alt		Site Address: 7682 Sedro	Northern State Road o-Woolley, Washington
			a to g	W W Re Da	ell Location ell Location eviewed by: ate Complet	N/S: 15'S E/W: 12'E EBF ed: 9/19/	of SE maint of SE maint 17	enance building corner enance building corner	Water Depth Time of Drill Water Depth After Compl	n At ling 15 feet bgs n letion 12.62 feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sampl ID	le USCS Class	Graphic	Lithologi	c Description	Well Detail/ Water Depth
0			90	0.0		SM		Moist, silty SAND with g hydrocarbon odor (20-76	ravel, brown, no)-10).	
2			20	0.0				No recovery		
10			0					Moiot to wat Cli T with fi		
- - 15 -			30	0.0	B16-15			hydrocarbon odor (70-30	1-0).	
20	\bigwedge		100	0.1	B16-20	SM		Wet, silty fine to mediun hydrocarbon odor (20-8	n SAND, gray, no I-0).	
Drillin Drillin Samp Hamn Total	Drilling Co./Driller: Drilling Equipment: Sampler Type: Hammer Type/Weight: Total Boring Depth:		r: S nt: G L ight: h: 20	Standard Probe/Russell GeoProbe Truck Liner Ibs 20 feet bgs		Well/Auger Di Well Screene Screen Slot S Filter Pack Us Surface Seal:	iameter: d Interval: iize: sed:	1/2 inches 10-20 feet bg 0.010 inches Colorado silica sand Concrete	S Boring terminate as monitoring we to 20 feet bgs.	ents: d at 20 feet bgs. Completed Il MW08, screened from 10
Total Well Depth: State Well ID No.:				JP 717		Monument Ty	/pe:	Flush mount	Page:	1 of 1

So	DUI	nd Sti	Eart	ies F K S V V V K R	Project: Project Numb Logged by: Date Started: Surface Conc Vell Location Vell Location Reviewed by: Date Complet	Port c per: 1303- GCF 9/19/ ditions: Grass N/S: 16'S o E/W: 6'E of EBF ted: 9/19/	of Skagit -003 17 s of SW main f SW mainte 17	tenance building corner enance building corner	er r Water Depth At Time of Drilling Water Depth After Completion			
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Samp ID	le USCS Class	Graphic	Litho	ologic	Description		Well Detail/ Water Depth
-			60	0.1		Fill		SAND (backfill), no	hydroc	arbon odor.		
-			100	0.1	B17-08	ML		Moist SILT with sar no hydrocarbon od Moist SILT with fine streaks, no hydroca	nd, brov lor (70-3 e sand, arbon o	vn with gray stre 30-0). brown with gray bdor (70-30-0).	eaks,	
10			90	0.1	B17-12			Boring terminated a bentonite.	at 15 fee	et bgs, backfilled	d with	
15 Drillin Samp Hamn Total Total State	ng Co ng Equ ner Ty Borin Well I Well I	/Drillen upmen pe: pe/We g Dept Depth: D No.:	r: Si ht: G Li ight: h: 15 	L andard Probe eoProbe Truc ner	/Russell k lbs feet bgs feet bgs	Well/Auger Di Well Screene Screen Slot S Filter Pack Us Surface Seal: Annular Seal: Monument Ty	iameter: d Interval: ize: sed: pe:	 ir fe ir 	nches eet bgs nches	Notes/Commo	ents:	of 1

So	DU	nd	art	Project: Project Num Logged by: Date Started Surface Con	Port of Skagit 1303-003 GCF I: 9/19/17 Iditions: Concrete				:		S	BORING LOG	Northerr	8 n Stat	te Road Washington	
			u vo g		Vell Locatio Vell Locatio Reviewed by Date Comple	n N/S: n E/W: : eted:	4' S of 7' W c EBF 9/19/	[:] SW of SW 17	mair / mai	nten: inter	ance building corner nance building corner		Water Dept Time of Dri Water Dept	h At ling h letion	13 	feet bgs feet bgs
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Samı ID	ble US CI	SCS ass		Graphic		Litholog	ic I	Description			Well Detail/ Water Depth
0 - - 5-			30	0.0		SP	P/GP				Moist SAND with angula (fill).	ar g	gravel, gray (0-5	0-50)		
-			50	0.0	B18-08	n	ML ML				Moist SILT with fine sar hydrocarbon odor (70-3 Moist SILT with fine sar streaks, no hydrocarbo	nd, 60-0 nd, n o	brown, no)). brown with gray dor (70-30-0).	/		
10 —			100	0.0	B18-12	Γ	ИL				Moist to wet SILT with f no hydrocarbon odor (7	ine ′0-3	sand, brown to 30-0).	gray,		\bigtriangledown
- 15 — -	\bigwedge		100	0.0	B18-16	5	SM			ľ	Wet, silty fine to mediur hydrocarbon odor (30-7	m S '0-0	AND, gray, no).			
-											Boring terminated at 16 bentonite.	fee	et bgs, backfille	d with		
20	20												1			
Drillin	Drilling Co./Driller: Standard Probe/Russell Drilling Equipment: GeoProbe Truck						ger Di	ame d Inf	eter:	: al·	inches	s as	Notes/Comm	ents:		
Samp	Sampler Type: Liner					Screen	Slot S	ize:			inches	5				
Hamn	ner T	ype/We	ight: h: 16	3	lbs feet bas	Filter Pa	ack Us Seal	sed:								
Total	Well	Depth:		-	feet bgs	Annular	Seal:									
State Well ID No.: Monument Type: Page: 1 of 1										of 1						

Sc	111	nd	Fart	Pr Pr Lo	oject: oject Number ogged by:	Port o r: 1303- GCF	of Skagit -003	BORING B19 LOG				
00	u	St	rateg	ies Su	ate Started: Irface Conditi	9/19/ ions: Grass	17 S	Site Address: 2070 Northern State Road Sedro-Woolley, Washington				
				W W	ell Location N ell Location E	I/S: 6'S of :/W: 25'E (of SW mainte	tenance building corner Water Depth At Time of Drilling 13.5 feet bgs				
				Da	ate Completed	d: 9/19/	17	After Completion feet bgs				
Depth (feet bgs)	Interval	Blow Count	% Recovery	PID (ppm)	Sample ID	USCS Class	Graphic	Lithologic Description Well Detail/ Water Depth				
0			80	0.1	B19-04	SM		Moist, silty SAND, brown, no hydrocarbon odor (30-70-0).				
5			100	0.1	B19-08	ML		Moist SILT with sand, brown with gray streaks, no hydrocarbon odor (60-40-0).				
 10			100	0.1		ML		Moist SILT with fine sand, brown, no hydrocarbon odor (70-30-0).				
-	\bigvee		100		B19-12	ML		Moist to wet SILT with fine sand, brown, no hydrocarbon odor (70-30-0). Wet SILT with fine sand, gray, no hydrocarbon odor (70-30-0).				
15 —	$\left \right $				P10 16			Lenses of silty sand at 13.5 and 15 feet bgs.				
20					, D 13-10			Boring terminated at 16 feet bgs, backfilled with bentonite.				
Drillin	ig Co g Ea	./Drille uipmer	r: St nt: G	tandard Probe/l eoProbe Truck	Russell W	ell/Auger Di ell Screene	iameter: d Interval	inches Notes/Comments: I: feet bas				
Samp	ler Ty	ype:	Li	ner	So	creen Slot S	ize:	inches				
Hamn	ner T	ype/We	ight:		Ibs Fi	Iter Pack Us	sed:					
Total	Borir Mell	ig Dept Denth:	n: 16)	feet bas	urtace Seal:						
State	Well	Total Well Depth: feet bgs Annular Seal: State Well ID No.: Monument Type: Page: 1 of 1										