UPLAND FEASIBILITY STUDY

Snopac Property
Facility Site ID No.: 1523145
Cleanup Site ID No.: 12463

Prepared for: 5055 Properties LLC

Project No. 150054 • December 20, 2023 FINAL

Aspect
A Geosyntec Company

earth + water

UPLAND FEASIBILITY STUDY

Snopac Property
Facility Site ID No.: 1523145
Cleanup Site ID No.: 12463

Prepared for: 5055 Properties LLC

Project No. 150054 • December 20, 2023 • FINAL

Aspect Consulting, LLC



12/20/2023

Adam Griffin, PE
Principal Engineer
agriffin@aspectconsulting.com

Breeyn Greer, PE
Senior Engineer
bgreer@aspectconsulting.com

V:\150054 Snopac-Manson\Deliverables\2021 09_Uplands Feasibility Study\Final\Snopac Upland FS_ Final_20231220.docx

Contents

Acronyms ..... **iiv**

Executive Summary **ES-1**

1 Introduction **1**
1.1 Site Description 1

2 Remedial Investigation Summary **3**
2.1 Contaminant Sources 3
2.2 Preliminary Constituents of Concern 4
2.3 Exposure Pathways and Potential Receptors 4

3 Interim Action Summary **5**
3.1 Interim Action Completion 6
3.1.1 Soil Compliance with Remediation Levels 6
3.2 Post-Interim Action Groundwater Monitoring 7

4 Post-Interim Action Uplands Compliance **8**
4.1 Soil Seaward of Shoring Wall 8
4.2 Soil Landward of Shoring Wall 8
4.2.1 Pentachlorophenol 8
4.2.2 TPH 8
4.2.3 Empirical Demonstration: Soils Protective of Leaching 9
4.2.4 Three-Fold Evaluation for Soil Compliance 9
4.3 Groundwater 11
4.4 Media Requiring Cleanup Evaluation 12
4.4.1 SBG-Containing Fill Soils Remaining on Shoreface 13
4.4.2 Wood Pilings on Shoreface 13
4.4.3 Fill Unit Groundwater 13

5 Cleanup Requirements **14**
5.1 Applicable, Relevant, and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) 14
5.2 Constituents of Concern 14
5.3 Cleanup Standards 15
5.3.1 Soil Cleanup Levels 15
5.3.2 Groundwater Cleanup Levels 15
5.3.3 Points of Compliance 16
5.4 Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) 16

6 Remedial Technology Screening 18

7 Remedial Alternatives 19

7.1 Alternative 1 – SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Partial Wood Piling Removal, MNA, ICs..... 19

7.2 Alternative 2 – SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal, MNA, ICs 21

7.3 Alternative 3 – SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal with Groundwater Treatment, MNA, and ICs 21

8 Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives 23

8.1 Evaluation with Respect to MTCA Threshold Requirements..... 23

8.1.1 Protection of Human Health and the Environment..... 23

8.1.2 Compliance with Cleanup Standards..... 23

8.1.3 Compliance with Applicable State and Federal Laws 23

8.1.4 Provisions for Compliance Monitoring 23

8.1.5 Conclusion Regarding Compliance with Threshold Requirements..... 24

8.2 Disproportionate Cost Analysis (DCA)..... 24

8.2.1 Overall Protectiveness 24

8.2.2 Permanence..... 24

8.2.3 Long-Term Effectiveness 25

8.2.4 Short-Term Risk Management..... 25

8.2.5 Implementability 25

8.2.6 Consideration of Public Concerns..... 26

8.2.7 Benefits Rankings, Estimated Costs, and Benefit/Cost Ratios 26

8.3 Evaluation of Reasonable Restoration Time Frame..... 26

8.4 Preferred Remedial Alternative..... 27

9 Conclusions 28

10 References 29

11 Limitations.....30

List of Tables

1a Analytical Results for Remaining Soil Seaward of Shoring Wall (Vadose)

1b Analytical Results for Remaining Soil Seaward of Shoring Wall (Saturated)

2a Analytical Results for Remaining Soil Landward of Shoring Wall (Vadose)

2b Analytical Results for Remaining Soil Landward of Shoring Wall (Saturated)

3 Statistical Compliance Summary for Upland Soil

4 Groundwater Analytical Results

5 Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements
6 Soil Cleanup Levels
7 Groundwater Cleanup Levels
8 Remedial Technology Identification for Site COCs
9 Remedial Alternative Cost Estimate Summary
10 Disproportionate Cost Analysis

List of Figures

1 Site Vicinity Map
2 Site Plan with Historical Features
3 Remedial Investigation - Exploration Locations
4 Interim Action Completion
5 Post-Interim Action Groundwater Monitoring
6 Remedial Alternative 1 Concept
7 Remedial Alternative 2 Concept
8 Remedial Alternative 3 Concept
9 Disproportionate Cost Analysis Summary

List of Appendices

A Post-Interim Action Tidal Study Memorandum
B Soil Compliance Statistics – Pro UCL Backup
C Detailed Cost Estimates
D Post-Interim Action Groundwater Monitoring – Laboratory Reports

Acronyms

Aspect	Aspect Consulting, LLC
ARAR	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement
bgs	below ground surface
bml	below mudline
BTEX	benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes
CAP	cleanup action plan
CMMP	contaminated media management plan
COC	constituent of concern
cPAHs	carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
CPOC	conditional point of compliance
CUL	cleanup level
DCA	disproportionate cost analysis
DNR	Washington State Department of Natural Resources
Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FS	Feasibility Study
GCMP	groundwater compliance monitoring plan
gpm	gallons per minute
GRA	General Response Actions
IA	Interim Action
IAWP	Interim Action Work Plan
IC	Institutional Controls
LDW	Lower Duwamish Waterway
mg/kg	milligrams/kilograms
mg/L	milligrams per liter
µg/L	micrograms per liter
MHHW	mean higher high water
MNA	monitored natural attenuation

MTCA	Model Toxics Control Act
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
OHWM	ordinary high water mark
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PCBs	polychlorinated biphenyls
PCP	pentachlorophenol
PCUL	preliminary cleanup level
PQL	practical quantification limits
RAL	remedial action level
RAO	remedial action objective
RI	Remedial Investigation
ROD	Record of Decision
SAP	Sampling Analysis Plan
SBG	spent sandblast grit
SCAP	source control action plan
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
TBT	tributyltin
TEF	toxic equivalency factor
TEQ	toxic equivalent concentration
TPH	total petroleum hydrocarbon

Executive Summary

Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect) has prepared this Upland Feasibility Study Report (Upland FS) on behalf of 5055 Properties LLC, for the upland portion of the Snopac Property (the Site). The Site is located at 5055 and 5053 East Marginal Way South in Seattle, Washington (Property), and borders the eastern portion of Slip 1 of the Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW; Figure 1).

The Site includes all upland and in-water areas impacted by historical releases of hazardous substances from the Property. Site groundwater, groundwater seeps, soil, and Slip 1 sediments have been impacted by historical releases of hazardous substances from the Property. 5055 Properties LLC entered an Agreed Order No. DE16300 (Agreed Order) with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) executed on July 15, 2019.

The Agreed Order requires separate FS Reports for the upland and in-water (sediment) portions of the Site, which are divided at the mean higher high water (MHHW) elevation. The scope of the Upland FS is for the upland portion of the Site above MHHW elevation. The intertidal and subtidal sediments (below MHHW elevation) are part of LDW Superfund site regulated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

All upland and sediment investigations are described in the Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, which determined the nature and extent of contamination in the upland and sediment portions of the Site (Aspect, 2023). Based on soil and groundwater quality (including intertidal seeps) and the intertidal and subtidal sediment data collected during the RI, the sandblast grit (SBG)-containing fill is the primary source of constituents of concern (COCs) at the Site in both upland and sediment media.

As required by the Agreed Order, an interim action (IA) was the completed in the uplands in accordance with an Interim Action Work Plan (IAWP; Aspect, 2020a). The IA scope included construction of a sheet pile shoring wall (shoring wall), which served as the IA western excavation limit inland of MHHW. The completed IA achieved the IAWP objectives of removing all SBG-containing fill and complying with soil remediation levels landward of the shoring wall, as reported in the Final Interim Action Report (Aspect, 2021d). Post-IA groundwater monitoring indicates Site COCs are naturally attenuating in Fill Unit groundwater. During the most recent event in April 2022, the COC exceedances in groundwater are limited to copper and nickel at two of five Fill Unit monitoring wells. The IA accomplished substantial contaminant source controls, contributing to the long-term protection of the adjacent LDW.

A compliance evaluation for the remaining uplands soil and groundwater post-IA conditions identified the media requiring cleanup evaluation in this Upland FS. The completed IA resulted in compliance of soils landward of the shoring wall. The remaining SBG-containing fill seaward of the shoring wall and above MHHW is the only contaminant source remaining on the uplands and is the primary media evaluated in this Upland FS.

This Upland FS evaluates three remedial alternatives and determines Alternative 1 to be the preferred remedial alternative. Remedial alternative 1 consists of SBG-containing fill removal (including completed IA), groundwater monitored natural attenuation (MNA), and institutional controls (ICs). The completed IA permanently removed all SBG-containing fill from the uplands landward of the shoring wall.

The removal of SBG-containing fill remaining above MHHW and seaward of the shoring wall can only be practicably removed during the in-water work. The in-water work will be conducted concurrently with the LDW sediment cleanup according to the LDW Record of Decision (ROD) (EPA, 2014), and the Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) (EPA, 2021). The preferred remedial alternative for the upland portion of the Site will be selected by Ecology in the Upland Cleanup Action Plan (CAP).

1 Introduction

Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect) has prepared this Upland Feasibility Study Report (Upland FS) on behalf of 5055 Properties LLC, for the upland portion of the Snopac Property (the Site). The Site is generally located at 5055 and 5053 East Marginal Way South in Seattle, Washington (Property), and borders the eastern portion of Slip 1 of the Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW; Figure 1).

The Site, as defined by Washington State's Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA), includes all upland and in-water areas impacted by historical releases of hazardous substances from the Property. Site groundwater, groundwater seeps, soil, and Slip 1 sediments have been impacted by historical releases of hazardous substances from the Property. 5055 Properties LLC entered an Agreed Order No. DE16300 (Agreed Order) with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) executed on July 15, 2019.

The Agreed Order requires separate FS Reports be completed for the upland and in-water (sediment) portions of the Site, which are divided at the mean higher high water (MHHW) elevation. The scope of this FS is for the portion of the Site above MHHW elevation. This Upland FS is prepared in accordance with MTCA requirements for selection of cleanup actions. The intertidal and subtidal sediments (below MHHW elevation) are part of LDW Superfund site and regulated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

The Remedial Investigation (RI) Report (Aspect, 2023) was prepared to satisfy requirements of the Agreed Order and Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Sections 173-340-350(7) and 173-204-550(6). The completed RI Report determined the nature and extent of contamination in the upland and sediment portions of the Site.

As required by the Agreed Order, an interim action (IA) was the completed in the uplands in accordance with an Interim Action Work Plan (IAWP; Aspect, 2020a). The IA scope included construction of a sheet pile shoring wall (shoring wall) which served as the IA western excavation limit, inland of MHHW. The completed IA achieved the IAWP objectives of removing all sandblast grit (SBG)-containing fill and complying with soil remediation levels, as reported in the Final Interim Action Report (Aspect, 2021d).

This Upland FS has been prepared to satisfy requirements of the Agreed Order and WAC Sections 173-340-350(8) and 173-204-550(7). The purpose of this Upland FS is to develop and evaluate remedial alternatives for the upland portion of the Site using the criteria defined in 173-340-360 WAC, including a disproportionate cost analysis (DCA). This Upland FS develops a preferred remedial alternative for the upland portion of the Site which will ultimately be selected by Ecology in the Upland Cleanup Action Plan (CAP).

1.1 Site Description

The Site has a long industrial history that began with the construction of the LDW and Slip 1 at the beginning of the 1900s. Starting sometime in the 1970s, SBG was disposed

of directly on the bank at the head of Slip 1 on west side of Property, and then later behind the retaining wall present at the Property shoreface. Fill materials, composed of both soil and anthropogenic debris that includes spent SBG, railroad ties, coal fragments, glass shards, concrete, and brick or masonry fragments, were also dumped behind the retaining wall to bring the shoreface area of the Property to current grade.

Ground surface elevation within the uplands is approximately Elevation 15 feet[1]. A building formerly used as a warehouse existed on the Property during remedial investigations. This building was demolished in November 2020 to allow for the IA. The IA was completed in early 2021, and the Property is currently vacant, fenced, and stabilized for stormwater in accordance with the City of Seattle construction permit (Section 3.1).

Site groundwater, groundwater seeps, soil, and Slip 1 sediments have been impacted by historical releases of hazardous substances from the Property. Public and private Site investigations have been ongoing since 2004 and served as the findings of fact in the Agreed Order. For a detailed Site description, Site history, investigation summary, and environmental summary, see the RI and IAWP (Aspect, 2023 and 2020a, respectively).

Four soil units occur at the Site, which from the surface down are: (1) fill materials (Fill Unit); (2) older native units consisting of estuarine deposits (Estuarine Unit); (3) native alluvium (Alluvium Unit); and (4) over-consolidated glacial deposits that underly the Alluvium Unit at a depth greater than 150 feet. Upland contamination occurred in the Fill Unit and is associated with the SBG-containing fill.

The Fill Unit is a water table (unconfined), water-bearing unit that is tidally influenced by the LDW. The Estuarine Unit functions as an aquitard, restricting groundwater flow between the Fill Unit and underlying Alluvium Unit. A confined aquifer is present in the Alluvium Unit beneath the Estuarine Unit aquitard.

The shoring wall installed during the IA fully penetrates the Fill Unit and the shallow portion[2] of the deeper Alluvium Unit. A tidal study was conducted to assess the hydraulic effect of the shoring wall on Site groundwater (Appendix A). The study determined tidal efficiency in the Fill Unit wells ranged from 0.9 to 1.5 percent at nearshore wells, an 85 to 98 percent reduction in tidal efficiency at these locations as a result of the shoring wall. Further, tidal response was not discernable in the two Fill Unit wells located farthest from the LDW (MW-12 and MW-17) further indicating the hydraulic cutoff effect of the shoring wall. After the shoring wall installation, the net (tidally averaged) groundwater flow direction in the Fill Unit is generally west towards the LDW and around the south end of the shoring wall where it then discharges to the LDW (Appendix A).

The confined Alluvium Unit is tidally influenced with groundwater level elevations ranging from 4 to 7.5 feet based on the 2017 and 2018 tidal study (Aspect, 2023). No substantial change was observed in the tidal responses in the Alluvium Unit as a result of the shoring wall, because the wall is not fully penetrating (Appendix A).

[1] North American Vertical Datum (NAVD) of 1988. All elevations referenced in this Upland FS hereafter are relative NAVD88 vertical datum.
[2] The sheet pile shoring wall was installed to a depth of approximately 45 feet below grade.

The following sections summarize findings from the RI Report (Section 2) and the IA (Section 3) as a basis of this Upland FS.

2 Remedial Investigation Summary

Significant uplands environmental investigations occurred prior to the 2019 Agreed Order with Ecology, and additional uplands characterization was performed in 2019 under the Agreed Order. Sediment investigations were performed by the EPA and their consultants in Slip 1 from 1997 to 1998 and 2004 to 2006, and then in 2015 and 2018 by 5055 Properties LLC, to supplement EPA results and support the sediment remedial action required by the LDW Record of Decision (ROD; EPA, 2014). All upland and sediment environmental investigations are reported in the RI Report (Aspect, 2023) and satisfy the RI requirements of the Agreed Order.

The RI exploration locations in the uplands are shown on Figure 3. Groundwater seep samples collected seaward of MHHW are also shown, as the groundwater seeps are critical to evaluating groundwater exposure pathways in the Upland RI and FS.

The following sections summarize the RI Report conclusions as a basis of developing and selecting a remedial alternative for the final cleanup action in this Upland FS.

2.1 Contaminant Sources

Based on soil and groundwater quality (including intertidal seeps[3]), and intertidal and subtidal sediment data collected during the RI, the SBG-containing fill is the primary source of constituents of concern (COCs) at the Site in both upland and sediment media. The SBG contains metals typical of smelter slag and is the source of metals at the Site. This SBG-containing fill, which contains waste paint, is sourcing exceedances of preliminary cleanup levels (PCULs) in groundwater discharging to the LDW and, through erosion of the shoreface, in in-water sediments. COCs in intertidal sediments below MHHW are also associated with SBG-containing fill or pure SBG exposed on the shoreface.

The areal extent of SBG-containing fill in the uplands estimated in the RI is depicted on Figures 2 and 3 (Aspect, 2023). SBG-containing fill was also observed on the intertidal shoreface, indicating that active bank erosion of SBG is occurring.

As tidally influenced groundwater migrates through the SBG-containing fill, soluble COCs are leached, and discharge as seeps to Slip 1, as confirmed by sampling of seeps discharging from the intertidal shoreface at low tides.

Other potential sources of COCs at the Site include the historical coal burners, petroleum releases from underground storage tanks (USTs), and possibly treated wood pilings and dock materials. These subsidiary COC sources fall within the mapped area of SBG-containing fill shown on Figure 2, and are evaluated further in this Upland FS.

[3] The seeps represent discharge of Site groundwater to Slip 1 of the LDW.

2.2 Preliminary Constituents of Concern

Concentrations of contaminants from SBG-containing fill exceeding upland PCULs established for LDW upland sites (Ecology, 2021) and in-water remedial action levels (RALs) established in the LDW ROD (EPA, 2014) are observed in uplands soil, groundwater, and sediments. Based on the RI data, the following analytes were identified as preliminary COCs for the Site (Aspect, 2023):

- Metals (arsenic[4], copper, lead, mercury, and zinc); nickel (groundwater only)
- Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)
- Pentachlorophenol (PCP)
- Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)
- Tributyltin (TBT)
- Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPHs; in a limited area of the uplands)

The extent of PCUL exceedances in uplands soil and groundwater coincides with the extent of SBG-containing fill. Inland of the SBG extent, including outside and within the footprint of the former building, fill soils exhibit isolated low-level concentrations of PAHs, PCBs, and metals that exceed PCULs but are typical of concentrations in urban fill soils[5]. There is no historical process on Site that explains the sporadic low-level exceedances outside of the SBG-containing fill.

Preliminary COCs in intertidal sediments below MHHW are also associated with SBG-containing fill or pure SBG exposed on the shoreface. Exceedances of LDW ROD RALs in subtidal sediments in Slip 1 of the LDW are also associated with the SBG.

Additional soil and groundwater analytical results have been collected since the RI and are reported in this Upland FS. These results are used to establish the Upland COCs, described in Section 5.2.

2.3 Exposure Pathways and Potential Receptors

Ecology's *Lower Duwamish Waterway PCUL Workbook and Supplemental Information*, (PCUL Document; Ecology, 2021)[6], summarizes environmental transport and exposure pathways applicable to soil and groundwater.

The following exposure pathways, evaluated in accordance with Ecology's PCUL Document and MTCA guidance, are considered complete at the Site and applicable to the uplands:

[4] Possessing properties of both a metal and nonmetal, arsenic is chemically classified as a metalloid, but grouped with metals in this Upland FS.
[5] Only the SBG-containing fill was removed during the IA. The compliance of low-level exceedances outside of SBG-containing fill are discussed in Section 4.
[6] The RI used PCULs from a 2019 PCUL Document. The most recent PCUL Document in May 2021 does not change the RI conclusions (Ecology, 2021).

- Direct contact of ecological (aquatic) receptors to surface water contaminated by Site groundwater discharge.
- Direct human exposure for an employee or construction worker to soil via ingestion, inhalation, or dermal absorption.
- Direct human exposure to groundwater via dermal absorption, for a construction worker working at or below the water table.

This Upland FS evaluates remedial alternatives based on their ability to mitigate these exposure pathways. The RI also determined the following exposure pathways to be complete for in-water sediments and surface water, which serve as a basis of the in-water LDW Superfund site sediment cleanup:

- Direct contact of ecological (benthic) receptors to contaminated sediment.
- Human exposure via consumption of aquatic organisms exposed to contaminated surface water.
- Direct contact of human receptors to contaminated sediment.
- Human exposure via consumption of aquatic organisms exposed to contaminated sediment.

3 Interim Action Summary

The SBG-containing fill is a significant source of contaminants to upland groundwater discharging to the sediments and surface waters of the LDW. The removal of upland SBG-containing fill was conducted as an Interim Action as defined in MTCA (WAC 173-340-430 (1)). The plan for the IA was approved by Ecology in a Final Interim Action Work Plan (IAWP; Aspect, 2020a).

The construction of a shoring wall was required to complete the IA remedial excavation in the uplands. The completed IA permanently removes sources of contamination to groundwater and the LDW and will not conflict with reasonable alternatives for the final cleanup action as required by MTCA (WAC 173-340-430[3][b]).

After completion of the Final IAWP activities, Ecology required groundwater monitoring to assess Site groundwater quality post-IA completion, and to verify the empirical demonstration of soil compliance with remediation levels for carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (cPAHs)[7] and naphthalene.

The IA Report summarizes the details of all completed IA activities and the post-IA groundwater monitoring, and satisfies the Agreed Order requirements for the IA (Aspect,

[7] Total toxic equivalent concentration (TEQ) of benzo(a)pyrene calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e). **Hereafter, all references to cPAH concentrations are total cPAH TEQ concentrations.**

2021d). This section summarizes the IA activities and findings as a basis of this Upland FS.

3.1 Interim Action Completion

The Final IAWP (Aspect, 2020a) required removal of SBG-containing fill landward of the shoring wall on the uplands at the Site. The completed IA achieved the IAWP objectives of removing SBG-containing fill and achieving soil remediation levels.

The IA was a component of construction permitted by the City of Seattle (City) Construction Permit 66942-CN (construction permit) issued on May 26, 2020. The construction permit included activities required to conduct the IA activities of building demolition, shoring wall installation, side-sewer connection, contaminated soil excavation, temporary dewatering, and backfill activities. Construction permit activities preceding remedial excavation began in August 2020. The IA soil removal activities started on December 26, 2020, and were completed on January 22, 2021. The IA Report (Aspect, 2021d) summarizes the details of all completed IA activities.

Removal of SBG-containing fill required temporary excavation dewatering and night work during low tides[8] the week of January 11, 2021. Removal of SBG-containing fill extended beyond the planned excavation limits[9] at shallow depths (less than 4 ft below ground surface [bgs]). In total, 5,983 tons of SBG-containing fill material were removed from the final IA excavation limits shown on Figure 4. The IA achieved permanent removal of nearly 6,000 tons of contaminated soil from the Site uplands immediately adjacent to the LDW. Nearly 80,000 gallons of groundwater were extracted during excavation in order to meet IA objectives, providing additional removal of contamination (in dissolved phase) from within the source area.

The IA excavation encountered a high density of wood pilings extending through the Estuarine Unit and into the Alluvium Unit. The wood pilings were cut at the Estuarine Unit at the bottom of the IA excavation, and removed from the Site and disposed with the contaminated soil.

The completed IA achieved the IAWP objectives of removing SBG-containing fill and achieving soil remediation levels. The completed IA has accomplished substantial contaminant source control along the LDW shoreline, thus contributing to the long-term protection of the adjacent LDW.

3.1.1 Soil Compliance with Remediation Levels

The Final IAWP (Aspect, 2020a) established performance monitoring analytes for all areas of IA excavation as:

- Metals (arsenic, copper, lead, mercury, and zinc)
- Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)

[8] Excavation below elevation 7 feet NAVD88 only occurred at tides less than 1 feet NAVD88 in accordance with the IAWP.

[9] The planned excavation limits in the Final IAWP estimated 3,500 tons of SBG-containing fill to be removed based on the extent of SBG- containing Fill inferred in RI Report (Aspect, 2023).

- Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)

The IA soil performance monitoring included the following analytes in selected areas of the IA excavation:

- Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) as gasoline-, diesel-, and oil-range organics in the area around MW-2
- Pentachlorophenol (PCP) in the area around MW-11 (Figure 3)

During the IA, Ecology approved adjustment of soil remediation levels for two performance monitoring analytes: cPAHs and naphthalene. The soil remediation level was based on empirical demonstration of soil concentrations protective of groundwater discharging to sediment and surface water in accordance with MTCA (Aspect, 2021a; Aspect, 2021b). In addition, remediation levels used to evaluate IA soil compliance were updated based on Ecology's current PCUL Document (Ecology, 2021) and laboratory practical quantification limits (PQLs).

The residual soils within the excavation sidewalls and bottom comply with the IA remediation levels when applying the MTCA three-fold soil compliance criteria (WAC 173-340-740(7)(d) and (e)) (Aspect, 2021d). This compliance was limited to soils at the extent of the IA remedial excavation in order to verify the completion of the IA excavation. The soil compliance for the entire uplands is evaluated in Section 4.

3.2 Post-Interim Action Groundwater Monitoring

After completion of the Final IAWP activities, four quarters of post-IA groundwater monitoring was conducted to assess Site groundwater quality and verify the empirical demonstration of soil compliance with remediation levels for cPAHs and naphthalene.

Groundwater well locations and the analyte schedule were approved by Ecology in the "Sampling and Analysis Plan for Groundwater Confirmation Monitoring" (SAP; Aspect, 2021c). New monitoring wells MW-13 through MW-17 were installed on June 21 and 23, 2021 in accordance with the SAP. The locations of the five new monitoring wells (MW-13 through MW-17) and the two existing monitoring wells (MW-8 and MW-12) are shown on Figure 5. The existing groundwater monitoring network consist of five Fill Unit monitoring wells, and two Alluvium Unit monitoring wells (Figure 5).

Wells MW-13, MW-15, and MW-16 are located near the shoring wall to assess the quality of Fill Unit groundwater in the area as close as practicable to the LDW. The shoring wall redirects flow of groundwater; therefore, Fill Unit wells MW-13 and MW-16 are positioned near the wall's southern and northern ends, respectively. The tidal study determined that Fill Unit groundwater flows around the southern end of the shoring wall at MW-13 where it discharges to the LDW. MW-14 is also near the shoring wall and is screened in the Alluvium Unit. MW-17 is located east of the completed IA area to assess the quality of upgradient Fill Unit groundwater entering the Site.

Four quarterly post-IA groundwater monitoring events were conducted in 2021 and 2022 and results discussed in Section 4.3.

4 Post-Interim Action Uplands Compliance

The section evaluates compliance of remaining uplands soil and groundwater for current (post-IA) conditions in order to identify the media requiring cleanup evaluation in this Upland FS.

4.1 Soil Seaward of Shoring Wall

SBG-containing fill remains on the seaward side of the shoring wall (referred to as the "shoreface"). The soil analytical results from uplands soil seaward of the shoring wall (Tables 1A and 1B) do not comply with remediation levels. This remaining SBG-containing fill seaward of the shoring wall is the primary media requiring cleanup evaluation in this Upland FS.

4.2 Soil Landward of Shoring Wall

The competed IA removed all SBG-containing fill landward of the shoring wall and verified compliance with remediation levels at the IA lateral and vertical excavation extents. The completed IA confirmed the SBG-containing fill lateral extent was limited at the former building footprint and vertical extent limited by the Estuarine Unit aquitard. The following sections evaluate compliance of all remaining soils analytical results (Tables 2A and Tables 2B) landward of shoring wall to assess the need for cleanup evaluation for this portion of the uplands.

4.2.1 Pentachlorophenol

An analytical reporting limit of 0.05 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) is achievable for PCP in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level for PCP is established at this PQL.

In accordance with the IAWP (Aspect, 2020a), soil samples were collected in the one location where PCP was detected in groundwater at the Site. The remaining vadose and saturated soil landward of the shoring wall complies with the PCP soil remediation level[10] (Tables 2A and 2B).

4.2.2 TPH

The IAWP evaluated the soil and groundwater data in the RI Report to determine TPH analytes for soil performance monitoring during the IA. The lack of any gasoline-range total petroleum hydrocarbons or benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX) exceedances in Site groundwater indicates that gasoline-range TPH and BTEX concentrations in Site soil are protective of groundwater. It was also demonstrated that PAHs are the appropriate analytes to address potential transport of diesel- and oil-range TPH at the Site, and PAHs were therefore selected as IA soil performance monitoring analytes (Aspect, 2023).

[10] Two 2017 soil samples (MW8-5-6 and MW10-5-6) from outside the extent of SBG-containing fill have reporting limits greater than the soil remediation level of 0.5 mg/kg.

One RI soil sample exceeded a generic 1,500 mg/kg soil cleanup level based on direct contact[11] where an 8,000-gallon diesel UST was historically present (Figure 2). To address direct-contact risks associated with the petroleum mixture, IA verification soil samples collected adjacent to this location were analyzed for gasoline-, diesel-, and oil-range TPH. The remaining vadose and saturated soil landward of the shoring wall complies with the generic TPH soil remediation level for direct contact (Tables 2A and 2B).

4.2.3 Empirical Demonstration: Soils Protective of Leaching

Under MTCA, contaminant concentrations in soil can be demonstrated empirically to be protective of groundwater via leaching if there are reliable groundwater data demonstrating no exceedances of groundwater cleanup levels (WAC 173-340-747(9)). The MTCA requirements for an empirical demonstration are that a sufficient length of time has elapsed for contaminant migration to have occurred, and that the current site characteristics are representative of future site conditions (WAC 173-340-747(9)(b)). As of 2004, high concentrations of contaminants (particularly arsenic) had migrated from the SBG-containing fill into upland groundwater and then the intertidal Seep 76. That is 13 to 15 years prior to collection of the Site groundwater monitoring data, demonstrating sufficient time has elapsed to observe contaminant migration into uplands groundwater.

Soil remediation levels for two upland Site COCs (cPAHs and naphthalene) were established based on empirical demonstration of soil concentrations protective of groundwater in accordance with MTCA (Aspect, 2021d). The Site sediment naphthalene data in the RI Report (Aspect, 2023) empirically demonstrate that the Site uplands soils were protective of LDW sediment before the IA started. The naphthalene data from Site seeps indicate that groundwater discharge, and thus uplands groundwater and associated soils, are also protective of discharge to LDW surface water for all receptors before the IA started.

The completed IA achieved compliance with the cPAH soil remediation level of 0.074 mg/kg. Compliance with the naphthalene soil remediation level of 0.056 mg/kg is demonstrated using the MTCA three-fold soil compliance criteria in the next section.

4.2.4 Three-Fold Evaluation for Soil Compliance

The vadose and saturated soils remaining landward of the shoring wall comply with the remediation levels when applying the MTCA three-fold soil compliance criteria (WAC 173-340-740(7)(d) and (e)). Table 3 summarizes this evaluation, which is described by COC below.

Concentrations of arsenic, mercury, zinc, PAHs (acenaphthene, anthracene, fluoranthene, naphthalene, and pyrene) and total PCBs exceed remediation levels in one or more samples of remaining soil. However, the residual concentrations for each of these

[11] Generic soil screening level based on direct contact and applicable to model remedy cleanups for petroleum-contaminated soil where gasoline-range TPH is present. The screening level is compared against the summed concentration of gasoline-, diesel-, and oil-range petroleum fractions (Ecology, 2017).

analytes in the collective soil remaining landward of the shoring wall (sample data combined) achieves the MTCA three-fold compliance criteria, as follows:

- The 95 percent upper confidence limit (95 percent UCL) concentration is less than the remediation level.
- Residual soil concentrations are less than two times the remediation level, with two exceptions described below.
- The frequency of soil sample exceedance is less than 10 percent.

For this evaluation, the 95 percent UCL values were calculated using the EPA's ProUCL version 5.1 software.[12] The ProUCL calculation outputs for each constituent are included in Appendix B.

COCs in soil were detected in soil at concentrations greater than two times their remediation level at the following two sample locations:

- **Zinc at MW-10**. Zinc was detected at a concentration of 393 mg/kg, 4.6 times the 85 mg/kg remediation level in a sample of saturated soil within the Fill Unit (5- to 6-foot depth). As shown on Figure 3, MW-10 is located in a parking area off the south end of the Property, well outside (and hydraulically upgradient of) the former area of SBG-containing fill, which is the source of contamination on the Property. Zinc is commonly present in urban soils at concentrations much higher than the natural background conditions that the remediation level is based. This is due in large part to zinc's presence at high concentrations in vehicle brakes (e.g., ranging from 9,600 to 18,000 mg/kg; Ecology, 2013) and in tires (10,000 mg/kg; Ecology, 2006). The abrasion and runoff of zinc from vehicle brakes and tires is represented in zinc concentrations measured in stormwater solids sampled from in urban areas across western Washington: median and maximum zinc concentrations of 373 and 9,250 mg/kg, respectively, reported by Ecology (2015). Therefore, while an area background concentration of zinc has not been formally determined in accordance with MTCA, we conclude that the detected zinc concentration in MW-10 soil is due to area background conditions unrelated to the Site. In addition, the detected zinc concentration in groundwater at new Fill Unit monitoring well MW-17, located adjacent to MW-10[13], was less than the PCUL, indicating that zinc soil concentrations in that immediate area are not adversely impacting groundwater.
- **Non-Carcinogenic PAHs at FB-4A**. Three non-carcinogenic PAHs (anthracene, fluoranthene, and pyrene) were detected at concentrations greater than two times their respective remediation levels in a sample of saturated soil from boring FB-4A, located in a parking area near the northern Property boundary (Figure 3). PAHs are ubiquitous in urban settings due to a variety of sources, including vehicle emissions and tire dust. The low-level detections of these PAHs at FB-4A—0.11 mg/kg, 0.43 mg/kg, and 0.41 mg/kg, respectively—are in the range of

[12] EPA's statistical software package for analysis of environmental data sets (https://www.epa.gov/land-research/proucl-software).
[13] MW-10 is screened in the deeper Alluvium Unit.

concentrations detected in residential neighborhood soils throughout Seattle (Ecology, 2011). Therefore, while area background concentrations of PAHs have not been formally determined in accordance with MTCA, we conclude that the detected PAHs concentration in FB-4A soil are due to area background conditions unrelated to the Site. In addition, no PAHs were detected above PCULs at new Fill Unit monitoring well MW-16, located downgradient of FB-4A, indicating that PAH soil concentrations in the FB-4A area are not adversely impacting groundwater.

- **Total PCBs at SB-8.** PCBs were detected at a concentration (0.0066 mg/kg) greater than three times the Total PCBs remediation level in vadose soil from boring SB-8, located in the northeastern footprint of the former building (Figure 3). No PCBs were detected (<0.002 mg/kg) in the two soil samples collected beneath the location of formerly stained concrete next to a former electrical transformer (Aspect, 2023). No PCBs were detected (<0.002 mg/kg) in any of the other seven soil samples collected in the former building footprint, including two deeper SB-8 samples (from 10.5-to-11.5, and 13-to-14 foot depths).

  The SBG-containing fill was placed with the former building present and is the only known source of PCBs at the Site. Low-level concentrations of PCBs are relatively widespread in urban soils (Ecology, 2015).

  In addition, during the post-IA groundwater monitoring to date, no PCBs were detected (with a very low reporting limit, <0.005 ug/L) in any Site monitoring wells including MW-15 and MW-16 located downgradient of SB-8 (Table 4). In addition, PCBs were never detected in upland groundwater during sampling conducted prior to the IA (Aspect, 2023). The groundwater results empirically demonstrate that PCB concentrations in Site soils, including the shallow soil at SB-8, are not adversely impacting Fill Unit groundwater.

Based on application of the MTCA three-fold soil compliance criteria, with consideration of area background concentrations and the empirical groundwater data, we conclude that the vadose and saturated soils remaining landward of the shoring wall (Tables 2A and Tables 2B, respectively) comply with the remediation levels. Soils landward of the shoring wall are therefore not considered for further cleanup action in this Upland FS.

4.3 Groundwater

Four post-IA groundwater monitoring events were conducted in June 2021, November 2021, January 2022, and April 2022. The groundwater monitoring results were screened against the most stringent groundwater PCUL for nonpotable groundwater (GWs #2-5) established in the PCUL Document (Ecology, 2021). For cPAHs, total PCBs, and PCP, the analytical method reporting limit, which is the PQL for purposes of this monitoring program, is greater than the PCUL. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the groundwater PCUL for those analytes is established at their respective PQLs (Aspect, 2021c).

Table 4 presents the groundwater analytical results from the four rounds of monitoring, with exceedances of PCULs highlighted in blue. The first round of sampling indicates

exceedances for selected constituents in four out of five Fill Unit wells. By the fourth event in April 2022, exceedances only occurred at two of the five Fill Unit monitoring wells. There are no PCUL exceedances in the two Alluvium Unit wells[14].

More specifically for the Fill Unit wells, no exceedances were detected for the organic COCs TPH, PCP, PCBs, and non-carcinogenic PAHs. These four events confirm compliance with groundwater PCULs for TPH, PCP, PCBs, and non-carcinogenic PAHs. Therefore, COCs in groundwater that exceeded PCULs in at least one result and require additional monitoring to demonstrate compliance are: arsenic, copper, nickel, zinc, naphthalene, and cPAHs.

As discussed in Section 3.1.1, soil remediation levels for cPAHs and naphthalene are dependent on an empirical demonstration of the protection of groundwater. Naphthalene was detected at MW-13 at a concentration of 1.5 µg/L, marginally exceeding the PCUL of 1.4 µg/L. This is one exceedance out of 20 total samples, and the two subsequent naphthalene results in MW-13 groundwater are less than the PCUL indicating that the adjusted soil remediation level is protective of groundwater.

Low-level exceedances of cPAHs were detected in new shoreline Fill Unit well MW-13 in three of four events and detected below the PCUL in the most recent event. At previously existing Fill Unit well MW-12 located east (upgradient) of the IA excavation area, low-level exceedances of cPAHs were detected in two of four events, and no cPAHs were detected in the two most recent events. The cPAHs are highly hydrophobic and the part-per-trillion (ppt) concentrations ranging from 7 to 20 ppt cPAHs detected in groundwater can be due to minor particulate matter present in a groundwater sample. The decreasing trend of cPAH groundwater exceedances at MW-12 and MW-13 and the current results complying with the stringent PCUL of 8 ppt indicate the adjusted soil remediation level is protective of groundwater.

The dissolved metals data indicate exceedances for arsenic, copper, nickel, and zinc in Fill Unit wells. Consistent with organics, the dissolved metals concentrations decreased over the four groundwater monitoring events. Only low-level copper and nickel exceeding their respective PCUL during the most recent event at only two of the five Fill Unit monitoring wells. The dissolved copper concentrations of 3.92 and 3.27 µg/L marginally exceed a stringent PCUL of 3.1 µg/L. Similarly, dissolved nickel occurred at a concentration of 9.51 µg/L marginally exceeding a stringent PCUL of 8.2 µg/L. These data suggest that dissolved metals concentrations are naturally attenuating as illustrated by a stable and shrinking plume.

4.4 Media Requiring Cleanup Evaluation

This section establishes three areas of contaminated upland media that, following successful completion of the IA, require evaluation in this Upland FS. The areas are based on exceedances of soil and groundwater CULs.

[14] There is one outlier PCB PCUL exceedance at MW-14 that is a laboratory-estimated value. The estimate result was “J” flagged because the laboratory’s QC sample and its duplicate did not meet the laboratory’s relative percent difference (RPD) limits.

4.4.1 SBG-Containing Fill Soils Remaining on Shoreface

The compliance of soils landward of the shoring wall is established in Section 4.2. However, the SBG-containing fill remaining seaward of the shoring wall is a significant source of COCs in both upland and in-water media. This SBG-containing fill, which is 15 to 20 feet wide from shoring wall to MHHW, is sourcing exceedances of PCULs in groundwater discharging to the LDW and, through erosion, contributing to exceedances in in-water sediments.

The SBG-containing fill remaining seaward of the shoring wall and landward of MHHW on the shoreface is the only source of contamination remaining on the uplands and is estimated to be approximately 2,500 cubic yards (CY) in quantity.

4.4.2 Wood Pilings on Shoreface

The IA excavation encountered and removed a high density of wood pilings. Prior to IA excavation, several wood pilings extending to depths of approximately 30 feet were removed using vibratory equipment to allow for construction of the shoring wall. The other wood pilings encountered during IA excavation were cut at the top of the Estuarine Unit, leaving wood piling remaining in the Alluvium Unit landward of the shoring wall. The post-IA groundwater monitoring results from all Fill Unit and Alluvium Unit monitoring wells were less than naphthalene CUL, indicating the remaining pilings are not a substantive source of naphthalene to groundwater across the Site.

The same density of wood pilings are anticipated in the SBG-containing fill on the shoreface. Ecology has identified the wood pilings remaining seaward of the shoring wall as a potential source of contamination to soil and groundwater and they are therefore a media evaluated for cleanup in this Upland FS.

4.4.3 Fill Unit Groundwater

As described in Section 4.3, the post-IA groundwater monitoring event indicated exceedances for arsenic, copper, nickel, zinc, naphthalene and cPAHs in selected Fill Unit wells. The post-IA groundwater monitoring results indicate Site COCs in groundwater are naturally attenuating as illustrated by decreasing concentrations and a stable and shrinking plume. During the most recent event in April 2022, the COC exceedances are limited to copper and nickel at only two of the five Fill Unit monitoring wells. This Upland FS evaluates Fill Unit groundwater as a media requiring cleanup.

Because there have been no exceedances of groundwater CULs detected in the Alluvium Unit, Alluvium Unit groundwater is not included as a media requiring cleanup in this Upland FS.

5 Cleanup Requirements

This section establishes the cleanup requirements for evaluation of remedial alternatives in this Upland FS.

5.1 Applicable, Relevant, and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)

The MTCA regulations (Chapter 70.105D Revised Code of Washington [RCW]) require that cleanup actions comply with applicable state and federal laws (WAC 173-340-360(2)a(iii)), which includes legally applicable requirements as well as requirements that determined to be relevant and appropriate. These requirements are collectively referred to as ARARs. The ARARs identified for the uplands Site are in Table 5.

5.2 Constituents of Concern

The RI Report (Aspect, 2020a) developed preliminary COCs based on initial screening against the most-stringent PCUL as summarized in Section 2.2. The IAWP developed soil performance analytes for IA performance monitoring; these results were evaluated for compliance in Section 4 and form a basis for updating the Site COC list for purposes of this Upland FS.

IA soil verification samples in the vicinity of the single groundwater exceedance complied with PCP soil remediation levels. Additionally, the post-IA groundwater did not detect PCP in MW-13, which was installed in the former location of MW-11. Therefore, PCP is not retained as a COC[15].

Similarly, IA soil verification samples analyzed for TPH in the vicinity of the soil sample collected at MW-2 complied with soil remediation levels. Additionally, the post-IA groundwater did not detect TPH in groundwater in MW-13. Based on the removal of TPH in soil exceeding the generic screening level, TPH is not retained as a COC.

Based on the post-interim action compliance results, the following are the Upland COCs retained for evaluation in the Upland FS:

- Metals (arsenic, copper, lead, mercury, and zinc); nickel (groundwater only)
- Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)
- Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)
- Tributyltin (TBT)

[15] Note there are two soil samples from the RI (MW8-5-6 and MW10-5-6) that have reporting limits of PCP greater than the soil remediation levels. These sample locations were collected from outside the extents of soil contamination and the elevated reporting limits do not indicate a CUL exceedance or soils out of compliance.

5.3 Cleanup Standards

This section proposes the soil and groundwater CULs for the Upland COCs and the points of compliance for those CULs. The final cleanup standards will be established in the Upland CAP.

5.3.1 Soil Cleanup Levels

Table 6 presents the most-stringent PCULs, the IA remediation levels, the PQLs, and, based on those, the CULs for soil. The exposure pathway with the most stringent soil PCUL is leaching to groundwater (for surface water or sediment protection; pathways SL-3 through SL-7). For TBT, soil erosion into LDW sediment (pathway SL-8) was the most stringent exposure pathway and soil PCUL basis. These soil PCULs apply irrespective of future land use, but they are also protective of direct contact for unrestricted land use (pathway SL-1).

Soil remediation levels for two Upland COCs (cPAHs and naphthalene) were established based on empirical demonstration of soil concentrations protective of groundwater in accordance with MTCA (Aspect, 2021d). The completed IA achieved compliance with the naphthalene soil remediation level of 0.056 mg/kg. The soil remediation level for naphthalene is less than the 1,600 mg/kg PCUL based on unrestricted direct contact with soil. Therefore, the soil remediation level for naphthalene of 0.056 mg/kg is anticipated to be protective of all exposure pathways and appropriate as the soil CUL. Of the 20 Fill Unit groundwater samples analyzed for naphthalene after the IA, only one groundwater sample (from MW-13) detected a naphthalene concentration of 1.5 ug/L greater than the PCUL of 1.4 ug/L. These groundwater results verify that the soil remediation level is an appropriate soil CUL.

The most stringent cPAH PCUL is 0.00031 mg/kg in vadose soils and 0.000016 mg/kg in saturated soils. These PCULs are based on leaching to groundwater for LDW surface water protection and are one to two orders of magnitude less than the 0.003 mg/kg analytical PQL for cPAH.[16] The IA achieved compliance with a cPAH soil remediation level of 0.074 mg/kg that was demonstrated to be protective of groundwater. The soil remediation level is less than the 0.19 mg/kg cPAH PCUL based on unrestricted direct contact and is therefore protective of all exposure pathways and appropriate as the soil CUL.

An analytical reporting limit of 0.002 mg/kg is achievable for PCB Aroclors in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil CUL for total PCBs is established at this PQL.

5.3.2 Groundwater Cleanup Levels

The RI Report (Aspect, 2020a) established drinking water is not a practicable future use for groundwater at the Site; the highest beneficial use of the groundwater is considered discharge to the LDW. The most stringent PCULs for non-potable water were established as screening levels in the RI Report and included in Table 7.

[16] The analytical reporting limits for individual cPAHs is 0.002 mg/kg; the PQL for total cPAH TEQ includes application of toxicity equivalency factors (TEFs) and summation of the individual cPAH reporting limits.

For cPAHs and total PCBs, the analytical method reporting limit, which is the PQL, is greater than the PCUL. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the groundwater CUL for those analytes is established at the respective PQL.

5.3.3 Points of Compliance

Under MTCA, the point of compliance is the location where the CULs must be attained in any specific media. The following points of compliance will be used to develop and evaluate remedial alternatives in this Upland FS:

Soil: Using CULs protective of the applicable exposure pathways, three soil points of compliance are identified:

- For protection of direct contact, the proposed soil point of compliance is in the upper 15 feet bgs throughout the upland Site, based on a reasonable maximum depth of excavation and assumed placement of excavated soils at the surface where contact occurs.
- For protection of leaching of contaminants from the vadose soil to groundwater, with subsequent discharge to surface water and/or sediments, the proposed point of compliance for vadose soil is the full vertical extent of the vadose zone throughout the upland Site.
- For protection of leaching of contaminants from the saturated soil to groundwater, with subsequent discharge to surface water and/or sediments, the point of compliance for saturated soil is throughout the saturated zone throughout the upland Site.

Groundwater: Discharge to surface water is the highest beneficial use of groundwater for the Site. MTCA allows for a conditional point of compliance (CPOC) for groundwater discharging to a surface water receiving body. Based on the Fill Unit groundwater flow discharge at the southern end of the sheet pile wall, MW-13 is positioned at the downgradient edge of the upland portion of the Site and as close as practicable to the groundwater discharge location. The final groundwater point of compliance will be determined by Ecology and is subject to completing the removal of SBG-containing fill seaward of the shoring wall to be conducted concurrently with the in-water sediment cleanup.

5.4 Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs)

Remedial action objectives (RAOs) are specific goals to be achieved by remedial alternatives that meet cleanup standards and provide protection of human health and the environment under a specified land use. Ecology has the following objectives for the LDW source control program (Ecology, 2016):

- The near-term goal of source control is to address existing, ongoing sources of contamination to the LDW, so that in-waterway sediment cleanup can begin without the risk of recontamination above remedial action levels (RALs), as defined in EPA's ROD.
- The long-term goal is to minimize risk of re-contaminating sediments above the sediment cleanup standards established in the ROD.

These source control objectives were a basis of the completed IA and remain objectives for this Upland FS.

The RAOs established for the uplands are as follows:

- **RAO 1:** Prevent direct human contact with contaminated Site soil and/or groundwater containing contaminants at concentrations above CULs.
- **RAO 2:** Prevent discharge of Site groundwater contaminants to the LDW surface water and sediments at concentrations above CULs.
- **RAO 3:** Prevent erosion of soil on shoreface into the LDW sediments.

RAOs are generally achieved by elimination of the associated exposure pathway. Pathway-specific exposure elimination can be accomplished through contaminant removal or treatment to meet chemical- and media-specific cleanup standards at specified points of compliance. Exposure elimination can also be accomplished through institutional controls.

6 Remedial Technology Screening

This section identifies and screens remedial technologies that may be effective cleanup action components to satisfy the RAOs defined in Section 5.4. General Response Actions (GRAs) represent categories of remedial technologies that may involve elimination or destruction of hazardous substances via engineered or natural physical, biological, or chemical processes; reduction in risk of exposure to hazardous substances via engineering or institutional controls; or some combination of protection mechanisms.

All relevant and potentially applicable remediation technologies associated with these GRAs were screened based on their potential applicability for Site COCs and are summarized in Table 8. The following technologies were retained for purposes of developing and evaluating remedial alternatives:

- **Removal.** Removal of the source of contamination represents a permanent remediation of the uplands. The completed IA removed 5,893 tons of SBG-containing fill (including wood pilings in Fill Unit) from the uplands. Removal of the remaining SBG-containing fill on the shoreface will require construction from in-water. Removal and off-Site disposal is the most permanent remedial technology and is retained for alternative development. Removal with on-Site pre-treatment and off-Site disposal is not retained as there is no remedial or cost benefit to treat soils prior to disposing off-Site. Removal with on-Site treatment and reuse is not retained for alternative development as the remedial technology is not applicable to all Site COCs.

- ***In-situ* Containment.** *In-situ* containment technologies (e.g., capping and/or impermeable barriers) are designed only to inhibit exposure pathways and do not reduce concentrations or toxicity of contaminated media. Capping is not retained as it would not address media requiring cleanup evaluation. Any remedial benefit of an impermeable barrier for groundwater would be accomplished by the existing sheet pile shoring wall; therefore, an impermeable barrier is not retained for alternative development.

- ***In-situ* Treatment.** *In-situ* treatment technologies can potentially reduce the concentration, mobility, and/or toxicity of a contaminated media. These technologies may rely on physical, biological, and/or chemical mechanisms to transform or destroy the target contaminants.

  In-situ chemical treatment of groundwater is retained for alternative development. The immobilization of dissolved metals from groundwater systems is demonstrated by sorption, precipitation, and co-precipitation processes and the use of iron-based media (ferrous iron or zero-valent iron) has been demonstrated effective at immobilizing dissolved metals in groundwater systems. The *in-situ* treatment of cPAHs in groundwater is feasible with sorptive-based media (e.g., granular activated carbon). Placement of media can be through amended backfill, large-diameter augers, and/or injection equipment.

- **Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA).** MNA is a cleanup technology that relies on natural attenuation processes to achieve RAOs within a reasonable time

frame. Natural attenuation is the reduction of contaminant concentrations over time through natural processes such as precipitation, sorption, dilution, dispersion, and/or biodegradation. MNA requires compliance monitoring to ensure that the anticipated concentration reductions occur at an acceptable rate, and that protection of human health and the environment is achieved. MNA of groundwater is retained for alternative development.

- **Groundwater Extraction and Treatment.** Groundwater extraction and treatment, or "pump and treat", is not retained for alternative development because the Fill Unit groundwater system is inadequate to support extraction, and the cost to construct and operate a system is infinitely disproportionate to any environmental benefit given the post-IA groundwater conditions.
- **Institutional Controls.** Institutional Controls (ICs) are administrative or engineering measures undertaken to limit or prohibit activities that may interfere with a cleanup action or result in exposure to contaminated media.

  The completed IA implemented ICs of interim fencing and signage to restrict human access and use of the shoreface and tidelands. Maintenance of these existing ICs and additional ICs are retained for alternative development.

7 Remedial Alternatives

Three remedial alternatives are developed for evaluation in this Upland FS, each of which incorporates the completed IA:

- Alternative 1 – SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Partial Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater MNA, ICs
- Alternative 2 – SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater MNA, and ICs
- Alternative 3 – SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater Treatment and MNA, and ICs

The following sections describe each remedial alternative component and assumptions necessary for estimating cost.

7.1 Alternative 1 – SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Partial Wood Piling Removal, MNA, ICs

Remedial Alternative 1 (conceptually depicted on Figure 6) consists of the following components:

- **SBG-Containing Fill Removal** – The remaining SBG-containing fill seaward of the shoring wall and landward of MHHW would be removed and disposed of off-Site at a Subtitle D disposal facility as non-dangerous special waste. The shoreface removal would be conducted as in-water work using barged equipment.

The removal limits would extend to the maximum extent practicable, assumed to be the northern and southern Property boundaries. Removal depth is assumed as the top of the Estuarine Unit consistent with the IA, and to an average depth of 11 feet bgs. Remaining soil analytical results from the saturated zone collected from the Estuarine Unit confirm that removal to the Estuarine Unit will achieve soil CULs (Table 2B)[17]. The removal would include cutting the wood pilings at the top of the Estuarine Unit, and removal of cuttings with the SBG-containing fill for off-Site disposal.

Backfill would re-establish stable slopes that both avoid a net fill below ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) and preserve upland land uses. Over-steepened and vertical sections would be replaced with stable slopes. The backfill surface would consist of the smallest substrate that would remain stable on the slopes. Above OHWM, the slope would be flattened to the extent possible up to the existing grade at the shoring wall. The restoration requires modifications to the shoring wall by restoring stormwater outfalls and cutting the top of the shoring wall to the restored grade. This restored shoreface area would be planted with a community of native trees, shrubs and herbaceous species to increase riparian habitat function.

- **Groundwater MNA –**The post-IA groundwater monitoring data suggest Site COCs in groundwater are naturally attenuating as illustrated by decreasing concentrations and stable and shrinking plume. During the most recent event in April 2022, the COC exceedances are limited to copper and nickel at two of the five Fill Unit wells. Additional groundwater monitoring will be conducted until four consecutive results comply with CULs to verify upland groundwater compliance landward of the shoring wall. Once compliance is demonstrated, no additional groundwater monitoring is planned until implementation of the in-water cleanup.

  A Groundwater Compliance Monitoring Plan (GCMP) will be developed during design of the SBG-containing fill removal and in-water sediment cleanup. The GCMP will report all completed groundwater monitoring results, evaluate MNA progress, and establish the final groundwater cleanup standards to be approved Ecology and establish the final groundwater points of compliance of groundwater monitoring wells and/or seeps seaward of the shoring wall.

  It is assumed that the restoration timeframe to reach CULs will be achieved 5 years after SBG-containing fill removal. For cost estimation, a total of 10 years of long-term monitoring and reporting is assumed.

- **ICs –** The interim ICs in place at the Site will be maintained until the SBG-containing fill is removed and the shoreface is restored. If uplands soil or

[17] During the IA, all saturated bottom confirmation samples were collected from the top of the Estuarine Unit; two samples (B-J-1 and B-K-1) were collected from 0.5-feet below the top of the Estuarine Unit.

compliance is not achieved after the SBG-containing fill is removed, a deed restriction to notify construction workers of contaminated soil and groundwater would be used to prevent construction worker direct exposure. A contaminated media management plan (CMMP) would be prepared to provide the handling requirements for any soil and groundwater to be removed during subsequent upland redevelopment activities.

The estimated capital cost of Remedial Alternative 1 is $3,997,000, and the estimated total remedy cost is $4,360,000 (Table 9). The Remedial Alternative 1 cost estimate includes the sunk costs of the completed Interim Action of $2,755,383. The detailed cost estimate is included in Appendix C-1.

7.2 Alternative 2 – SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal, MNA, ICs

Remedial Alternative 2 consists of the Remedial Alternative 1 components with the addition of full removal of wood pilings, as follows:

- **SBG-Containing Fill Removal** – Same as Remedial Alternative 1.
- **Groundwater MNA –** Same as Remedial Alternative 1. The addition of the wood piling removal is not anticipated to change the Fill Unit groundwater MNA scope and restoration timeframe.
- **ICs –** Same as Remedial Alternative 1.
- **Wood Piling Complete Removal –** The wood pilings seaward of the shoring wall will be removed in their entirety, including the portion in the Alluvium Unit. It is assumed that the removal will be conducted using a vibratory crane from the upland and not require in-water work.

The estimated capital cost of Remedial Alternative 2 is $4,452,000, and the estimated total remedy cost is $4,810,000 (Table 9). The Remedial Alternative 2 cost estimate includes the sunk costs of the completed Interim Action of $2,755,383. The detailed cost estimate is included in Appendix C-2.

7.3 Alternative 3 – SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal with Groundwater Treatment, MNA, and ICs

Remedial Alternative 3 consists of the Remedial Alternative 2 components with the addition of Fill Unit active groundwater treatment. The description of each remedial alternative component includes assumptions necessary for estimating cost.

- **SBG-Containing Fill Removal** – Same as Remedial Alternative 1.
- **Wood Piling Complete Removal –** Same as Remedial Alternative 2.

- **ICs –** Same as Remedial Alternative 1.

- **Active Groundwater Treatment –** The post-IA groundwater conditions indicate that MNA alone will achieve groundwater compliance landward of the shorting wall. The active treatment would target any groundwater exceedances that remain in uplands after SBG-containing fill is removed. The assumed treatment is the use of iron-media to immobilize low-level dissolved metals remaining in groundwater. Iron will be emplaced in the subsurface through direct-push injections after the remaining SBG-containing fill is removed.

- **Groundwater MNA** – It is assumed that the restoration time frame to when CULs will be achieved is 2 years after SBG-containing fill removal. For cost estimation purposes, it is assumed that SBG-containing fill removal will occur 5 years after this Upland FS, for a total monitoring and reporting period of 7 years.

The estimated capital cost of Remedial Alternative 3 is $4,788,000, and the estimated total remedy cost is $5,020,000 (Table 9). The Remedial Alternative 3 cost estimate includes the sunk costs of the completed Interim Action of $2,755,383. The detailed cost estimate is included in Appendix C-3.

8 Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives

Each alternative was evaluated against MTCA criteria, and a DCA was completed to compare the incremental costs and incremental environmental benefits of the cleanup alternatives. This section describes the evaluation process and DCA results.

8.1 Evaluation with Respect to MTCA Threshold Requirements

The three remedial alternatives were evaluated for compliance with the MTCA threshold criteria described in the following section.

8.1.1 Protection of Human Health and the Environment

All three alternatives would be protective of human health and the environment by mitigating each potential exposure pathway through removal of the SBG-containing fill on the shoreface.

8.1.2 Compliance with Cleanup Standards

All three remedial alternatives are likely to achieve compliance with cleanup standards for continued industrial use. The removal of the SBG-containing fill from the shoreface will achieve cleanup standards for all soils on the uplands. The post-IA groundwater monitoring data indicate that MNA alone will achieve groundwater cleanup standards landward of the shoring wall. Therefore, any Fill Unit groundwater seaward of the shoring wall is also anticipated to comply with groundwater cleanup standards after removal of the remaining SBG-containing fill included in all alternatives.

Alternative 3 adds active groundwater treatment in order to enhance MNA, providing incrementally greater assurance that groundwater cleanup standards will be met within a shorter restoration timeline.

8.1.3 Compliance with Applicable State and Federal Laws

The remedial alternatives were developed to comply with MTCA and the potentially applicable state and federal laws and local requirements identified in Section 5.1 and Table 5. All alternatives are expected to comply with all applicable state and federal laws and local requirements, and the required engineering design and agency-review process would include steps to ensure compliance.

8.1.4 Provisions for Compliance Monitoring

All three alternatives provide for compliance monitoring. Health and safety protocols outlined in a Site-specific health and safety plan (required in all alternatives) would provide protection monitoring. Each alternative includes soil verification performance monitoring at the limits of the SBG-containing fill removal on the shoreface. The final groundwater point of compliance will be determined by Ecology and is subject to completing the removal of SBG-containing fill seaward of the shoring wall to be conducted concurrently with the in-water cleanup. Additional groundwater monitoring locations and/or seep monitoring may be determined necessary by Ecology for compliance.

8.1.5 Conclusion Regarding Compliance with Threshold Requirements

Based on the above evaluation, Remedial Alternatives 1 through 3 are considered to comply with the MTCA threshold criteria. Therefore, all three alternatives are carried forward to the next stage of evaluation.

8.2 Disproportionate Cost Analysis (DCA)

The purpose of a DCA is to determine whether a cleanup action uses permanent solutions to the maximum extent practicable by comparing the relative benefits and costs of remedial alternatives. A DCA quantifies the environmental benefits by first rating each cleanup alternative with respect to six criteria as specified in WAC 173-340-360(3)(f).

Environmental benefit was quantified by scoring each alternative with respect to each of the DCA criteria. Rating values (scores were assigned on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 indicates the criteria is satisfied to a very low degree, and 10 indicates the factor is satisfied to a very high degree.

Because Ecology does not consider the six DCA criteria to be of equal importance, each criterion was assigned a "weighting factor" as follows:

- Overall protectiveness: 30 percent
- Permanence: 20 percent
- Long-term effectiveness: 20 percent
- Short-term effectiveness: 10 percent
- Implementability: 10 percent
- Consideration of public concerns: 10 percent

The basis for scoring for each category and the calculated benefit cost ratio are in Table 9 and shown on Figure 9.

8.2.1 Overall Protectiveness

MTCA defines the overall protectiveness criterion as:

> "Overall protectiveness of human health and the environment, including the degree to which existing risks are reduced, time required to reduce risk and attain cleanup standards, on-Site and off-Site risks resulting from implementation, and improvement of the overall environmental quality." (WAC 173-340-360(3)(f))

The protectiveness of each alternative was ranked in Table 10 based on its effectiveness in reducing risks and achieving cleanup standards (i.e., cleanup levels at the point of compliance).

8.2.2 Permanence

MTCA defines the permanence criterion as:

> "The degree to which the alternative permanently reduces the toxicity, mobility or volume of hazardous substances, including the adequacy of the alternative in

> destroying the hazardous substances, the reduction or elimination of hazardous substance releases and sources of releases, the degree of irreversibility of waste treatment process, and the characteristics and quantity of treatment residuals generated." (WAC 173-340-360(3)(f)).

The basis for the permanence rating for each alternative considers degree of reduction in toxicity, mobility, or volume, and irreversibility of treatment or destruction.

8.2.3 Long-Term Effectiveness

MTCA defines the long-term effectiveness criterion as:

> "Long-term effectiveness includes the degree of certainty that the alternative will be successful, the reliability of the alternative during the period of time hazardous substances are expected to remain on Site at concentrations that exceed cleanup levels, the magnitude of residual risk with the alternative in place, and the effectiveness of controls required to manage treatment residues or remaining wastes." (WAC 173-340-360(3)(f)).

The basis for the long-term effectiveness rating for each alternative is presented in Table 10 relative to certainty and reliability in the long-term, and magnitude of residual risks.

8.2.4 Short-Term Risk Management

MTCA defines the short-term risk management criterion as:

> "Management of short-term risks, including the protection of human health and the environment associated with the alternative during construction and implementation." (WAC 173-340-360(3)(f)).

This criterion assesses potential risks associated with remedial alternative implementation, considering protection of workers, protection of the community, and potential impacts to the environment during remedy implementation. In general, the potential for adverse short-term impacts such as worker injuries, exposure to contamination, or contaminant releases to the environment increases with construction duration and the quantities of contaminated materials handled. An alternative with lesser short-term risks scores higher than one with greater risks.

8.2.5 Implementability

MTCA defines the implementability criterion as:

> "Ability to be implemented including consideration of whether the alternative is technically possible, availability of necessary off-Site facilities, services and materials, administrative and regulatory requirements, scheduling, size, complexity, monitoring requirements, access for construction operations and monitoring, and integration with existing facility operations and other current or potential remedial actions." (WAC 173-340-360(3)(f)).

Implementability generally decreases with increased complexity of the alternatives. The basis for the implementability rating for each alternative is presented in Table 10 relative to technical feasibility/constructability and administrative feasibility.

8.2.6 Consideration of Public Concerns

The public will prefer permanent remedial actions, and the complete removal of the SBG-containing fill is permanent to the maximum extent. The selected remedial action in the CAP will be published for public comment. The implementation of the CAP will require State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review, which also requires a public comment period. Public comments will be responded to and incorporated into the remedial action implementation as warranted.

8.2.7 Benefits Rankings, Estimated Costs, and Benefit/Cost Ratios

Table 10 summarizes the alternative-specific ratings with respect to the six criteria discussed above. The MTCA benefits rankings, estimated costs, and benefit/cost ratios for the remedial alternatives are summarized in the table below and presented in Table 10 and on Figure 9.

	Benefit Ranking	Estimated Total Cost	Benefit/Cost Ratio
Alternative 1	7.1	$4,360,000	1.63
Alternative 2	7.5	$4,810,000	1.56
Alternative 3	7.8	$5,020,000	1.55

The MTCA benefits ranking is obtained for each alternative by multiplying the score assigned for the six evaluation criteria by their corresponding weighting factors, and summing the weighted values. The benefit rankings range from a low of 7.1 for Alternative 1 to a high of 7.8 for Alternative 3.

The estimated total costs for the alternatives range from $4,360,000 (Alternative 1) to $5,020,000 million (Alternative 3). The detailed cost estimates for each Alternative are included in Appendix C.

The benefit/cost ratio is equal to the MTCA benefits ranking divided by its total estimated cost as a relative measure of cost-effectiveness. Because all three alternatives include permanent removal of all contaminated media from the uplands, the range in total estimated cost is small—the highest cost Alternative 3 is only 15 percent greater than lowest cost Alternative 1. The incremental environmental benefit with Alternatives 2 and 3 is small; therefore, the range in benefit/cost ratio of alternatives is also small.

Based on the results of the DCA, Alternative 1 is permanent to the maximum extent practicable.

8.3 Evaluation of Reasonable Restoration Time Frame

The source of the contamination to groundwater and the LDW is the SBG-containing fill. The completed IA removed all SBG-containing fill landward of the shoring wall, and all three alternatives will remove the remaining SBG-containing fill from the Site.

Based on the post-IA groundwater monitoring results, MNA will achieve groundwater compliance in a reasonable restoration time frame estimated to be 5 years after SBG-containing fill removal.

8.4 Preferred Remedial Alternative

Alternative 1 is the preferred remedial alternative for the uplands and consists of SBG-containing fill removal, groundwater MNA, and ICs. The SBG-containing fill seaward of the shoring wall will be removed and disposed of off-Site at a Subtitle D disposal facility, completing the removal of all SBG-containing fill from the Site. The shoreface removal will be conducted as in-water work using barged equipment and will be conducted concurrently with the in-water sediment cleanup, in accordance with the LDW ROD.

The SBG-containing fill removal limits will extend from the shoring wall to MHHW and assumed to the northern and southern Property boundaries. All SBG-containing fill will be removed, requiring the excavation bottom be advanced to the top of the Estuarine Unit where soil compliance was verified during the IA. Removal will include cutting the wood pilings at the Estuarine Unit, and removal of the pile cuttings with the SBG-containing fill for proper off-Site disposal.

The restoration will include backfill to grade with a more-gentle slope, with habitat restoration elements designed and permitted as part of the in-water cleanup. The restoration will require modifications to the shoring wall by restoring stormwater outfalls and cutting the top of the shoring wall to the restored grade.

The preferred remedial alternative permanently removes all contamination from the Site which is resilient to climate changes and provides assurance of long-term remedy effectiveness. The backfill and shoreface restoration design will incorporate climate change information including predicted sea level rise.

Additional groundwater monitoring will be conducted until four consecutive results comply with CULs to verify upland groundwater compliance landward of the shoring wall. Once compliance is demonstrated, no additional groundwater monitoring is planned until implementation of the in-water cleanup. A GCMP will be developed during design of the SBG-containing fill removal and in-water sediment cleanup. The GCMP will report all completed groundwater monitoring results, evaluate MNA progress, and be submitted to Ecology for approval.

The interim ICs will be maintained at the Site until the SBG-containing fill removal and the shoreface restoration are completed. If uplands soil compliance is not achieved after the SBG-containing fill is removed, a deed restriction to notify construction workers of contaminated materials and require appropriate protection measures would be used to prevent construction worker direct exposure. A CMMP would be prepared to provide the handling requirements for any soil and groundwater.

9 Conclusions

This Upland FS has been prepared to develop and evaluate remedial alternatives for the upland portion of the Site to satisfy requirements of the Agreed Order and WAC Sections 173-340-350(8) and 173-204-550(7).

A compliance evaluation of post-IA conditions of the remaining uplands soil and groundwater identified the media requiring cleanup evaluation in this Upland FS. The completed IA resulted in compliance of soils landward of the shoring wall. The remaining SBG-containing fill seaward of the shoring wall and above MHHW is the remaining source on the uplands and is the primary media evaluated in this Upland FS.

Three remedial alternatives were evaluated in this Upland FS. The environmental benefit was determined through a DCA for additional remedial alternative components of wood piling removal (Alternatives 2 and 3) and Fill Unit groundwater treatment (Alternative 3) and determined to be disproportionate to the incremental cost.

Alternative 1 is the preferred remedial alternative for the uplands and consists of SBG-containing fill removal, groundwater MNA, and ICs. The SBG-containing fill seaward of the shoring wall will be removed and disposed of off-Site, completing the removal of all SBG-containing fill from the Site. The shoreface removal will be conducted as in-water work using barged equipment.

The scope of this Upland FS, and the preferred Remedial Alternative 1, is limited to landward MHHW. However, it is infeasible to only conduct the shoreface cleanup to MHHW, and the SBG-containing fill removal from shoreface will be conducted concurrently with the sediment cleanup according to the LDW ROD.

This Upland FS develops a preferred remedial alternative for the upland portion of the Site, which will be selected by Ecology in the Upland CAP.

10 References

Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect), 2020a, Final Interim Action Work Plan, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington, March 10, 2020.

Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect), 2021a, Draft Proposed Total cPAH TEQ Cleanup Level in Soil, Snopac Property Site, 5505 and 5053 East Marginal Way South, Seattle Washington, January 12, 2021.

Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect), 2021b, Draft Proposal to Not Remove Naphthalene in Soil Above Remediation Levels, Snopac Property Site, 5505 and 5053 East Marginal Way South, Seattle Washington, January 21, 2021.

Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect), 2021c, Sampling and Analysis Plan for Groundwater Confirmation Monitoring, Snopac Property Uplands, Seattle Washington, July 2, 2021.

Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect), 2021d, Final Interim Action Report, Snopac Property, Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect), 2021c, Sampling and Analysis Plan for Groundwater Confirmation Monitoring, Snopac Property Uplands, Seattle Washington, September 16, 2021.

Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect), 2023, Final Remedial Investigation Report, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington, December 20, 2023.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2014, Record of Decision, Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund Site.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2021, Lower Duwamish Waterway Explanation of Significant Difference September 2021.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), 2006, A Survey of Zinc Concentrations in Industrial Stormwater Runoff, Ecology Publication No. 06-03-009, January 2006.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), 2011, Urban Seattle Area Soil dioxin and PAH Concentrations Initial Summary Report, Ecology Publication No. 11-09-049, September 2011.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), 2013, Better Brakes Baseline Report, Updated Brake Friction Material Release Estimates for Copper, Nickel, Zinc, and Antimony, Ecology Publication No. 13-04-010, July 2013.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), 2015, Western Washington NPDES Phase 1 Stormwater Permit, Final S8.D Data Characterization, 2009-2013, Ecology Publication No. 15-03-001, February 2015.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), 2016, Revised Policy Memorandum on groundwater cleanup levels for upland sites bordering the LDW, March 2016.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), 2021, Lower Duwamish Waterway Preliminary Cleanup Level Workbook including Supplemental Information, May 2021.

11 Limitations

Work for this project was performed for 5055 Properties LLC (Client), and this report was prepared in accordance with generally accepted professional practices for the nature and conditions of work completed in the same or similar localities, at the time the work was performed. This report does not represent a legal opinion. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made.

All reports prepared by Aspect Consulting for the Client apply only to the services described in the Agreement(s) with the Client. Any use or reuse by any party other than the Client is at the sole risk of that party, and without liability to Aspect Consulting. Aspect Consulting's original files/reports shall govern in the event of any dispute regarding the content of electronic documents furnished to others.

TABLES

Table 1A. Analytical Results for Soil Remaining Seaward of Shoring Wall (Vadose)

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

	Location	B-4	B-6	SSA-1	SSA-2	SSA-3	SSA-4
	Date	01/24/2017	01/24/2017	07/02/2015	07/02/2015	07/02/2015	07/02/2015
	Sample	B4-SBG-0	B6-0.8-1.1	SSA-1	SSA-2	SSA-3	SSA-4
	Depth (feet below ground surface)	0 ft	0.8 - 1.1 ft	0 - 0.25 ft	0 - 0.25 ft	0 - 0.25 ft	0 - 0.25 ft
Analyte	Vadose Soil Remediation Level[1]						
Metals							
Arsenic	7.3	--	--	**12.1**	**27.3**	**4890**	**70.1**
Copper	36	--	--	**49.1**	**65.9**	**3430**	**55.3**
Lead	50	--	--	**66.6**	**54.7**	**1720**	**61.7**
Mercury	0.07	--	--	**0.052**	**0.082**	**0.28**	**0.25**
Zinc	86	--	--	**76.4**	**150**	**12900**	**196**
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)							
1-Methylnaphthalene	34	< 0.5 U	< 0.5 U	**0.075**	**0.043**	**0.028**	**0.03**
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.67	< 0.5 U	< 0.5 U	**0.097**	**0.053**	**0.023**	**0.036**
Acenaphthene	0.5	**0.16**	**0.11**	**0.022**	**0.045**	**0.069**	**0.038**
Acenaphthylene	1.3	< 0.1 U	< 0.1 U	**0.027**	**0.042**	**0.019**	**0.018**
Anthracene	0.96	**0.53**	**0.21**	**0.16**	**0.2**	**0.14**	**0.078**
Fluoranthene	1.7	**4.2**	**1.7**	**0.65**	**0.83**	**0.99**	**0.53**
Fluorene	0.54	**0.17**	< 0.1 U	**0.046**	**0.058**	**0.054**	**0.034**
Naphthalene[1]	0.056	< 0.1 U	< 0.1 U	**0.079**	**0.071**	**0.032**	**0.044**
Phenanthrene	1.5	**2.2**	**1.1**	**0.32**	**0.62**	**0.64**	**0.36**
Pyrene	2.6	**3.8**	**2**	**0.46**	**0.76**	**1.1**	**0.49**
Total cPAHs TEQ[1,2]	0.074	**3.1**	**1.3**	**0.92**	**1.6**	**1.05 J**	**0.54**
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)							
Pentachlorophenol[3]	0.05	**2.1 J**	**2.6 J**	--	--	--	--
Organotin Compounds							
Tributyltin Ion	0.12	**3.9**	**2.2**	**--**	**--**	**4.3**	**--**
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)							
Total PCBs Aroclors[4]	0.002	**0.43**	**0.46**	**0.041**	**0.051**	**0.6**	< 0.02 U
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)							
Gasoline Range Organics	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Diesel Range Organics	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Motor Oil Range Organics	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
G+D+O Range Organics[5]	1500	--	--	--	--	--	--

Notes:

All concentrations are in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).

Bold - detected

Blue Shaded - Detected result exceeded remediation level

IAWP - Interim Action Work Plan (Aspect, 2020b)

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

J - Result value estimated

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation.

1. Remediation levels are the most-stringent Preliminary Cleanup Levels (PCULs) from the Preliminary Cleanup Levels Workbook for the Lower Duwamish Waterway (Ecology, 2020) or established empirically and approved by Ecology for the Interim Action. Empirically derived remediation levels for naphthalene and Total cPAHs TEQ are subject to post-interim action groundwater monitoring to be established as cleanup levels.

2. Carcinogenic PAHs total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene (total cPAH s TEQ) calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).

3. Interim action verification soil samples analyzed for pentachlorophenol in the one location pentachlorphenol was detected in groundwater. An analytical reporting limit of 0.05 mg/kg is achievable for PCP in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

4. An analytical reporting limit of 0.002 mg/kg is achievable by the laboratory for PCB Aroclors in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

5. A combined TPH remediation level is based on the generic direct contact cleanup level of 1,500 mg/kg that applies only if gasoline-range TPH is detected. (Ecology, 2017).

Table 1B. Analytical Results for Soil Remaining Seaward of Shoring Wall (Saturated)

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

Location		B-5	B-5	B-5	B-8
Date		01/24/2017	01/24/2017	01/24/2017	01/24/2017
Sample		B5-10-10.2	B5-13-14	B5-16-17	B8-12-13
Depth (feet below ground surface)		10 - 10.2 ft	13 - 14 ft	16 - 17 ft	12 - 13 ft
Analyte	**Saturated Soil Remediation Level**				
Metals					
Arsenic	7.3	--	**6.39**	**3.4**	**5.34**
Copper	36	--	**23.3**	**14.8**	**21**
Lead	50	--	**4.88**	**1.72**	**3.15**
Mercury	0.07	--	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 2 U
Zinc	85	--	**24**	**20.7**	**24.3**
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)					
1-Methylnaphthalene	34	< 0.5 U	--	--	--
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.67	< 0.5 U	--	--	--
Acenaphthene	0.028	**0.15**	--	--	--
Acenaphthylene	1.3	< 0.1 U	--	--	--
Anthracene	0.051	**0.62**	--	--	--
Benz(a)anthracene	0.000057	**2.4**	--	--	--
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.000016	**3**	--	--	--
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.0002	**3.5**	--	--	--
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	0.67	**1.6**	--	--	--
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.002	**1.5**	--	--	--
Chrysene	0.0064	**2.9**	--	--	--
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	0.000029	**0.48**	--	--	--
Fluoranthene	0.09	**4.4**	--	--	--
Fluorene	0.029	**0.13**	--	--	--
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.00056	**2**	--	--	--
Naphthalene[1]	0.056	< 0.1 U	--	--	--
Phenanthrene	1.5	**1.8**	--	--	--
Pyrene	0.14	**4.1**	--	--	--
Total Benzofluoranthenes		**5**	--	--	--
Total HPAHs	12	**25.88**	--	--	--
Total LPAHs	5.2	**2.7**	--	--	--
Total cPAHs TEQ[1,2]	0.074	**4.017**	--	--	--
Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)					
Pentachlorophenol[3]	0.05	**2 J**	--	--	--
Organotin Compounds					
Tributyltin Ion	0.12	**3.7**	**--**	**--**	**--**
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB)					
Total PCBs Aroclors[4]	0.002	**0.32**	--	--	--
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)					
Gasoline-Range Organics	--	--	--	--	--
Diesel-Range Organics	--	--	< 50 U	< 50 U	< 50 U
Motor Oil-Range Organics	--	--	< 250 U	< 250 U	< 250 U
G+D+O Range Organics[5]	1500*	--	< 250 U	< 250 U	< 250 U

Notes:

All concentrations are in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).

Bold - detected

Blue Shaded - Detected result exceeded remediation level

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

J - Result value estimated

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation.

HPAH = high-molecular weight PAH; LPAH = low-molecular weight PAH

1. Remediation levels are the most-stringent Preliminary Cleanup Levels (PCULs) from the Preliminary Cleanup Levels Workbook for the Lower Duwamish Waterway (Ecology, 2020) or established empirically and approved by Ecology for the Interim Action. Empirically derived remediation levels for naphthalene and Total cPAHs TEQ are subject to post-interim action groundwater monitoring to be established as cleanup levels.

2. Carcinogenic PAHs total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene (total cPAH s TEQ) calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).

3. Interim action verification soil samples analyzed for pentachlorophenol in the one location pentachlorphenol was detected in groundwater. An analytical reporting limit of 0.05 mg/kg is achievable for PCP in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

4. An analytical reporting limit of 0.002 mg/kg is achievable by the laboratory for PCB Aroclors in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

5. A combined TPH remediation level is based on the generic direct contact cleanup level of 1,500 mg/kg that applies only if gasoline-range TPH is detected. (Ecology, 2017).

Table 2A. Analytical Results for Soil Remaining Landward of Shoring Wall (Vadose)

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

Analyte	Vadose Soil Remediation Level[1]	Location	B-A-2	B-B-2	B-C-2	B-F-2	SW-AA-1	SW-AA-2	SW-A-3	SW-B-3	SW-C-5	SW-D-3	SW-E-2.5
		Date	01/04/2021	01/04/2021	01/04/2021	01/05/2021	01/21/2021	01/21/2021	12/31/2020	12/31/2020	01/15/2021	01/15/2021	01/15/2021
		Sample	B-A-2-11.5	B-B-2-11.5	B-C-2-11.5	B-F-2-11.5	SW-AA-1-12.5	SW-AA-2-12.5	SW-A-3-12	SW-B-3-12	SW-C-5-12	SW-D-3-12	SW-E-2.5-12
		Depth (feet below ground surface)	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.5	3.5	4	4	4	4	4
Metals													
Arsenic	7.3		**1.34**	< 1 U	**1.63**	**3.49**	**1.08**	**1.14**	**1.6**	**8.55**	**1.86**	**2.02**	**4.88**
Copper	36		**6.79**	**5.98**	**5.92**	**9.67**	**5.88**	--	**4.1**	**11.2**	**7.81**	**6.96**	--
Lead	50		**1.45**	< 1 U	**1.26**	**3.29**	< 1	--	**1.02**	**10.1**	**5.41**	**2.14**	--
Mercury	0.07		**0.017**	**0.015**	**0.01**	**0.13**	< 0.01	--	**0.01**	**0.048**	**0.019**	**0.015**	--
Zinc	86		**16.8**	**12.6**	**13.5**	**87**	**12.2**	--	**11.4**	**34.8**	**20.2**	**16.8**	--
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)													
1-Methylnaphthalene	34		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002	--	< 0.002 U	**0.0022**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	--
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.67		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002	--	< 0.002 U	**0.0039 J**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	--
Acenaphthene	0.5		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	--
Acenaphthylene	1.3		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	--
Anthracene	0.96		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	--
Fluoranthene	1.7		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.0034**	< 0.002	--	**0.003**	**0.0048**	**0.0063**	**0.0029**	--
Fluorene	0.54		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	--
Naphthalene[1]	0.056		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002	--	< 0.002 U	**0.0022**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	--
Phenanthrene	1.5		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002	--	**0.0021**	**0.0041**	**0.0042**	< 0.002 U	--
Pyrene	2.6		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.0027**	< 0.002	--	**0.0029**	**0.0053**	**0.0056**	**0.0026**	--
Total cPAHs TEQ[1,2]	0.074		< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	**0.0033**	< 0.00302 U	--	**0.0033**	**0.0061 J**	**0.0057**	**0.0030**	--
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)													
Pentachlorophenol[3]	0.05		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)													
Total PCBs Aroclors[4]	0.002		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.0023**	< 0.002 U	--
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)													
Gasoline Range Organics	--		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Diesel Range Organics	--		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Motor Oil Range Organics	--		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
G+D+O Range Organics[5]	1500			--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Notes:

All concentrations are in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).

Bold - detected

Blue Shaded - Detected result exceeded remediation level

IAWP - Interim Action Work Plan (Aspect, 2020b)

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

J - Result value estimated

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation.

1. Remediation levels are the most-stringent Preliminary Cleanup Levels (PCULs) from the Preliminary Cleanup Levels Workbook for the Lower Duwamish Waterway (Ecology, 2020) or established empirically and approved by Ecology for the Interim Action. Empirically derived remediation levels for naphthalene and Total cPAHs TEQ are subject to post-interim action groundwater monitoring to be established as cleanup levels.

2. Carcinogenic PAHs total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene (total cPAH s TEQ) calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).

3. Interim action verification soil samples analyzed for pentachlorophenol in the one location pentachlorophenol was detected in groundwater. An analytical reporting limit of 0.05 mg/kg is achievable for PCP in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

4. An analytical reporting limit of 0.002 mg/kg is achievable by the laboratory for PCB Aroclors in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

5. A combined TPH remediation level is based on the generic direct contact cleanup level of 1,500 mg/kg that applies only if gasoline-range TPH is detected. (Ecology, 2017).

Table 2A. Analytical Results for Soil Remaining Landward of Shoring Wall (Vadose)

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

Analyte	Vadose Soil Remediation Level[1]	Location	SW-F-2	SW-G-2	SW-H-2	SW-I-3	SW-J-3	SW-K-2	SW-K-3	SW-L-2	SW-L-4	SW-M-1	SW-M-3
		Date	12/30/2020	12/30/2020	12/30/2020	12/31/2020	01/15/2021	12/31/2020	01/15/2021	12/31/2020	01/22/2021	12/31/2020	01/22/2021
		Sample	SW-F-2-12	SW-G-2-12	SW-H-2-12	SW-I-3-12	SW-J-3-13	SW-K-2-12	SW-K-3-13	SW-L-2-12	SW-L-4-13	SW-M-1-12	SW-M-3-14
		Depth (feet below ground surface)	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	2
Metals													
Arsenic	7.3		**1.8**	**1.32**	**3.33**	**2.02**	**2.45**	**3.14**	**3.02**	**2.48**	**1.6**	**4.12**	**1.29**
Copper	36		**7.16**	**5.77**	**7.04**	**6.07**	**8.16**	**23.3**	**7.06**	**20.7**	**6.36**	**14.5**	**7.13**
Lead	50		**1.7**	**1.02**	**2.56**	**1.26**	**1.64**	**13.4**	**2.46**	**12.5**	**1.16**	**21.8**	**1.98**
Mercury	0.07		**0.012**	< 0.01 U	**0.01**	< 0.01 U	**0.088**	**0.061**	**0.017**	**0.033**	< 0.01 U	**0.025**	< 0.01 U
Zinc	86		**33.3**	**12.8**	**18**	**14.7**	**17**	**57.2**	**27.9**	**37.9**	**65**	**31.9**	**14**
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)													
1-Methylnaphthalene	34		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.056**	**0.0021**	**0.073**	< 0.002 U	**0.011**	< 0.002 U
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.67		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.071 J**	**0.0024**	**0.095 J**	< 0.002 U	**0.015 J**	< 0.002 U
Acenaphthene	0.5		**0.003**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Acenaphthylene	1.3		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	**0.0053**	< 0.002 U	**0.0027**	< 0.002 U
Anthracene	0.96		**0.0068**	**0.0037**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.015**	< 0.002 U	**0.0096**	< 0.002 U	**0.0066**	< 0.002 U
Fluoranthene	1.7		**0.041**	**0.025**	**0.0054**	< 0.002 U	**0.0043**	**0.085**	**0.0029**	**0.041**	< 0.002 U	**0.036**	< 0.002 U
Fluorene	0.54		**0.0021**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Naphthalene[1]	0.056		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.093**	< 0.002 U	**0.076**	< 0.002 U	**0.013**	< 0.002 U
Phenanthrene	1.5		**0.029**	**0.017**	**0.0032**	< 0.002 U	**0.0029**	**0.06**	**0.0037**	**0.045**	< 0.002 U	**0.02**	< 0.002 U
Pyrene	2.6		**0.042**	**0.024**	**0.0049**	< 0.002 U	**0.0042**	**0.074**	**0.003**	**0.059**	< 0.002 U	**0.05**	< 0.002 U
Total cPAHs TEQ[1,2]	0.074		**0.035 J**	**0.017 J**	**0.0054 J**	< 0.00302 U	**0.0037**	**0.070 J**	**0.0041**	**0.046 J**	< 0.00302 U	**0.059 J**	< 0.00302 U
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)													
Pentachlorophenol[3]	0.05		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	< 0.05 U	--	< 0.05 U	--
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)													
Total PCBs Aroclors[4]	0.002		< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.0024**	< 0.002 U	**0.0025**	< 0.002 U
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)													
Gasoline Range Organics	--		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Diesel Range Organics	--		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Motor Oil Range Organics	--		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
G+D+O Range Organics[5]	1500		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Notes:

All concentrations are in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).

Bold - detected

Blue Shaded - Detected result exceeded remediation level

IAWP - Interim Action Work Plan (Aspect, 2020b)

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

J - Result value estimated

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation.

1. Remediation levels are the most-stringent Preliminary Cleanup Levels (PCULs) from the Preliminary Cleanup Levels Workbook for the Lower Duwamish Waterway (Ecology, 2020) or established empirically and approved by Ecology for the Interim Action. Empirically derived remediation levels for naphthalene and Total cPAHs TEQ are subject to post-interim action groundwater monitoring to be established as cleanup levels.

2. Carcinogenic PAHs total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene (total cPAH s TEQ) calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).

3. Interim action verification soil samples analyzed for pentachlorophenol in the one location pentachlorophenol was detected in groundwater. An analytical reporting limit of 0.05 mg/kg is achievable for PCP in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

4. An analytical reporting limit of 0.002 mg/kg is achievable by the laboratory for PCB Aroclors in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

5. A combined TPH remediation level is based on the generic direct contact cleanup level of 1,500 mg/kg that applies only if gasoline-range TPH is detected. (Ecology, 2017).

Table 2A. Analytical Results for Soil Remaining Landward of Shoring Wall (Vadose)

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

Analyte	Vadose Soil Remediation Level[1]	Location: SW-N-5	MW-8	SB-1	SB-2	SB-3	SB-4	SB-5	SB-6	SB-7	SB-8	SUMP
		Date: 01/22/2021	01/25/2017	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019
		Sample: SW-N-5-13	MW8-5-6	SB1-6-7	SB2-2-3	SB3-5-6	SB4-2-3	SB5-2-3	SB6-5-6	SB7-2-3	SB8-5.5-6.5	SUMP-6-7
		Depth (feet below ground surface): 3	5 - 6 ft	6 - 7 ft	2 - 3 ft	5 - 6 ft	2 - 3 ft	2 - 3 ft	5 - 6 ft	2 - 3 ft	5.5 - 6.5 ft	6 - 7 ft
Metals												
Arsenic	7.3	**1.69**	**1.54**	**1.42**	**1.21**	**1.38**	**2.49**	**1.56**	**1.56**	**1.54**	**1.64**	**1.3**
Copper	36	**6.51**	**5.97**	**6.16**	**6.25**	< 5 U	**6.51**	**5.23**	**5.61**	**5.52**	**16.2**	**6.02**
Lead	50	**1.63**	< 1 U	**1.12**	< 1 U	< 1 U	**1.3**	< 1 U	**1.03**	< 1 U	**2.29**	< 1 U
Mercury	0.07	< 0.01 U	< 1 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U
Zinc	86	**15.7**	**11.4**	**14**	**12.7**	**12.3**	**13.4**	**13.5**	**12.8**	**12.7**	**20**	**12.7**
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)												
1-Methylnaphthalene	34	< 0.002 U	< 0.05 U	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.67	< 0.002 U	< 0.05 U	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Acenaphthene	0.5	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 UJ	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Acenaphthylene	1.3	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 UJ	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Anthracene	0.96	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 UJ	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Fluoranthene	1.7	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	**0.003 J**	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	**0.05**	< 0.002 U
Fluorene	0.54	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 UJ	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Naphthalene[1]	0.056	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 UJ	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Phenanthrene	1.5	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 UJ	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	**0.014**	< 0.002 U
Pyrene	2.6	< 0.002 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 UJ	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	**0.038**	< 0.002 U
Total cPAHs TEQ[1,2]	0.074	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00151 U	**0.0021 J**	--	--	--	< 0.00151 U	--	**0.018**	**0.0016**
Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)												
Pentachlorophenol[3]	0.05	--	< 0.5 U	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)												
Total PCBs Aroclors[4]	0.002	< 0.002 U	< 0.2 U	< 0.002 U	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	**0.0066**	< 0.002 U
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)												
Gasoline Range Organics	--	--	--	< 5 U	--	--	--	--	< 5 U	--	< 5 U	< 5 U
Diesel Range Organics	--	--	< 50 U	< 50 U	--	--	--	--	< 50 U	--	< 50 U	**310 X**
Motor Oil Range Organics	--	--	< 250 U	< 250 U	--	--	--	--	< 250 U	--	< 250 U	**1300**
G+D+O Range Organics[5]	1500	--	< 250 U	< 250 U	--	--			<250 U	--	<250 U	**1610 X**

Notes:

All concentrations are in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).

Bold - detected

Blue Shaded - Detected result exceeded remediation level

IAWP - Interim Action Work Plan (Aspect, 2020b)

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

J - Result value estimated

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation.

1. Remediation levels are the most-stringent Preliminary Cleanup Levels (PCULs) from the Preliminary Cleanup Levels Workbook for the Lower Duwamish Waterway (Ecology, 2020) or established empirically and approved by Ecology for the Interim Action. Empirically derived remediation levels for naphthalene and Total cPAHs TEQ are subject to post-interim action groundwater monitoring to be established as cleanup levels.

2. Carcinogenic PAHs total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene (total cPAH s TEQ) calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).

3. Interim action verification soil samples analyzed for pentachlorophenol in the one location pentachlorophenol was detected in groundwater. An analytical reporting limit of 0.05 mg/kg is achievable for PCP in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

4. An analytical reporting limit of 0.002 mg/kg is achievable by the laboratory for PCB Aroclors in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

5. A combined TPH remediation level is based on the generic direct contact cleanup level of 1,500 mg/kg that applies only if gasoline-range TPH is detected. (Ecology, 2017).

Table 2B. Analytical Results for Soil Remaining Landward of Shoring Wall (Saturated)

Project No. 150054, Snopac, Seattle, Washington

Location		B-A-1[6]	B-B-1[6]	B-C-1[6]	B-D-1[6]	B-E-1[6]	B-F-1[6]	B-G-1[6]	B-H-1[6]	B-I-1[6]	B-J-1[6]	B-K-1[6]	B-L-1[6]	SW-A-1	SW-B-1	SW-C-1	SW-D-1
Date		01/13/2021	01/13/2021	01/13/2021	01/12/2021	01/12/2021	01/12/2021	01/12/2021	01/12/2021	01/11/2021	01/13/2021	01/15/2021	01/11/2021	01/13/2021	01/13/2021	01/13/2021	01/12/2021
Sample		B-A-1-5	B-B-1-5	B-C-1-6	B-D-1-6	B-E-1-5.5	B-F-1-5	B-G-1-6	B-H-1-6	B-I-1-4.5	B-J-1-4	B-K-1-4.5	B-L-1-4	SW-A-1-8	SW-B-1-8	SW-C-1-9	SW-D-1-8
Depth (feet below ground surface)		11	11	10	10	10.5	11	10	10	11.5	12	11.5	12	8	8	7	8
Analyte	**Saturated Soil Remediation Level**																
Metals																	
Arsenic	7.3	**7.57**	**5**	**5.23**	**7.05**	**4.58**	**3.33**	**3.66**	**4.69**	**4.92 J**	**3.24**	**10.1**	**5.13 J**	**1.11**	**1.45**	**1.4**	**1.29**
Copper	36	**17.4**	**17.5**	**31.2**	**19.9**	**26.1**	**24.7**	**18.2**	**27**	**16.9**	**22.8**	**19.7**	**23.7**	**6.45**	**7.26**	**5.17**	**6.07**
Lead	50	**2.69**	**2.65**	**4.62**	**3.42**	**3.98**	**3.57**	**3.76**	**3.93**	**3.07**	**3.22**	**3.85**	**3.27**	< 1 U	< 1 U	**1.73**	**1.11**
Mercury	0.07	**0.032**	**0.026**	**0.042**	**0.035**	**0.046**	**0.035**	**0.029**	**0.04**	**0.028**	**0.033**	**0.036**	**0.036**	**0.016**	**0.01**	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U
Zinc	85	**15.9**	**20.1**	**23.9**	**27.9**	**20.4**	**19.9**	**21.8**	**22.5**	**20.9**	**20.3**	**23.9**	**26.1**	**48.3**	**29.3**	**21.3**	**14.6**
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)																	
1-Methylnaphthalene	34	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	**0.0038**	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.67	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	**0.004**	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Acenaphthene	0.028	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	**0.007**	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Acenaphthylene	1.3	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Anthracene	0.051	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	**0.0088**	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Fluoranthene	0.09	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	**0.056 J**	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.0021 J**	< 0.002 U
Fluorene	0.029	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	**0.006**	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Naphthalene[1]	0.056	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	**0.0057**	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.0021**	**0.0071**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Phenanthrene	1.5	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	**0.055**	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.0029**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Pyrene	0.14	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	**0.052**	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Total cPAHs TEQ[1,2]	0.074	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00604 U	**0.035**	< 0.00604 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	**0.005**	< 0.00302 U
Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)																	
Pentachlorophenol[3]	0.05	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB)																	
Total PCBs Aroclors[4]	0.002	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.004 UJ	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)																	
Gasoline-Range Organics	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	< 5 U	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Diesel-Range Organics	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	< 50 U	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Motor Oil-Range Organics	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	< 250 U	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
G+D+O Range Organics[5]	1500*		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	< 250 U	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Notes:

All concentrations are in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).

Bold - detected

Blue Shaded - Detected result exceeded remediation level

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

J - Result value estimated

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation.

HPAH = high-molecular weight PAH; LPAH = low-molecular weight PAH

1. Remediation levels are the most-stringent Preliminary Cleanup Levels (PCULs) from the Preliminary Cleanup Levels Workbook for the Lower Duwamish Waterway (Ecology, 2020) or established empirically and approved by Ecology for the Interim Action. Empirically derived remediation levels for naphthalene and Total cPAHs TEQ are subject to post-interim action groundwater monitoring to be established as cleanup levels.
2. Carcinogenic PAHs total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene (total cPAH s TEQ) calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).
3. Interim action verification soil samples analyzed for pentachlorophenol in the one location pentachlorphenol was detected in groundwater. An analytical reporting limit of 0.05 mg/kg is achievable for PCP in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.
4. An analytical reporting limit of 0.002 mg/kg is achievable by the laboratory for PCB Aroclors in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.
5. A combined TPH remediation level is based on the generic direct contact cleanup level of 1,500 mg/kg that applies only if gasoline-range TPH is detected. (Ecology, 2017).
6. Sample collected from the Estuarine Unit during the interim action. Samples B-J-1 and B-K-1 were collected 0.5-feet deeper than the upper estuarine unit surface.

Table 2B. Analytical Results for Soil Remaining Landward of Shoring Wall (Saturated)

Project No. 150054, Snopac, Seattle, Washington

Location		SW-E-1	SW-F-1	SW-G-1	SW-H-1	SW-I-1	SW-J-1	SW-K-1	SW-L-1	FB-1	FB-1A	FB-4	FB-4A	FB-6	FB-6A	FB-7	FB-7A	FB-8
Date		01/12/2021	01/12/2021	01/12/2021	01/12/2021	01/11/2021	01/11/2021	01/11/2021	01/11/2021	08/25/2011	10/05/2011	08/25/2011	10/05/2011	08/26/2011	10/05/2011	08/26/2011	10/05/2011	08/26/2011
Sample		SW-E-1-8	SW-F-1-8	SW-G-1-7	SW-H-1-9	SW-I-1-8	SW-J-1-8	SW-K-1-5	SW-L-1-8	082511-FB1-9.5	100511-FB1A-9.8	082511-FB4-8.7	100511-FB4A-9.7	082611-FB6-11.6	100511-FB6A-11.5	082611-FB7-11.8	100511-FB7A-11.8	082611-FB8-11.6
Depth (feet below ground surface)		8	8	9	7	8	8	8	8									
Analyte	**Saturated Soil Remediation Level**																	
Metals																		
Arsenic	7.3	**2.33**	**2.23**	**1.14**	**1.17**	**1.05 J**	**1.12 J**	**1.16 J**	**5.59 J**	< 3.3 U	--	< 3.5 U	--	**5.1**	--	**9.8**	--	**7.4**
Copper	36	**7.45**	**20.7**	**6.39**	**6.77**	**6.54**	**6.78**	**6.29**	**18.1**	**8**	--	**11**	--	**21**	--	**26**	--	**30**
Lead	50	**1.12**	**1.95**	**1.38**	**2.42**	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	**3.45**	< 1.7 U	--	< 1.8 U	--	**50**	--	**3.7**	--	**13**
Mercury	0.07	**0.015**	**0.028**	**0.01**	**0.018**	< 0.1 U	< 0.1 U	< 0.1 U	**0.041**	< 0.02 U	--	< 0.018 U	--	**0.038**	--	< 0.046 U	--	< 0.094 U
Zinc	85	**17.1**	**73**	**44**	**19**	**20.6**	**21.8**	**25.3**	**50.4**	**23**	--	**21**	--	**30**	--	**39**	--	**45**
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)																		
1-Methylnaphthalene	34	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.011**	< 0.0063 U	--	< 0.006 U	--	< 0.0078 U	--	< 0.0075 U	--	< 0.0088 U
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.67	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.0075**	< 0.0063 U	--	< 0.006 U	--	< 0.0078 U	--	< 0.0075 U	--	< 0.0088 U
Acenaphthene	0.028	< 0.002 U	**0.0032**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.036**	< 0.0063 U	< 0.0234 U	< 0.006 U	**0.046**	< 0.0078 U	< 0.0231 U	< 0.0075 U	< 0.0223 U	< 0.0088 U
Acenaphthylene	1.3	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.0063 U	< 0.0234 U	< 0.006 U	< 0.0188 U	< 0.0078 U	< 0.0231 U	< 0.0075 U	< 0.0223 U	< 0.0088 U
Anthracene	0.051	< 0.002 U	**0.008**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.0063 U	< 0.0234 U	< 0.006 U	**0.11**	< 0.0078 U	< 0.0231 U	< 0.0075 U	< 0.0223 U	< 0.0088 U
Fluoranthene	0.09	< 0.002 U	**0.064 J**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.064**	< 0.0063 U	< 0.0234 U	< 0.006 U	**0.43**	< 0.0078 U	< 0.0231 U	< 0.0075 U	< 0.0223 U	< 0.0088 U
Fluorene	0.029	< 0.002 U	**0.0046**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.018**	< 0.0063 U	< 0.0234 U	< 0.006 U	< 0.0188 U	< 0.0078 U	< 0.0231 U	< 0.0075 U	< 0.0223 U	< 0.0088 U
Naphthalene[1]	0.056	< 0.002 U	**0.0023**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.01**	< 0.0063 U	< 0.0234 U	< 0.006 U	< 0.0188 U	< 0.0078 U	< 0.0231 U	< 0.0075 U	< 0.0223 U	< 0.0088 U
Phenanthrene	1.5	< 0.002 U	**0.0088**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.0063 U	< 0.0234 U	< 0.006 U	**0.0499**	< 0.0078 U	< 0.0231 U	< 0.0075 U	< 0.0223 U	< 0.0088 U
Pyrene	0.14	< 0.002 U	**0.046**	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	**0.11**	< 0.0063 U	< 0.0234 U	< 0.006 U	**0.41**	< 0.0078 U	< 0.0231 U	< 0.0075 U	< 0.0223 U	< 0.0088 U
Total cPAHs TEQ[1,2]	0.074	< 0.00302 U	**0.052**	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	< 0.00302 U	**0.008**	< 0.005 U	< 0.018 U	< 0.005 U	**0.07**	< 0.006 U	< 0.018 U	< 0.006 U	< 0.017 U	< 0.007 U
Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)																		
Pentachlorophenol[3]	0.05	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB)																		
Total PCBs Aroclors[4]	0.002	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U	< 0.12 U	< 0.0000577 U	< 0.012 U	< 0.0000468 U	--	< 0.0000565 U	--	--	--
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)																		
Gasoline-Range Organics	--	--	--	--	--	< 5 U	--	--	--	< 10 U	< 19.2 U	--	--	--	--	< 14 U	< 18.1 U	< 9.9 U
Diesel-Range Organics	--	--	--	--	--	< 50 U	--	--	--	< 31 U	< 21.7 U	< 30 U	< 17.4 U	< 39 U	< 21.5 U	< 39 U	< 20.8 U	< 43 U
Motor Oil-Range Organics	--	--	--	--	--	< 250 U	--	--	--	< 63 U	**46.5**	< 60 U	< 34.9 U	< 79 U	**112**	< 78 U	< 41.6 U	< 86 U
G+D+O Range Organics[5]	1500*	--	--	--	--	< 250 U	--	--	--	< 63 U	**46.5**	--	--	--	--	< 78 U	< 41.6 U	< 86 U

Notes:

All concentrations are in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).

Bold - detected

Blue Shaded - Detected result exceeded remediation level

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

J - Result value estimated

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation.

HPAH = high-molecular weight PAH; LPAH = low-molecular weight PAH

1. Remediation levels are the most-stringent Preliminary Cleanup Levels (PCULs) from the Preliminary Cleanup Levels Workbook for the Lower Duwamish Waterway (Ecology, 2020) or established empirically and approved by Ecology for the Interim Action. Empirically derived remediation levels for naphthalene and Total cPAHs TEQ are subject to post-interim action groundwater monitoring to be established as cleanup levels.

2. Carcinogenic PAHs total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene (total cPAH s TEQ) calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).

3. Interim action verification soil samples analyzed for pentachlorophenol in the one location pentachlorphenol was detected in groundwater. An analytical reporting limit of 0.05 mg/kg is achievable for PCP in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

4. An analytical reporting limit of 0.002 mg/kg is achievable by the laboratory for PCB Aroclors in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

5. A combined TPH remediation level is based on the generic direct contact cleanup level of 1,500 mg/kg that applies only if gasoline-range TPH is detected. (Ecology, 2017).

6. Sample collected from the Estuarine Unit during the interim action. Samples B-J-1 and B-K-1 were collected 0.5-feet deeper than the upper estuarine unit surface.

Table 2B. Analytical Results for Soil Remaining Landward of Shoring Wall (Saturated)

Project No. 150054, Snopac, Seattle, Washington

Location		FB-8A	MW-8	MW-10	MW-10	MW-12	MW-12	SB-1	SB-2	SB-2	SB-3	SB-4	SB-4	SB-5	SB-6	SB-7	SB-8	SB-8
Date		10/05/2011	01/25/2017	01/25/2017	01/25/2017	01/26/2017	01/26/2017	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019	08/26/2019
Sample		100511-FB8A-11.7	MW8-15.5-16.5	MW10-5-6	MW10-15.5-16.5	MW12-11-12	MW12-17.5-18.5	SB1-10-11	SB2-10.5-11.5	SB2-13-14	SB3-10-11	SB4-8-9	SB4-13-14	SB5-9-10	SB6-10.5-11.5	SB7-10-11	SB8-10.5-11.5	SB8-13-14
Depth (feet below ground surface)																		
Analyte	Saturated Soil Remediation Level																	
Metals																		
Arsenic	7.3	--	**5.01**	**12.9**	**3.29**	**8**	< 5 U	**1.77**	**3.06**	--	**2.62**	**1.65**	--	**1.57**	**2.37**	**1.86**	**1.27**	--
Copper	36	--	**25.2**	**28**	**14.6**	**24**	**5.08**	**5.89**	**10.2**	--	**8.95**	**5.64**	--	**5.7**	**8.14**	**7**	**5.71**	--
Lead	50	--	**3.95**	**49.4**	**2.4**	**2.84**	< 1 U	**1.01**	**1.68**	--	**1.4**	**1.11**	--	**1.07**	**1.24**	< 1 U	< 1 U	--
Mercury	0.07	--	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 0.01 U	**0.014**	--	**0.016**	**0.12**	**0.032**	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	--
Zinc	85	--	**26.3**	**393**	**20.7**	**17.5**	**12.7**	**13.4**	**17.4**	--	**16.3**	**15.2**	--	**16.9**	**16.5**	**13.3**	**13.4**	--
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)																		
1-Methylnaphthalene	34	--	--	**0.07**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.67	--	--	**0.076**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Acenaphthene	0.028	< 0.0293 U	--	< 0.01 U	--	--	--	--	**0.0087 J**	< 0.002 UJ	--	< 0.002 U	--	--	--	--	**0.003 J**	< 0.002 UJ
Acenaphthylene	1.3	< 0.0293 U	--	< 0.01 U	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 UJ	--	< 0.002 U	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 UJ	< 0.002 UJ
Anthracene	0.051	< 0.0293 U	--	**0.015**	--	--	--	--	**0.0033 J**	< 0.002 UJ	--	< 0.002 U	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 UJ	< 0.002 UJ
Fluoranthene	0.09	< 0.0293 U	--	**0.13**	--	--	--	--	**0.034 J**	< 0.002 UJ	--	< 0.002 U	--	--	--	--	**0.0051 J**	< 0.002 UJ
Fluorene	0.029	< 0.0293 U	--	**0.014**	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 UJ	< 0.002 UJ	--	< 0.002 U	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 UJ	< 0.002 UJ
Naphthalene[1]	0.056	< 0.0293 U	--	**0.056**	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 UJ	--	< 0.002 U	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 UJ	< 0.002 UJ
Phenanthrene	1.5	< 0.0293 U	--	**0.13**	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 UJ	< 0.002 UJ	--	< 0.002 U	--	--	--	--	**0.0033 J**	< 0.002 UJ
Pyrene	0.14	< 0.0293 U	--	**0.12**	--	--	--	--	**0.024 J**	< 0.002 UJ	--	< 0.002 U	--	--	--	--	**0.0038 J**	< 0.002 UJ
Total cPAHs TEQ[1,2]	0.074	**0.024**	--	**0.074**	--	--	--	--	**0.00598 J**	< 0.00151 UJ	--	< 0.00151 U	--	--	--	--	< 0.00151 UJ	< 0.00151 UJ
Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)																		
Pentachlorophenol[3]	0.05	--	--	< 0.5 U	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB)																		
Total PCBs Aroclors[4]	0.002	--	--	< 0.2 U	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	--	< 0.002 U	--	--	--	--	< 0.002 U	< 0.002 U
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)																		
Gasoline-Range Organics	--	< 25.4 U	--	--	--	--	--	--	< 5 U	--	--	< 5 U	--	--	--	--	--	--
Diesel-Range Organics	--	< 27.3 U	< 50 U	< 50 U	< 50 U	< 50 U	< 50 U	--	< 50 U	--	--	< 50 U	--	--	--	--	--	--
Motor Oil-Range Organics	--	**116**	< 250 U	< 250 U	< 250 U	< 250 U	< 250 U	--	< 250 U	--	--	< 250 U	--	--	--	--	--	--
G+D+O Range Organics[5]	1500*	**116**	--	--	--	--	--	--	< 250 U	--	--	< 250 U	--	--	--	--	--	--

Notes:

All concentrations are in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).

Bold - detected

Blue Shaded - Detected result exceeded remediation level

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

J - Result value estimated

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation.

HPAH = high-molecular weight PAH; LPAH = low-molecular weight PAH

1. Remediation levels are the most-stringent Preliminary Cleanup Levels (PCULs) from the Preliminary Cleanup Levels Workbook for the Lower Duwamish Waterway (Ecology, 2020) or established empirically and approved by Ecology for the Interim Action. Empirically derived remediation levels for naphthalene and Total cPAHs TEQ are subject to post-interim action groundwater monitoring to be established as cleanup levels.
2. Carcinogenic PAHs total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene (total cPAH s TEQ) calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).
3. Interim action verification soil samples analyzed for pentachlorophenol in the one location pentachlorphenol was detected in groundwater. An analytical reporting limit of 0.05 mg/kg is achievable for PCP in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.
4. An analytical reporting limit of 0.002 mg/kg is achievable by the laboratory for PCB Aroclors in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.
5. A combined TPH remediation level is based on the generic direct contact cleanup level of 1,500 mg/kg that applies only if gasoline-range TPH is detected. (Ecology, 2017).
6. Sample collected from the Estuarine Unit during the interim action. Samples B-J-1 and B-K-1 were collected 0.5-feet deeper than the upper estuarine unit surface.

Table 3. Statistical Compliance Summary for Upland Soil

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

	Remediation Levels (mg/kg)			Exceedance Frequency (must be <10%)		Exceedance Factor (must be ≤2)		95% Upper Confidence Limit (UCL) Concentration (mg/kg)	
Indicator Hazardous Substance	Vadose Zone Soil	Saturated Zone Soil	Number of Samples	Number of Samples Exceeding Remediation Level	Frequency of Exceedance	Maximum Remaining Concentration (mg/kg)	Exceedance Factor for Maximum Concentration	95% UCL Concentration (mg/kg)[1]	Notes
Metals									
Arsenic	7.3	7.3	75	7	9%	12.9	1.8	4.070	Data do not follow a discernable distribution; Maximum 95% UCL selected
Copper	36	36	73	0	0%	--	--	--	
Lead	50	50	73	0	0%	--	--	--	
Mercury	0.07	0.07	74	3	4%	0.13	1.9	0.0295	Detected results appear Approximate Gamma Distributed at 5% confidence Level
Zinc	86	85	73	2	3%	393	4.6	31.36	Data do not follow a discernable distribution; Maximum 95% UCL selected
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)									
1-Methylnaphthalene	34	34	67	0	0%	--		--	
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.67	0.67	67	0	0%	--		--	
Acenaphthene	0.5	0.028	67	2	3%	0.046	1.6	0.00393	Detected results appear Approximate Gamma Distributed at 5% confidence Level
Acenaphthylene	1.3	1.3	67	0	0%	--	--	--	
Anthracene	0.96	0.051	67	1	1%	0.11	2.2	0.0036	Detected results appear Normal Distributed at 5% confidence Level
Fluoranthene	1.7	0.09	67	2	3%	0.43	4.8	0.0233	Data do not follow a discernable distribution; Maximum 95% UCL selected
Fluorene	0.54	0.029	67	0	0%	--	--	--	
Naphthalene	0.056	0.056	67	2	3%	0.093	1.7	0.0141	Detected results appear Lognormal at 5% confidence Level; max 95% lognormal UCL selecte
Phenanthrene	1.5	1.5	67	0	0%	--	--	--	
Pyrene	2.6	0.14	67	1	1%	0.41	2.9	0.0435	Data do not follow a discernable distribution; Maximum 95% UCL selected
Total cPAHs TEQ[3]	0.074	0.074	67	0	0%	--	--	--	
Semivolatile Organic Compounds									
Pentachlorophenol	0.05	0.05	4	0	0%	--	--	--	
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)									
Total PCB Aroclors	0.002	0.002	60	4	7%	0.0066	3.3	0.00097	Data do not follow a discernable distribution; Maximum 95% UCL selected
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)									
Gasoline-Range Organics	1,500	1,500	2	0	0%	--	--	--	
Diesel-Range Organics									
Motor Oil-Range Organics									

Notes:

mg/kg - milligrams per kilogram

1. EPA software ProUCL v. 5.1 was used to calculate the 95% Upper Confidence Limit for analytes that exceed remediation levels. In accordance with PROUCL guidelines, outliers were removed from the UCL estimates.

2. -- : No exceedances so exceedance magnitude and 95% UCL not calculated.

3. Carcinogenic PAHs total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene (total cPAH s TEQ) calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).

J - Result value estimated

Table 4. Groundwater Analytical Results

Project No. 150054. Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

			FILL UNIT									
		Location	MW-12	MW-12	MW-12	MW-12	MW-12	MW-12	MW-13	MW-13	MW-13	MW-13
		Date	02/07/2017	01/28/2018	06/29/2021	11/10/2021	01/17/2022	04/13/2022	06/25/2021	11/11/2021	01/18/2022	04/14/2022
Analyte	Unit	PCUL										
Metals												
Arsenic	ug/L	8	**1.1**	**2.19**	**23.7**	**4.46**	**2.22**	**2.09**	**2.97**	**2.43**	< 1 U	< 1 U
Copper	ug/L	3.1	< 5 U	< 5 U	< 1 U	< 2 U	**3.2**	< 3 U	**4.03**	**2.58**	< 2.5 U	< 3 U
Lead	ug/L	5.6	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U
Mercury	ug/L	0.025	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U
Nickel	ug/L	8.2	**5.08**	**3.27**	**14.1**	**13.2**	**10.8**	**4.24**	**42.6**	**35.3**	**6.57**	**2.92**
Zinc	ug/L	81	< 5 U	< 5 U	**1.99 J**	< 5 U	**6.36**	< 5 U	**161 J**	**147**	**26**	**6.45**
Organometallic												
Tributyltin	ug/L		--	--	< 0.35 U	< 0.35 U	< 0.35 U	< 0.32 UJ	< 0.33 U	< 0.334 U	< 0.37 U	< 0.31 UJ
SVOCs												
Pentachlorophenol[(1)]	ug/L	0.05	< 2 U	< 2 U	--	--	--		< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U
PAHs												
1-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L	800	< 0.2 U	< 0.2 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	**0.072**	**0.55**	**0.62**	**0.072**
2-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L	14	< 0.2 U	< 0.2 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	**0.19**	**0.088**	< 0.05 U
Acenaphthene	ug/L	5.3	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	**0.007**	**0.091**	< 0.005 U	**0.006**	**3.4**	**1.3**	**1.8**	**0.55**
Acenaphthylene	ug/L		< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	**0.08**	**0.028**	**0.035**	**0.012**
Anthracene	ug/L	2.1	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	**0.095**	**0.034**	**0.029**	**0.011**
Fluoranthene	ug/L	1.8	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	**0.029**	**0.024**	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	**0.86**	**0.058**	**0.035**	**0.013**
Fluorene	ug/L	3.7	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	**1.1**	**0.26**	**0.5**	**0.05**
Naphthalene	ug/L	1.4	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	**0.016**	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	**0.005**	**1.5**	**0.71**	**0.37**
Phenanthrene	ug/L		< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	**0.022**	**0.016 J**	**0.0076**	**0.0077**	**0.014**	**0.038 J**	**0.2**	**0.027**
Pyrene	ug/L	2	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	**0.031**	**0.028**	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	**0.56**	**0.034**	**0.024**	**0.01**
Total cPAHs TEQ [1,2]	ug/L	0.008	< 0.02265 U	< 0.02265 U	**0.02018**	**0.01937**	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	**0.00909**	**0.00838**	**0.01178**	**0.00761**
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)												
Total PCBs (Sum of Aroclors)[(1,3)]	ug/L	0.005	< 0.1 U	< 0.1 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
TPHs												
Diesel Range Organics	ug/L	500	< 50 U	**110 X**	--	--	--	--	**230 X**	**230 X**	**220 X**	**210 X**
Motor Oil Range Organics	ug/L	500	< 250 U	**290**	--	--	--	--	< 250 U	< 250 U	< 250 U	< 250 U
Extended Range Organics	ug/L	500	< 250 U	**400 X**	--	--	--	--	**230 X**	**230 X**	**220 X**	**210 X**

Notes:

Bold - detected

Gray Shaded - Sampling events occurred prior to the interim action in 2020

Blue Shaded - Detected result or non-detected RL exceeded PCUL

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

TBT results UJ due to assorted low-bias QC issues. Non-detects may not be definitive.

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation

FD - Field Duplicate QC sample

D - Dissolved Fraction (filtered) sample result

T - Total Fraction (unfiltered) sample result

cPAHs = carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons

"--" - indicates results not available

µg/L = microgram per liter

ND = 1/2 RDL - calculated using 1/2 the reporting limit for non-detected components

ND = 1 - calculated using the reporting limit value for non-detected components

PCUL = Preliminary Cleanup Level

1. Most stringent screening levels are the most stringent preliminary cleanup levels (PCULs) for groundwater (GWs #2-5) established by the May 2021 LDW Preliminary Cleanup Level Workbook (Ecology, 2021).

2. The Laboratory Method Reporting Limit (MRL) is the Practical Quantitation Limit (PQL), as per WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), for purposes of this monitoring program. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the groundwater PCULs are established at the PQL.

3. TEQ: Total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene, calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e). The total cPAH TEQ PCUL incorporates TEF values for each individual cPAH and is set at the PQL.

4. Total PCBs is the sum of detected Aroclor concentrations.

Table 4. Groundwater Analytical Results

Project No. 150054. Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

			FILL UNIT										
		Location	MW-15	MW-15	MW-15	MW-15	MW-16	MW-16	MW-16	MW-16	MW-17	MW-17	MW-17	MW-17
		Date	06/25/2021	11/11/2021	01/18/2022	04/14/2022	06/25/2021	11/11/2021	01/18/2022	04/14/2022	06/25/2021	11/10/2021	01/17/2022	04/13/2022
Analyte	Unit	PCUL												
Metals														
Arsenic	ug/L	8	**5.55**	**3.63**	**1.04**	**5.28**	**24.1**	**8.93**	**2.25**	**1.39**	< 1 U	**1.92**	< 1 U	**1.03**
Copper	ug/L	3.1	**3.76**	**4.78**	**5.55**	**3.92**	**4.54**	**4.63**	**6.49**	**3.27**	< 1 U	**2.19**	**7.2**	< 3 U
Lead	ug/L	5.6	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	**3.43**	< 1 U
Mercury	ug/L	0.025	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	**0.01**	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	**0.011**	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U
Nickel	ug/L	8.2	**12.9**	**14.8**	**7.05**	**9.51**	**10**	**20.6**	**7.65**	**4.9**	**2.19**	**2.03**	**1.36**	**1.98**
Zinc	ug/L	81	**4.57 J**	< 5 U	**4.64**	< 5 U	**5.07 J**	< 5 U	**4.56**	**18.3**	**5.85 J**	< 5 U	**23.1**	< 5 U
Organometallic														
Tributyltin	ug/L		< 0.35 U	< 0.32 U	< 0.37 U	< 0.32 UJ	< 0.35 U	< 0.32 U	< 0.36 U	< 0.31 UJ	< 0.35 U	< 0.35 U	< 0.36 U	< 0.33 UJ
SVOCs														
Pentachlorophenol[(1)]	ug/L	0.05	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PAHs														
1-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L	800	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U
2-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L	14	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U
Acenaphthene	ug/L	5.3	**0.013**	< 0.005 U	**0.0051**	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	**0.0067**	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
Acenaphthylene	ug/L		< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
Anthracene	ug/L	2.1	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
Fluoranthene	ug/L	1.8	**0.012**	< 0.005 U	**0.012**	< 0.005 U	**0.0065**	< 0.005 U	**0.005**	< 0.005 U	**0.0065**	< 0.005 U	**0.0055**	< 0.005 U
Fluorene	ug/L	3.7	**0.005**	< 0.005 U	**0.0058**	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
Naphthalene	ug/L	1.4	**0.011**	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	**0.015**	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U
Phenanthrene	ug/L		**0.016**	**0.0069 J**	**0.025**	< 0.005 U	**0.014**	**0.0066 J**	**0.01**	< 0.005 U	**0.012**	**0.0072 J**	**0.0082**	< 0.005 U
Pyrene	ug/L	2	**0.012**	< 0.005 U	**0.011**	< 0.005 U	**0.008**	< 0.005 U	**0.005**	< 0.005 U	**0.006**	< 0.005 U	**0.0053**	< 0.005 U
Total cPAHs TEQ [1,2]	ug/L	0.008	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)														
Total PCBs (Sum of Aroclors)[(1,3)]	ug/L	0.005	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
TPHs														
Diesel Range Organics	ug/L	500	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Motor Oil Range Organics	ug/L	500	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Extended Range Organics	ug/L	500	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Notes:

Bold - detected

Gray Shaded - Sampling events occurred prior to the interim action in 2020

Blue Shaded - Detected result or non-detected RL exceeded PCUL

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

TBT results UJ due to assorted low-bias QC issues. Non-detects may not be definitive.

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation

FD - Field Duplicate QC sample

D - Dissolved Fraction (filtered) sample result

T - Total Fraction (unfiltered) sample result

cPAHs = carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons

"--" - indicates results not available

µg/L = microgram per liter

ND = 1/2 RDL - calculated using 1/2 the reporting limit for non-detected components

ND = 1 - calculated using the reporting limit value for non-detected components

PCUL = Preliminary Cleanup Level

1. Most stringent screening levels are the most stringent preliminary cleanup levels (PCULs) for groundwater (GWs #2-5) established by the May 2021 LDW Preliminary Cleanup Level Workbook (Ecology, 2021).

2. The Laboratory Method Reporting Limit (MRL) is the Practical Quantitation Limit (PQL), as per WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), for purposes of this monitoring program. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the groundwater PCULs are established at the PQL.

3. TEQ: Total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene, calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e). The total cPAH TEQ PCUL incorporates TEF values for each individual cPAH and is set at the PQL.

4. Total PCBs is the sum of detected Aroclor concentrations.

Table 4. Groundwater Analytical Results

Project No. 150054. Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

			ALLUVIUM UNIT									
		Location	MW-14	MW-14	MW-14	MW-14	MW-8	MW-8	MW-8	MW-8	MW-8	MW-8
		Date	06/25/2021	11/10/2021	01/17/2022	04/13/2022	02/08/2017	01/29/2018	06/25/2021	11/10/2021	01/17/2022	4/13/2022
Analyte	Unit	PCUL										
Metals												
Arsenic	ug/L	8	**1.03**	**1.15**	**1.08**	< 1 U	**2.42**	**1.35**	**1.17**	**1.19**	< 1 U	< 1 U
Copper	ug/L	3.1	< 1 U	**18.2**	< 2.5 U	< 3 U	< 5 U	< 5 U	< 1 U	< 2 U	< 2.5 U	< 3 U
Lead	ug/L	5.6	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 1 U
Mercury	ug/L	0.025	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 1 U	< 1 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U	< 0.01 U
Nickel	ug/L	8.2	**2.79**	**7.07**	**4.96**	**3.43**	**3.53**	**2.17**	**1.74**	**2.49**	**2.77**	**1.63**
Zinc	ug/L	81	**1.62 J**	**12.9**	**6.09**	< 5 U	< 5 U	< 5 U	< 1 UJ	< 5 U	**6.49**	< 5 U
Organometallic												
Tributyltin	ug/L		< 0.34 U	< 0.70 U	< 0.36 U	< 0.33 UJ	--	--	< 0.34 U	< 0.36 U	< 0.36 U	< 0.32 UJ
SVOCs												
Pentachlorophenol[(1)]	ug/L	0.05	--	--	--	--	< 2 U	< 2 U	--	--	--	--
PAHs												
1-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L	800	**0.12**	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.2 U	< 0.2 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U
2-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L	14	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.2 U	< 0.2 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U
Acenaphthene	ug/L	5.3	**0.87**	**0.98**	**1.3**	**1.1**	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
Acenaphthylene	ug/L		**0.0055**	< 0.005 U	**0.0081**	**0.0068**	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
Anthracene	ug/L	2.1	**0.039**	**0.034**	**0.027**	**0.028**	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
Fluoranthene	ug/L	1.8	**0.11**	**0.18**	**0.16**	**0.21**	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
Fluorene	ug/L	3.7	**0.1**	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
Naphthalene	ug/L	1.4	**0.62**	**0.11**	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	**0.0068**	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U	< 0.05 U
Phenanthrene	ug/L		**0.092**	**0.04**	**0.056**	**0.053**	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	**0.0085**	< 0.005 U	**0.0065**	< 0.005 U
Pyrene	ug/L	2	**0.11**	**0.14**	**0.12**	**0.16**	< 0.03 U	< 0.03 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
Total cPAHs TEQ [1,2]	ug/L	0.008	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.02265 U	< 0.02265 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U	< 0.00755 U
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)												
Total PCBs (Sum of Aroclors)[(1,3)]	ug/L	0.005	< 0.005 U	**0.0168 J**	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.1 U	< 0.1 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U	< 0.005 U
TPHs												
Diesel Range Organics	ug/L	500	--	--	--	--	**110 X**	**100 X**	--	--	--	--
Motor Oil Range Organics	ug/L	500	--	--	--	--	< 250 U	< 250 U	--	--	--	--
Extended Range Organics	ug/L	500	--	--	--	--	**110 X**	**100 X**	--	--	--	--

Notes:

Bold - detected

Gray Shaded - Sampling events occurred prior to the interim action in 2020

Blue Shaded - Detected result or non-detected RL exceeded PCUL

U - Analyte not detected at or above Reporting Limit (RL) shown

UJ - Analyte not detected and the Reporting Limit (RL) is an estimate

TBT results UJ due to assorted low-bias QC issues. Non-detects may not be definitive.

X - Chromatographic pattern does not match fuel standard used for quantitation

FD - Field Duplicate QC sample

D - Dissolved Fraction (filtered) sample result

T - Total Fraction (unfiltered) sample result

cPAHs = carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons

"--" - indicates results not available

µg/L = microgram per liter

ND = 1/2 RDL - calculated using 1/2 the reporting limit for non-detected components

ND = 1 - calculated using the reporting limit value for non-detected components

PCUL = Preliminary Cleanup Level

1. Most stringent screening levels are the most stringent preliminary cleanup levels (PCULs) for groundwater (GWs #2-5) established by the May 2021 LDW Preliminary Cleanup Level Workbook (Ecology, 2021).

2. The Laboratory Method Reporting Limit (MRL) is the Practical Quantitation Limit (PQL), as per WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), for purposes of this monitoring program. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the groundwater PCULs are established at the PQL.

3. TEQ: Total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene, calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e). The total cPAH TEQ PCUL incorporates TEF values for each individual cPAH and is set at the PQL.

4. Total PCBs is the sum of detected Aroclor concentrations.

Table 5. Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements

Project No. 150054. Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

Topic	Standard or Requirement	Regulatory Citation		Comment
		Federal	State	
Cleanup Requirements	Evaluation and conduct of cleanup actions		MTCA Cleanup Regulation (WAC 173-340)	Cleanup activities at the Site is being conducted under formal oversight by Ecology under Agreed Order. After completion of the Agreed Order requirements, the final uplands cleanup action will also be conducted under formal oversight by Ecology.
Land Disposal of Waste	Disposal of materials containing PCBs	Toxic Substances Control Act (15 USC 2605; 40 CFR Part 761)	--	--
	Hazardous or Dangerous waste	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Land Disposal Restrictions (42 USC 7401-7642; 40 CFR 268)	Dangerous Waste Regulations Land Disposal Restrictions (RCW 70.105; WAC 173-303, 140- 141)	--
Waste Treatment Storage and Disposal	Disposal limitations	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 USC 7401-7642;40 CFR 264 and 265)	Washington State Dangerous Waste Regulations (RCW 70.105; WAC 173-303)	--
Solid Waste Disposal	Requirements for solid waste handling management and disposal	Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 USC 215103259-6901-6991; 40 CFR 257-258)	Solid Waste Handling Standards (RCW 70.95; WAC 173-350)	--
Discharge to Surface Water	Point source standards for new discharges to surface water	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (40 CFR 122, 125)	Ecology Water Quality Construction Discharge Permit Program (RCW 90.48; WAC 173-216, 222)	For any uplands cleanup construction discharges to surface water, they will comply with Ecology Water Quality Program permit and discharge requirements.
Shoreline	Construction and development	--	Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58; WAC 173-16); King County and City of Seattle Shoreline Master Plans (KCC Title 25; SMC 23.60); Ecology Shoreline Variance Permit (Chapter 173-27-170)	The completed IA obtained a shoreline variance permit which included review for compliance with all local and state regulation criteria. Other cleanup construction on the shoreface will require the same permit and compliance review.
Construction Water Management	Discharges to public owned treatment works; National pretreatment Standards;	40 CFR Part 403	King County Industrial Wastewater Discharge Authorizations (Local)	The completed IA obtained and complied with King County Wastewater Discharge Authorization No. 1092-01 for permitted discharge of temporary dewatering to public treatment works.
Air	Air Quality		Washington Clean Air Act (RCW 70.94; WAC 173-400; WAC 173-460)	
Cultural Resources		Archeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USCA 496a-1)	Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP)	Ground disturbing cleanup construction activities require an Inadvertent Discovery Plan to guide monitoring and notifications required for discovery of cultural artifacts.
Construction Safety	Worker Safety and Health	Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)	Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act (WISHA) regulations (29 CFR 1910.120; Chapter 296-62 WAC)	
Environmental Impact Review	State Environmental Policy Act	--	State Environmental Policy Act RCW 43.21C; WAC 197-11-790)	Ecology will be lead SEPA agency and review planned environmental construction activities and determine if any environmental impact assessment is required, or issue a determination of non-significance.

Notes:

ARAR = applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement
Ecology = Washington State Department of Ecology
EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
LDW = Lower Duwamish Waterway
MCL = maximum contaminant level
MTCA = Model Toxics Control Act
NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act
PCB = polychlorinated biphenyl
SEPA = State Environmental Policy Act
-- = not applicable

Table 6. Soil Cleanup Levels

Project 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

DRAFT

Constituent	Most Stringent PCUL		Practical Quantitation Level (PQL)	Interim Action Remediation Levels		Soil Cleanup Levels	
	Vadose Zone Soil	Saturated Zone Soil		Vadose Zone Soil	Saturated Zone Soil	Vadose Zone Soil	Saturated Zone Soil
Metals							
Arsenic	7.3	7.3	1	--	--	7.3	7.3
Copper	36	36	1	--	--	36	36
Lead	50	50	1	--	--	50	50
Mercury	0.07	0.07	0.01	--	--	0.07	0.07
Zinc	86	85	1	--	--	86	85
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH)							
1-Methylnaphthalene	34	34	0.002	--	--	34	34
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.67	0.67	0.002	--	--	0.67	0.67
Acenaphthene	0.5	0.028	0.002	--	--	0.5	0.028
Acenaphthylene	1.3	1.3	0.002	--	--	1.3	1.3
Anthracene	0.96	0.051	0.002	--	--	0.96	0.051
Fluoranthene	1.7	0.09	0.002	--	--	1.7	0.09
Fluorene	0.54	0.029	0.002	--	--	0.54	0.029
Naphthalene[1]	0.039	0.0021	0.002	0.056	0.056	0.056	0.056
Phenanthrene	1.5	1.5	0.002			1.5	1.5
Pyrene	2.6	0.14	0.002			2.6	0.14
Total cPAHs TEQ[1,2]	0.00031	0.000016	0.003	0.074	0.074	0.074	0.074
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB)3							
Total PCB Aroclors	0.000043	0.0000022	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002

Notes:

All concentrations are in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).

Most stringency PCUL from the PCUL Document for the Lower Duwamish Waterway (Ecology, 2021) and the TPH PCUL is based on the generic direct contact cleanup level of 1,500 mg/kg (Ecology, 2017). The Interim Action Soil Remediation Levels in the Final Interim Action Report (Aspect, 2021d).

1. Remediation Level based on empirical demonstration of groundwater protectiveness (Aspect, 2021d).
2. TEQ: Total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene, calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).
3. An analytical report limit of 0.002 mg/kg is achievable by the laboratory for PCB Aroclors in soil. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the soil remediation level is established at this practical quantitation limit.

Table 7. Groundwater Cleanup Levels

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

Constituent	Most Stringent PCUL[1]	Practical Quantification Limit (PQL)[2]	Groundwater Cleanup Level
Metals - Dissolved			
Arsenic	8	*1*	8
Copper	3.1	*1*	3.1
Lead	5.6	*1*	5.6
Mercury	0.025	*0.01*	0.025
Nickel	8.2	*1*	8.2
Zinc	81	*1*	81
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)			
1-Methylnaphthalene	800	*0.05*	800
2-Methylnaphthalene	14	*0.05*	14
Acenaphthene	5.3	*0.005*	5.3
Acenaphthylene	--	*0.005*	--
Anthracene	2.1	*0.005*	2.1
Fluoranthene	1.8	*0.005*	1.8
Fluorene	3.7	*0.005*	3.7
Naphthalene	1.4	*0.005*	1.4
Phenanthrene	--	*0.005*	--
Pyrene	2	*0.005*	2
Total cPAHs TEQ[3]	0.0049	*0.008*[4]	0.008
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)			
Total PCB Aroclors	0.000007	*0.005*	0.005

Notes:

All concentrations are in milligrams per liter (ug/L).

1. Most stringent screening levels are the most stringent preliminary cleanup levels (PCULs) for non-potable groundwater established by the Ecology PCUL Document (Ecology, 2021).

2. In accordance with WAC 173-340-700(6)(d), the groundwater CUL will be established at the PQL.

3. TEQ: Total toxic equivalent concentration of benzo(a)pyrene, calculated in accordance with WAC 173-340-708(8)(e).

4. The total cPAH TEQ RL incorporates TEF values for each individual cPAH.

Table 8. Remedial Technology Identification for Site COCs

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

	Metals		Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)		Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)
Remedial Technologies	**Soil**	**Groundwater**	**Soil**	**Groundwater**	**Soil**
Removal					
Off-Site Treatment/Disposal	X		X		X
On-Site (Ex Situ) Pre-Treatment/Off-site Disposal	X		X		X
On-Site Treatment and Reuse	X		X		
***In Situ* Containment Technologies**					
Capping	X		X		X
Impermeable Barriers for Groundwater Containment		X		X	
***In Situ* Treatment Technologies**		s			
Physical Treatment	X	X	X	X	
Chemical Treatment	X	X	X	X	
Biological Treatment		X	X	X	
Monitored Natural Attenuation		X		X	
Groundwater Extraction and Treatment		X		X	X
Institutional Controls	X	X	X	X	X

Notes:

X = Contaminant/media for which remedial technology is potentially applicable

Technology retained for remedial alternative development

Table 9. Remedial Alternative Cost Estimate Summary

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

Remedial Alternative	Estimated Capital Cost	Estimated O&M Period (years)	Estimated Total Cost
1) SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Partial Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater MNA, Ics	$ 3,997,000	10	$ 4,360,000
2) SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater MNA, and Ics	$ 4,452,000	10	$ 4,810,000
3) SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater Treatment and MNA, and Ics	$ 4,788,000	7	$ 5,020,000

Notes:

1. Estimated cost are in 2021 dollars. All costs include the completed Interim Action sunk costs. The estimated future costs are preliminary, Feasibility Study-level estimates based on existing information and are estimated to be within +50/-30% of actual costs.

MNA = groundwater monitored natural attenuation

ICs = Institutional Controls

Table 10. Disproportionate Cost Analysis

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

	MTCA Description of DCA Criterion (WAC 173-340-360(3)(f))		Alternative 1 SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Partial Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater MNA, Ics	Alternative 2 SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater MNA, and Ics	Alternative 3 SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater Treatment and MNA, and Ics
(1) OVERALL PROTECTIVENESS	*Overall protectiveness of human health and the environment, including the degree to which existing risks are reduced, time required to reduce risk and attain cleanup standards, on-site and offsite risks resulting from implementation, and improvement of the overall environmental quality.*		Alternative 1 provides a high degree of protectiveness by removal of the source of contamination at the Site, the SBG-containing fill remaining on the shoreface.	The wood pilings do no represent an exposure risk, and therefore the removal of wood pilings do not provide any additional protectiveness.	The active treatment of Fill Unit groundwater is capable of reducing the time to reach groundwater cleanup standards relative to MNA alone in Alternatives 1 and 2.
	Score[1]		8	8	9
	Weighted Score[2]	**30%**	**2.4**	**2.4**	**2.7**
(2) PERMANENCE	*The degree of permanent reduction in toxicity, mobility or volume of hazardous substances, including the adequacy of the alternative in destroying the hazardous substances, the reduction or elimination of hazardous substance releases and sources of releases, the degree of irreversibility of waste treatment process, and the characteristics and quantity of treatment residuals generated.*		Alternative 1 provides a high degree of permanence by removal of the source of contamination at the Site, the SBG-containing fill remaining on the shoreface. Removal is the permanent remedial solution.	Removal of the wood pilings does represent a slight increase in permanence, by removing a potential source of contamination.	Alternative 3 provides nominal incremental permanence relative to Alternatives 1 and 2.
	Score[1]		7	8	9
	Weighted Score[2]	**20%**	**1.4**	**1.6**	**1.8**
(3) LONG-TERM EFFECTIVENESS	*Long-term effectiveness includes the degree of certainty that the alternative will be successful, long-term reliability, the magnitude of residual risk, and the effectiveness of controls required to manage treatment residues or remaining wastes.*		Alternative 1 is effective in the long-term by permanently removing the source of contamination at the Site.	Removal of the wood pilings does represent a slight increase in long-term effectiveness, by removing a potential source of contamination.	MNA of Fill Unit groundwater is expected to be effective long-term at the Site once the SBG-containing fill is removed. The use of treatment to enhance MNA of Fill Unit groundwater does not provide any incremental long-term effectiveness.
	Score[1]		7	8	8
	Weighted Score[2]	**20%**	**1.4**	**1.6**	**1.6**

Table 10. Disproportionate Cost Analysis

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington


	MTCA Description of DCA Criterion (WAC 173-340-360(3)(f))		Alternative 1 SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Partial Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater MNA, Ics	Alternative 2 SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater MNA, and Ics	Alternative 3 SBG-Containing Fill Removal, Complete Wood Piling Removal, Groundwater Treatment and MNA, and Ics
(4) SHORT-TERM RISKS	*Management of short-term risks, including the protection of human health and the environment associated with the alternative during construction and implementation.*		The removal of the SBG-containing fill requires in-water construction which represent short-term risks that can be mitigated through design and construction practices.	Removal of the wood pilings is an additional construction element, requiring a change and represents some additional short-term risks	The active treatment of Fill Unit groundwater consists of the direct push injection placement of reactive iron as slurry. The slurry injection will require pressurized equipment, representing an incremental short-term risk.
	Score[1]		6	5	3
	Weighted Score[2]	**10%**	**0.6**	**0.5**	**0.3**
(5) IMPLEMENTABILITY	*Implementability, including consideration of whether the alternative is technically possible, availability of necessary offsite facilities, services and materials, administrative and regulatory requirements, scheduling, size, complexity, monitoring requirements, access for construction operations and monitoring, and integration with existing facility operations and other current or potential remedial actions.*		The removal of the SBG-containing fill requires in-water construction and federal permitting, making the removal of the SBG-containing fill not readily implementable due to the permitting timeline. The means and methods for the in-water construction are readily implementable.	The wood piling removal is ready implementable from the landward side of the shoring wall.	The use of injections of slurry to treatment groundwater would need to be pilot-tested and demonstrated at the Site
	Score[1]		5	5	4
	Weighted Score[2]	**10%**	**0.5**	**0.5**	**0.4**
(6) PUBLIC CONCERNS	*Consideration of public concerns, including the extent to which the alternative addresses such concerns. This process includes concerns from individuals, community groups, local governments, tribes, federal and state agencies, or any other organization that may have an interest in or knowledge of the site.*				
	Score[1]		8	9	10
	Weighted Score[2]	**10%**	**0.8**	**0.9**	**1.0**
	MTCA Benefits Ranking[3]		**7.1**	**7.5**	**7.8**
	Estimated Cost[4]		**$4,360,000**	**$4,810,000**	**$5,020,000**
	Benefit/Cost Ratio[(5)]		**1.63**	**1.56**	**1.55**

DCA = Disproportionate cost analysis
IC = institutional control
MTCA = Model Toxics Control Act
SBG = sandblast grit
MNA = monitored natural attenuation
ICs = Institutional Controls

Notes:

1. The Score for each criterion's subfactor is scored between 1 and 10, with 1 being the least favorable score and 10 the most favorable score based on the cleanup alternative's ability to meet the subfactor evaluated (e.g., not effective, not permanent, carries high short-term risks, difficult to implement).
2. The Weighted Score for each DCA criterion is obtained by multiplying the average of the subfactor scores for the criterion by the assigned weighting factor (% listed) for the criterion.
3. The MTCA benefits ranking for each alternative is obtained by summing the weighted scores for the six DCA criteria.
4. Costs are estimated in 2021 dollars. All costs include the completed Interim Action sunk costs. The costs shown are rounded to the nearest $10,000 dollar. Itemized cost estimates are provided in Appendix B.
5. The benefit/cost ratio is obtained by dividing the alternative's MTCA benefits ranking by its estimated cost. This ratio is multiplied by 1E6 for all alternatives such that the benefit/cost ratios are in the range of 1-10 for relative comparison (see Figure 9).

FIGURES




Site Vicinity Map

Upland Feasibility Study
Snopac Property
Seattle, Washington

Aspect CONSULTING	AUG-2021	BY: MLK / TDR	FIGURE NO. 1
	PROJECT NO. 150054	REVISED BY: SCC	

Basemap Layer Credits | | Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

GIS Path: T:\projects_8\Snopac_150054\Delivered\Uplands\FS_2021_08\01 Site Vicinity Map.mxd | | Coordinate System: NAD 1983 StatePlane Washington North FIPS 4601 Feet | | Date Saved: 8/23/2021 | | User: ssudd | | Print Date: 8/23/2021




Site Plan with Historical Features

Upland Feasibility Study
Snopac Property
Seattle, Washington

Aspect Consulting	AUG-2021	BY: MLK / TDR	FIGURE NO. 2
	PROJECT NO. 150054	REVISED BY: ACG / SCC	

Basemap Layer Credits || EagleView Technologies, Inc.

GIS Path: T:\projects_8\Snopac_150054\Delivered\Uplands\S_2021_08\02 Site Plan with Historical Features.mxd || Coordinate System: NAD 1983 StatePlane Washington North FIPS 4601 Feet || Date Saved: 8/27/2021 || User: scudd || Print Date: 8/27/2021



- Soil Boring
- Soil Boring (Farallon, 2011)
- Monitoring Well
- Seep Sample
- Waste Characterization Test Pit
- Soil Samples
- Seep 76 (LDWG, 2004)
- Sheet Pile Shoring Wall
- Extent of Uplands SBG - Containing Fill Inferred in RI Report (Aspect, 2020b)
- Property Boundary
- Mean Higher High Water (+9 ft, NAVD88)
- King County Tax Parcel

0 35
Feet

Note: All exploration locations are summarized and results reported in the Combined Remedial Investigation Report (Aspect, 2020)


Remedial Investigation - Exploration Locations

Upland Feasibility Study
Snopac Property
Seattle, Washington

Aspect CONSULTING	AUG-2021	BY: MLK / TDR	FIGURE NO. 3
	PROJECT NO. 150054	REVISED BY: ACG / SCC	

Basemap Layer Credits || EagleView Technologies, Inc.

GIS Path: T:\projects_8\Snopac_150054\Delivered\Uplands\FS_2021_08\03.RI_Exploration_Locations.mxd || Coordinate System: NAD_1983_StatePlane_Washington_North_FIPS_4601_Feet || Date Saved: 8/27/2021 || User: scudd || Print Date: 8/27/2021




Interim Action Completion

Upland Feasibility Study
Snopac Property
Seattle, Washington

Aspect Consulting	APR-2023	BY: BMG / SCC	FIGURE NO. 4
	PROJECT NO. 150054	REVISED BY: ACG / SCC	

GIS Path: G:\projects\Snopac_150054\Delivered\Uplands\FS_2021_08\04 Interim Action Completion.mxd || Coordinate System: NAD 1983 StatePlane Washington North FIPS 4601 Feet || Date Saved: 4/7/2023 || User: nkochie || Print Date: 4/7/2023




Post-Interim Action Groundwater Monitoring

Upland Feasibility Study
Snopac Property
Seattle, Washington

Aspect Consulting	APR-2023	BY: BMG / SCC	FIGURE NO. 5
	PROJECT NO. 150054	REVISED BY: ACG / SCC	

GIS Path: G:\projects\Snopac_150054\Delivered\Uplands\FS_2021_08\05 Post-IA Groundwater Monitoring.mxd || Coordinate System: NAD 1983 StatePlane Washington North FIPS 4601 Feet || Date Saved: 4/7/2023 || User: nkochle || Print Date: 4/7/2023




Remedial Alternative 1 Concept

Upland Feasibility Study
Snopac Property
Seattle, Washington

Aspect Consulting	APR-2023	BY: BMG / SCC	FIGURE NO. 6
	PROJECT NO. 150054	REVISED BY: ACG / SCC	

GIS Path: G:\projects\Snopac_150054\Delivered\Uplands\FS_2021_08\06 Remedial Alternative 1 Concept.mxd || Coordinate System: NAD 1983 StatePlane Washington North FIPS 4601 Feet || Date Saved: 4/7/2023 || User: nkochle || Print Date: 4/7/2023



Remedial Alternative 2 Components

- SBG - Containing Fill and Wooden Pile Removal
- Completed Interim Action
- Fill Unit Monitoring Well
- Alluvium Monitoring Well
- In-Water Project Area
- Sheet Pile Shoring Wall
- Historical Building (Demolished prior to Interim Action in 2020)
- Property Boundary
- Mean Higher High Water (+9 ft, NAVD88)
- King County Tax Parcel

0 35
Feet


N

Remedial Alternative 2 Concept

Upland Feasibility Study
Snopac Property
Seattle, Washington

Aspect Consulting	APR-2023	BY: BMG / SCC	FIGURE NO. 7
	PROJECT NO. 150054	REVISED BY: ACG / SCC	

GIS Path: G:\projects\Snopac_150054\Delivered\Uplands\FS_2021_08\07 Remedial Alternative 2 Concept.mxd || Coordinate System: NAD 1983 StatePlane Washington North FIPS 4601 Feet || Date Saved: 4/7/2023 || User: nkochie || Print Date: 4/7/2023




Remedial Alternative 3 Concept

Upland Feasibility Study
Snopac Property
Seattle, Washington

Aspect Consulting	APR-2023	BY: BMG / SCC	FIGURE NO. 8
	PROJECT NO. 150054	REVISED BY: ACG / SCC	

GIS Path: G:\projects\Snopac_150054\Delivered\Uplands\FS_2021_08\08 Remedial Alternative 3 Concept.mxd || Coordinate System: NAD 1983 StatePlane Washington North FIPS 4601 Feet || Date Saved: 4/7/2023 || User: rkochie || Print Date: 4/7/2023



Notes:

1. Estimated cost are in 2021 dollars. All costs include the completed Interim Action sunk costs. The estimated future costs are preliminary, Feasibility Study-level estimates based on existing information and are estimated to be within +50/-30% of actual costs.

Aspect Consulting
12/18/2023

Figure 9
Disproportionate Cost Analysis Summary
Upland Feasibility Study
Project No. 150054

APPENDIX A

Post-Interim Action Tidal Study Memorandum

MEMORANDUM

Project No. 150054

April 3, 2023

To: Sandra Matthews, Washington State Department of Ecology

cc: John Heckel, Manson Construction Co.
Doug Steding, Northwest Resource Law PLLC
Jane Sund, Integral Consulting

From:

Matthew M. Lewis, LHG
Project Hydrogeologist
mlewis@aspectconsulting.com

Steve J. Germiat, LHG
Principal Hydrogeologist
sgermiat@aspectconsulting.com

State of Washington Hydrogeologist 272 Licensed Geologist 4/3/2023
Steve J. Germiat

Re: **Post-Interim Action Tidal Study Methods and Results**
Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

Introduction and Summary of Findings

This memo provides the methods and results of a tidal study Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect) completed as part of the Upland groundwater compliance activities at the Snopac Property (Site) located at 5055 East Marginal Way South in Seattle, Washington. The work was completed to assess the hydraulic effect of the recently installed sheet pile cutoff wall[1] on the Site groundwater levels and flow directions, as required by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) in a January 11, 2022, Completion of Interim Action Activities Letter. This cutoff wall extends along most of the shoreline at the Site and abuts the concrete bulkhead wall on the north-adjacent Federal Center property (Figure 1). The tidal study involved measurement of water levels for over 72 hours at five monitoring wells completed in the Fill Unit, and two wells completed in the Alluvium Unit, to evaluate the effects of tidal fluctuations on groundwater levels and gradients, and

[1] Installed to a depth of approximately 45 feet below grade as part of the 2021 upland interim action as described in the Interim Action Report (Aspect, 2021).

to define groundwater flow conditions, including tidally averaged groundwater elevations and flow direction.

The findings of the tidal study are:

- Tidal efficiency in the Fill Unit wells ranged from 0.9 to 1.5 percent, but the Alluvium Unit wells ranged from 16 to 19 percent. Lag times in the Fill Unit wells were between 1.4 and 3.8 hours in the Fill wells, but they were about 0.5 hours in the Alluvium Unit wells. Tidal signals were not discernable in the two Fill wells located farthest from the Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW) shoreline (MW-12 and MW-17).
- Following installation of the sheet pile wall, the net (tidally averaged) groundwater flow direction in the Fill Unit is generally west towards the river, flowing around the south end of the cutoff wall. During higher-high tide, the gradient at the north end of the site shifts inland for less than 6 hours before returning to its typical western flow direction. Groundwater flow in the Alluvium Unit could not be directly calculated based on two wells but is assumed to flow towards the LDW.
- The results from the Fill wells were compared to the closest wells used in a previous tidal study, conducted by Aspect in February 2017, before the sheet pile wall was installed. Tidal magnitude and efficiency both showed a significant decrease (85 to 98 percent decrease) as a result of the sheet pile wall. However, no substantive change in tidal influence was observed in the Alluvium Unit because the wall does not fully penetrate the aquifer, allowing tidal pressures to propagate beneath the wall.

The following sections describe the tidal study field methods and results.

Field Methods

Aspect completed the tidal study using unvented pressure transducers (TD-Divers), manufactured by Van Essen Instruments. The TD-Divers were deployed for over 72 hours at 5-minute intervals (12:45 p.m. on March 21 through 12:45 p.m. on March 24, 2022) in the following seven wells:

- Fill Unit wells**:** MW-12, MW-13, MW-15, MW-16, MW-17
- Alluvium Unit wells: MW-8, MW-14

For the study duration, a barometric pressure transducer was installed above the water column in one of the study wells to record local fluctuations in atmospheric pressure that can affect the groundwater levels. Tidal stage data was acquired from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Tidal Station 9447130 located at the Seattle Ferry Terminal in Elliott Bay. Project well locations are presented on Figure 1.

Data Analysis and Results

Once the transducers were retrieved, the data were downloaded and corrected to account for changes in atmospheric pressure during the study using the data from the barometric pressure transducer. The data logger readings were converted to groundwater elevations using the depth-to-water measurements collected at the beginning and end of the tidal study and the surveyed top-of-well-casing elevations.

Tidal Study Data Analysis

Each well's water level data were processed by computing a series of running averages to filter out lunar and solar tidal signals (Serfes, 1991), resulting in a single average groundwater elevation for each well on March 23, 2022, at 1:45 a.m. Additionally, for each well, we calculated tidal efficiency (represented as a ratio of measured tidal amplitude in the well to tidal amplitude recorded in Elliott Bay) and tidal lag times (the average time for the tidal signal to be expressed in the well water level). For tidal efficiency and lag times, only the high tide data were used because at lower low tidal stages the tide is below the bottom of the Fill Unit (top of aquitard). When this occurs, the Fill Unit water table remains essentially perched on the aquitard several feet above the tidal stage, making the low tide data unreliable for analysis.

The tidally averaged groundwater elevations from the Fill Unit wells were used to create a groundwater elevation contour map from which the net groundwater flow directions (accounting for the full tidal cycle) can be estimated (Figure 1). A groundwater elevation contour map was not developed for the Alluvium wells because that would require at least three wells to be meaningful.

Tidal Study Results

Tidal study results indicate the tidal cycle is causing discernable water level elevation fluctuations in the Fill Unit wells along the shoreline (MW-13, MW-15, and MW-16), but not in the more distal wells (MW-12 and MW-17). Tidal efficiency in the shoreline Fill Unit wells ranged from 0.9 to 1.5 percent, and the tidal lag times were between 1.4 to 3.8 hours. However, the tidal signal was too weak in the distal Fill Unit wells to determine tidal efficiency or lag. The low tidal efficiencies reflect the fact that the sheet pile wall fully penetrates the Fill Unit across the property's entire shoreline. The differences in the remaining tidal effects among shoreline wells may be attributable to variation in the aquitard thickness or competence.

Tidal study results in the two Alluvium Unit wells (MW-8 and MW-14) indicate a higher hydraulic connectivity to tidal pressures in the LDW than the Fill Unit wells, with tidal efficiency of 16 percent and 19% and lag times of 0.45 hours and 0.48 hours, respectively. The higher tidal efficiency can be attributed to the sheet pile wall not fully penetrating the Alluvium Unit,[2] allowing tidal pressures to propagate into the unit beneath the bottom of the wall. See Table 1 below for results.

[2] Alluvium Unit is estimated to extend to a depth of roughly 160 feet below grade (Aspect, 2020).

Table 1. Tidal Study Results (Post-Installation of Sheet Pile Wall)

Well	Tidally Averaged Groundwater Elevation in Feet (NAVD88)	Maximum Tidal Swing in feet	Discernible Tidal Signal?	Average Tidal Efficiency	Average Tidal Lag in hours
Fill Unit Wells					
MW-12	7.82	0.09	No	-	-
MW-13	7.15	0.14	Yes	0.9%	3.3
MW-15	7.78	0.28	Yes	1.5%	2.8
MW-16	7.79	0.23	Yes	1.3%	1.4
MW-17	8.01	0.15	No	-	-
MW-7	n/a	n/a	Yes	1.3%	2.5
Alluvium Unit Wells					
MW-8	6.67	2.32	Yes	0.19	0.45
MW-14	6.34	1.90	Yes	0.16	0.48

Note: The tidal study at MW-7 was conducted in June 2021 after installation of the sheet pile wall.

Hydrographs of water level elevations in the Site wells and the tidal elevations measured in Elliott Bay during the tidal study duration are shown on Figure 2.

Groundwater Flow in Fill Unit After Sheet Pile Wall

The groundwater elevation contours on Figure 1 indicate that, with the sheet pile wall in place along the Site shoreline, the net (tidally averaged) gradient and flow direction within the Fill Unit is generally westward towards the LDW as expected. However, there appears to be a groundwater boundary dividing flow into the northwest direction and southwest around the cutoff wall. For the tidally averaged condition, the water table immediately inland from the cutoff wall is essentially flat in the northern half of the Site (0.01-foot head difference between MW-16 at the north end and MW-15 near the center of the wall), and with a steeper gradient (0.63-foot head difference) southward from MW-15 to MW-13 near the south end of the wall. We attribute these conditions to the fact that the sheet pile wall extends up to the concrete bulkhead along the shore of the north-adjacent property, largely eliminating hydraulic connection between the Fill Unit at the north end of the site and the LDW. This means that the hydraulic connection between the Fill Unit at the Site and the LDW is primarily constrained to the south end of the sheet pile wall near MW-13.

Groundwater in the southern half of the Site generally flows towards the southwest near MW-13. There is a western flow in the northern half of the site with a divide in between that likely varies throughout the tidal cycle. In addition, the net gradient from east to west is substantially higher in the southern portion of the Site (approximately 0.006 feet/foot between wells MW-17 and MW-13) than in the northern portion (approximately 0.0002 feet/foot between wells MW-12 and MW-16; see Figure 1). A driver for the southwestern flow component is the geometry of Slip 1 extending out from the LDW to the southwestern corner of the site. This can create a groundwater “sink” at the southern end of the cutoff wall where the gradient increases as the groundwater discharges into the LDW.

Comparison to Groundwater Conditions Prior to Sheet Pile Wall

As a component of the Site Remedial Investigation (RI), tidal studies were completed in early 2017, prior to installation of the sheet pile wall (Aspect, 2020). These data provide a basis of comparison and evaluation of the hydraulic effects created on the Site groundwater system by the sheet pile wall. Where possible, data from the wells in this tidal study were compared to the closest wells used in the 2017 study (see Figure 1 and Table 2 below).

Tidal effects in the Fill Unit are significantly lower in 2022 compared to those observed prior to the construction of the sheet pile wall. The tidal magnitude and efficiency in MW-3 in 2017 were 1.97 feet and 73 percent but were calculated at 0.28 feet and 1.5 percent in MW-15, located 12 feet to the south. These parameters were measured in MW-4 at 2.46 feet and 44 percent, but only 0.23 feet and 1.3 percent in MW-16, located 53 feet to the north along the shoreline. MW-2 and MW-13 are too distant to directly compare but show similar before-and-after trends. These results indicate the sheet pile wall has reduced hydraulic connection of the Fill Unit to the LDW, as reflected by greatly diminished tidal magnitudes and efficiencies. The connectivity of the Fill Unit to the LDW is now primarily at the south end of the sheet pile wall, near MW-13, versus along the entire shoreline as it was before. This suggests that MW-13 can be used to monitor the primary groundwater discharge point from the Fill Unit to the LDW.

Table 2. Tidal Study Comparisons

Well	Maximum Tidal Magnitude in feet	Average Tidal Efficiency
Fill Unit Wells		
MW-2	*3.86*	*32%*
MW-3	*1.97*	*73%*
MW-15	0.28	1.5%
MW-4	*2.46*	*44%*
MW-16	0.23	1.3%
MW-13	0.14	0.9%
Alluvium Unit Wells		
MW-6	*1.42*	*9.3%*
MW-8	2.32	19%
MW-14	1.90	16%

Note:
Italics indicate data from 2017 study.
Proximal well pairs are MW-3 with MW-15 and MW-4 with MW-16.

There is not sufficient data to directly compare tidal effects in the Alluvium Unit on a well-to-well basis; however, the 2022 tidal magnitude and efficiency data collected after the sheet pile installation are in the same order of magnitude as data collected in 2017. We attribute this to fact

that the sheet pile wall only penetrates the upper portion of the very thick (> 100 feet) aquifer, allowing tidal pressures from the LDW to propagate beneath the wall.

References

Aspect Consulting (Aspect), 2020, Remedial Investigation Report, Snopac Property, July 7, 2020.

Aspect Consulting (Aspect), 2021, Interim Action Report, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington, September 16, 2021.

Serfes, 1991, Determining the Mean Hydraulic Gradient of Ground Water Affected by Tidal Fluctuations, Ground Water, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp 549–555.

Limitations


Work for this project was performed for the 5055 Properties, LLC (Client), and this memorandum was prepared in accordance with generally accepted professional practices for the nature and conditions of work completed in the same or similar localities, at the time the work was performed. This memorandum does not represent a legal opinion. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made.

All reports prepared by Aspect Consulting for the Client apply only to the services described in the Agreement(s) with the Client. Any use or reuse by any party other than the Client is at the sole risk of that party, and without liability to Aspect Consulting. Aspect Consulting's original files/reports shall govern in the event of any dispute regarding the content of electronic documents furnished to others.

Attachments: Figure 1 – Well Locations Map with Groundwater Contours
Figure 2 – Hydrographs of Project Wells and Elliott Bay Tidal Elevations

V:\150054 Snopac-Manson\Deliverables\2021 09_Uplands Feasibility Study\Public Review Draft\Appendices\Appendix A\Tidal Study Results Memo_FINAL_04032023.docx

FIGURES



Existing Monitoring Well Locations

SAP for Groundwater Monitoring
5055 Properties, LLC
Seattle, Washington

Aspect Consulting	JUN-2022	BY: BMG / SCC	FIGURE NO. 1
	PROJECT NO. 150054	REVISED BY: SCC	

Basemap Layer Credits || EagleView Technologies, Inc.

GIS Path: T:\projects_8\Snopac_150054\Deliverel\SAP\groundwater\Q1 Existing Monitoring Well Locations June 2022 Update.mxd || Coordinate System: NAD 1983 StatePlane Washington North FIPS 4601 Feet || Date Saved: 6/10/2022 || User: sscudd || Print Date: 6/10/2022




Figure 2
Hydrographs of Project Wells and Elliott Bay Tidal Elevations

APPENDIX B

Soil Compliance Statistics – Pro UCL Backup

Outlier Tests for Selected Uncensored Variables

User Selected Options

Date/Time of Computation	ProUCL 5.110/26/2021 4:24:51 AM
From File	Stats for PROUCL.xls
Full Precision	OFF

Rosner's Outlier Test for Arsenic

Mean	3.167
Standard Deviation	2.459
Number of data	75
Number of suspected outliers	1

#	Mean	sd	Potential outlier	Obs. Number	Test value	Critical value (5%)	Critical value (1%)
1	3.167	2.442	12.9	64	3.986	3.285	3.645

For 5% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier

Potential outliers is: 12.9

For 1% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier

Potential outliers is: 12.9

Rosner's Outlier Test for Mercury

Mean	0.108
Standard Deviation	0.268
Number of data	74
Number of suspected outliers	1

#	Mean	sd	Potential outlier	Obs. Number	Test value	Critical value (5%)	Critical value (1%)
1	0.108	0.266	1	22	3.349	3.28	3.64

For 5% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier

Potential outliers is: 1

For 1% Significance Level, there is no Potential Outlier

Rosner's Outlier Test for Zinc

Mean	28.84
Standard Deviation	45.63
Number of data	73
Number of suspected outliers	1

Potential	Obs.	Test	Critical	Critical

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
54	#	Mean	sd	outlier	Number	value	value (5%)	value (1%)				
55	1	28.84	45.32	393	62	8.035	3.275	3.635				
56												
57	For 5% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
58	Potential outliers is: 393											
59												
60	For 1% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
61	Potential outliers is: 393											
62												
63												
64	Rosner's Outlier Test for Acenaphthene											
65												
66												
67	Mean	0.00551										
68	Standard Deviation	0.00846										
69	Number of data	67										
70	Number of suspected outliers	1										
71												
72				Potential	Obs.	Test	Critical	Critical				
73	#	Mean	sd	outlier	Number	value	value (5%)	value (1%)				
74	1	0.00551	0.0084	0.0458	55	4.799	3.242	3.602				
75												
76	For 5% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
77	Potential outliers is: 0.0458											
78												
79	For 1% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
80	Potential outliers is: 0.0458											
81												
82												
83	Rosner's Outlier Test for Anthracene											
84												
85												
86	Mean	0.0063										
87	Standard Deviation	0.0136										
88	Number of data	67										
89	Number of suspected outliers	1										
90												
91				Potential	Obs.	Test	Critical	Critical				
92	#	Mean	sd	outlier	Number	value	value (5%)	value (1%)				
93	1	0.0063	0.0135	0.105	55	7.324	3.242	3.602				
94												
95	For 5% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
96	Potential outliers is: 0.105											
97												
98	For 1% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
99	Potential outliers is: 0.105											
100												
101												
102	Rosner's Outlier Test for Fluoranthene											
103												
104												
105	Mean	0.0197										
106	Standard Deviation	0.0564										

			Number of data	67							
			Number of suspected outliers	1							
			Potential	Obs.	Test	Critical	Critical				
#	Mean	sd	outlier	Number	value	value (5%)	value (1%)				
1	0.0197	0.056	0.434	55	7.401	3.242	3.602				
For 5% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
Potential outliers is: 0.434											
For 1% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
Potential outliers is: 0.434											
Rosner's Outlier Test for Naphthalene1											
			Mean	0.00783							
			Standard Deviation	0.0161							
			Number of data	67							
			Number of suspected outliers	1							
			Potential	Obs.	Test	Critical	Critical				
#	Mean	sd	outlier	Number	value	value (5%)	value (1%)				
1	0.00783	0.016	0.093	15	5.319	3.242	3.602				
For 5% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
Potential outliers is: 0.093											
For 1% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
Potential outliers is: 0.093											
Rosner's Outlier Test for Pyrene											
			Mean	0.0195							
			Standard Deviation	0.0542							
			Number of data	67							
			Number of suspected outliers	1							
			Potential	Obs.	Test	Critical	Critical				
#	Mean	sd	outlier	Number	value	value (5%)	value (1%)				
1	0.0195	0.0538	0.411	55	7.28	3.242	3.602				
For 5% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
Potential outliers is: 0.411											
For 1% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
Potential outliers is: 0.411											
Rosner's Outlier Test for Total PCBs Aroclors4											

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
160												
161												
162				Mean	0.0108							
163				Standard Deviation	0.0386							
164				Number of data	60							
165				Number of suspected outliers	1							
166												
167				Potential	Obs.	Test	Critical	Critical				
168	#	Mean	sd	outlier	Number	value	value (5%)	value (1%)				
169	1	0.0108	0.0383	0.2	22	4.945	3.2	3.56				
170												
171	For 5% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
172	Potential outliers is: 0.2											
173												
174	For 1% Significance Level, there is 1 Potential Outlier											
175	Potential outliers is: 0.2											
176												

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	UCL Statistics for Data Sets with Non-Detects											
2												
3	User Selected Options											
4	Date/Time of Computation	ProUCL 5.110/26/2021 4:49:42 AM										
5	From File	Stats for PROUCL_Outliers removed_a.xls										
6	Full Precision	OFF										
7	Confidence Coefficient	95%										
8	Number of Bootstrap Operations	2000										
9												
10	Arsenic											
11												
12	General Statistics											
13	Total Number of Observations					74	Number of Distinct Observations					65
14	Number of Detects					70	Number of Non-Detects					4
15	Number of Distinct Detects					62	Number of Distinct Non-Detects					4
16	Minimum Detect					1.05	Minimum Non-Detect					1
17	Maximum Detect					10.1	Maximum Non-Detect					5
18	Variance Detects					4.971	Percent Non-Detects					5.405%
19	Mean Detects					3.026	SD Detects					2.23
20	Median Detects					2.02	CV Detects					0.737
21	Skewness Detects					1.524	Kurtosis Detects					1.753
22	Mean of Logged Detects					0.889	SD of Logged Detects					0.639
23												
24	Normal GOF Test on Detects Only											
25	Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic					0.791	Normal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only					
26	5% Shapiro Wilk P Value					1.504E-13	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
27	Lilliefors Test Statistic					0.195	Lilliefors GOF Test					
28	5% Lilliefors Critical Value					0.106	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
29	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level											
30												
31	Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics using Normal Critical Values and other Nonparametric UCLs											
32	KM Mean					2.953	KM Standard Error of Mean					0.256
33	KM SD					2.183	95% KM (BCA) UCL					3.367
34	95% KM (t) UCL					3.38	95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL					3.379
35	95% KM (z) UCL					3.375	95% KM Bootstrap t UCL					3.459
36	90% KM Chebyshev UCL					3.722	95% KM Chebyshev UCL					4.07
37	97.5% KM Chebyshev UCL					4.554	99% KM Chebyshev UCL					5.503
38												
39	Gamma GOF Tests on Detected Observations Only											
40	A-D Test Statistic					2.633	Anderson-Darling GOF Test					
41	5% A-D Critical Value					0.761	Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
42	K-S Test Statistic					0.171	Kolmogorov-Smirnov GOF					
43	5% K-S Critical Value					0.107	Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
44	Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level											
45												
46	Gamma Statistics on Detected Data Only											
47	k hat (MLE)					2.445	k star (bias corrected MLE)					2.349
48	Theta hat (MLE)					1.238	Theta star (bias corrected MLE)					1.288
49	nu hat (MLE)					342.2	nu star (bias corrected)					328.9
50	Mean (detects)					3.026						
51												
52	Gamma ROS Statistics using Imputed Non-Detects											
53	GROS may not be used when data set has > 50% NDs with many tied observations at multiple DLs											

54	GROS may not be used when kstar of detects is small such as <1.0, especially when the sample size is small (e.g., <15-20)										
55	For such situations, GROS method may yield incorrect values of UCLs and BTVs										
56	This is especially true when the sample size is small.										
57	For gamma distributed detected data, BTVs and UCLs may be computed using gamma distribution on KM estimates										
58					Minimum	0.01			Mean	2.939	
59					Maximum	10.1			Median	1.94	
60					SD	2.207			CV	0.751	
61					k hat (MLE)	1.977			k star (bias corrected MLE)	1.906	
62					Theta hat (MLE)	1.486			Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	1.542	
63					nu hat (MLE)	292.6			nu star (bias corrected)	282.1	
64					Adjusted Level of Significance (β)	0.0468					
65					Approximate Chi Square Value (282.08, α)	244.2			Adjusted Chi Square Value (282.08, β)	243.5	
66					95% Gamma Approximate UCL (use when n>=50)	3.395			95% Gamma Adjusted UCL (use when n<50)	3.405	
67											
68	Estimates of Gamma Parameters using KM Estimates										
69					Mean (KM)	2.953			SD (KM)	2.183	
70					Variance (KM)	4.764			SE of Mean (KM)	0.256	
71					k hat (KM)	1.831			k star (KM)	1.765	
72					nu hat (KM)	270.9			nu star (KM)	261.3	
73					theta hat (KM)	1.613			theta star (KM)	1.673	
74					80% gamma percentile (KM)	4.486			90% gamma percentile (KM)	5.916	
75					95% gamma percentile (KM)	7.29			99% gamma percentile (KM)	10.36	
76											
77	Gamma Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics										
78					Approximate Chi Square Value (261.29, α)	224.9			Adjusted Chi Square Value (261.29, β)	224.2	
79					95% Gamma Approximate KM-UCL (use when n>=50)	3.432			95% Gamma Adjusted KM-UCL (use when n<50)	3.442	
80											
81	Lognormal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only										
82					Shapiro Wilk Approximate Test Statistic	0.904			Shapiro Wilk GOF Test		
83					5% Shapiro Wilk P Value	9.9395E-6			Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
84					Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.148			Lilliefors GOF Test		
85					5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.106			Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
86	Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level										
87											
88	Lognormal ROS Statistics Using Imputed Non-Detects										
89					Mean in Original Scale	2.946			Mean in Log Scale	0.857	
90					SD in Original Scale	2.198			SD in Log Scale	0.652	
91					95% t UCL (assumes normality of ROS data)	3.372			95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL	3.386	
92					95% BCA Bootstrap UCL	3.395			95% Bootstrap t UCL	3.461	
93					95% H-UCL (Log ROS)	3.382					
94											
95	Statistics using KM estimates on Logged Data and Assuming Lognormal Distribution										
96					KM Mean (logged)	0.864			KM Geo Mean	2.372	
97					KM SD (logged)	0.633			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	1.941	
98					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.0747			95% H-UCL (KM -Log)	3.348	
99					KM SD (logged)	0.633			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	1.941	
100					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.0747					
101											
102	DL/2 Statistics										
103					DL/2 Normal				DL/2 Log-Transformed		
104					Mean in Original Scale	2.949			Mean in Log Scale	0.858	
105					SD in Original Scale	2.198			SD in Log Scale	0.65	
106					95% t UCL (Assumes normality)	3.374			95% H-Stat UCL	3.381	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
107	DL/2 is not a recommended method, provided for comparisons and historical reasons											
108												
109	Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics											
110	Data do not follow a Discernible Distribution at 5% Significance Level											
111												
112	Suggested UCL to Use											
113	95% KM (Chebyshev) UCL					4.07						
114												
115	Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.											
116	Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.											
117	These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).											
118	However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.											
119												

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	UCL Statistics for Data Sets with Non-Detects											
2												
3	User Selected Options											
4	Date/Time of Computation	ProUCL 5.110/26/2021 4:56:22 AM										
5	From File	Stats for PROUCL_Outliers removed_b.xls										
6	Full Precision	OFF										
7	Confidence Coefficient	95%										
8	Number of Bootstrap Operations	2000										
9												
10	Mercury											
11												
12	General Statistics											
13	Total Number of Observations	69					Number of Distinct Observations	30				
14	Number of Detects	39					Number of Non-Detects	30				
15	Number of Distinct Detects	26					Number of Distinct Non-Detects	7				
16	Minimum Detect	0.01					Minimum Non-Detect	0.01				
17	Maximum Detect	0.13					Maximum Non-Detect	1				
18	Variance Detects	7.2466E-4					Percent Non-Detects	43.48%				
19	Mean Detects	0.033					SD Detects	0.0269				
20	Median Detects	0.028					CV Detects	0.816				
21	Skewness Detects	2.345					Kurtosis Detects	6.037				
22	Mean of Logged Detects	-3.645					SD of Logged Detects	0.664				
23												
24	Normal GOF Test on Detects Only											
25	Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.727					Shapiro Wilk GOF Test					
26	5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.939					Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
27	Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.215					Lilliefors GOF Test					
28	5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.14					Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
29	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level											
30												
31	Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics using Normal Critical Values and other Nonparametric UCLs											
32	KM Mean	0.024					KM Standard Error of Mean	0.00289				
33	KM SD	0.0231					95% KM (BCA) UCL	0.0286				
34	95% KM (t) UCL	0.0288					95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL	0.0288				
35	95% KM (z) UCL	0.0287					95% KM Bootstrap t UCL	0.0305				
36	90% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0326					95% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0366				
37	97.5% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.042					99% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0527				
38												
39	Gamma GOF Tests on Detected Observations Only											
40	A-D Test Statistic	1.008					Anderson-Darling GOF Test					
41	5% A-D Critical Value	0.758					Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
42	K-S Test Statistic	0.121					Kolmogorov-Smirnov GOF					
43	5% K-S Critical Value	0.143					Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
44	Detected data follow Appr. Gamma Distribution at 5% Significance Level											
45												
46	Gamma Statistics on Detected Data Only											
47	k hat (MLE)	2.297					k star (bias corrected MLE)	2.137				
48	Theta hat (MLE)	0.0144					Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.0154				
49	nu hat (MLE)	179.2					nu star (bias corrected)	166.7				
50	Mean (detects)	0.033										
51												
52	Gamma ROS Statistics using Imputed Non-Detects											
53	GROS may not be used when data set has > 50% NDs with many tied observations at multiple DLs											

54	GROS may not be used when kstar of detects is small such as <1.0, especially when the sample size is small (e.g., <15-20)										
55	For such situations, GROS method may yield incorrect values of UCLs and BTVs										
56	This is especially true when the sample size is small.										
57	For gamma distributed detected data, BTVs and UCLs may be computed using gamma distribution on KM estimates										
58					Minimum	0.01			Mean	0.0233	
59					Maximum	0.13			Median	0.012	
60					SD	0.0231			CV	0.992	
61					k hat (MLE)	1.903			k star (bias corrected MLE)	1.83	
62					Theta hat (MLE)	0.0122			Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.0127	
63					nu hat (MLE)	262.6			nu star (bias corrected)	252.6	
64					Adjusted Level of Significance (β)	0.0465					
65					Approximate Chi Square Value (252.55, α)	216.8			Adjusted Chi Square Value (252.55, β)	216.1	
66					95% Gamma Approximate UCL (use when n>=50)	0.0271			95% Gamma Adjusted UCL (use when n<50)	0.0272	
67											
68	Estimates of Gamma Parameters using KM Estimates										
69					Mean (KM)	0.024			SD (KM)	0.0231	
70					Variance (KM)	5.3576E-4			SE of Mean (KM)	0.00289	
71					k hat (KM)	1.074			k star (KM)	1.037	
72					nu hat (KM)	148.2			nu star (KM)	143	
73					theta hat (KM)	0.0223			theta star (KM)	0.0231	
74					80% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0385			90% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0547	
75					95% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0709			99% gamma percentile (KM)	0.108	
76											
77	Gamma Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics										
78					Approximate Chi Square Value (143.05, α)	116.4			Adjusted Chi Square Value (143.05, β)	115.9	
79					95% Gamma Approximate KM-UCL (use when n>=50)	0.0295			95% Gamma Adjusted KM-UCL (use when n<50)	0.0296	
80											
81	Lognormal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only										
82					Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.939			Shapiro Wilk GOF Test		
83					5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.939			Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
84					Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.1			Lilliefors GOF Test		
85					5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.14			Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
86	Detected Data appear Approximate Lognormal at 5% Significance Level										
87											
88	Lognormal ROS Statistics Using Imputed Non-Detects										
89					Mean in Original Scale	0.022			Mean in Log Scale	-4.239	
90					SD in Original Scale	0.0239			SD in Log Scale	0.926	
91					95% t UCL (assumes normality of ROS data)	0.0268			95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL	0.027	
92					95% BCA Bootstrap UCL	0.028			95% Bootstrap t UCL	0.0284	
93					95% H-UCL (Log ROS)	0.0284					
94											
95	Statistics using KM estimates on Logged Data and Assuming Lognormal Distribution										
96					KM Mean (logged)	-4.013			KM Geo Mean	0.0181	
97					KM SD (logged)	0.687			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	2.007	
98					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.0869			95% H-UCL (KM -Log)	0.027	
99					KM SD (logged)	0.687			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	2.007	
100					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.0869					
101											
102	DL/2 Statistics										
103	DL/2 Normal								DL/2 Log-Transformed		
104					Mean in Original Scale	0.0309			Mean in Log Scale	-4.124	
105					SD in Original Scale	0.0624			SD in Log Scale	1.039	
106					95% t UCL (Assumes normality)	0.0435			95% H-Stat UCL	0.0369	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
107	DL/2 is not a recommended method, provided for comparisons and historical reasons											
108												
109	Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics											
110	Detected Data appear Approximate Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level											
111												
112	Suggested UCL to Use											
113	95% KM Approximate Gamma UCL					0.0295	95% GROS Approximate Gamma UCL					0.0271
114												
115	When a data set follows an approximate (e.g., normal) distribution passing one of the GOF test											
116	When applicable, it is suggested to use a UCL based upon a distribution (e.g., gamma) passing both GOF tests in ProUCL											
117												
118	Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.											
119	Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.											
120	These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).											
121	However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.											
122												

1	UCL Statistics for Data Sets with Non-Detects										
2											
3	User Selected Options										
4	Date/Time of Computation	ProUCL 5.110/26/2021 4:59:42 AM									
5	From File	Stats for PROUCL_Outliers removed_c.xls									
6	Full Precision	OFF									
7	Confidence Coefficient	95%									
8	Number of Bootstrap Operations	2000									
9											
10											
11	Zinc										
12											
13	General Statistics										
14	Total Number of Observations		72			Number of Distinct Observations			59		
15						Number of Missing Observations			0		
16	Minimum		11.4			Mean			23.78		
17	Maximum		87			Median			19.95		
18	SD		14.76			Std. Error of Mean			1.74		
19	Coefficient of Variation		0.621			Skewness			2.29		
20											
21	Normal GOF Test										
22	Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic		0.735			Shapiro Wilk GOF Test					
23	5% Shapiro Wilk P Value		0			Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
24	Lilliefors Test Statistic		0.22			Lilliefors GOF Test					
25	5% Lilliefors Critical Value		0.104			Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
26	Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level										
27											
28	Assuming Normal Distribution										
29	95% Normal UCL					95% UCLs (Adjusted for Skewness)					
30	95% Student's-t UCL		26.68			95% Adjusted-CLT UCL (Chen-1995)			27.14		
31						95% Modified-t UCL (Johnson-1978)			26.76		
32											
33	Gamma GOF Test										
34	A-D Test Statistic		3.116			Anderson-Darling Gamma GOF Test					
35	5% A-D Critical Value		0.756			Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
36	K-S Test Statistic		0.168			Kolmogorov-Smirnov Gamma GOF Test					
37	5% K-S Critical Value		0.106			Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
38	Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level										
39											
40	Gamma Statistics										
41	k hat (MLE)		4.005			k star (bias corrected MLE)			3.847		
42	Theta hat (MLE)		5.938			Theta star (bias corrected MLE)			6.181		
43	nu hat (MLE)		576.7			nu star (bias corrected)			554		
44	MLE Mean (bias corrected)		23.78			MLE Sd (bias corrected)			12.12		
45						Approximate Chi Square Value (0.05)			500.4		
46	Adjusted Level of Significance		0.0467			Adjusted Chi Square Value			499.4		
47											
48	Assuming Gamma Distribution										
49	95% Approximate Gamma UCL (use when n>=50))		26.33			95% Adjusted Gamma UCL (use when n<50)			26.38		
50											
51	Lognormal GOF Test										
52	Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic		0.896			Shapiro Wilk Lognormal GOF Test					
53	5% Shapiro Wilk P Value		2.0305E-6			Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level					

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
54				Lilliefors Test Statistic		0.13	Lilliefors Lognormal GOF Test					
55				5% Lilliefors Critical Value		0.104	Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level					
56	Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level											
57												
58	Lognormal Statistics											
59				Minimum of Logged Data		2.434			Mean of logged Data			3.039
60				Maximum of Logged Data		4.466			SD of logged Data			0.475
61												
62	Assuming Lognormal Distribution											
63				95% H-UCL		25.92			90% Chebyshev (MVUE) UCL			27.44
64				95% Chebyshev (MVUE) UCL		29.3			97.5% Chebyshev (MVUE) UCL			31.88
65				99% Chebyshev (MVUE) UCL		36.95						
66												
67	Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics											
68	Data do not follow a Discernible Distribution (0.05)											
69												
70	Nonparametric Distribution Free UCLs											
71				95% CLT UCL		26.64			95% Jackknife UCL			26.68
72				95% Standard Bootstrap UCL		26.63			95% Bootstrap-t UCL			27.47
73				95% Hall's Bootstrap UCL		26.93			95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL			26.83
74				95% BCA Bootstrap UCL		27.21						
75				90% Chebyshev(Mean, Sd) UCL		29			95% Chebyshev(Mean, Sd) UCL			31.36
76				97.5% Chebyshev(Mean, Sd) UCL		34.64			99% Chebyshev(Mean, Sd) UCL			41.09
77												
78	Suggested UCL to Use											
79				95% Student's-t UCL		26.68			or 95% Modified-t UCL			26.76
80												
81	Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.											
82	Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.											
83	These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).											
84	However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.											
85												

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	UCL Statistics for Data Sets with Non-Detects											
2												
3	User Selected Options											
4	Date/Time of Computation	ProUCL 5.110/26/2021 5:02:33 AM										
5	From File	Stats for PROUCL_Outliers removed_d.xls										
6	Full Precision	OFF										
7	Confidence Coefficient	95%										
8	Number of Bootstrap Operations	2000										
9												
10	Acenaphthene											
11												
12	General Statistics											
13	Total Number of Observations	66					Number of Distinct Observations	17				
14	Number of Detects	6					Number of Non-Detects	60				
15	Number of Distinct Detects	5					Number of Distinct Non-Detects	12				
16	Minimum Detect	0.003					Minimum Non-Detect	0.002				
17	Maximum Detect	0.036					Maximum Non-Detect	0.0293				
18	Variance Detects	1.6616E-4					Percent Non-Detects	90.91%				
19	Mean Detects	0.0102					SD Detects	0.0129				
20	Median Detects	0.0051					CV Detects	1.27				
21	Skewness Detects	2.265					Kurtosis Detects	5.265				
22	Mean of Logged Detects	-5.066					SD of Logged Detects	0.971				
23												
24	Normal GOF Test on Detects Only											
25	Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.645					Shapiro Wilk GOF Test					
26	5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.788					Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
27	Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.378					Lilliefors GOF Test					
28	5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.325					Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
29	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level											
30												
31	Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics using Normal Critical Values and other Nonparametric UCLs											
32	KM Mean	0.00278					KM Standard Error of Mean	5.7823E-4				
33	KM SD	0.00427					95% KM (BCA) UCL	0.00396				
34	95% KM (t) UCL	0.00375					95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL	0.00377				
35	95% KM (z) UCL	0.00373					95% KM Bootstrap t UCL	0.00584				
36	90% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.00452					95% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0053				
37	97.5% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.00639					99% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.00853				
38												
39	Gamma GOF Tests on Detected Observations Only											
40	A-D Test Statistic	0.726					Anderson-Darling GOF Test					
41	5% A-D Critical Value	0.712					Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
42	K-S Test Statistic	0.274					Kolmogorov-Smirnov GOF					
43	5% K-S Critical Value	0.34					Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
44	Detected data follow Appr. Gamma Distribution at 5% Significance Level											
45												
46	Gamma Statistics on Detected Data Only											
47	k hat (MLE)	1.191					k star (bias corrected MLE)	0.707				
48	Theta hat (MLE)	0.00852					Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.0144				
49	nu hat (MLE)	14.29					nu star (bias corrected)	8.48				
50	Mean (detects)	0.0102										
51												
52	Gamma ROS Statistics using Imputed Non-Detects											
53	GROS may not be used when data set has > 50% NDs with many tied observations at multiple DLs											

54	GROS may not be used when kstar of detects is small such as <1.0, especially when the sample size is small (e.g., <15-20)										
55	For such situations, GROS method may yield incorrect values of UCLs and BTVs										
56	This is especially true when the sample size is small.										
57	For gamma distributed detected data, BTVs and UCLs may be computed using gamma distribution on KM estimates										
58					Minimum	0.003			Mean	0.01	
59					Maximum	0.036			Median	0.01	
60					SD	0.00358			CV	0.357	
61					k hat (MLE)	11.73			k star (bias corrected MLE)	11.21	
62					Theta hat (MLE)	8.5341E-4			Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	8.9324E-4	
63					nu hat (MLE)	1549			nu star (bias corrected)	1480	
64					Adjusted Level of Significance (β)	0.0464					
65					Approximate Chi Square Value (N/A, α)	1391			Adjusted Chi Square Value (N/A, β)	1390	
66					95% Gamma Approximate UCL (use when n>=50)	0.0106			95% Gamma Adjusted UCL (use when n<50)	0.0107	
67											
68	Estimates of Gamma Parameters using KM Estimates										
69					Mean (KM)	0.00278			SD (KM)	0.00427	
70					Variance (KM)	1.8194E-5			SE of Mean (KM)	5.7823E-4	
71					k hat (KM)	0.425			k star (KM)	0.416	
72					nu hat (KM)	56.12			nu star (KM)	54.91	
73					theta hat (KM)	0.00654			theta star (KM)	0.00669	
74					80% gamma percentile (KM)	0.00451			90% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0078	
75					95% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0114			99% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0204	
76											
77	Gamma Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics										
78					Approximate Chi Square Value (54.91, α)	38.88			Adjusted Chi Square Value (54.91, β)	38.58	
79					95% Gamma Approximate KM-UCL (use when n>=50)	0.00393			95% Gamma Adjusted KM-UCL (use when n<50)	0.00396	
80											
81	Lognormal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only										
82					Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.82			Shapiro Wilk GOF Test		
83					5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.788			Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
84					Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.258			Lilliefors GOF Test		
85					5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.325			Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
86	Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level										
87											
88	Lognormal ROS Statistics Using Imputed Non-Detects										
89					Mean in Original Scale	0.00113			Mean in Log Scale	-9.014	
90					SD in Original Scale	0.0046			SD in Log Scale	2.031	
91					95% t UCL (assumes normality of ROS data)	0.00207			95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL	0.00219	
92					95% BCA Bootstrap UCL	0.00313			95% Bootstrap t UCL	0.00459	
93					95% H-UCL (Log ROS)	0.00205					
94											
95	Statistics using KM estimates on Logged Data and Assuming Lognormal Distribution										
96					KM Mean (logged)	-6.099			KM Geo Mean	0.00225	
97					KM SD (logged)	0.435			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	1.826	
98					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.0605			95% H-UCL (KM -Log)	0.00272	
99					KM SD (logged)	0.435			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	1.826	
100					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.0605					
101											
102	DL/2 Statistics										
103					DL/2 Normal				DL/2 Log-Transformed		
104					Mean in Original Scale	0.00291			Mean in Log Scale	-6.408	
105					SD in Original Scale	0.0051			SD in Log Scale	0.879	
106					95% t UCL (Assumes normality)	0.00396			95% H-Stat UCL	0.00307	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
107	DL/2 is not a recommended method, provided for comparisons and historical reasons											
108												
109	Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics											
110	Detected Data appear Approximate Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level											
111												
112	Suggested UCL to Use											
113	95% KM Approximate Gamma UCL					0.00393						
114												
115	When a data set follows an approximate (e.g., normal) distribution passing one of the GOF test											
116	When applicable, it is suggested to use a UCL based upon a distribution (e.g., gamma) passing both GOF tests in ProUCL											
117												
118	Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.											
119	Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.											
120	These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).											
121	However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.											
122												

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	UCL Statistics for Data Sets with Non-Detects											
2												
3	User Selected Options											
4	Date/Time of Computation	ProUCL 5.110/26/2021 5:04:55 AM										
5	From File	Stats for PROUCL_Outliers removed_e.xls										
6	Full Precision	OFF										
7	Confidence Coefficient	95%										
8	Number of Bootstrap Operations	2000										
9												
10	Anthracene											
11												
12	General Statistics											
13	Total Number of Observations	66					Number of Distinct Observations	19				
14	Number of Detects	9					Number of Non-Detects	57				
15	Number of Distinct Detects	8					Number of Distinct Non-Detects	12				
16	Minimum Detect	0.0033					Minimum Non-Detect	0.002				
17	Maximum Detect	0.015					Maximum Non-Detect	0.0293				
18	Variance Detects	1.7828E-5					Percent Non-Detects	86.36%				
19	Mean Detects	0.00853					SD Detects	0.00422				
20	Median Detects	0.008					CV Detects	0.495				
21	Skewness Detects	0.583					Kurtosis Detects	-0.511				
22	Mean of Logged Detects	-4.881					SD of Logged Detects	0.53				
23												
24	Normal GOF Test on Detects Only											
25	Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.901					Shapiro Wilk GOF Test					
26	5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.829					Detected Data appear Normal at 5% Significance Level					
27	Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.178					Lilliefors GOF Test					
28	5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.274					Detected Data appear Normal at 5% Significance Level					
29	Detected Data appear Normal at 5% Significance Level											
30												
31	Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics using Normal Critical Values and other Nonparametric UCLs											
32	KM Mean	0.00297					KM Standard Error of Mean	3.7547E-4				
33	KM SD	0.00277					95% KM (BCA) UCL	0.00362				
34	95% KM (t) UCL	0.0036					95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL	0.00365				
35	95% KM (z) UCL	0.00359					95% KM Bootstrap t UCL	0.00374				
36	90% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0041					95% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.00461				
37	97.5% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.00532					99% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.00671				
38												
39	Gamma GOF Tests on Detected Observations Only											
40	A-D Test Statistic	0.309					Anderson-Darling GOF Test					
41	5% A-D Critical Value	0.724					Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
42	K-S Test Statistic	0.15					Kolmogorov-Smirnov GOF					
43	5% K-S Critical Value	0.28					Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
44	Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level											
45												
46	Gamma Statistics on Detected Data Only											
47	k hat (MLE)	4.415					k star (bias corrected MLE)	3.017				
48	Theta hat (MLE)	0.00193					Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.00283				
49	nu hat (MLE)	79.47					nu star (bias corrected)	54.31				
50	Mean (detects)	0.00853										
51												
52	Gamma ROS Statistics using Imputed Non-Detects											
53	GROS may not be used when data set has > 50% NDs with many tied observations at multiple DLs											

54	GROS may not be used when kstar of detects is small such as <1.0, especially when the sample size is small (e.g., <15-20)										
55	For such situations, GROS method may yield incorrect values of UCLs and BTVs										
56	This is especially true when the sample size is small.										
57	For gamma distributed detected data, BTVs and UCLs may be computed using gamma distribution on KM estimates										
58					Minimum	0.0033			Mean	0.0098	
59					Maximum	0.015			Median	0.01	
60					SD	0.00157			CV	0.16	
61					k hat (MLE)	28.82			k star (bias corrected MLE)	27.52	
62					Theta hat (MLE)	3.4002E-4			Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	3.5608E-4	
63					nu hat (MLE)	3804			nu star (bias corrected)	3633	
64					Adjusted Level of Significance (β)	0.0464					
65					Approximate Chi Square Value (N/A, α)	3494			Adjusted Chi Square Value (N/A, β)	3491	
66					95% Gamma Approximate UCL (use when n>=50)	0.0102			95% Gamma Adjusted UCL (use when n<50)	0.0102	
67											
68	Estimates of Gamma Parameters using KM Estimates										
69					Mean (KM)	0.00297			SD (KM)	0.00277	
70					Variance (KM)	7.6603E-6			SE of Mean (KM)	3.7547E-4	
71					k hat (KM)	1.154			k star (KM)	1.112	
72					nu hat (KM)	152.4			nu star (KM)	146.8	
73					theta hat (KM)	0.00258			theta star (KM)	0.00267	
74					80% gamma percentile (KM)	0.00474			90% gamma percentile (KM)	0.00667	
75					95% gamma percentile (KM)	0.00858			99% gamma percentile (KM)	0.013	
76											
77	Gamma Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics										
78					Approximate Chi Square Value (146.80, α)	119.8			Adjusted Chi Square Value (146.80, β)	119.3	
79					95% Gamma Approximate KM-UCL (use when n>=50)	0.00364			95% Gamma Adjusted KM-UCL (use when n<50)	0.00366	
80											
81	Lognormal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only										
82					Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.927			Shapiro Wilk GOF Test		
83					5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.829			Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
84					Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.174			Lilliefors GOF Test		
85					5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.274			Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
86	Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level										
87											
88	Lognormal ROS Statistics Using Imputed Non-Detects										
89					Mean in Original Scale	0.0022			Mean in Log Scale	-6.715	
90					SD in Original Scale	0.00304			SD in Log Scale	1.076	
91					95% t UCL (assumes normality of ROS data)	0.00283			95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL	0.00281	
92					95% BCA Bootstrap UCL	0.00301			95% Bootstrap t UCL	0.0031	
93					95% H-UCL (Log ROS)	0.00292					
94											
95	Statistics using KM estimates on Logged Data and Assuming Lognormal Distribution										
96					KM Mean (logged)	-6.014			KM Geo Mean	0.00244	
97					KM SD (logged)	0.511			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	1.873	
98					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.0698			95% H-UCL (KM -Log)	0.00314	
99					KM SD (logged)	0.511			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	1.873	
100					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.0698					
101											
102	DL/2 Statistics										
103	DL/2 Normal								DL/2 Log-Transformed		
104					Mean in Original Scale	0.00299			Mean in Log Scale	-6.348	
105					SD in Original Scale	0.00385			SD in Log Scale	0.92	
106					95% t UCL (Assumes normality)	0.00378			95% H-Stat UCL	0.00343	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
107	DL/2 is not a recommended method, provided for comparisons and historical reasons											
108												
109	Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics											
110	Detected Data appear Normal Distributed at 5% Significance Level											
111												
112	Suggested UCL to Use											
113					95% KM (t) UCL	0.0036						
114												
115	Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.											
116	Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.											
117	These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).											
118	However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.											
119												

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	UCL Statistics for Data Sets with Non-Detects											
2												
3	User Selected Options											
4	Date/Time of Computation	ProUCL 5.110/26/2021 5:06:46 AM										
5	From File	Stats for PROUCL_Outliers removed_f.xls										
6	Full Precision	OFF										
7	Confidence Coefficient	95%										
8	Number of Bootstrap Operations	2000										
9												
10	Fluoranthene											
11												
12	General Statistics											
13	Total Number of Observations	66					Number of Distinct Observations	29				
14	Number of Detects	21					Number of Non-Detects	45				
15	Number of Distinct Detects	17					Number of Distinct Non-Detects	13				
16	Minimum Detect	0.0021					Minimum Non-Detect	0.002				
17	Maximum Detect	0.13					Maximum Non-Detect	0.056				
18	Variance Detects	0.00118					Percent Non-Detects	68.18%				
19	Mean Detects	0.0292					SD Detects	0.0343				
20	Median Detects	0.0063					CV Detects	1.175				
21	Skewness Detects	1.528					Kurtosis Detects	2.375				
22	Mean of Logged Detects	-4.347					SD of Logged Detects	1.398				
23												
24	Normal GOF Test on Detects Only											
25	Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.788					Shapiro Wilk GOF Test					
26	5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.908					Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
27	Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.272					Lilliefors GOF Test					
28	5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.188					Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
29	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level											
30												
31	Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics using Normal Critical Values and other Nonparametric UCLs											
32	KM Mean	0.0108					KM Standard Error of Mean	0.00287				
33	KM SD	0.0227					95% KM (BCA) UCL	0.0161				
34	95% KM (t) UCL	0.0156					95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL	0.0156				
35	95% KM (z) UCL	0.0155					95% KM Bootstrap t UCL	0.0178				
36	90% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0194					95% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0233				
37	97.5% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0287					99% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0394				
38												
39	Gamma GOF Tests on Detected Observations Only											
40	A-D Test Statistic	1.241					Anderson-Darling GOF Test					
41	5% A-D Critical Value	0.784					Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
42	K-S Test Statistic	0.261					Kolmogorov-Smirnov GOF					
43	5% K-S Critical Value	0.197					Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
44	Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level											
45												
46	Gamma Statistics on Detected Data Only											
47	k hat (MLE)	0.737					k star (bias corrected MLE)	0.664				
48	Theta hat (MLE)	0.0396					Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.044				
49	nu hat (MLE)	30.97					nu star (bias corrected)	27.88				
50	Mean (detects)	0.0292										
51												
52	Gamma ROS Statistics using Imputed Non-Detects											
53	GROS may not be used when data set has > 50% NDs with many tied observations at multiple DLs											

54	GROS may not be used when kstar of detects is small such as <1.0, especially when the sample size is small (e.g., <15-20)										
55	For such situations, GROS method may yield incorrect values of UCLs and BTVs										
56	This is especially true when the sample size is small.										
57	For gamma distributed detected data, BTVs and UCLs may be computed using gamma distribution on KM estimates										
58					Minimum	0.0021			Mean	0.0161	
59					Maximum	0.13			Median	0.01	
60					SD	0.0211			CV	1.307	
61					k hat (MLE)	1.41			k star (bias corrected MLE)	1.356	
62					Theta hat (MLE)	0.0114			Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.0119	
63					nu hat (MLE)	186.1			nu star (bias corrected)	179	
64					Adjusted Level of Significance (β)	0.0464					
65					Approximate Chi Square Value (179.01, α)	149.1			Adjusted Chi Square Value (179.01, β)	148.5	
66					95% Gamma Approximate UCL (use when n>=50)	0.0193			95% Gamma Adjusted UCL (use when n<50)	0.0194	
67											
68	Estimates of Gamma Parameters using KM Estimates										
69					Mean (KM)	0.0108			SD (KM)	0.0227	
70					Variance (KM)	5.1710E-4			SE of Mean (KM)	0.00287	
71					k hat (KM)	0.225			k star (KM)	0.225	
72					nu hat (KM)	29.73			nu star (KM)	29.71	
73					theta hat (KM)	0.0479			theta star (KM)	0.0479	
74					80% gamma percentile (KM)	0.015			90% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0326	
75					95% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0539			99% gamma percentile (KM)	0.111	
76											
77	Gamma Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics										
78					Approximate Chi Square Value (29.71, α)	18.27			Adjusted Chi Square Value (29.71, β)	18.06	
79					95% Gamma Approximate KM-UCL (use when n>=50)	0.0176			95% Gamma Adjusted KM-UCL (use when n<50)	0.0177	
80											
81	Lognormal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only										
82					Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.868			Shapiro Wilk GOF Test		
83					5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.908			Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
84					Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.221			Lilliefors GOF Test		
85					5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.188			Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
86	Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level										
87											
88	Lognormal ROS Statistics Using Imputed Non-Detects										
89					Mean in Original Scale	0.00963			Mean in Log Scale	-6.993	
90					SD in Original Scale	0.0233			SD in Log Scale	2.291	
91					95% t UCL (assumes normality of ROS data)	0.0144			95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL	0.0147	
92					95% BCA Bootstrap UCL	0.0157			95% Bootstrap t UCL	0.017	
93					95% H-UCL (Log ROS)	0.0312					
94											
95	Statistics using KM estimates on Logged Data and Assuming Lognormal Distribution										
96					KM Mean (logged)	-5.59			KM Geo Mean	0.00373	
97					KM SD (logged)	1.16			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	2.234	
98					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.148			95% H-UCL (KM -Log)	0.0101	
99					KM SD (logged)	1.16			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	2.234	
100					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.148					
101											
102	DL/2 Statistics										
103					DL/2 Normal				DL/2 Log-Transformed		
104					Mean in Original Scale	0.0113			Mean in Log Scale	-5.759	
105					SD in Original Scale	0.023			SD in Log Scale	1.453	
106					95% t UCL (Assumes normality)	0.0161			95% H-Stat UCL	0.0138	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
107	DL/2 is not a recommended method, provided for comparisons and historical reasons											
108												
109	Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics											
110	Data do not follow a Discernible Distribution at 5% Significance Level											
111												
112	Suggested UCL to Use											
113	95% KM (Chebyshev) UCL					0.0233						
114												
115	Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.											
116	Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.											
117	These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).											
118	However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.											
119												

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	UCL Statistics for Data Sets with Non-Detects											
2												
3	User Selected Options											
4	Date/Time of Computation	ProUCL 5.110/26/2021 5:08:59 AM										
5	From File	Stats for PROUCL_Outliers removed_g.xls										
6	Full Precision	OFF										
7	Confidence Coefficient	95%										
8	Number of Bootstrap Operations	2000										
9												
10	Naphthalene											
11												
12	General Statistics											
13	Total Number of Observations	66					Number of Distinct Observations	21				
14	Number of Detects	9					Number of Non-Detects	57				
15	Number of Distinct Detects	9					Number of Distinct Non-Detects	13				
16	Minimum Detect	0.0021					Minimum Non-Detect	0.002				
17	Maximum Detect	0.076					Maximum Non-Detect	0.0293				
18	Variance Detects	7.3737E-4					Percent Non-Detects	86.36%				
19	Mean Detects	0.0194					SD Detects	0.0272				
20	Median Detects	0.0071					CV Detects	1.401				
21	Skewness Detects	1.685					Kurtosis Detects	1.54				
22	Mean of Logged Detects	-4.765					SD of Logged Detects	1.334				
23												
24	Normal GOF Test on Detects Only											
25	Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.683					Shapiro Wilk GOF Test					
26	5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.829					Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
27	Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.371					Lilliefors GOF Test					
28	5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.274					Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
29	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level											
30												
31	Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics using Normal Critical Values and other Nonparametric UCLs											
32	KM Mean	0.00442					KM Standard Error of Mean	0.00146				
33	KM SD	0.0112					95% KM (BCA) UCL	0.00697				
34	95% KM (t) UCL	0.00686					95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL	0.00699				
35	95% KM (z) UCL	0.00683					95% KM Bootstrap t UCL	0.0162				
36	90% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.00881					95% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0108				
37	97.5% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.0136					99% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.019				
38												
39	Gamma GOF Tests on Detected Observations Only											
40	A-D Test Statistic	0.699					Anderson-Darling GOF Test					
41	5% A-D Critical Value	0.753					Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
42	K-S Test Statistic	0.244					Kolmogorov-Smirnov GOF					
43	5% K-S Critical Value	0.29					Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
44	Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level											
45												
46	Gamma Statistics on Detected Data Only											
47	k hat (MLE)	0.732					k star (bias corrected MLE)	0.562				
48	Theta hat (MLE)	0.0265					Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.0345				
49	nu hat (MLE)	13.17					nu star (bias corrected)	10.11				
50	Mean (detects)	0.0194										
51												
52	Gamma ROS Statistics using Imputed Non-Detects											
53	GROS may not be used when data set has > 50% NDs with many tied observations at multiple DLs											

54	GROS may not be used when kstar of detects is small such as <1.0, especially when the sample size is small (e.g., <15-20)										
55	For such situations, GROS method may yield incorrect values of UCLs and BTVs										
56	This is especially true when the sample size is small.										
57	For gamma distributed detected data, BTVs and UCLs may be computed using gamma distribution on KM estimates										
58					Minimum	0.0021			Mean	0.0113	
59					Maximum	0.076			Median	0.01	
60					SD	0.0101			CV	0.892	
61					k hat (MLE)	3.677			k star (bias corrected MLE)	3.52	
62					Theta hat (MLE)	0.00307			Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.0032	
63					nu hat (MLE)	485.4			nu star (bias corrected)	464.7	
64					Adjusted Level of Significance (β)	0.0464					
65					Approximate Chi Square Value (464.66, α)	415.7			Adjusted Chi Square Value (464.66, β)	414.6	
66					95% Gamma Approximate UCL (use when n>=50)	0.0126			95% Gamma Adjusted UCL (use when n<50)	0.0126	
67											
68	Estimates of Gamma Parameters using KM Estimates										
69					Mean (KM)	0.00442			SD (KM)	0.0112	
70					Variance (KM)	1.2504E-4			SE of Mean (KM)	0.00146	
71					k hat (KM)	0.156			k star (KM)	0.159	
72					nu hat (KM)	20.63			nu star (KM)	21.03	
73					theta hat (KM)	0.0283			theta star (KM)	0.0278	
74					80% gamma percentile (KM)	0.00505			90% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0132	
75					95% gamma percentile (KM)	0.024			99% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0551	
76											
77	Gamma Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics										
78					Approximate Chi Square Value (21.03, α)	11.61			Adjusted Chi Square Value (21.03, β)	11.46	
79					95% Gamma Approximate KM-UCL (use when n>=50)	0.00801			95% Gamma Adjusted KM-UCL (use when n<50)	0.00812	
80											
81	Lognormal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only										
82					Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.889			Shapiro Wilk GOF Test		
83					5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.829			Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
84					Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.17			Lilliefors GOF Test		
85					5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.274			Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
86	Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level										
87											
88	Lognormal ROS Statistics Using Imputed Non-Detects										
89					Mean in Original Scale	0.00277			Mean in Log Scale	-9.521	
90					SD in Original Scale	0.0116			SD in Log Scale	2.762	
91					95% t UCL (assumes normality of ROS data)	0.00516			95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL	0.00531	
92					95% BCA Bootstrap UCL	0.00661			95% Bootstrap t UCL	0.0141	
93					95% H-UCL (Log ROS)	0.0108					
94											
95	Statistics using KM estimates on Logged Data and Assuming Lognormal Distribution										
96					KM Mean (logged)	-6.005			KM Geo Mean	0.00247	
97					KM SD (logged)	0.688			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	2.004	
98					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.0914			95% H-UCL (KM -Log)	0.00371	
99					KM SD (logged)	0.688			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	2.004	
100					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.0914					
101											
102	DL/2 Statistics										
103					DL/2 Normal				DL/2 Log-Transformed		
104					Mean in Original Scale	0.00459			Mean in Log Scale	-6.298	
105					SD in Original Scale	0.0116			SD in Log Scale	1.056	
106					95% t UCL (Assumes normality)	0.00697			95% H-Stat UCL	0.00432	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
107	DL/2 is not a recommended method, provided for comparisons and historical reasons											
108												
109	Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics											
110	Detected Data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level											
111												
112	Suggested UCL to Use											
113	95% KM Approximate Gamma UCL					0.00801						
114												
115	Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.											
116	Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.											
117	These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).											
118	However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.											
119												

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	UCL Statistics for Data Sets with Non-Detects											
2												
3	User Selected Options											
4	Date/Time of Computation	ProUCL 5.110/26/2021 5:12:46 AM										
5	From File	Stats for PROUCL_Outliers removed_h.xls										
6	Full Precision	OFF										
7	Confidence Coefficient	95%										
8	Number of Bootstrap Operations	2000										
9												
10	Pyrene											
11												
12	General Statistics											
13	Total Number of Observations					66	Number of Distinct Observations					31
14	Number of Detects					20	Number of Non-Detects					46
15	Number of Distinct Detects					19	Number of Distinct Non-Detects					12
16	Minimum Detect					0.0026	Minimum Non-Detect					0.002
17	Maximum Detect					0.12	Maximum Non-Detect					0.0293
18	Variance Detects					0.00129	Percent Non-Detects					69.7%
19	Mean Detects					0.0337	SD Detects					0.036
20	Median Detects					0.024	CV Detects					1.067
21	Skewness Detects					1.182	Kurtosis Detects					0.772
22	Mean of Logged Detects					-4.15	SD of Logged Detects					1.403
23												
24	Normal GOF Test on Detects Only											
25	Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic					0.824	Shapiro Wilk GOF Test					
26	5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value					0.905	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
27	Lilliefors Test Statistic					0.233	Lilliefors GOF Test					
28	5% Lilliefors Critical Value					0.192	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
29	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level											
30												
31	Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics using Normal Critical Values and other Nonparametric UCLs											
32	KM Mean					0.0117	KM Standard Error of Mean					0.00305
33	KM SD					0.0242	95% KM (BCA) UCL					0.0166
34	95% KM (t) UCL					0.0168	95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL					0.0169
35	95% KM (z) UCL					0.0167	95% KM Bootstrap t UCL					0.0181
36	90% KM Chebyshev UCL					0.0208	95% KM Chebyshev UCL					0.025
37	97.5% KM Chebyshev UCL					0.0307	99% KM Chebyshev UCL					0.042
38												
39	Gamma GOF Tests on Detected Observations Only											
40	A-D Test Statistic					0.992	Anderson-Darling GOF Test					
41	5% A-D Critical Value					0.778	Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
42	K-S Test Statistic					0.244	Kolmogorov-Smirnov GOF					
43	5% K-S Critical Value					0.201	Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
44	Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level											
45												
46	Gamma Statistics on Detected Data Only											
47	k hat (MLE)					0.783	k star (bias corrected MLE)					0.699
48	Theta hat (MLE)					0.043	Theta star (bias corrected MLE)					0.0482
49	nu hat (MLE)					31.33	nu star (bias corrected)					27.97
50	Mean (detects)					0.0337						
51												
52	Gamma ROS Statistics using Imputed Non-Detects											
53	GROS may not be used when data set has > 50% NDs with many tied observations at multiple DLs											

54	GROS may not be used when kstar of detects is small such as <1.0, especially when the sample size is small (e.g., <15-20)										
55	For such situations, GROS method may yield incorrect values of UCLs and BTVs										
56	This is especially true when the sample size is small.										
57	For gamma distributed detected data, BTVs and UCLs may be computed using gamma distribution on KM estimates										
58					Minimum	0.0026			Mean	0.0172	
59					Maximum	0.12			Median	0.01	
60					SD	0.0223			CV	1.299	
61					k hat (MLE)	1.383			k star (bias corrected MLE)	1.33	
62					Theta hat (MLE)	0.0124			Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.0129	
63					nu hat (MLE)	182.5			nu star (bias corrected)	175.5	
64					Adjusted Level of Significance (β)	0.0464					
65					Approximate Chi Square Value (175.54, α)	145.9			Adjusted Chi Square Value (175.54, β)	145.3	
66					95% Gamma Approximate UCL (use when n>=50)	0.0207			95% Gamma Adjusted UCL (use when n<50)	0.0208	
67											
68	Estimates of Gamma Parameters using KM Estimates										
69					Mean (KM)	0.0117			SD (KM)	0.0242	
70					Variance (KM)	5.8355E-4			SE of Mean (KM)	0.00305	
71					k hat (KM)	0.234			k star (KM)	0.233	
72					nu hat (KM)	30.84			nu star (KM)	30.78	
73					theta hat (KM)	0.05			theta star (KM)	0.0501	
74					80% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0165			90% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0352	
75					95% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0577			99% gamma percentile (KM)	0.118	
76											
77	Gamma Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics										
78					Approximate Chi Square Value (30.78, α)	19.1			Adjusted Chi Square Value (30.78, β)	18.9	
79					95% Gamma Approximate KM-UCL (use when n>=50)	0.0188			95% Gamma Adjusted KM-UCL (use when n<50)	0.019	
80											
81	Lognormal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only										
82					Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.864			Shapiro Wilk GOF Test		
83					5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.905			Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
84					Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.22			Lilliefors GOF Test		
85					5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.192			Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
86	Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level										
87											
88	Lognormal ROS Statistics Using Imputed Non-Detects										
89					Mean in Original Scale	0.0106			Mean in Log Scale	-7.068	
90					SD in Original Scale	0.0248			SD in Log Scale	2.439	
91					95% t UCL (assumes normality of ROS data)	0.0157			95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL	0.0158	
92					95% BCA Bootstrap UCL	0.0167			95% Bootstrap t UCL	0.018	
93					95% H-UCL (Log ROS)	0.0435					
94											
95	Statistics using KM estimates on Logged Data and Assuming Lognormal Distribution										
96					KM Mean (logged)	-5.568			KM Geo Mean	0.00382	
97					KM SD (logged)	1.207			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	2.2	
98					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.153			95% H-UCL (KM -Log)	0.011	
99					KM SD (logged)	1.207			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	2.2	
100					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.153					
101											
102	DL/2 Statistics										
103					DL/2 Normal				DL/2 Log-Transformed		
104					Mean in Original Scale	0.0119			Mean in Log Scale	-5.789	
105					SD in Original Scale	0.0244			SD in Log Scale	1.485	
106					95% t UCL (Assumes normality)	0.0169			95% H-Stat UCL	0.0143	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
107	DL/2 is not a recommended method, provided for comparisons and historical reasons											
108												
109	Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics											
110	Data do not follow a Discernible Distribution at 5% Significance Level											
111												
112	Suggested UCL to Use											
113	95% KM (Chebyshev) UCL					0.025						
114												
115	Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.											
116	Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.											
117	These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).											
118	However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.											
119												

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	UCL Statistics for Data Sets with Non-Detects											
2												
3	User Selected Options											
4	Date/Time of Computation	ProUCL 5.110/26/2021 5:15:33 AM										
5	From File	Stats for PROUCL_Outliers removed_i.xls										
6	Full Precision	OFF										
7	Confidence Coefficient	95%										
8	Number of Bootstrap Operations	2000										
9												
10	Total PCBs Aroclors											
11												
12	General Statistics											
13	Total Number of Observations	59					Number of Distinct Observations	12				
14	Number of Detects	4					Number of Non-Detects	55				
15	Number of Distinct Detects	4					Number of Distinct Non-Detects	8				
16	Minimum Detect	0.0023					Minimum Non-Detect	4.6800E-5				
17	Maximum Detect	0.0066					Maximum Non-Detect	0.2				
18	Variance Detects	4.4167E-6					Percent Non-Detects	93.22%				
19	Mean Detects	0.00345					SD Detects	0.0021				
20	Median Detects	0.00245					CV Detects	0.609				
21	Skewness Detects	1.991					Kurtosis Detects	3.97				
22	Mean of Logged Detects	-5.78					SD of Logged Detects	0.507				
23												
24	Normal GOF Test on Detects Only											
25	Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.667					Shapiro Wilk GOF Test					
26	5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.748					Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
27	Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.424					Lilliefors GOF Test					
28	5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.375					Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level					
29	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level											
30												
31	Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics using Normal Critical Values and other Nonparametric UCLs											
32	KM Mean	2.9222E-4					KM Standard Error of Mean	1.5541E-4				
33	KM SD	0.001					95% KM (BCA) UCL	N/A				
34	95% KM (t) UCL	5.5200E-4					95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL	N/A				
35	95% KM (z) UCL	5.4785E-4					95% KM Bootstrap t UCL	N/A				
36	90% KM Chebyshev UCL	7.5846E-4					95% KM Chebyshev UCL	9.6965E-4				
37	97.5% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.00126					99% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.00184				
38												
39	Gamma GOF Tests on Detected Observations Only											
40	A-D Test Statistic	0.835					Anderson-Darling GOF Test					
41	5% A-D Critical Value	0.659					Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
42	K-S Test Statistic	0.443					Kolmogorov-Smirnov GOF					
43	5% K-S Critical Value	0.396					Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level					
44	Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level											
45												
46	Gamma Statistics on Detected Data Only											
47	k hat (MLE)	4.688					k star (bias corrected MLE)	1.339				
48	Theta hat (MLE)	7.3598E-4					Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.00258				
49	nu hat (MLE)	37.5					nu star (bias corrected)	10.71				
50	Mean (detects)	0.00345										
51												
52	Gamma ROS Statistics using Imputed Non-Detects											
53	GROS may not be used when data set has > 50% NDs with many tied observations at multiple DLs											

54	GROS may not be used when kstar of detects is small such as <1.0, especially when the sample size is small (e.g., <15-20)										
55	For such situations, GROS method may yield incorrect values of UCLs and BTVs										
56	This is especially true when the sample size is small.										
57	For gamma distributed detected data, BTVs and UCLs may be computed using gamma distribution on KM estimates										
58					Minimum	0.0023			Mean	0.00956	
59					Maximum	0.01			Median	0.01	
60					SD	0.00173			CV	0.181	
61					k hat (MLE)	14.78			k star (bias corrected MLE)	14.04	
62					Theta hat (MLE)	6.4661E-4			Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	6.8070E-4	
63					nu hat (MLE)	1744			nu star (bias corrected)	1657	
64					Adjusted Level of Significance (β)	0.0459					
65					Approximate Chi Square Value (N/A, α)	1563			Adjusted Chi Square Value (N/A, β)	1561	
66					95% Gamma Approximate UCL (use when n>=50)	0.0101			95% Gamma Adjusted UCL (use when n<50)	N/A	
67											
68	Estimates of Gamma Parameters using KM Estimates										
69					Mean (KM)	2.9222E-4			SD (KM)	0.001	
70					Variance (KM)	1.0091E-6			SE of Mean (KM)	1.5541E-4	
71					k hat (KM)	0.0846			k star (KM)	0.0916	
72					nu hat (KM)	9.985			nu star (KM)	10.81	
73					theta hat (KM)	0.00345			theta star (KM)	0.00319	
74					80% gamma percentile (KM)	1.7720E-4			90% gamma percentile (KM)	7.4748E-4	
75					95% gamma percentile (KM)	0.0017			99% gamma percentile (KM)	0.00485	
76											
77	Gamma Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics										
78					Approximate Chi Square Value (10.81, α)	4.455			Adjusted Chi Square Value (10.81, β)	4.352	
79					95% Gamma Approximate KM-UCL (use when n>=50)	7.0918E-4			95% Gamma Adjusted KM-UCL (use when n<50)	7.2584E-4	
80											
81	Lognormal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only										
82					Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.693			Shapiro Wilk GOF Test		
83					5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.748			Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
84					Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.412			Lilliefors GOF Test		
85					5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.375			Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level		
86	Detected Data Not Lognormal at 5% Significance Level										
87											
88	Lognormal ROS Statistics Using Imputed Non-Detects										
89					Mean in Original Scale	5.3230E-4			Mean in Log Scale	-8.354	
90					SD in Original Scale	9.7838E-4			SD in Log Scale	1.258	
91					95% t UCL (assumes normality of ROS data)	7.4521E-4			95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL	7.6186E-4	
92					95% BCA Bootstrap UCL	8.4373E-4			95% Bootstrap t UCL	9.6967E-4	
93					95% H-UCL (Log ROS)	8.2962E-4					
94											
95	Statistics using KM estimates on Logged Data and Assuming Lognormal Distribution										
96					KM Mean (logged)	-9.666			KM Geo Mean	6.3374E-5	
97					KM SD (logged)	1.091			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	2.494	
98					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.169			95% H-UCL (KM -Log)	1.6436E-4	
99					KM SD (logged)	1.091			95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	2.494	
100					KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.169					
101											
102	DL/2 Statistics										
103					DL/2 Normal				DL/2 Log-Transformed		
104					Mean in Original Scale	0.0039			Mean in Log Scale	-6.826	
105					SD in Original Scale	0.0149			SD in Log Scale	1.221	
106					95% t UCL (Assumes normality)	0.00714			95% H-Stat UCL	0.00356	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
107	DL/2 is not a recommended method, provided for comparisons and historical reasons											
108												
109	Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics											
110	Data do not follow a Discernible Distribution at 5% Significance Level											
111												
112	Suggested UCL to Use											
113	95% KM (Chebyshev) UCL					9.6965E-4						
114												
115	Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.											
116	Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.											
117	These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).											
118	However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.											
119												

APPENDIX C

Detailed Cost Estimates

Table C-1. Remedial Alternative 1 Cost Estimate

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

CAPITAL COSTS

Direct Costs

Completed Interim Action	**Quantity**	**Units**	**Unit Cost**	**Cost ($)**	**Description**
Interim Action Sunk Costs	1	LS	$2,755,383	$2,755,383	

SBG-Containing Fill Removal from Shoreface					**Description**
Pre-Construction, Mobilization, Site Preparation	1	LS	10%	$76,000	Percent of total construction costs. Includes mob/demob, bonds/insurance, health and safety, temporary facilities and controls.
Excavation of Shoreface	2,400	CY	$66	$158,400	Excavation of SBG-containing fill in uplands inland of MHHW. Conducted from barge.
Soil Transportation to Subtitle D Facility	3,960	tons	$28	$110,880	Assumes 10% swell, and unit weight of 1.5 tons/LCY.
Soil Disposal at Subtitle D Landfill	3,960	tons	$54	$213,840	
Import, place and compact backfill	3,740	tons	$44	$164,560	Assume shoreface backfill material density of 1.3 ton/cy. Factor of 1.2 applied to account for compaction.
Turbidity Controls	1	LS	$0	$0	Assumes conducted concurrently with in-water cleanup.
Shoreface – Topographic Survey	1	LS	$4,000	$4,000	Lump sum based on 66% of shoreface area above MHHW.
Shoreface – Habitat Restoration	1	LS	$56,000	$56,000	Lump sum based on 66% of shoreface area above MHHW.
Shoring Wall Finish	1	LS	$50,000	$50,000	Shoring wall to be cut to restoration grade and stormwater outfalls restored.
			Direct Cost (Subtotal):	$3,589,063	
			B&O Tax (1.5% Subtotal):	$13,000	B&O and Sales Tax included in lump sum Interim Action sunk costs and only
			Sales Tax (10.25% Subtotal):	$85,000	applied to SBG-Containing Fill Removal from Shoreface (future costs).
			Total Direct Cost:	***$3,687,063***	

Indirect Costs	**Quantity**	**Units**	**Unit Cost**	**Extension**	**Description**
Upland Cleanup Action Plan	1	LS	$15,000	$15,000	Aspect contract authorized for this item.
Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring	4	Event	$15,000	$60,000	
Groundwater Compliance Monitoring Plan	1	LS	$10,000	$10,000	
Contaminated Media Management Plan	1	LS	$10,000	$10,000	
Institutional Controls	1	LS	$7,500	$7,500	
			Total Indirect Cost:	***$102,500***	
			Total Capital Costs (Subtotal):	$3,790,000	
			Contingency (20% Subtotal):	$206,923	Contingency only applied to future costs (not Interim Action Sunk Costs).
			TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS:	**$3,997,000**	

Long-term Monitoring and Reporting

Direct Annual Operating Costs	**Quantity**	**Units**	**Unit Cost**	**Extension**	**Description**
Groundwater Compliance Monitoring	1	Event	$15,000	$15,000	
Annual Reporting	1	Event	$10,000	$10,000	
			Project Management (15%):	$3,750	
			Annual Subtotals:	$28,750	Annual monitoring frequency before shoreface cleanup (years 1-5).
				$43,750	Semi-annual compliance monitoring frequency (years 6-10).
			TOTAL LONG-TERM MONITORING AND REPORTING COST:	**$360,000**	
			TOTAL REMEDY COST (Actual Dollars, 10 years):	***$4,360,000***	

Notes:

1. The costs presented are preliminary, Feasibility Study-level estimates based on existing information and are estimated to be within +50/-30% of actual costs.
2. The costs are in current dollars (2021). The estimate will need to be updated to account for inflation once the project is approved and the schedule is better defined.

Table C-2. Remedial Alternative 2 Cost Estimate

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

CAPITAL COSTS

Direct Costs

Completed Interim Action	**Quantity**	**Units**	**Unit Cost**	**Cost ($)**	**Description**
Interim Action Sunk Costs	1	LS	$2,755,383	$2,755,383	

SBG-Containing Fill and Piling Removal from Shoreface					**Description**
Pre-Construction, Mobilization, Site Preparation	1	LS	10%	$107,000	Percent of total construction costs. Includes mob/demob, bonds/insurance, health and safety, temporary facilities and controls.
Excavation of Shoreface	2,400	CY	$66	$158,400	Excavation of SBG-containing fill in uplands inland of MHHW. Conducted from barge.
Soil Transportation to Subtitle D Facility	3,960	tons	$28	$110,880	Assumes 10% swell, and unit weight of 1.5 tons/LCY
Soil Disposal at Subtitle D Landfill	3,960	tons	$54	$213,840	
Wood Piling Removal	1	LS	$200,000	$200,000	Based on project experience
Wood Piling Disposal	2,000	tons	$54	$108,000	
Import, place and compact backfill	3,740	tons	$44	$164,560	Assume shoreface backfill material density of 1.3 ton/cy. Factor of 1.2 applied to account for compaction.
Turbidity Controls	1	LS	$0	$0	Assumes conducted concurrently with in-water cleanup
Shoreface – Topographic Survey	1	LS	$4,000	$4,000	Lump sum based on 66% of shoreface area above MHHW.
Shoreface – Habitat Restoration	1	LS	$56,000	$56,000	Lump sum based on 66% of shoreface area above MHHW.
Shoring Wall Finish	1	LS	$50,000	$50,000	Shoring wall to be cut to restoration grade and stormwater outfalls restored
			Direct Cost (Subtotal):	$3,928,063	
			B&O Tax (1.5% Subtotal):	$18,000	B&O and Sales Tax included in lump sum Interim Action sunk costs and only applied to SBG-Containing Fill Removal from Shoreface (future costs).
			Sales Tax (10.25% Subtotal):	$120,000	
			Total Direct Cost:	***$4,066,063***	

Indirect Costs	**Quantity**	**Units**	**Unit Cost**	**Extension**	**Description**
Upland Cleanup Action Plan	1	LS	$15,000	$15,000	
Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring	4	Event	$15,000	$60,000	
Groundwater Compliance Monitoring Plan	1	LS	$10,000	$10,000	
Contaminated Media Management Plan	1	LS	$10,000	$10,000	
Institutional Controls	1	LS	$7,500	$7,500	
			Total Indirect Cost:	***$102,500***	
			Total Capital Costs (Subtotal):	$4,169,000	
			Contingency (20% Subtotal):	$282,723	Contingency only applied to future costs (not Interim Action Sunk Costs).
			TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS:	**$4,452,000**	

Long-term Monitoring and Reporting

Direct Annual Operating Costs	**Quantity**	**Units**	**Unit Cost**	**Extension**	**Description**
Groundwater Compliance Monitoring	1	Event	$15,000	$15,000	
Annual Reporting	1	Event	$10,000	$10,000	
			Project Management (15%):	$3,750	
			Annual Subtotals:	$28,750	Annual monitoring frequency before shoreface cleanup (years 1-5)
				$43,750	Semi-annual compliance monitoring frequency (years 6-10)
			TOTAL LONG-TERM MONITORING AND REPORTING COST:	**$360,000**	
			TOTAL REMEDY COST (Actual Dollars, 10 years):	***$4,810,000***	

Notes:

1. The costs presented are preliminary, Feasibility Study-level estimates based on existing information and are estimated to be within +50/-30% of actual costs.
2. The costs are in current dollars (2021). The estimate will need to be updated to account for inflation once the project is approved and the schedule is better defined.

Table C-3. Remedial Alternative 3 Cost Estimate

Project No. 150054, Snopac Property, Seattle, Washington

CAPITAL COSTS

Direct Costs

Completed Interim Action	**Quantity**	**Units**	**Unit Cost**	**Cost ($)**	**Description**
Interim Action Sunk Costs	1	LS	$2,755,383	$2,755,383	
SBG-Containing Fill and Piling Removal from Shoreface					**Description**
Pre-Construction, Mobilization, Site Preparation	1	LS	10%	$127,000	Percent of total construction costs. Includes mob/demob, bonds/insurance, health and safety, temporary facilities and controls.
Excavation of Shoreface	2,400	CY	$66	$158,400	Excavation of SBG-containing fill in uplands inland of MHHW. Conducted from barge.
Soil Transportation to Subtitle D Facility	3,960	tons	$28	$110,880	Assumes 10% swell, and unit weight of 1.5 tons/LCY
Soil Disposal at Subtitle D Landfill	3,960	tons	$54	$213,840	
Wood Piling Removal	1	LS	$200,000	$200,000	Based on project experience
Wood Piling Disposal	2,000	tons	$54	$108,000	
Import, place and compact backfill	3,740	tons	$44	$164,560	Assume shoreface backfill material density of 1.3 ton/cy. Factor of 1.2 applied to account for compaction.
Turbidity Controls	1	LS	$0	$0	Assumes conducted concurrently with in-water cleanup
Shoreface – Topographic Survey	1	LS	$4,000	$4,000	Lump sum based on 66% of shoreface area above MHHW.
Shoreface – Habitat Restoration	1	LS	$57,000	$57,000	Lump sum based on 66% of shoreface area above MHHW.
Shoring Wall Finish	1	LS	$50,000	$50,000	Shoring wall to be cut to restoration grade and stormwater outfalls restored
Fill Unit Groundwater Treatment					
Reagent Injection Subcontractors	15	days	$8,000	$120,000	Based on recent quotes from similar projects.
Zero Valent Iron (ZVI) Product	17,500	lbs	$5	$87,500	Based on Alternative 3 treatment area, saturated thickness of 6 ft, and reagent dosing of 0.5% by mass
			Direct Cost (Subtotal):	$4,156,563	
			B&O Tax (1.5% Subtotal):	$21,000	B&O and Sales Tax included in lump sum Interim Action sunk costs and only applied to SBG-Containing Fill Removal from Shoreface (future costs).
			Sales Tax (10.25% Subtotal):	$144,000	
			Total Direct Cost :	***$4,321,563***	

Indirect Costs	**Quantity**	**Units**	**Unit Cost**	**Extension**	**Description**
Upland Cleanup Action Plan	1	LS	$15,000	$15,000	
Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring	4	Event	$15,000	$60,000	
Groundwater Compliance Monitoring Plan	1	LS	$10,000	$10,000	
Contaminated Media Management Plan	1	LS	$10,000	$10,000	
Groundwater Treatment Design	1	LS	$25,000	$25,000	
Institutional Controls	1	LS	$7,500	$7,500	
			Total Indirect Cost :	***$127,500***	
			Total Capital Costs (Subtotal):	$4,449,000	
			Contingency (20% Subtotal):	$338,723	Contingency only applied to future costs (not Interim Action Sunk Costs).
			TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS:	**$4,788,000**	

Long-term Monitoring and Reporting

Direct Annual Operating Costs	**Quantity**	**Units**	**Unit Cost**	**Extension**	**Description**
Groundwater Compliance Monitoring	1	Event	$15,000	$15,000	
Annual Reporting	1	Event	$10,000	$10,000	
			Project Management (15%):	$3,750	
			Annual Subtotals:	$28,750	Annual monitoring frequency before shoreface cleanup (years 1-5)
				$43,750	Semi-annual compliance monitoring frequency (years 6-7)
			TOTAL LONG-TERM MONITORING AND REPORTING COST:	**$230,000**	
			TOTAL REMEDY COST (Actual Dollars, 7 years):	***$5,020,000***	

Notes:

1. The costs presented are preliminary, Feasibility Study-level estimates based on existing information and are estimated to be within +50/-30% of actual costs.
2. The costs are in current dollars (2021). The estimate will need to be updated to account for inflation once the project is approved and the schedule is better defined.

APPENDIX D

Post-Interim Action Groundwater Monitoring – Laboratory Reports

eurofins | Environment Testing America



ANALYTICAL REPORT

Eurofins FGS, Seattle
5755 8th Street East
Tacoma, WA 98424
Tel: (253)922-2310

Laboratory Job ID: 580-104116-1
Client Project/Site: 106490

For:
Friedman & Bruya
3012 16TH AVENUE WEST
Seattle, Washington 98119-2029

Attn: Michael Erdahl

Authorized for release by:
7/14/2021 3:04:25 PM

Nathan Lewis, Project Manager I
(253)922-2310
Nathan.Lewis@Eurofinset.com

LINKS

Review your project results through TotalAccess

Have a Question? Ask The Expert

Visit us at:
www.eurofinsus.com/Env

This report has been electronically signed and authorized by the signatory. Electronic signature is intended to be the legally binding equivalent of a traditionally handwritten signature.

Results relate only to the items tested and the sample(s) as received by the laboratory.

Table of Contents

Cover Page 1
Table of Contents 2
Case Narrative 3
Definitions 4
Client Sample Results 5
QC Sample Results 12
Chronicle 13
Certification Summary 15
Sample Summary 16
Chain of Custody 17
Receipt Checklists 18

Case Narrative

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Laboratory: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

Narrative

Job Narrative
580-104116-1

Comments
No additional comments.

Receipt
The samples were received on 6/29/2021 1:55 PM. Unless otherwise noted below, the samples arrived in good condition, and where required, properly preserved and on ice. The temperature of the cooler at receipt was 4.3º C.

GC/MS Semi VOA
Method Organotins: Surrogate recovery for the following sample was outside the upper control limit: MW16-062521 (580-104116-2). This sample did not contain any target analytes; therefore, re-extraction and/or re-analysis was not performed.

Organic Prep
No analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Definitions/Glossary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Qualifiers

GC/MS Semi VOA

Qualifier	Qualifier Description
J	Result is less than the RL but greater than or equal to the MDL and the concentration is an approximate value.
S1+	Surrogate recovery exceeds control limits, high biased.

Glossary

Abbreviation	These commonly used abbreviations may or may not be present in this report.
¤	Listed under the "D" column to designate that the result is reported on a dry weight basis
%R	Percent Recovery
CFL	Contains Free Liquid
CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CNF	Contains No Free Liquid
DER	Duplicate Error Ratio (normalized absolute difference)
Dil Fac	Dilution Factor
DL	Detection Limit (DoD/DOE)
DL, RA, RE, IN	Indicates a Dilution, Re-analysis, Re-extraction, or additional Initial metals/anion analysis of the sample
DLC	Decision Level Concentration (Radiochemistry)
EDL	Estimated Detection Limit (Dioxin)
LOD	Limit of Detection (DoD/DOE)
LOQ	Limit of Quantitation (DoD/DOE)
MCL	EPA recommended "Maximum Contaminant Level"
MDA	Minimum Detectable Activity (Radiochemistry)
MDC	Minimum Detectable Concentration (Radiochemistry)
MDL	Method Detection Limit
ML	Minimum Level (Dioxin)
MPN	Most Probable Number
MQL	Method Quantitation Limit
NC	Not Calculated
ND	Not Detected at the reporting limit (or MDL or EDL if shown)
NEG	Negative / Absent
POS	Positive / Present
PQL	Practical Quantitation Limit
PRES	Presumptive
QC	Quality Control
RER	Relative Error Ratio (Radiochemistry)
RL	Reporting Limit or Requested Limit (Radiochemistry)
RPD	Relative Percent Difference, a measure of the relative difference between two points
TEF	Toxicity Equivalent Factor (Dioxin)
TEQ	Toxicity Equivalent Quotient (Dioxin)
TNTC	Too Numerous To Count

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW15-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 07:55
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-1
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.35		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/06/21 22:45	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*76*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/06/21 22:45*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW16-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 08:00
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-2
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.35		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/06/21 23:11	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*151*	*S1+*	*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/06/21 23:11*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW13-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 10:05
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-3
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.33		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/06/21 23:37	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*84*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/06/21 23:37*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW14-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 10:09
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-4
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.34		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/07/21 00:03	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*35*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/07/21 00:03*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW17-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 11:47
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-5
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.35		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/07/21 00:30	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*38*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/07/21 00:30*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW-8-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 12:00
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-6
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.34		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/07/21 00:56	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*36*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/07/21 00:56*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW-160-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 13:30
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-7
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.35		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/07/21 01:22	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*95*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/07/21 01:22*	*1*

QC Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Lab Sample ID: MB 580-360666/1-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Method Blank
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte	MB Result	MB Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.30		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/06/21 21:26	1

Surrogate	*MB %Recovery*	*MB Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*103*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/06/21 21:26*	*1*

Lab Sample ID: LCS 580-360666/2-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte			Spike Added	LCS Result	LCS Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits		
Tributyltin			1.79	0.295	J	ug/L		16	11 - 150		

Surrogate	*LCS %Recovery*	*LCS Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*111*		*10 - 142*

Lab Sample ID: LCSD 580-360666/3-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample Dup
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte			Spike Added	LCSD Result	LCSD Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Tributyltin			1.79	0.348		ug/L		19	11 - 150	16	35

Surrogate	*LCSD %Recovery*	*LCSD Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*140*		*10 - 142*

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW15-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-1
Date Collected: 06/25/21 07:55
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/06/21 22:45	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW16-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-2
Date Collected: 06/25/21 08:00
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/06/21 23:11	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW13-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-3
Date Collected: 06/25/21 10:05
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/06/21 23:37	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW14-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-4
Date Collected: 06/25/21 10:09
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/07/21 00:03	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW17-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-5
Date Collected: 06/25/21 11:47
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/07/21 00:30	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-8-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-6
Date Collected: 06/25/21 12:00
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/07/21 00:56	TL1	FGS SEA

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW-160-062521

Date Collected: 06/25/21 13:30
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-7

Matrix: Water

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/07/21 01:22	TL1	FGS SEA

Laboratory References:

FGS SEA = Eurofins FGS, Seattle, 5755 8th Street East, Tacoma, WA 98424, TEL (253)922-2310

Accreditation/Certification Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Laboratory: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

All accreditations/certifications held by this laboratory are listed. Not all accreditations/certifications are applicable to this report.

Authority	Program	Identification Number	Expiration Date
Alaska (UST)	State	20-004	02-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Defense ELAP	L2236	01-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Energy	L2236	01-19-22
ANAB	ISO/IEC 17025	L2236	01-19-22
California	State	2954	06-30-21 *
Florida	NELAP	E87575	06-30-22
Kentucky (WW)	State	KY98042	12-31-21
Louisiana	NELAP	03073	06-30-22
Maine	State	2020012	05-02-22
Montana (UST)	State	NA	04-14-27
New Jersey	NELAP	WA014	06-30-22
New York	NELAP	11662	04-01-22
Oregon	NELAP	4167	07-07-21
US Fish & Wildlife	US Federal Programs	058448	05-31-22
USDA	US Federal Programs	P330-20-00031	02-10-23
Washington	State	C788	07-13-21
Wisconsin	State	399133460	08-31-21

* Accreditation/Certification renewal pending - accreditation/certification considered valid.

Sample Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Lab Sample ID	Client Sample ID	Matrix	Collected	Received	Asset ID
580-104116-1	MW15-062521	Water	06/25/21 07:55	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-2	MW16-062521	Water	06/25/21 08:00	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-3	MW13-062521	Water	06/25/21 10:05	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-4	MW14-062521	Water	06/25/21 10:09	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-5	MW17-062521	Water	06/25/21 11:47	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-6	MW-8-062521	Water	06/25/21 12:00	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-7	MW-160-062521	Water	06/25/21 13:30	06/29/21 13:55	

SUBCONTRACT SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Send Report To Michael Erdahl

Company Friedman and Bruya, Inc.

Address 3012 16th Ave W

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98119

Phone # (206) 285-8282 merdahl@friedmanandbruya.com

SUBCONTRACTER Eurofins

PROJECT NAME/NO. 106490

PO # B-312

REMARKS

Please Email Results

TURNAROUND TIME

☒ Standard TAT

☐ RUSH

Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL

☐ Dispose after 30 days

☐ Return samples

☐ Will call with instructions

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Matrix	# of jars	ANALYSES REQUESTED: Dioxins/Furans	EPH	VPH	Tributyltin							Notes
MW15-062521		6/25/21	0755	Water	1				X							
MW16-062521			0800		1				X							
MW13-062521			~~0915~~ 1005		1				X							
MW14-062521			~~1005~~ 1009		1				X							
MW17-062521			~~1009~~ 1147		1				X							
MW-8-062521			~~1147~~ 1200		1				X							
MW-160-062521			1330		1				X							

SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by:	Michael Erdahl	Friedman & Bruya	6/28/21	
Received by:	Kim Crosby	EFGS	6/29/21	1355
Relinquished by:				
Received by:				

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282
Fax (206) 283-5044

580-104116 Chain of Custody

Therm. ID: IR9 Cor: 4.3 ° Unc: 4.3 °

Cooler Dsc: Ice

Packing:

Cust. Seal: Yes No X

Blue Ice, Wet, Dry, None

FedEx:

UPS:

Lab Cour: X

Other:

7/14/2021

Login Sample Receipt Checklist

Client: Friedman & Bruya

Job Number: 580-104116-1

Login Number: 104116
List Number: 1
Creator: Greene, Ashton R

List Source: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

Question	Answer	Comment
Radioactivity wasn't checked or is </= background as measured by a survey meter.	N/A	
The cooler's custody seal, if present, is intact.	True	
Sample custody seals, if present, are intact.	True	
The cooler or samples do not appear to have been compromised or tampered with.	True	
Samples were received on ice.	True	
Cooler Temperature is acceptable.	True	
Cooler Temperature is recorded.	True	
COC is present.	True	
COC is filled out in ink and legible.	True	
COC is filled out with all pertinent information.	True	
Is the Field Sampler's name present on COC?	False	Received project as a subcontract.
There are no discrepancies between the containers received and the COC.	True	
Samples are received within Holding Time (excluding tests with immediate HTs)	True	
Sample containers have legible labels.	True	
Containers are not broken or leaking.	True	
Sample collection date/times are provided.	True	
Appropriate sample containers are used.	True	
Sample bottles are completely filled.	True	
Sample Preservation Verified.	True	
There is sufficient vol. for all requested analyses, incl. any requested MS/MSDs	True	
Containers requiring zero headspace have no headspace or bubble is <6mm (1/4").	True	
Multiphasic samples are not present.	True	
Samples do not require splitting or compositing.	True	
Residual Chlorine Checked.	N/A	

eurofins | Environment Testing America



ANALYTICAL REPORT

Eurofins FGS, Seattle
5755 8th Street East
Tacoma, WA 98424
Tel: (253)922-2310

Laboratory Job ID: 580-104115-1
Client Project/Site: 106507

For:
Friedman & Bruya
3012 16TH AVENUE WEST
Seattle, Washington 98119-2029

Attn: Michael Erdahl

Authorized for release by:
7/14/2021 12:21:29 PM

Nathan Lewis, Project Manager I
(253)922-2310
Nathan.Lewis@Eurofinset.com

LINKS
Review your project results through TotalAccess
Have a Question? Ask The Expert
Visit us at: www.eurofinsus.com/Env

This report has been electronically signed and authorized by the signatory. Electronic signature is intended to be the legally binding equivalent of a traditionally handwritten signature.

Results relate only to the items tested and the sample(s) as received by the laboratory.

Table of Contents

Cover Page 1
Table of Contents 2
Case Narrative 3
Definitions 4
Client Sample Results 5
QC Sample Results 6
Chronicle 7
Certification Summary 8
Sample Summary 9
Chain of Custody 10
Receipt Checklists 11

Case Narrative

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Laboratory: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

Narrative

Job Narrative
580-104115-1

Comments
No additional comments.

Receipt
The sample was received on 6/29/2021 1:55 PM. Unless otherwise noted below, the sample arrived in good condition, and where required, properly preserved and on ice. The temperature of the cooler at receipt was 4.3º C.

GC/MS Semi VOA
Method Organotins: The laboratory control sample (LCS) and laboratory control sample duplicate (LCSD) for preparation batch 580-360666 and analytical batch 580-361143 recovered outside control limits for the following analytes: Dibutyltin. This analyte was biased high in the LCS and was not detected in the associated samples; therefore, the data have been reported.

No additional analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described above or in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Organic Prep
No analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Definitions/Glossary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Qualifiers

GC/MS Semi VOA

Qualifier	Qualifier Description
J	Result is less than the RL but greater than or equal to the MDL and the concentration is an approximate value.

Glossary

Abbreviation	These commonly used abbreviations may or may not be present in this report.
¤	Listed under the "D" column to designate that the result is reported on a dry weight basis
%R	Percent Recovery
CFL	Contains Free Liquid
CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CNF	Contains No Free Liquid
DER	Duplicate Error Ratio (normalized absolute difference)
Dil Fac	Dilution Factor
DL	Detection Limit (DoD/DOE)
DL, RA, RE, IN	Indicates a Dilution, Re-analysis, Re-extraction, or additional Initial metals/anion analysis of the sample
DLC	Decision Level Concentration (Radiochemistry)
EDL	Estimated Detection Limit (Dioxin)
LOD	Limit of Detection (DoD/DOE)
LOQ	Limit of Quantitation (DoD/DOE)
MCL	EPA recommended "Maximum Contaminant Level"
MDA	Minimum Detectable Activity (Radiochemistry)
MDC	Minimum Detectable Concentration (Radiochemistry)
MDL	Method Detection Limit
ML	Minimum Level (Dioxin)
MPN	Most Probable Number
MQL	Method Quantitation Limit
NC	Not Calculated
ND	Not Detected at the reporting limit (or MDL or EDL if shown)
NEG	Negative / Absent
POS	Positive / Present
PQL	Practical Quantitation Limit
PRES	Presumptive
QC	Quality Control
RER	Relative Error Ratio (Radiochemistry)
RL	Reporting Limit or Requested Limit (Radiochemistry)
RPD	Relative Percent Difference, a measure of the relative difference between two points
TEF	Toxicity Equivalent Factor (Dioxin)
TEQ	Toxicity Equivalent Quotient (Dioxin)
TNTC	Too Numerous To Count

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Client Sample ID: MW-12-062921
Date Collected: 06/29/21 10:55
Date Received: 06/29/21 14:03

Lab Sample ID: 580-104115-1
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.35		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/07/21 01:48	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*48*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/07/21 01:48*	*1*

QC Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Lab Sample ID: MB 580-360666/1-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Method Blank
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte	MB Result	MB Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.30		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/06/21 21:26	1

Surrogate	*MB %Recovery*	*MB Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*103*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/06/21 21:26*	*1*

Lab Sample ID: LCS 580-360666/2-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte			Spike Added	LCS Result	LCS Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits		
Tributyltin			1.79	0.295	J	ug/L		16	11 - 150		

Surrogate	*LCS %Recovery*	*LCS Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*111*		*10 - 142*

Lab Sample ID: LCSD 580-360666/3-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample Dup
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte			Spike Added	LCSD Result	LCSD Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Tributyltin			1.79	0.348		ug/L		19	11 - 150	16	35

Surrogate	*LCSD %Recovery*	*LCSD Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*140*		*10 - 142*

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Client Sample ID: MW-12-062921

Date Collected: 06/29/21 10:55
Date Received: 06/29/21 14:03

Lab Sample ID: 580-104115-1

Matrix: Water

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/07/21 01:48	TL1	FGS SEA

Laboratory References:

FGS SEA = Eurofins FGS, Seattle, 5755 8th Street East, Tacoma, WA 98424, TEL (253)922-2310

Accreditation/Certification Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Laboratory: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

All accreditations/certifications held by this laboratory are listed. Not all accreditations/certifications are applicable to this report.

Authority	Program	Identification Number	Expiration Date
Alaska (UST)	State	20-004	02-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Defense ELAP	L2236	01-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Energy	L2236	01-19-22
ANAB	ISO/IEC 17025	L2236	01-19-22
California	State	2954	06-30-21 *
Florida	NELAP	E87575	06-30-22
Kentucky (WW)	State	KY98042	12-31-21
Louisiana	NELAP	03073	06-30-22
Maine	State	2020012	05-02-22
Montana (UST)	State	NA	04-14-27
New Jersey	NELAP	WA014	06-30-22
New York	NELAP	11662	04-01-22
Oregon	NELAP	4167	07-07-21
US Fish & Wildlife	US Federal Programs	058448	05-31-22
USDA	US Federal Programs	P330-20-00031	02-10-23
Washington	State	C788	07-13-21
Wisconsin	State	399133460	08-31-21

* Accreditation/Certification renewal pending - accreditation/certification considered valid.

Sample Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Lab Sample ID	Client Sample ID	Matrix	Collected	Received	Asset ID
580-104115-1	MW-12-062921	Water	06/29/21 10:55	06/29/21 14:03	

SUBCONTRACT SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Send Report To Michael Erdahl

Company Friedman and Bruya, Inc.

Address 3012 16th Ave W

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98119

Phone # (206) 285-8282 merdahl@friedmanandbruya.com

SUBCONTRACTER Eurofins

PROJECT NAME/NO.	PO #
106507	B-312

REMARKS

Please Email Results

TURNAROUND TIME

☑ Standard TAT

☐ RUSH

Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL

☐ Dispose after 30 days

☐ Return samples

☐ Will call with instructions

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Matrix	# of jars	ANALYSES REQUESTED: Dioxins/Furans	EPH	VPH	Tributyltin							Notes
MW-12-062921		6/29/21	1055	water	1				X							

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282
Fax (206) 283-5044

	SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by:		Michael Erdahl	Friedman & Bruya	6/29/21	1225
Received by:		Kim Presley	EFGS	6/29/21	1355
Relinquished by:					
Received by:					

Therm. ID: IR9 Cor: 4.3 ° Unc: 4.3 °

Cooler Dsc: Ice Blue

Packing: Bubble

Cust. Seal: Yes No ☒

Blue Ice: Wet, Dry, None

FedEx:

UPS:

Lab Cour: ☒

Other:

7/14/2021

Login Sample Receipt Checklist

Client: Friedman & Bruya

Job Number: 580-104115-1

Login Number: 104115
List Number: 1
Creator: Greene, Ashton R

List Source: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

Question	Answer	Comment
Radioactivity wasn't checked or is </= background as measured by a survey meter.	N/A	
The cooler's custody seal, if present, is intact.	True	
Sample custody seals, if present, are intact.	True	
The cooler or samples do not appear to have been compromised or tampered with.	True	
Samples were received on ice.	True	
Cooler Temperature is acceptable.	True	
Cooler Temperature is recorded.	True	
COC is present.	True	
COC is filled out in ink and legible.	True	
COC is filled out with all pertinent information.	True	
Is the Field Sampler's name present on COC?	False	Received project as a subcontract.
There are no discrepancies between the containers received and the COC.	True	
Samples are received within Holding Time (excluding tests with immediate HTs)	True	
Sample containers have legible labels.	True	
Containers are not broken or leaking.	True	
Sample collection date/times are provided.	True	
Appropriate sample containers are used.	True	
Sample bottles are completely filled.	True	
Sample Preservation Verified.	True	
There is sufficient vol. for all requested analyses, incl. any requested MS/MSDs	True	
Containers requiring zero headspace have no headspace or bubble is <6mm (1/4").	True	
Multiphasic samples are not present.	True	
Samples do not require splitting or compositing.	True	
Residual Chlorine Checked.	N/A	

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

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

July 15, 2021

Breeyn Greer, Project Manager
Aspect Consulting, LLC
710 2nd Ave S, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms Greer:

Included are the amended results from the testing of material submitted on June 25, 2021 from the SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490 project. The naphthalene, mercury and metals reporting limits were lowered.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.



Michael Erdahl
Project Manager

Enclosures
c: Aspect Data, Adam Griffin
ASP0708R.DOC

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

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

July 8, 2021

Breeyn Greer, Project Manager
Aspect Consulting, LLC
710 2nd Ave S, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms Greer:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on June 25, 2021 from the SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490 project. There are 42 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days, or as directed by the Chain of Custody document. 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 have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.



Michael Erdahl
Project Manager

Enclosures
c: Aspect Data, Adam Griffin
ASP0708R.DOC

CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on June 25, 2021 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the Aspect Consulting, LLC SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

Laboratory ID	Aspect Consulting, LLC
106490 -01	MW-15-062521
106490 -02	MW-16-062521
106490 -03	MW-12-062521
106490 -04	MW-13-062521
106490 -05	MW-14-062521
106490 -06	MW-17-062521
106490 -07	MW-8-062521
106490 -08	MW-160-062521

The samples were sent to Eurofins for tributyltin analysis. The report will be forwarded upon receipt.

Zinc in the 200.8 matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate failed the acceptance criteria. The laboratory control sample passed the acceptance criteria, therefore the results were due to matrix effect.

The 8082 laboratory control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate failed the relative percent difference for Aroclor 1260. PCBs were not detected, therefore the data were acceptable.

All other quality control requirements were acceptable.

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/25/21
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted: 06/28/21
Date Analyzed: 06/28/21

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 Laboratory ID	Diesel Range (C_{10}-C_{25})	Motor Oil Range (C_{25}-C_{36})	Surrogate (% Recovery) (Limit 41-152)
MW-13-062521 106490-04	230 x	<250	83
Method Blank 01-1504 MB	<50	<250	130

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-15-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-01
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	106490-01.148
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	5.55
Copper	3.76
Lead	<1
Nickel	12.9
Zinc	4.57

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-16-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-02 x2
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	106490-02 x2.157
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Copper	4.54
Lead	<1
Nickel	10.0
Zinc	5.07

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-16-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-02 x10
Date Analyzed:	06/30/21	Data File:	106490-02 x10.158
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	24.1

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-12-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-03
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	106490-03.149
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	23.7
Copper	<1
Lead	<1
Nickel	14.1
Zinc	1.99

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-13-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-04
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	106490-04.150
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	2.97
Copper	4.03
Lead	<1
Nickel	42.6

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-13-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-04 x10
Date Analyzed:	06/30/21	Data File:	106490-04 x10.147
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Zinc	161

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-14-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-05
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	106490-05.151
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.03
Copper	<1
Lead	<1
Nickel	2.79
Zinc	1.62

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-17-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-06
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	106490-06.152
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	<1
Lead	<1
Nickel	2.19
Zinc	5.85

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-8-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-07
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	106490-07.153
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.17
Copper	<1
Lead	<1
Nickel	1.74
Zinc	<1

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-160-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-08 x2
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	106490-08 x2.158
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Copper	6.26
Lead	<1
Nickel	11.0
Zinc	17.4

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-160-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-08 x10
Date Analyzed:	06/30/21	Data File:	106490-08 x10.159
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	23.6

Analysis For Total Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	NA	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	I1-407 mb
Date Analyzed:	06/30/21	Data File:	I1-407 mb.095
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	<1
Lead	<0.5
Nickel	<1
Zinc	<1

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/25/21
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted: 06/28/21
Date Analyzed: 06/29/21

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED MERCURY USING EPA METHOD 1631E

Results Reported as ug/L (ppb)

Sample ID Laboratory ID	Dissolved Mercury
MW-15-062521 106490-01	<0.01
MW-16-062521 106490-02	<0.01
MW-12-062521 106490-03	<0.01
MW-13-062521 106490-04	<0.01
MW-14-062521 106490-05	<0.01
MW-17-062521 106490-06	<0.01
MW-8-062521 106490-07	<0.01
MW-160-062521 106490-08	<0.01
Method Blank i1-403 MB	<0.01

Analysis for Semivolatile Phenols By EPA Method 8270E SIM

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	07/01/21	Lab ID:	106490-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/02/21	Data File:	070227.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15 ip	50	150
Phenol-d6	10 ip	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	88	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Pentachlorophenol	<0.05

Analysis for Semivolatile Phenols By EPA Method 8270E SIM

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	07/01/21	Lab ID:	01-1540 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/02/21	Data File:	070225.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	13 vo	50	150
Phenol-d6	8 vo	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	74	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Pentachlorophenol	<0.05

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-15-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	070110.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	12	11	65
Phenol-d6	9 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	59	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	54	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	57	30	131
Terphenyl-d14	57	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	0.011
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	0.013
Fluorene	0.0050
Phenanthrene	0.016
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.012
Pyrene	0.012
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-16-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-02 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	070111.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	14	11	65
Phenol-d6	10 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	64	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	68	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	81	30	131
Terphenyl-d14	76	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.005
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.014
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.0065
Pyrene	0.0080
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	070112.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	10 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	9 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	60	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	64	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	78	30	131
Terphenyl-d14	76	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	0.005
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.072
Acenaphthylene	0.080
Acenaphthene	3.4
Fluorene	1.1
Phenanthrene	0.014
Anthracene	0.095
Fluoranthene	0.86
Pyrene	0.56
Benz(a)anthracene	0.019
Chrysene	0.019
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-14-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-05 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	070113.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	10 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	9 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	50	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	50	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	66	30	131
Terphenyl-d14	65	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	0.62
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.12
Acenaphthylene	0.0055
Acenaphthene	0.87
Fluorene	0.10
Phenanthrene	0.092
Anthracene	0.039
Fluoranthene	0.11
Pyrene	0.11
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-17-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-06 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	070114.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	7 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	6 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	42 ip	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	43 ip	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	68	30	131
Terphenyl-d14	55	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	0.015
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	0.0067
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.012
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.0065
Pyrene	0.0060
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-8-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-07 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	070115.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	13	11	65
Phenol-d6	10 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	63	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	64	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	93	30	131
Terphenyl-d14	83	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	0.0068
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0085
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-160-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	070116.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	3 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	3 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	24 ip	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	28 ip	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	44	30	131
Terphenyl-d14	41 ip	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.005
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0075
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.0070
Pyrene	0.0092
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	01-1531 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	070109.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15	11	65
Phenol-d6	10 vo	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	75	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	76	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	78	30	131
Terphenyl-d14	89	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.005
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-15-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/28/21	Lab ID:	106490-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/29/21	Data File:	062907.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	37	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-16-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/28/21	Lab ID:	106490-02 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/29/21	Data File:	062908.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	24	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/28/21	Lab ID:	106490-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/29/21	Data File:	062910.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	28	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-14-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-05 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/30/21	Data File:	063010.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	40	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-17-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106490-06 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/30/21	Data File:	063011.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	26	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-8-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/28/21	Lab ID:	106490-07 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/29/21	Data File:	062913.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	29	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-160-062521	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/25/21	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/28/21	Lab ID:	106490-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/29/21	Data File:	062914.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	32	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/28/21	Lab ID:	01-1506 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/29/21	Data File:	062906.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	25	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	01-1532 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/30/21	Data File:	063007.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	47	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/25/21
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490

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

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Diesel Extended	ug/L (ppb)	2,500	132	140	63-142	6

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/25/21
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED METALS USING EPA METHOD 200.8

Laboratory Code: 106488-02 (Matrix Spike)

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Sample Result	Percent Recovery MS	Percent Recovery MSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Arsenic	ug/L (ppb)	10	11.5	97	94	70-130	3
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	<5	70	70	70-130	0
Lead	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	76	76	70-130	0
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	6.52	73	71	70-130	3
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	<5	68 vo	67 vo	70-130	1

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Acceptance Criteria
Arsenic	ug/L (ppb)	10	94	85-115
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	100	85-115
Lead	ug/L (ppb)	10	97	85-115
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	100	85-115
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	92	85-115

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/25/21
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED MERCURY USING EPA METHOD 1631E

Laboratory Code: 106490-01 (Matrix Spike)

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Sample Result	Percent Recovery MS	Percent Recovery MSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Mercury	ug/L (ppb)	0.01	<0.01	79	82	71-125	4

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Mercury	ug/L (ppb)	0.01	96	99	78-125	3

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/25/21
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILE PHENOLS BY EPA METHOD 8270E SIM

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 30)
Pentachlorophenol	ug/L (ppb)	0.63	99	96	70-130	3

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/25/21
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILES BY EPA METHOD 8270E

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Naphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	67	67	66-94	0
2-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	72	71	68-98	1
1-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	73	71	67-97	3
Acenaphthylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	77	76	70-130	1
Acenaphthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	73	72	70-130	1
Fluorene	ug/L (ppb)	5	79	77	70-130	3
Phenanthrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	79	80	70-130	1
Anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	80	81	70-130	1
Fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	88	87	70-130	1
Pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	86	84	70-130	2
Benz(a)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	85	70-130	1
Chrysene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	84	70-130	0
Benzo(a)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	90	90	70-130	0
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	87	62-130	2
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	84	70-130	0
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	94	94	70-130	0
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	91	70-130	2
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	86	87	70-130	1

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/25/21
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS AS AROCLOR 1016/1260 BY EPA METHOD 8082A

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Aroclor 1016	ug/L (ppb)	0.13	53	60	25-111	12
Aroclor 1260	ug/L (ppb)	0.13	65	81	23-123	22 vo

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/25/21
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 106490

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS AS AROCLOR 1016/1260 BY EPA METHOD 8082A

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Aroclor 1016	ug/L (ppb)	0.13	66	64	25-111	3
Aroclor 1260	ug/L (ppb)	0.13	77	80	23-123	4

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.

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.

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 analyte 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 due to sample matrix effects.

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.

106490

SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

ME 06/25/21 AIG 1 of 1

Page # 1 of 1

Report To Breagn Greer

Company Aspect

Address

City, State, ZIP

Phone 316.617.0499 Email bgreer@aspectconsulting.com

SAMPLERS (signature)

PROJECT NAME: SnoPal

PO #: 150054

REMARKS

Project specific RLs? - Yes / No

INVOICE TO

TURNAROUND TIME
- ☑ Standard turnaround
- ☐ RUSH
- Rush charges authorized by:


SAMPLE DISPOSAL
- ☐ Archive samples
- ☐ Other
- Default: Dispose after 30 days

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Type	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	BTEX EPA 8021	NWTPH-HCID	VOCs EPA 8260	Low level PAH - 8270 PAHs EPA 8270	TCL3 - add'l cPAHs - 8270 PCBs EPA 8082	Dissolved As, Cu, Pb Ni, Zn - 200.8	Dissolved Hg MALVd 1631E	Tributyltin - 250 SIM	PFAS - 537.1	SDG 106507 Turbidity & TDS
MW-15-062521	01 A→J	6/25/21	0755	Water	10						X	X	X	X	X		6 / 6796
MW-16-062521	02 A→I		0800		9												5 / 17840
MW-12-062521	03 A→E		0915		5						●	●			●		12 / 1230
MW-13-062521	04 A→K		1005		11	X										X	2 / 5498
MW-14-062521	05 A→I		1009		9												8 / 1270
MW-17-062521	06 A→J		1147		10												<25 / 564
MW-8-062521	07 A→J		1200		10												10 / 1375
MW-160-062521	08 A→I	↓	1330	↓	9						↓	↓	↓	↓	↓		5 / 17840

● PAHs, PCBs, TBT issued in Notes SDG 106507


SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by:	Daniel Schmidt	Aspect	6/25/21	1717
Received by:	JOE MOHAMMED	FEDEX	6/25/21	1717
Relinquished by:				
Received by:		Samples received at 3 °C		

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282




Data File Name : C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\06-28-21\030F0901.D
Operator : TL
Instrument : GC1
Sample Name : 106490-04
Run Time Bar Code:
Acquired on : 28 Jun 21 04:58 PM
Report Created on: 29 Jun 21 10:19 AM

Page Number : 1
Vial Number : 30
Injection Number : 1
Sequence Line : 9
Instrument Method: DX.MTH
Analysis Method : DEFAULT.MTH



Data File Name : C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\06-28-21\024F0701.D
Operator : TL
Instrument : GC1
Sample Name : 01-1504 mb
Run Time Bar Code:
Acquired on : 28 Jun 21 03:19 PM
Report Created on: 29 Jun 21 10:26 AM

Page Number : 1
Vial Number : 24
Injection Number : 1
Sequence Line : 7
Instrument Method: DX.MTH
Analysis Method : DEFAULT.MTH



Data File Name : C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\06-28-21\003F0801.D
Operator : TL
Instrument : GC1
Sample Name : 500 Dx 63-79C
Run Time Bar Code:
Acquired on : 28 Jun 21 04:20 PM
Report Created on: 29 Jun 21 10:19 AM

Page Number : 1
Vial Number : 3
Injection Number : 1
Sequence Line : 8
Instrument Method: DX.MTH
Analysis Method : DEFAULT.MTH

eurofins | Environment Testing America



ANALYTICAL REPORT

Eurofins FGS, Seattle
5755 8th Street East
Tacoma, WA 98424
Tel: (253)922-2310

Laboratory Job ID: 580-104116-1
Client Project/Site: 106490

For:
Friedman & Bruya
3012 16TH AVENUE WEST
Seattle, Washington 98119-2029

Attn: Michael Erdahl

Authorized for release by:
7/14/2021 3:04:25 PM

Nathan Lewis, Project Manager I
(253)922-2310
Nathan.Lewis@Eurofinset.com

LINKS

Review your project results through TotalAccess

Have a Question? Ask The Expert

Visit us at:
www.eurofinsus.com/Env

This report has been electronically signed and authorized by the signatory. Electronic signature is intended to be the legally binding equivalent of a traditionally handwritten signature.

Results relate only to the items tested and the sample(s) as received by the laboratory.

Table of Contents

Cover Page 1
Table of Contents 2
Case Narrative 3
Definitions 4
Client Sample Results 5
QC Sample Results 12
Chronicle 13
Certification Summary 15
Sample Summary 16
Chain of Custody 17
Receipt Checklists 18

Case Narrative

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Laboratory: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

Narrative

Job Narrative
580-104116-1

Comments
No additional comments.

Receipt
The samples were received on 6/29/2021 1:55 PM. Unless otherwise noted below, the samples arrived in good condition, and where required, properly preserved and on ice. The temperature of the cooler at receipt was 4.3º C.

GC/MS Semi VOA
Method Organotins: Surrogate recovery for the following sample was outside the upper control limit: MW16-062521 (580-104116-2). This sample did not contain any target analytes; therefore, re-extraction and/or re-analysis was not performed.

Organic Prep
No analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Definitions/Glossary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Qualifiers

GC/MS Semi VOA

Qualifier	Qualifier Description
J	Result is less than the RL but greater than or equal to the MDL and the concentration is an approximate value.
S1+	Surrogate recovery exceeds control limits, high biased.

Glossary

Abbreviation	These commonly used abbreviations may or may not be present in this report.
¤	Listed under the "D" column to designate that the result is reported on a dry weight basis
%R	Percent Recovery
CFL	Contains Free Liquid
CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CNF	Contains No Free Liquid
DER	Duplicate Error Ratio (normalized absolute difference)
Dil Fac	Dilution Factor
DL	Detection Limit (DoD/DOE)
DL, RA, RE, IN	Indicates a Dilution, Re-analysis, Re-extraction, or additional Initial metals/anion analysis of the sample
DLC	Decision Level Concentration (Radiochemistry)
EDL	Estimated Detection Limit (Dioxin)
LOD	Limit of Detection (DoD/DOE)
LOQ	Limit of Quantitation (DoD/DOE)
MCL	EPA recommended "Maximum Contaminant Level"
MDA	Minimum Detectable Activity (Radiochemistry)
MDC	Minimum Detectable Concentration (Radiochemistry)
MDL	Method Detection Limit
ML	Minimum Level (Dioxin)
MPN	Most Probable Number
MQL	Method Quantitation Limit
NC	Not Calculated
ND	Not Detected at the reporting limit (or MDL or EDL if shown)
NEG	Negative / Absent
POS	Positive / Present
PQL	Practical Quantitation Limit
PRES	Presumptive
QC	Quality Control
RER	Relative Error Ratio (Radiochemistry)
RL	Reporting Limit or Requested Limit (Radiochemistry)
RPD	Relative Percent Difference, a measure of the relative difference between two points
TEF	Toxicity Equivalent Factor (Dioxin)
TEQ	Toxicity Equivalent Quotient (Dioxin)
TNTC	Too Numerous To Count

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW15-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 07:55
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-1
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.35		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/06/21 22:45	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*76*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/06/21 22:45*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW16-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 08:00
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-2
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.35		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/06/21 23:11	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*151*	*S1+*	*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/06/21 23:11*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW13-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 10:05
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-3
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.33		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/06/21 23:37	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*84*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/06/21 23:37*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW14-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 10:09
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-4
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.34		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/07/21 00:03	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*35*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/07/21 00:03*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW17-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 11:47
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-5
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.35		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/07/21 00:30	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*38*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/07/21 00:30*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW-8-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 12:00
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-6
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.34		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/07/21 00:56	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*36*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/07/21 00:56*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW-160-062521
Date Collected: 06/25/21 13:30
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-7
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.35		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/07/21 01:22	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*95*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/07/21 01:22*	*1*

QC Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Lab Sample ID: MB 580-360666/1-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Method Blank
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte	MB Result	MB Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.30		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/06/21 21:26	1

Surrogate	*MB %Recovery*	*MB Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*103*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/06/21 21:26*	*1*

Lab Sample ID: LCS 580-360666/2-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte			Spike Added	LCS Result	LCS Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits		
Tributyltin			1.79	0.295	J	ug/L		16	11 - 150		

Surrogate	*LCS %Recovery*	*LCS Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*111*		*10 - 142*

Lab Sample ID: LCSD 580-360666/3-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample Dup
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte			Spike Added	LCSD Result	LCSD Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Tributyltin			1.79	0.348		ug/L		19	11 - 150	16	35

Surrogate	*LCSD %Recovery*	*LCSD Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*140*		*10 - 142*

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW15-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-1
Date Collected: 06/25/21 07:55
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/06/21 22:45	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW16-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-2
Date Collected: 06/25/21 08:00
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/06/21 23:11	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW13-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-3
Date Collected: 06/25/21 10:05
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/06/21 23:37	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW14-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-4
Date Collected: 06/25/21 10:09
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/07/21 00:03	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW17-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-5
Date Collected: 06/25/21 11:47
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/07/21 00:30	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-8-062521
Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-6
Date Collected: 06/25/21 12:00
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/07/21 00:56	TL1	FGS SEA

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Client Sample ID: MW-160-062521

Date Collected: 06/25/21 13:30
Date Received: 06/29/21 13:55

Lab Sample ID: 580-104116-7

Matrix: Water

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/07/21 01:22	TL1	FGS SEA

Laboratory References:

FGS SEA = Eurofins FGS, Seattle, 5755 8th Street East, Tacoma, WA 98424, TEL (253)922-2310

Accreditation/Certification Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Laboratory: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

All accreditations/certifications held by this laboratory are listed. Not all accreditations/certifications are applicable to this report.

Authority	Program	Identification Number	Expiration Date
Alaska (UST)	State	20-004	02-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Defense ELAP	L2236	01-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Energy	L2236	01-19-22
ANAB	ISO/IEC 17025	L2236	01-19-22
California	State	2954	06-30-21 *
Florida	NELAP	E87575	06-30-22
Kentucky (WW)	State	KY98042	12-31-21
Louisiana	NELAP	03073	06-30-22
Maine	State	2020012	05-02-22
Montana (UST)	State	NA	04-14-27
New Jersey	NELAP	WA014	06-30-22
New York	NELAP	11662	04-01-22
Oregon	NELAP	4167	07-07-21
US Fish & Wildlife	US Federal Programs	058448	05-31-22
USDA	US Federal Programs	P330-20-00031	02-10-23
Washington	State	C788	07-13-21
Wisconsin	State	399133460	08-31-21

* Accreditation/Certification renewal pending - accreditation/certification considered valid.

Sample Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106490

Job ID: 580-104116-1

Lab Sample ID	Client Sample ID	Matrix	Collected	Received	Asset ID
580-104116-1	MW15-062521	Water	06/25/21 07:55	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-2	MW16-062521	Water	06/25/21 08:00	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-3	MW13-062521	Water	06/25/21 10:05	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-4	MW14-062521	Water	06/25/21 10:09	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-5	MW17-062521	Water	06/25/21 11:47	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-6	MW-8-062521	Water	06/25/21 12:00	06/29/21 13:55	
580-104116-7	MW-160-062521	Water	06/25/21 13:30	06/29/21 13:55	

SUBCONTRACT SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Send Report To Michael Erdahl

Company Friedman and Bruya, Inc.

Address 3012 16th Ave W

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98119

Phone # (206) 285-8282 merdahl@friedmanandbruya.com

SUBCONTRACTER Eurofins

PROJECT NAME/NO. 106490

PO # B-312

REMARKS

Please Email Results

TURNAROUND TIME

☒ Standard TAT

☐ RUSH

Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL

☐ Dispose after 30 days

☐ Return samples

☐ Will call with instructions

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Matrix	# of jars	ANALYSES REQUESTED: Dioxins/Furans	EPH	VPH	Tributyltin							Notes
MW15-062521		6/25/21	0755	Water	1				X							
MW16-062521			0800		1				X							
MW13-062521			~~0915~~ 1005		1				X							
MW14-062521			~~1005~~ 1009		1				X							
MW17-062521			~~1009~~ 1147		1				X							
MW-8-062521			~~1147~~ 1200		1				X							
MW-160-062521			1330		1				X							

SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by:	Michael Erdahl	Friedman & Bruya	6/28/21	
Received by:	Kim Crosby	EFGS	6/29/21	1355
Relinquished by:				
Received by:				

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282
Fax (206) 283-5044

580-104116 Chain of Custody

Therm. ID: IR9 Cor: 4.3 ° Unc: 4.3 °

Cooler Dsc: Ice

Packing:

Cust. Seal: Yes No X

Blue Ice, Wet, Dry, None

FedEx:

UPS:

Lab Cour: X

Other:

7/14/2021

Login Sample Receipt Checklist

Client: Friedman & Bruya

Job Number: 580-104116-1

Login Number: 104116
List Number: 1
Creator: Greene, Ashton R

List Source: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

Question	Answer	Comment
Radioactivity wasn't checked or is </= background as measured by a survey meter.	N/A	
The cooler's custody seal, if present, is intact.	True	
Sample custody seals, if present, are intact.	True	
The cooler or samples do not appear to have been compromised or tampered with.	True	
Samples were received on ice.	True	
Cooler Temperature is acceptable.	True	
Cooler Temperature is recorded.	True	
COC is present.	True	
COC is filled out in ink and legible.	True	
COC is filled out with all pertinent information.	True	
Is the Field Sampler's name present on COC?	False	Received project as a subcontract.
There are no discrepancies between the containers received and the COC.	True	
Samples are received within Holding Time (excluding tests with immediate HTs)	True	
Sample containers have legible labels.	True	
Containers are not broken or leaking.	True	
Sample collection date/times are provided.	True	
Appropriate sample containers are used.	True	
Sample bottles are completely filled.	True	
Sample Preservation Verified.	True	
There is sufficient vol. for all requested analyses, incl. any requested MS/MSDs	True	
Containers requiring zero headspace have no headspace or bubble is <6mm (1/4").	True	
Multiphasic samples are not present.	True	
Samples do not require splitting or compositing.	True	
Residual Chlorine Checked.	N/A	

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

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

July 15, 2021

Breeyn Greer, Project Manager
Aspect Consulting, LLC
710 2nd Ave S, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms Greer:

Included are the amended results from the testing of material submitted on June 29, 2021 from the Snopac 150054, F&BI 106507 project. The naphthalene reporting limits were lowered.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.



Michael Erdahl
Project Manager

Enclosures
c: Aspect Data, Adam Griffin
ASP0708R.DOC

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

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

July 8, 2021

Breeyn Greer, Project Manager
Aspect Consulting, LLC
710 2nd Ave S, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104


Dear Ms Greer:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on June 29, 2021 from the Snopac 150054, F&BI 106507 project. There are 8 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days, or as directed by the Chain of Custody document. 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 have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.



Michael Erdahl
Project Manager

Enclosures
c: Aspect Data, Adam Griffin
ASP0708R.DOC

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on June 29, 2021 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the Aspect Consulting, LLC Snopac 150054, F&BI 106507 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

Laboratory ID	Aspect Consulting, LLC
106507 -01	MW-12-062921

Sample MW-12-062921 was sent to Eurofins for tributyltin analysis. The report generated by Eurofins will be forwarded to your office upon receipt.

All quality control requirements were acceptable.

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-12-062921	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/29/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 106507
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106507-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	070117.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	16	11	65
Phenol-d6	14	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	56	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	54	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	81	30	131
Terphenyl-d14	62	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	0.016
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	0.0070
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.022
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.029
Pyrene	0.031
Benz(a)anthracene	0.012
Chrysene	0.013
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.015
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.020
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.0070
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.0065
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 106507
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	01-1531 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	07/01/21	Data File:	070109.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15	11	65
Phenol-d6	10 vo	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	75	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	76	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	78	30	131
Terphenyl-d14	89	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.005
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-12-062921	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	06/29/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 106507
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	106507-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/30/21	Data File:	063012.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	44	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 106507
Date Extracted:	06/30/21	Lab ID:	01-1532 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	06/30/21	Data File:	063007.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	47	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/29/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 106507

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILES BY EPA METHOD 8270E

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Naphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	67	67	66-94	0
2-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	72	71	68-98	1
1-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	73	71	67-97	3
Acenaphthylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	77	76	70-130	1
Acenaphthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	73	72	70-130	1
Fluorene	ug/L (ppb)	5	79	77	70-130	3
Phenanthrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	79	80	70-130	1
Anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	80	81	70-130	1
Fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	88	87	70-130	1
Pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	86	84	70-130	2
Benz(a)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	85	70-130	1
Chrysene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	84	70-130	0
Benzo(a)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	90	90	70-130	0
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	87	62-130	2
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	84	70-130	0
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	94	94	70-130	0
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	91	70-130	2
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	86	87	70-130	1

Date of Report: 07/08/21
Date Received: 06/29/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 106507

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS AS AROCLOR 1016/1260 BY EPA METHOD 8082A

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Aroclor 1016	ug/L (ppb)	0.13	66	64	25-111	3
Aroclor 1260	ug/L (ppb)	0.13	77	80	23-123	4

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.

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.

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 analyte 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 due to sample matrix effects.

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.

106507

SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Page # 1 of 1

Report To Breeyn Greer
Company Aspect
Address 710 2nd Ave Ste 550
City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98104
Phone 316-617-0499 Email bgreer@aspectconsulting.com

SAMPLERS (signature) Rachel C ME 06/29/21

PROJECT NAME: SnoPac
PO #: 150054
REMARKS:
INVOICE TO: AP
Project specific RLs? - (Yes) / No

TURNAROUND TIME: D07
[X] Standard turnaround
[ ] RUSH
Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL
[ ] Archive samples
[ ] Other
Default: Dispose after 30 days

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Type	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	BTEX EPA 8021	NWTPH-HCID	VOCs EPA 8260	PAHs EPA 8270	PCBs EPA 8082	low level PAH 8270	PCB - wipes 8082	TPH		Notes
						ANALYSES REQUESTED											
MW-12-062921	01A-C	6/29/21	1055	W	3								X	X	X		additional volume for MW-12-062

Samples received at 4°C

SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by: Rachel C	Rachel Cornwell	Aspect	6/29/21	1210
Received by:	James Bruya	F&B	6/29	1210
Relinquished by:				
Received by:				

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282

eurofins | Environment Testing America



ANALYTICAL REPORT

Eurofins FGS, Seattle
5755 8th Street East
Tacoma, WA 98424
Tel: (253)922-2310

Laboratory Job ID: 580-104115-1
Client Project/Site: 106507

For:
Friedman & Bruya
3012 16TH AVENUE WEST
Seattle, Washington 98119-2029

Attn: Michael Erdahl

Authorized for release by:
7/14/2021 12:21:29 PM

Nathan Lewis, Project Manager I
(253)922-2310
Nathan.Lewis@Eurofinset.com

LINKS
Review your project results through TotalAccess
Have a Question? Ask The Expert
Visit us at: www.eurofinsus.com/Env

This report has been electronically signed and authorized by the signatory. Electronic signature is intended to be the legally binding equivalent of a traditionally handwritten signature.

Results relate only to the items tested and the sample(s) as received by the laboratory.

Table of Contents

Cover Page 1
Table of Contents 2
Case Narrative 3
Definitions 4
Client Sample Results 5
QC Sample Results 6
Chronicle 7
Certification Summary 8
Sample Summary 9
Chain of Custody 10
Receipt Checklists 11

Case Narrative

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Laboratory: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

Narrative

Job Narrative
580-104115-1

Comments
No additional comments.

Receipt
The sample was received on 6/29/2021 1:55 PM. Unless otherwise noted below, the sample arrived in good condition, and where required, properly preserved and on ice. The temperature of the cooler at receipt was 4.3º C.

GC/MS Semi VOA
Method Organotins: The laboratory control sample (LCS) and laboratory control sample duplicate (LCSD) for preparation batch 580-360666 and analytical batch 580-361143 recovered outside control limits for the following analytes: Dibutyltin. This analyte was biased high in the LCS and was not detected in the associated samples; therefore, the data have been reported.

No additional analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described above or in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Organic Prep
No analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Definitions/Glossary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Qualifiers

GC/MS Semi VOA

Qualifier	Qualifier Description
J	Result is less than the RL but greater than or equal to the MDL and the concentration is an approximate value.

Glossary

Abbreviation	These commonly used abbreviations may or may not be present in this report.
¤	Listed under the "D" column to designate that the result is reported on a dry weight basis
%R	Percent Recovery
CFL	Contains Free Liquid
CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CNF	Contains No Free Liquid
DER	Duplicate Error Ratio (normalized absolute difference)
Dil Fac	Dilution Factor
DL	Detection Limit (DoD/DOE)
DL, RA, RE, IN	Indicates a Dilution, Re-analysis, Re-extraction, or additional Initial metals/anion analysis of the sample
DLC	Decision Level Concentration (Radiochemistry)
EDL	Estimated Detection Limit (Dioxin)
LOD	Limit of Detection (DoD/DOE)
LOQ	Limit of Quantitation (DoD/DOE)
MCL	EPA recommended "Maximum Contaminant Level"
MDA	Minimum Detectable Activity (Radiochemistry)
MDC	Minimum Detectable Concentration (Radiochemistry)
MDL	Method Detection Limit
ML	Minimum Level (Dioxin)
MPN	Most Probable Number
MQL	Method Quantitation Limit
NC	Not Calculated
ND	Not Detected at the reporting limit (or MDL or EDL if shown)
NEG	Negative / Absent
POS	Positive / Present
PQL	Practical Quantitation Limit
PRES	Presumptive
QC	Quality Control
RER	Relative Error Ratio (Radiochemistry)
RL	Reporting Limit or Requested Limit (Radiochemistry)
RPD	Relative Percent Difference, a measure of the relative difference between two points
TEF	Toxicity Equivalent Factor (Dioxin)
TEQ	Toxicity Equivalent Quotient (Dioxin)
TNTC	Too Numerous To Count

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Client Sample ID: MW-12-062921
Date Collected: 06/29/21 10:55
Date Received: 06/29/21 14:03

Lab Sample ID: 580-104115-1
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.35		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/07/21 01:48	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*48*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/07/21 01:48*	*1*

QC Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Lab Sample ID: MB 580-360666/1-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Method Blank
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte	MB Result	MB Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.30		ug/L		06/30/21 12:04	07/06/21 21:26	1

Surrogate	*MB %Recovery*	*MB Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*103*		*10 - 142*	*06/30/21 12:04*	*07/06/21 21:26*	*1*

Lab Sample ID: LCS 580-360666/2-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte			Spike Added	LCS Result	LCS Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits		
Tributyltin			1.79	0.295	J	ug/L		16	11 - 150		

Surrogate	*LCS %Recovery*	*LCS Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*111*		*10 - 142*

Lab Sample ID: LCSD 580-360666/3-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 361143

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample Dup
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 360666

Analyte			Spike Added	LCSD Result	LCSD Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Tributyltin			1.79	0.348		ug/L		19	11 - 150	16	35

Surrogate	*LCSD %Recovery*	*LCSD Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*140*		*10 - 142*

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Client Sample ID: MW-12-062921

Date Collected: 06/29/21 10:55
Date Received: 06/29/21 14:03

Lab Sample ID: 580-104115-1

Matrix: Water

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			360666	06/30/21 12:04	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	361143	07/07/21 01:48	TL1	FGS SEA

Laboratory References:

FGS SEA = Eurofins FGS, Seattle, 5755 8th Street East, Tacoma, WA 98424, TEL (253)922-2310

Accreditation/Certification Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Laboratory: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

All accreditations/certifications held by this laboratory are listed. Not all accreditations/certifications are applicable to this report.

Authority	Program	Identification Number	Expiration Date
Alaska (UST)	State	20-004	02-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Defense ELAP	L2236	01-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Energy	L2236	01-19-22
ANAB	ISO/IEC 17025	L2236	01-19-22
California	State	2954	06-30-21 *
Florida	NELAP	E87575	06-30-22
Kentucky (WW)	State	KY98042	12-31-21
Louisiana	NELAP	03073	06-30-22
Maine	State	2020012	05-02-22
Montana (UST)	State	NA	04-14-27
New Jersey	NELAP	WA014	06-30-22
New York	NELAP	11662	04-01-22
Oregon	NELAP	4167	07-07-21
US Fish & Wildlife	US Federal Programs	058448	05-31-22
USDA	US Federal Programs	P330-20-00031	02-10-23
Washington	State	C788	07-13-21
Wisconsin	State	399133460	08-31-21

* Accreditation/Certification renewal pending - accreditation/certification considered valid.

Sample Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 106507

Job ID: 580-104115-1

Lab Sample ID	Client Sample ID	Matrix	Collected	Received	Asset ID
580-104115-1	MW-12-062921	Water	06/29/21 10:55	06/29/21 14:03	

SUBCONTRACT SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Send Report To Michael Erdahl

Company Friedman and Bruya, Inc.

Address 3012 16th Ave W

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98119

Phone # (206) 285-8282 merdahl@friedmanandbruya.com

SUBCONTRACTER Eurofins

PROJECT NAME/NO.	PO #
106507	B-312

REMARKS

Please Email Results

TURNAROUND TIME

☑ Standard TAT

☐ RUSH

Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL

☐ Dispose after 30 days

☐ Return samples

☐ Will call with instructions

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Matrix	# of jars	ANALYSES REQUESTED: Dioxins/Furans	EPH	VPH	Tributyltin							Notes
MW-12-062921		6/29/21	1055	water	1				X							

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282
Fax (206) 283-5044

	SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by:		Michael Erdahl	Friedman & Bruya	6/29/21	1225
Received by:		Kim Presley	EFGS	6/29/21	1355
Relinquished by:					
Received by:					

Therm. ID: IR9 Cor: 4.3 ° Unc: 4.3 °

Cooler Dsc: Ice Blue

Packing: Bubble

Cust. Seal: Yes No ☒

Blue Ice: Wet, Dry, None

FedEx:

UPS:

Lab Cour: ☒

Other:

7/14/2021

Login Sample Receipt Checklist

Client: Friedman & Bruya

Job Number: 580-104115-1

Login Number: 104115
List Number: 1
Creator: Greene, Ashton R

List Source: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

Question	Answer	Comment
Radioactivity wasn't checked or is </= background as measured by a survey meter.	N/A	
The cooler's custody seal, if present, is intact.	True	
Sample custody seals, if present, are intact.	True	
The cooler or samples do not appear to have been compromised or tampered with.	True	
Samples were received on ice.	True	
Cooler Temperature is acceptable.	True	
Cooler Temperature is recorded.	True	
COC is present.	True	
COC is filled out in ink and legible.	True	
COC is filled out with all pertinent information.	True	
Is the Field Sampler's name present on COC?	False	Received project as a subcontract.
There are no discrepancies between the containers received and the COC.	True	
Samples are received within Holding Time (excluding tests with immediate HTs)	True	
Sample containers have legible labels.	True	
Containers are not broken or leaking.	True	
Sample collection date/times are provided.	True	
Appropriate sample containers are used.	True	
Sample bottles are completely filled.	True	
Sample Preservation Verified.	True	
There is sufficient vol. for all requested analyses, incl. any requested MS/MSDs	True	
Containers requiring zero headspace have no headspace or bubble is <6mm (1/4").	True	
Multiphasic samples are not present.	True	
Samples do not require splitting or compositing.	True	
Residual Chlorine Checked.	N/A	

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

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

January 13, 2022

Breeyn Greer, Project Manager
Aspect Consulting, LLC
710 2nd Ave S, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms Greer:

Included is the amended report from the testing of material submitted on November 11, 2021 from the Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222 project. Samples MW-16-111121 and MW-160-111121 were reextracted and reanalyzed for metals by 200.8. There was a discrepancy with between the original analysis of MW-160-111121 and the reanalysis, therefore the results for MW-160-111121 have been updated.

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

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.



Michael Erdahl
Project Manager

Enclosures
c: Aspect Data
ASP1202R.DOC

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

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

December 2, 2021

Breeyn Greer, Project Manager
Aspect Consulting, LLC
710 2nd Ave S, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104


Dear Ms Greer:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on November 11, 2021 from the Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222 project. There are 43 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days, or as directed by the Chain of Custody document. 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 have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.



Michael Erdahl
Project Manager

Enclosures
c: Aspect Data
ASP1202R.DOC

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on November 11, 2021 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the Aspect Consulting, LLC Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

Laboratory ID	Aspect Consulting, LLC
111222 -01	MW-8-111021
111222 -02	MW-14-111021
111222 -03	MW-12-111021
111222 -04	MW-17-111021
111222 -05	MW-16-111121
111222 -06	MW-160-111121
111222 -07	MW-15-111121
111222 -08	MW-13-111121

Phenanthrene was detected in the 8270E method blank. Detections in the field samples within ten times the concentration detected were qualified.

The 8082 laboratory control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate failed the relative percent difference for Aroclor 1016 and 1260. The data were flagged accordingly.

All other quality control requirements were acceptable.

Date of Report: 12/02/21
Date Received: 11/11/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted: 11/12/21
Date Analyzed: 11/12/21

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 Laboratory ID	Diesel Range (C_{10}-C_{25})	Motor Oil Range (C_{25}-C_{36})	Surrogate (% Recovery) (Limit 47-140)
MW-13-111121 111222-08	230 x	<250	114
Method Blank 01-2621 MB2	<50	<250	123

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-8-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/16/21	Lab ID:	111222-01 x5
Date Analyzed:	11/16/21	Data File:	111222-01 x5.121
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.19
Copper	<2
Lead	<1
Nickel	2.49
Zinc	<5

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-14-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/16/21	Lab ID:	111222-02 x5
Date Analyzed:	11/16/21	Data File:	111222-02 x5.122
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.15
Copper	18.2
Lead	<1
Nickel	7.07
Zinc	12.9

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-12-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/16/21	Lab ID:	111222-03 x5
Date Analyzed:	11/16/21	Data File:	111222-03 x5.123
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	4.46
Copper	<2
Lead	<1
Nickel	13.2
Zinc	<5

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-17-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/16/21	Lab ID:	111222-04 x5
Date Analyzed:	11/16/21	Data File:	111222-04 x5.124
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.92
Copper	2.19
Lead	<1
Nickel	2.03
Zinc	<5

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-16-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/16/21	Lab ID:	111222-05 x5
Date Analyzed:	11/16/21	Data File:	111222-05 x5.125
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	8.93
Copper	4.63
Lead	<1
Nickel	20.6
Zinc	<5

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-160-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	01/04/22	Lab ID:	111222-06 rex x5
Date Analyzed:	01/04/22 17:30:34	Data File:	111222-06 rex x5.091
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	9.48
Copper	4.40
Lead	<1
Nickel	20.8
Zinc	7.89

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-15-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/16/21	Lab ID:	111222-07 x5
Date Analyzed:	11/16/21	Data File:	111222-07 x5.133
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	3.63
Copper	4.78
Lead	<1
Nickel	14.8
Zinc	<5

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-13-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/16/21	Lab ID:	111222-08 x5
Date Analyzed:	11/16/21	Data File:	111222-08 x5.134
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	2.43
Copper	2.58
Lead	<1
Nickel	35.3
Zinc	147

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	NA	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/16/21	Lab ID:	I1-752 mb
Date Analyzed:	11/16/21	Data File:	I1-752 mb.084
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<0.2
Copper	<0.4
Lead	<0.2
Nickel	<0.2
Zinc	<1

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	NA	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	01/04/22	Lab ID:	I2-03 mb
Date Analyzed:	01/04/22 12:42:14	Data File:	I2-03 mb.037
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<0.2
Copper	<0.5
Lead	<0.2
Nickel	<0.2
Zinc	<1

Date of Report: 12/02/21
Date Received: 11/11/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted: 11/12/21
Date Analyzed: 11/15/21

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED MERCURY USING EPA METHOD 1631E

Results Reported as ug/L (ppb)

Sample ID Laboratory ID	Total Mercury
MW-8-111021 111222-01	<0.01
MW-14-111021 111222-02	<0.01
MW-12-111021 111222-03	<0.01
MW-17-111021 111222-04	<0.01
MW-16-111121 111222-05	<0.01
MW-160-111121 111222-06	<0.01
MW-15-111121 111222-07	<0.01
MW-13-111121 111222-08	<0.01
Method Blank i1-742 MB	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-8-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/15/21	Lab ID:	111222-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111513.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	10 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	7 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	76	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	80	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	97	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	91	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-14-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/15/21	Lab ID:	111222-02 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111514.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	9 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	5 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	65	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	69	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	80	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	72	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	0.11
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	0.98
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.040
Anthracene	0.034
Fluoranthene	0.18
Pyrene	0.14
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-12-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/15/21	Lab ID:	111222-03 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111515.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	9 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	7 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	83	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	85	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	89	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	90	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	0.091
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.016 fb
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.024
Pyrene	0.028
Benz(a)anthracene	0.012
Chrysene	0.014
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.014
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.018
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.0063
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.011
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	0.010

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-17-111021 f	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/17/21	Lab ID:	111222-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/18/21	Data File:	111807.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	21	11	65
Phenol-d6	15	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	71	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	79	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	97	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	103	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0072 fb
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-16-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/15/21	Lab ID:	111222-05 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111517.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	5 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	6 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	76	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	77	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	41	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	91	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0066 fb
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-160-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/15/21	Lab ID:	111222-06 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111518.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	10 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	7 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	78	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	80	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	54	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	84	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-15-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/15/21	Lab ID:	111222-07 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111519.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	3 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	5 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	77	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	77	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	19	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	85	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0069 fb
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/15/21	Lab ID:	111222-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/16/21	Data File:	111520.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	4 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	6 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	77	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	77	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	24	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	87	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	1.5
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.19
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.55
Acenaphthylene	0.028
Acenaphthene	1.3
Fluorene	0.26
Phenanthrene	0.038
Anthracene	0.034
Fluoranthene	0.058
Pyrene	0.034
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.0056
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.0073
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/17/21	Lab ID:	01-2701 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/18/21	Data File:	111806.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	18	11	65
Phenol-d6	12	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	70	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	71	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	76	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	93	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0065 lc
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/15/21	Lab ID:	01-2685 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111512.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	11	11	65
Phenol-d6	8 vo	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	81	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	84	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	87	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	99	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis for Semivolatile Phenols By EPA Method 8270E SIM

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/15/21	Lab ID:	111222-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111509.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS6
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15 vo	50	150
Phenol-d6	8 vo	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	111	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Pentachlorophenol	<0.05

Analysis for Semivolatile Phenols By EPA Method 8270E SIM

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/15/21	Lab ID:	01-2686 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111507.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS6
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15 vo	50	150
Phenol-d6	9 vo	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	86	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Pentachlorophenol	<0.05

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-8-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/12/21	Lab ID:	111222-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111507.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	32	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-14-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/12/21	Lab ID:	111222-02 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111508.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	12 ip	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	0.0088 jl
Aroclor 1260	0.0080 jl
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-12-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/12/21	Lab ID:	111222-03 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111509.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	24	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-17-111021	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/12/21	Lab ID:	111222-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111510.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	18 ip	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-16-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/12/21	Lab ID:	111222-05 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111511.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	27	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-160-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/12/21	Lab ID:	111222-06 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111512.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	31	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-15-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/12/21	Lab ID:	111222-07 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111513.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	16 ip	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-111121	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	11/11/21	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/12/21	Lab ID:	111222-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111514.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	25	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222
Date Extracted:	11/12/21	Lab ID:	01-2628 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	11/15/21	Data File:	111504.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	36	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Date of Report: 12/02/21
Date Received: 11/11/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222

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

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Diesel Extended	ug/L (ppb)	2,500	124	128	61-133	3

Date of Report: 12/02/21
Date Received: 11/11/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED METALS USING EPA METHOD 200.8

Laboratory Code: 111261-01 (Matrix Spike)

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Sample Result	Percent Recovery MS	Percent Recovery MSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Arsenic	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	99	94	70-130	5
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	<5	98	94	70-130	4
Lead	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	96	90	70-130	6
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	<1	103	96	70-130	7
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	<5	96	90	70-130	6

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Acceptance Criteria
Arsenic	ug/L (ppb)	10	96	85-115
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	99	85-115
Lead	ug/L (ppb)	10	97	85-115
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	100	85-115
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	96	85-115

Date of Report: 12/02/21
Date Received: 11/11/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED METALS USING EPA METHOD 200.8

Laboratory Code: 201003-01 (Matrix Spike)

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Sample Result	Percent Recovery MS	Percent Recovery MSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Arsenic	ug/L (ppb)	10	1.54	100	97	70-130	3
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	<5	89	88	70-130	1
Lead	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	81	80	70-130	1
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	2.65	93	94	70-130	1
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	9.50	88	89	70-130	1

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Acceptance Criteria
Arsenic	ug/L (ppb)	10	90	85-115
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	92	85-115
Lead	ug/L (ppb)	10	94	85-115
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	95	85-115
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	93	85-115

Date of Report: 12/02/21
Date Received: 11/11/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TOTAL MERCURY USING EPA METHOD 1631E

Laboratory Code: 111225-01 (Matrix Spike)

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Sample Result	Percent Recovery MS	Percent Recovery MSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Mercury	ug/L (ppb)	0.01	<0.01	92	91	71-125	1

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Mercury	ug/L (ppb)	0.01	119	125	78-125	5

Date of Report: 12/02/21
Date Received: 11/11/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILES BY EPA METHOD 8270E

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Naphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	81	77	62-90	5
2-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	78	64-93	7
1-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	82	76	64-93	8
Acenaphthylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	92	91	70-130	1
Acenaphthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	87	86	70-130	1
Fluorene	ug/L (ppb)	5	93	93	70-130	0
Phenanthrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	91	70-130	2
Anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	90	93	70-130	3
Fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	92	92	70-130	0
Pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	100	98	70-130	2
Benz(a)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	95	96	70-130	1
Chrysene	ug/L (ppb)	5	98	98	70-130	0
Benzo(a)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	101	102	70-130	1
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	102	103	70-130	1
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	99	102	70-130	3
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	97	98	70-130	1
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	96	95	70-130	1
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	95	94	70-130	1

Date of Report: 12/02/21
Date Received: 11/11/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILES BY EPA METHOD 8270E

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Naphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	80	82	62-90	2
2-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	83	84	64-93	1
1-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	82	83	64-93	1
Acenaphthylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	94	94	70-130	0
Acenaphthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	88	89	70-130	1
Fluorene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	90	70-130	1
Phenanthrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	91	90	70-130	1
Anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	93	70-130	4
Fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	92	92	70-130	0
Pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	105	102	70-130	3
Benz(a)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	96	95	70-130	1
Chrysene	ug/L (ppb)	5	98	97	70-130	1
Benzo(a)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	100	100	70-130	0
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	101	102	70-130	1
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	101	99	70-130	2
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	91	89	70-130	2
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	90	87	70-130	3
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	86	70-130	3

Date of Report: 12/02/21
Date Received: 11/11/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILE PHENOLS BY EPA METHOD 8270E SIM

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 30)
Pentachlorophenol	ug/L (ppb)	2.5	93	98	70-130	5

Date of Report: 12/02/21
Date Received: 11/11/21
Project: Snopac 150054, F&BI 111222

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS AS AROCLOR 1016/1260 BY EPA METHOD 8082A

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Aroclor 1016	ug/L (ppb)	0.063	40	59	25-111	38 vo
Aroclor 1260	ug/L (ppb)	0.063	44	60	23-123	31 vo

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.

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.

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 analyte 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 due to sample matrix effects.

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.

111222

SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY ME 11/11/21 EO4/AI3

Report To Breelyn Greer
Company Aspect Consulting
Address 710 2nd Ave Suite 550
City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98104
Phone 612.2327343 Email bgreer@aspectconsulting.com

SAMPLERS (signature) Monique Rutte
PROJECT NAME SnoPac
PO# 150054
REMARKS
Project specific RLs? - Yes / No
INVOICE TO

Page # 1 of 1


TURNAROUND TIME
☒ Standard turnaround
☐ RUSH
Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL
☐ Archive samples
☐ Other
Default: Dispose after 30 days

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Type	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	BTEX EPA 8021	NWTPH-HCID	Turbidity, TDS, SM 2130B, 2540C	Dissolved Methane RSK-175	PCB Aroclors 8082A	Dissolved Metals As, Cu, Pb, Ni, Zn 200.8	Dissolved Mercury Method 1631E	Permanganate pH SM 4500		Notes
										ANALYSES REQUESTED							
MW-8-111021	01 A-H	11/10/21	0940	water	8					X	X	X	X	X			4 / 1997
MW-14-111021	02		1115														3 / 1653
MW-12-111021	03		1240														12 / 3505
MW-17-111021	04		1355														60 / 1666
MW-16-111121	05	11/11/21	0900														58 / 7262
MW-160-111121	06		0900														58 / 7262
MW-15-111121	07		1040														28 / 1940
MW-13-111121	08 A-K		1210		11	X									X		6 / 1371


SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by: Monique Rutte	monique Rutte	ASPECT	11/11/21	1500
Received by: HNguyen	HONG NGUYEN	FBI	11/11/21	15:05
Relinquished by:				
Received by:		Samples received at 2 °C		

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282




Data File Name : C:\HPCHEM\4\DATA\11-12-21\018F1001.D
Operator : TL
Instrument : GC#4
Sample Name : 111222-08
Run Time Bar Code:
Acquired on : 12 Nov 21 04:57 PM
Report Created on: 15 Nov 21 10:07 AM

Page Number : 1
Vial Number : 18
Injection Number : 1
Sequence Line : 10
Instrument Method: DX.MTH
Analysis Method : DEFAULT.MTH



Data File Name	: C:\HPCHEM\4\DATA\11-12-21\015F0501.D		
Operator	: TL	Page Number	: 1
Instrument	: GC#4	Vial Number	: 15
Sample Name	: 01-2621 mb2	Injection Number	: 1
Run Time Bar Code:		Sequence Line	: 5
Acquired on	: 12 Nov 21 12:33 PM	Instrument Method	: DX.MTH
Report Created on	: 15 Nov 21 10:07 AM	Analysis Method	: DEFAULT.MTH



Data File Name	: C:\HPCHEM\4\DATA\11-12-21\003F0201.D		
Operator	: TL	Page Number	: 1
Instrument	: GC#4	Vial Number	: 3
Sample Name	: 500 Dx 64-13H	Injection Number	: 1
Run Time Bar Code:		Sequence Line	: 2
Acquired on	: 12 Nov 21 05:56 AM	Instrument Method	: DX.MTH
Report Created on	: 15 Nov 21 10:07 AM	Analysis Method	: DEFAULT.MTH

eurofins | Environment Testing America



ANALYTICAL REPORT

Eurofins FGS, Seattle
5755 8th Street East
Tacoma, WA 98424
Tel: (253)922-2310

Laboratory Job ID: 580-107586-1
Client Project/Site: 111222

For:
Friedman & Bruya
3012 16TH AVENUE WEST
Seattle, Washington 98119-2029

Attn: Michael Erdahl

Authorized for release by:
11/30/2021 2:43:32 PM

Nathan Lewis, Project Manager I
(253)922-2310
Nathan.Lewis@Eurofinset.com

LINKS
Review your project results through TotalAccess
Have a Question? Ask The Expert
Visit us at: www.eurofinsus.com/Env

This report has been electronically signed and authorized by the signatory. Electronic signature is intended to be the legally binding equivalent of a traditionally handwritten signature.

Results relate only to the items tested and the sample(s) as received by the laboratory.

Table of Contents

Cover Page 1
Table of Contents 2
Case Narrative 3
Definitions 4
Client Sample Results 5
QC Sample Results 13
Chronicle 14
Certification Summary 16
Sample Summary 17
Chain of Custody 18
Receipt Checklists 19

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Laboratory: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

Narrative

Job Narrative
580-107586-1

Comments
No additional comments.

Receipt
The samples were received on 11/17/2021 12:40 PM. Unless otherwise noted below, the samples arrived in good condition, and where required, properly preserved and on ice. The temperature of the cooler at receipt was 2.0º C.

Receipt Exceptions
The container label for the following sample did not match the information listed on the Chain-of-Custody (COC): MW-12-111021 (580-107586-3). The container labels list the sampling time 1430, while the COC lists 1240. The sample is logged in per COC.

GC/MS Semi VOA
Method Organotins: The following samples were received in Seattle outside of holding time or with insufficient hold time remaining: MW-8-111021 (580-107586-1), MW-14-111021 (580-107586-2), MW-12-111021 (580-107586-3) and MW-17-111021 (580-107586-4).

Method Organotins: Surrogate recovery for the following samples was outside the upper control limit: MW-160-111121 (580-107586-6) and MW-13-111121 (580-107586-8). This sample did not contain any target analytes; therefore, re-extraction and/or re-analysis was not performed.

No additional analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described above or in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Organic Prep
Method Organotin: A deviation from the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) occurred. Details are as follows: Samples were received in wide mouth bottle instead of narrow mouth bottles. Since the Extraction process is not compatible with wide mouth bottles the samples were transferred to narrow mouth bottles.

No additional analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described above or in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Definitions/Glossary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Qualifiers

GC/MS Semi VOA

Qualifier	Qualifier Description
H	Sample was prepped or analyzed beyond the specified holding time
S1+	Surrogate recovery exceeds control limits, high biased.

Glossary

Abbreviation	These commonly used abbreviations may or may not be present in this report.
¤	Listed under the "D" column to designate that the result is reported on a dry weight basis
%R	Percent Recovery
CFL	Contains Free Liquid
CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CNF	Contains No Free Liquid
DER	Duplicate Error Ratio (normalized absolute difference)
Dil Fac	Dilution Factor
DL	Detection Limit (DoD/DOE)
DL, RA, RE, IN	Indicates a Dilution, Re-analysis, Re-extraction, or additional Initial metals/anion analysis of the sample
DLC	Decision Level Concentration (Radiochemistry)
EDL	Estimated Detection Limit (Dioxin)
LOD	Limit of Detection (DoD/DOE)
LOQ	Limit of Quantitation (DoD/DOE)
MCL	EPA recommended "Maximum Contaminant Level"
MDA	Minimum Detectable Activity (Radiochemistry)
MDC	Minimum Detectable Concentration (Radiochemistry)
MDL	Method Detection Limit
ML	Minimum Level (Dioxin)
MPN	Most Probable Number
MQL	Method Quantitation Limit
NC	Not Calculated
ND	Not Detected at the reporting limit (or MDL or EDL if shown)
NEG	Negative / Absent
POS	Positive / Present
PQL	Practical Quantitation Limit
PRES	Presumptive
QC	Quality Control
RER	Relative Error Ratio (Radiochemistry)
RL	Reporting Limit or Requested Limit (Radiochemistry)
RPD	Relative Percent Difference, a measure of the relative difference between two points
TEF	Toxicity Equivalent Factor (Dioxin)
TEQ	Toxicity Equivalent Quotient (Dioxin)
TNTC	Too Numerous To Count

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Client Sample ID: MW-8-111021

Date Collected: 11/10/21 09:40
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-1

Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	H	0.36		ug/L		11/18/21 10:55	11/22/21 18:09	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*80*		*10 - 150*	*11/18/21 10:55*	*11/22/21 18:09*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Client Sample ID: MW-14-111021
Date Collected: 11/10/21 11:15
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-2
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	H	0.70		ug/L		11/18/21 10:55	11/29/21 22:13	2

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*50*		*10 - 150*	*11/18/21 10:55*	*11/29/21 22:13*	*2*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Client Sample ID: MW-12-111021

Date Collected: 11/10/21 12:40
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-3

Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	H	0.35		ug/L		11/18/21 10:55	11/22/21 18:59	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*139*		*10 - 150*	*11/18/21 10:55*	*11/22/21 18:59*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Client Sample ID: MW-17-111021

Date Collected: 11/10/21 13:55
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-4

Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	H	0.35		ug/L		11/18/21 10:55	11/22/21 19:24	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*119*		*10 - 150*	*11/18/21 10:55*	*11/22/21 19:24*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Client Sample ID: MW-16-111021
Date Collected: 11/11/21 09:00
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-5
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.32		ug/L		11/18/21 10:55	11/22/21 19:49	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*139*		*10 - 150*	*11/18/21 10:55*	*11/22/21 19:49*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Client Sample ID: MW-160-111121
Date Collected: 11/11/21 09:00
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-6
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.36		ug/L		11/18/21 10:55	11/22/21 20:14	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*298*	*S1+*	*10 - 150*	*11/18/21 10:55*	*11/22/21 20:14*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Client Sample ID: MW-15-111121
Date Collected: 11/11/21 10:40
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-7
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.32		ug/L		11/18/21 10:55	11/22/21 20:39	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*134*		*10 - 150*	*11/18/21 10:55*	*11/22/21 20:39*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Client Sample ID: MW-13-111121
Date Collected: 11/11/21 12:10
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-8
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.34		ug/L		11/18/21 10:55	11/22/21 21:03	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*152*	*S1+*	*10 - 150*	*11/18/21 10:55*	*11/22/21 21:03*	*1*

QC Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Lab Sample ID: MB 580-373712/1-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 373997

Client Sample ID: Method Blank
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 373712

Analyte	MB Result	MB Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.30		ug/L		11/18/21 10:55	11/22/21 11:53	1

Surrogate	*MB %Recovery*	*MB Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*102*		*10 - 150*	*11/18/21 10:55*	*11/22/21 11:53*	*1*

Lab Sample ID: LCS 580-373712/2-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 373997

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 373712

Analyte			Spike Added	LCS Result	LCS Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits		
Tributyltin			1.79	0.324		ug/L		18	11 - 150		

Surrogate	*LCS %Recovery*	*LCS Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*78*		*10 - 150*

Lab Sample ID: LCSD 580-373712/3-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 373997

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample Dup
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 373712

Analyte			Spike Added	LCSD Result	LCSD Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Tributyltin			1.79	0.437		ug/L		24	11 - 150	30	35

Surrogate	*LCSD %Recovery*	*LCSD Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*107*		*10 - 150*

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Client Sample ID: MW-8-111021
Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-1
Date Collected: 11/10/21 09:40
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			373712	11/18/21 10:55	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	373997	11/22/21 18:09	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-14-111021
Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-2
Date Collected: 11/10/21 11:15
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			373712	11/18/21 10:55	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		2	374513	11/29/21 22:13	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-12-111021
Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-3
Date Collected: 11/10/21 12:40
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			373712	11/18/21 10:55	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	373997	11/22/21 18:59	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-17-111021
Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-4
Date Collected: 11/10/21 13:55
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			373712	11/18/21 10:55	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	373997	11/22/21 19:24	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-16-111021
Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-5
Date Collected: 11/11/21 09:00
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			373712	11/18/21 10:55	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	373997	11/22/21 19:49	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-160-111121
Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-6
Date Collected: 11/11/21 09:00
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			373712	11/18/21 10:55	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	373997	11/22/21 20:14	TL1	FGS SEA

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Client Sample ID: MW-15-111121
Date Collected: 11/11/21 10:40
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-7
Matrix: Water

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			373712	11/18/21 10:55	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	373997	11/22/21 20:39	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-13-111121
Date Collected: 11/11/21 12:10
Date Received: 11/17/21 12:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-107586-8
Matrix: Water

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			373712	11/18/21 10:55	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	373997	11/22/21 21:03	TL1	FGS SEA

Laboratory References:

FGS SEA = Eurofins FGS, Seattle, 5755 8th Street East, Tacoma, WA 98424, TEL (253)922-2310

Accreditation/Certification Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Laboratory: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

All accreditations/certifications held by this laboratory are listed. Not all accreditations/certifications are applicable to this report.

Authority	Program	Identification Number	Expiration Date
Alaska (UST)	State	20-004	02-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Defense ELAP	L2236	01-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Energy	L2236	01-19-22
ANAB	ISO/IEC 17025	L2236	01-19-22
California	State	2954	06-30-21 *
Florida	NELAP	E87575	06-30-22
Kentucky (WW)	State	KY98042	12-31-21
Louisiana	NELAP	03073	06-30-22
Maine	State	2020012	05-02-22
Montana (UST)	State	NA	04-14-27
New Jersey	NELAP	WA014	06-30-22
New York	NELAP	11662	04-01-22
Oregon	NELAP	4167	07-07-22
US Fish & Wildlife	US Federal Programs	058448	05-31-22
USDA	US Federal Programs	P330-20-00031	02-10-23
Washington	State	C788	07-13-22
Wisconsin	State	399133460	08-31-22

* Accreditation/Certification renewal pending - accreditation/certification considered valid.

Sample Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 111222

Job ID: 580-107586-1

Lab Sample ID	Client Sample ID	Matrix	Collected	Received
580-107586-1	MW-8-111021	Water	11/10/21 09:40	11/17/21 12:40
580-107586-2	MW-14-111021	Water	11/10/21 11:15	11/17/21 12:40
580-107586-3	MW-12-111021	Water	11/10/21 12:40	11/17/21 12:40
580-107586-4	MW-17-111021	Water	11/10/21 13:55	11/17/21 12:40
580-107586-5	MW-16-111021	Water	11/11/21 09:00	11/17/21 12:40
580-107586-6	MW-160-111121	Water	11/11/21 09:00	11/17/21 12:40
580-107586-7	MW-15-111121	Water	11/11/21 10:40	11/17/21 12:40
580-107586-8	MW-13-111121	Water	11/11/21 12:10	11/17/21 12:40

SUBCONTRACT SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

107586

Page # 1 of 1

Send Report To Michael Erdahl

Company Friedman and Bruya, Inc.

Address 3012 16th Ave W

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98119

Phone # (206) 285-8282 merdahl@friedmanandbruya.com

SUBCONTRACTER Eurofins

PROJECT NAME/NO.	PO #
111222	B-500

REMARKS

Please Email Results EDD: Aqua EDD

TURNAROUND TIME
- [x] Standard TAT
- [ ] RUSH
- Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL
- [ ] Dispose after 30 days
- [ ] Return samples
- [ ] Will call with instructions

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Matrix	# of jars	ANALYSES REQUESTED: Dioxins/Furans	EPH	VPH	Tributyltin							Notes
MW-8-111021		11/10/21	0940	water					X							
MW-14-111021			1115						X							
MW-12-111021			1240						X							
MW-17-111021			1355						X							
MW-16-111021		11/11/21	0900						X							
MW-160-111121			0900						X							
MW-15-111121			1040						X							
MW-13-111121			1210						X							

580-107586 Chain of Custody

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282
Fax (206) 283-5044

	SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by:		Michael Erdahl	Friedman & Bruya	11/17/21	1019
Received by:		Ashton Greene	EFGS	11/17/21	1240
Relinquished by:					
Received by:					

Therm. ID: IR9 Cor: 2.0 ° Unc: 1.8 °
Cooler Dsc: LGBL
Packing: BLK
Cust. Seal: Yes ___ No X
Blue Ice (Wet) Dry None
FedEx:
UPS:
Lab Cour:
Other: QDT

11/30/2021

Login Sample Receipt Checklist

Client: Friedman & Bruya

Job Number: 580-107586-1

Login Number: 107586
List Number: 1
Creator: Blankinship, Tom X

List Source: Eurofins FGS, Seattle

Question	Answer	Comment
Radioactivity wasn't checked or is </= background as measured by a survey meter.	True	
The cooler's custody seal, if present, is intact.	True	
Sample custody seals, if present, are intact.	True	
The cooler or samples do not appear to have been compromised or tampered with.	True	
Samples were received on ice.	True	
Cooler Temperature is acceptable.	True	
Cooler Temperature is recorded.	True	
COC is present.	True	
COC is filled out in ink and legible.	True	
COC is filled out with all pertinent information.	True	
Is the Field Sampler's name present on COC?	False	Received project as a subcontract.
There are no discrepancies between the containers received and the COC.	False	Refer to Job Narrative for details.
Samples are received within Holding Time (excluding tests with immediate HTs)	False	Expiring on day of receipt.
Sample containers have legible labels.	True	
Containers are not broken or leaking.	True	
Sample collection date/times are provided.	True	
Appropriate sample containers are used.	True	
Sample bottles are completely filled.	True	
Sample Preservation Verified.	N/A	
There is sufficient vol. for all requested analyses, incl. any requested MS/MSDs	True	
Containers requiring zero headspace have no headspace or bubble is <6mm (1/4").	N/A	
Multiphasic samples are not present.	True	
Samples do not require splitting or compositing.	True	
Residual Chlorine Checked.	N/A	

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D.
Yelena Aravkina, M.S.
Michael Erdahl, B.S.
Vineta Mills, M.S.
Eric Young, B.S.

3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
(206) 285-8282
fbi@isomedia.com
www.friedmanandbruya.com

February 14, 2022

Breeyn Greer, Project Manager
Aspect Consulting, LLC
710 2nd Ave S, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms Greer:

Included is the amended report from the testing of material submitted on January 18, 2022 from the SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246 project. The total mercury results have been corrected to read dissolved mercury results.

We apologize for the inconvenience and hope you will call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.



Michael Erdahl
Project Manager

Enclosures
c: Aspect Data
ASP0201R.DOC

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D.
Yelena Aravkina, M.S.
Michael Erdahl, B.S.
Vineta Mills, M.S.
Eric Young, B.S.

3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
(206) 285-8282
fbi@isomedia.com
www.friedmanandbruya.com

February 1, 2022

Breeyn Greer, Project Manager
Aspect Consulting, LLC
710 2nd Ave S, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms Greer:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on January 18, 2022 from the SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246 project. There are 41 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days, or as directed by the Chain of Custody document. 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 have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.



Michael Erdahl
Project Manager

Enclosures
c: Aspect Data
ASP0201R.DOC

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on January 18, 2022 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the Aspect Consulting, LLC SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

Laboratory ID	Aspect Consulting, LLC
201246 -01	MW-8-011722
201246 -02	MW-14-011722
201246 -03	MW-12-011722
201246 -04	MW-17-011722
201246 -05	MW-16-011822
201246 -06	MW-160-011822
201246 -07	MW-15-011822
201246 -08	MW-13-011822

The samples were sent to Eurofins for tribuyltin analysis. The report is enclosed.

The 8270E PAH and 8082A PCB containers for sample MW-17-011722 were centrifuged prior to extraction. The data were flagged accordingly.

Several 8270E surrogates failed in the method blank. The affected compounds were qualified accordingly.

All other quality control requirements were acceptable.

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted: 01/19/21
Date Analyzed: 01/19/21

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 Laboratory ID	Diesel Range (C_{10}-C_{25})	Motor Oil Range (C_{25}-C_{36})	Surrogate (% Recovery) (Limit 41-152)
MW-13-011822 201246-08	220 x	<250	145
Method Blank 02-0188 MB	<50	<250	144

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-8-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-01 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-01 x5.163
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	<2.5
Lead	<1
Nickel	2.77
Zinc	6.49

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-14-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-02 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-02 x5.164
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.08
Copper	<2.5
Lead	<1
Nickel	4.96
Zinc	6.09

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-12-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-03 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-03 x5.165
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	2.22
Copper	3.20
Lead	<1
Nickel	10.8
Zinc	6.36

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-17-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-04 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-04 x5.166
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	7.20
Lead	3.43
Nickel	1.36
Zinc	23.1

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-16-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-05 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-05 x5.167
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	2.25
Copper	6.49
Lead	<1
Nickel	7.65
Zinc	4.56

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-160-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-06 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-06 x5.168
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.90
Copper	4.75
Lead	<1
Nickel	5.65
Zinc	3.23

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-15-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-07 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-07 x5.169
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.04
Copper	5.55
Lead	<1
Nickel	7.05
Zinc	4.64

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-13-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-08 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-08 x5.170
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	<2.5
Lead	<1
Nickel	6.57
Zinc	26.0

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	NA	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	I2-52 mb
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	I2-52 mb.040
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<0.2
Copper	<0.5
Lead	<0.2
Nickel	<0.2
Zinc	<0.5

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted: 01/24/22
Date Analyzed: 01/25/22

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED MERCURY USING EPA METHOD 1631E

Results Reported as ug/L (ppb)

Sample ID Laboratory ID	Dissolved Mercury
MW-8-011722 201246-01	<0.01
MW-14-011722 201246-02	<0.01
MW-12-011722 201246-03	<0.01
MW-17-011722 201246-04	<0.01
MW-16-011822 201246-05	0.011
MW-160-011822 201246-06	0.016
MW-15-011822 201246-07	0.010
MW-13-011822 201246-08	<0.01
Method Blank i2-55 MB	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-8-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012011.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	0 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	0 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	69	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	76	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	2 ip	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	92	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0065
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-14-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-02 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012012.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	12	11	65
Phenol-d6	7 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	76	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	77	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	92	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	86	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	0.0081
Acenaphthene	1.3
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.056
Anthracene	0.027
Fluoranthene	0.16
Pyrene	0.12
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-12-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-03 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012013.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	10 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	7 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	74	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	75	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	68	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	86	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0076
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-17-011722 cf	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012014.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	0 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	0 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	81	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	84	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	1 ip	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	83	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0082
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.0055
Pyrene	0.0053
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-16-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-05 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012015.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	7 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	7 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	80	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	84	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	43	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	87	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.010
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.0050
Pyrene	0.0050
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-160-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-06 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/21/22	Data File:	012016.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	0 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	2 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	83	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	84	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	5 ip	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	90	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.010
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.0063
Pyrene	0.0063
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-15-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-07 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/21/22	Data File:	012017.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	3 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	4 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	73	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	76	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	20	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	76	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	0.0051
Fluorene	0.0058
Phenanthrene	0.025
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.012
Pyrene	0.011
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/21/22	Data File:	012018.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	8 vo	11	65
Phenol-d6	8 vo	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	87	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	86	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	43	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	91	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	0.71
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.088
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.62
Acenaphthylene	0.035
Acenaphthene	1.8
Fluorene	0.50
Phenanthrene	0.20
Anthracene	0.029
Fluoranthene	0.035
Pyrene	0.024
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.0083
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.012
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.0073
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank cf	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	02-191 mb2 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012009.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15	11	65
Phenol-d6	8 vo	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	82	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	84	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	87	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	96	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	02-191 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012010.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	9 vo	11	65
Phenol-d6	5 vo	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	49 vo	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	49	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	47	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	54	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05 js
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05 js
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05 js
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis for Semivolatile Phenols By EPA Method 8270E SIM

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/21/22	Lab ID:	201246-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	012512.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS6
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	12 vo	50	150
Phenol-d6	7 vo	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	105	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Pentachlorophenol	<0.05

Analysis for Semivolatile Phenols By EPA Method 8270E SIM

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/21/22	Lab ID:	02-232 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	012511.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS6
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15 vo	50	150
Phenol-d6	8 vo	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	76	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Pentachlorophenol	<0.05

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-8-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012011.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	31	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-14-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-02 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012012.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	35	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-12-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-03 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012013.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	32	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-17-011722 cf	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012015.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	30	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-16-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-05 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012016.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	39	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-160-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-06 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012017.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	37	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-15-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-07 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012018.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	34	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012019.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	31	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	02-0190 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012007.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	25	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank cf	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	02-0190 mb3 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012008.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	47	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

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

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Diesel Extended	ug/L (ppb)	2,500	112	128	63-142	13

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED METALS USING EPA METHOD 200.8

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Arsenic	ug/L (ppb)	10	96	98	85-115	2
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	95	98	85-115	3
Lead	ug/L (ppb)	10	94	96	85-115	2
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	92	95	85-115	3
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	93	96	85-115	3

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED MERCURY USING EPA METHOD 1631E

Laboratory Code: 201127-01 (Matrix Spike)

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Sample Result	Percent Recovery MS	Percent Recovery MSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Mercury	ug/L (ppb)	0.01	0.000	92	81	71-125	13

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Mercury	ug/L (ppb)	0.01	97	99	78-125	2

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILES BY EPA METHOD 8270E

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Naphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	80	83	62-90	4
2-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	81	80	64-93	1
1-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	83	82	64-93	1
Acenaphthylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	89	70-130	6
Acenaphthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	86	92	70-130	7
Fluorene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	92	70-130	3
Phenanthrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	94	70-130	5
Anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	91	70-130	2
Fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	88	92	70-130	4
Pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	93	94	70-130	1
Benz(a)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	92	93	70-130	1
Chrysene	ug/L (ppb)	5	92	93	70-130	1
Benzo(a)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	86	86	70-130	0
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	95	94	70-130	1
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	95	96	70-130	1
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	98	98	70-130	0
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	103	100	70-130	3
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	102	100	70-130	2

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILE PHENOLS BY EPA METHOD 8270E SIM

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 30)
Pentachlorophenol	ug/L (ppb)	0.63	93	98	70-130	5

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS AS AROCLOR 1016/1260 BY EPA METHOD 8082A

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Aroclor 1016	ug/L (ppb)	0.063	46	51	25-111	10
Aroclor 1260	ug/L (ppb)	0.063	56	68	23-123	19

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.

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.

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 analyte 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 due to sample matrix effects.

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.

SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

01-18-22

D04/A16

Page # 1 of 1

201246

Report To Breeyn Greer

Company Aspect Consulting

Address 710 2nd Ave Suite 550

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98104

Phone 612.232.7343 Email bgreer@aspectconsulting.com

SAMPLERS (*signature*) Monique Rutte

PROJECT NAME SnoPac

PO # 150054

REMARKS All samples >1,000 us/cm EXCEPT MW-17 & MW-13

Project specific RLs? - Yes / No

INVOICE TO

TURNAROUND TIME

- [x] Standard turnaround
- [ ] RUSH
- Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL


- [ ] Archive samples
- [ ] Other
- Default: Dispose after 30 days

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Type	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	BTEX EPA 8021	NWTPH-HCID	VOCs EPA 8260	6 SIM PAHs EPA 8270	PCB Aroclors EPA 8082	Dissolved Hg 1631E	Low-level PAHs 8270D SIM	Monobutyltin SM 2540D	PCP 8270-SIM	Notes
MW-8-011722	01 A-K	1/17/22	0940	water	8						*						
MW-14-011722	02		1110														
MW-12-011722	03		1255														
MW-17-011722	04		1510														centrifuge for PAH/PCBs
MW-16-011822	05	1/18/22	0915														
MW-160-011822	06		0915														
MW-15-011822	07		1100														
MW-13-011822	08 A-K				11	X										X	* As, Cu, Pb, Ni, Zn


ANALYSES REQUESTED

SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by: Monique Rutte	Monique Rutte	Aspect	1/18/22	1545
Received by:	Eric Clever	FedEx	1/19/22	1045
Relinquished by:				
Received by:		Samples received at 4 °C		

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
Ph. (206) 285-8282




Data File Name	: C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\01-19-22\054F1901.D		
Operator	: TL	Page Number	: 1
Instrument	: GC1	Vial Number	: 54
Sample Name	: 201246-08	Injection Number	: 1
Run Time Bar Code:		Sequence Line	: 19
Acquired on	: 20 Jan 22 04:03 AM	Instrument Method	: DX.MTH
Report Created on	: 20 Jan 22 11:38 AM	Analysis Method	: DEFAULT.MTH



Data File Name : C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\01-19-22\037F1501.D
Operator : TL
Instrument : GC1
Sample Name : 02-0188 mb
Run Time Bar Code:
Acquired on : 19 Jan 22 11:01 PM
Report Created on: 20 Jan 22 11:40 AM

Page Number : 1
Vial Number : 37
Injection Number : 1
Sequence Line : 15
Instrument Method: DX.MTH
Analysis Method : DEFAULT.MTH



Data File Name	: C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\01-19-22\003F0201.D		
Operator	: TL	Page Number	: 1
Instrument	: GC1	Vial Number	: 3
Sample Name	: 500 Dx 65-27F	Injection Number	: 1
Run Time Bar Code:		Sequence Line	: 2
Acquired on	: 19 Jan 22 06:09 AM	Instrument Method	: DX.MTH
Report Created on	: 20 Jan 22 11:41 AM	Analysis Method	: DEFAULT.MTH

eurofins | Environment Testing America



ANALYTICAL REPORT

Eurofins Seattle
5755 8th Street East
Tacoma, WA 98424
Tel: (253)922-2310

Laboratory Job ID: 580-109453-1
Client Project/Site: 201246

For:
Friedman & Bruya
3012 16TH AVENUE WEST
Seattle, Washington 98119-2029

Attn: Michael Erdahl

Authorized for release by:
1/31/2022 11:55:35 AM

Nathan Lewis, Project Manager I
(253)922-2310
Nathan.Lewis@Eurofinset.com

LINKS
Review your project results through TotalAccess
Have a Question? Ask The Expert
Visit us at: www.eurofinsus.com/Env

This report has been electronically signed and authorized by the signatory. Electronic signature is intended to be the legally binding equivalent of a traditionally handwritten signature.

Results relate only to the items tested and the sample(s) as received by the laboratory.

Table of Contents

Cover Page 1
Table of Contents 2
Case Narrative 3
Definitions 4
Client Sample Results 5
QC Sample Results 13
Chronicle 14
Certification Summary 16
Sample Summary 17
Chain of Custody 18
Receipt Checklists 19

Case Narrative

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Laboratory: Eurofins Seattle

Narrative

Job Narrative
580-109453-1

Comments
No additional comments.

Receipt
The samples were received on 1/19/2022 2:40 PM. Unless otherwise noted below, the samples arrived in good condition, and where required, properly preserved and on ice. The temperature of the cooler at receipt was 2.0º C.

GC/MS Semi VOA
Method Organotins: The RPD of the laboratory control sample (LCS) and laboratory control sample duplicate (LCSD) for preparation batch 580-379029 and analytical batch 580-379353 recovered outside control limits for the following analytes: Tributyltin.

No additional analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described above or in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Organic Prep
Method Organotin: Insufficient sample volume was available to perform a matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate/sample duplicate (MS/MSD/DUP) associated with preparation batch 580-379029, so a LCS and LCSD were used instead.

No additional analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described above or in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Definitions/Glossary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Qualifiers

GC/MS Semi VOA

Qualifier	Qualifier Description
*1	LCS/LCSD RPD exceeds control limits.
J	Result is less than the RL but greater than or equal to the MDL and the concentration is an approximate value.

Glossary

Abbreviation	These commonly used abbreviations may or may not be present in this report.
¤	Listed under the "D" column to designate that the result is reported on a dry weight basis
%R	Percent Recovery
CFL	Contains Free Liquid
CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CNF	Contains No Free Liquid
DER	Duplicate Error Ratio (normalized absolute difference)
Dil Fac	Dilution Factor
DL	Detection Limit (DoD/DOE)
DL, RA, RE, IN	Indicates a Dilution, Re-analysis, Re-extraction, or additional Initial metals/anion analysis of the sample
DLC	Decision Level Concentration (Radiochemistry)
EDL	Estimated Detection Limit (Dioxin)
LOD	Limit of Detection (DoD/DOE)
LOQ	Limit of Quantitation (DoD/DOE)
MCL	EPA recommended "Maximum Contaminant Level"
MDA	Minimum Detectable Activity (Radiochemistry)
MDC	Minimum Detectable Concentration (Radiochemistry)
MDL	Method Detection Limit
ML	Minimum Level (Dioxin)
MPN	Most Probable Number
MQL	Method Quantitation Limit
NC	Not Calculated
ND	Not Detected at the reporting limit (or MDL or EDL if shown)
NEG	Negative / Absent
POS	Positive / Present
PQL	Practical Quantitation Limit
PRES	Presumptive
QC	Quality Control
RER	Relative Error Ratio (Radiochemistry)
RL	Reporting Limit or Requested Limit (Radiochemistry)
RPD	Relative Percent Difference, a measure of the relative difference between two points
TEF	Toxicity Equivalent Factor (Dioxin)
TEQ	Toxicity Equivalent Quotient (Dioxin)
TNTC	Too Numerous To Count

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-8-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:40
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-1
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.36		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 12:39	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*19*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 12:39*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-14-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 11:10
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-2
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.36		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 13:03	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*29*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 13:03*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-12-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 12:55
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-3
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.35		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 13:28	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*33*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 13:28*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-17-011722

Date Collected: 01/17/22 15:10
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-4

Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.36		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 13:53	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*38*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 13:53*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-16-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:15
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-5
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.36		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 14:18	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*43*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 14:18*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-160-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:15
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-6
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.35		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 14:43	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*31*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 14:43*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-15-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 11:00
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-7
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.37		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 15:08	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*53*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 15:08*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-13-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 12:50
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-8
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.37		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 15:33	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*46*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 15:33*	*1*

QC Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Lab Sample ID: MB 580-379029/1-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 379353

Client Sample ID: Method Blank
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 379029

Analyte	MB Result	MB Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.30		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 11:24	1

Surrogate	*MB %Recovery*	*MB Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*26*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 11:24*	*1*

Lab Sample ID: LCS 580-379029/2-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 379353

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 379029

Analyte			Spike Added	LCS Result	LCS Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits		
Tributyltin			1.79	0.236	J	ug/L		13	11 - 150		

Surrogate	*LCS %Recovery*	*LCS Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*18*		*10 - 150*

Lab Sample ID: LCSD 580-379029/3-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 379353

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample Dup
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 379029

Analyte			Spike Added	LCSD Result	LCSD Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Tributyltin			1.79	0.350	*1	ug/L		20	11 - 150	39	35

Surrogate	*LCSD %Recovery*	*LCSD Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*42*		*10 - 150*

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-8-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-1
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:40
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 12:39	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-14-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-2
Date Collected: 01/17/22 11:10
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 13:03	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-12-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-3
Date Collected: 01/17/22 12:55
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 13:28	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-17-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-4
Date Collected: 01/17/22 15:10
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 13:53	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-16-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-5
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:15
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 14:18	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-160-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-6
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:15
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 14:43	TL1	FGS SEA

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-15-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 11:00
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-7
Matrix: Water

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 15:08	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-13-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 12:50
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-8
Matrix: Water

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 15:33	TL1	FGS SEA

Laboratory References:

FGS SEA = Eurofins Seattle, 5755 8th Street East, Tacoma, WA 98424, TEL (253)922-2310

Accreditation/Certification Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Laboratory: Eurofins Seattle

All accreditations/certifications held by this laboratory are listed. Not all accreditations/certifications are applicable to this report.

Authority	Program	Identification Number	Expiration Date
Alaska (UST)	State	20-004	02-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Defense ELAP	L2236	01-19-25
ANAB	Dept. of Energy	L2236	01-19-25
ANAB	ISO/IEC 17025	L2236	01-19-25
California	State	2954	01-30-22
Florida	NELAP	E87575	06-30-22
Louisiana	NELAP	03073	06-30-22
Maine	State	2020012	05-02-22
Montana (UST)	State	NA	04-14-27
New Jersey	NELAP	WA014	06-30-22
New York	NELAP	11662	04-01-22
Oregon	NELAP	4167	07-07-22
US Fish & Wildlife	US Federal Programs	058448	05-31-22
USDA	US Federal Programs	P330-20-00031	02-10-23
Washington	State	C788	07-13-22
Wisconsin	State	399133460	08-31-22

Sample Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Lab Sample ID	Client Sample ID	Matrix	Collected	Received
580-109453-1	MW-8-011722	Water	01/17/22 09:40	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-2	MW-14-011722	Water	01/17/22 11:10	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-3	MW-12-011722	Water	01/17/22 12:55	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-4	MW-17-011722	Water	01/17/22 15:10	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-5	MW-16-011722	Water	01/17/22 09:15	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-6	MW-160-011722	Water	01/17/22 09:15	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-7	MW-15-011722	Water	01/17/22 11:00	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-8	MW-13-011722	Water	01/17/22 12:50	01/19/22 14:40

SUBCONTRACT SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

109453

Send Report To Michael Erdahl

Company Friedman and Bruya, Inc.

Address 3012 16th Ave W

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98119

Phone # (206) 285-8282 merdahl@friedmanandbruya.com

SUBCONTRACTER
Eurofins

PROJECT NAME/NO.	PO #
20126	C-30

REMARKS

Aspect EDD

Page # 1 of 1

TURNAROUND TIME
☒ Standard TAT
☐ RUSH
Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL
☐ Dispose after 30 days
☐ Return samples
☐ Will call with instructions

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Type	# of Jars	ANALYSES REQUESTED: Tributyltin											Notes
MW-8-011722		1/17/2022	940	Water	1	X											
MW-14-011722		1/17/2022	1110	Water	1	X											
MW-12-011722		1/17/2022	1255	Water	1	X											
MW-17-011722		1/17/2022	1510	Water	1	X											
MW-16-011722		1/17/2022	915	Water	1	X											
MW-160-011722		1/17/2022	915	Water	1	X											
MW-15-011722		1/17/2022	1100	Water	1	X											
MW-13-011722		1/17/2022	1250	Water	1	X											

580-109453 Chain of Custody

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282
Fax (206) 283-5044

	SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by:		Michael Erdahl	Friedman & Bruya	1/19/22	0945
Received by:		Ashton Greene	EFGS	1/19/22	1440
Relinquished by:					
Received by:					

4g Bl/gel/tub IR8 2.0/1.8

01 Dr

Login Sample Receipt Checklist

Client: Friedman & Bruya

Job Number: 580-109453-1

Login Number: 109453
List Number: 1
Creator: Blankinship, Tom X

List Source: Eurofins Seattle

Question	Answer	Comment
Radioactivity wasn't checked or is </= background as measured by a survey meter.	True	
The cooler's custody seal, if present, is intact.	True	
Sample custody seals, if present, are intact.	True	
The cooler or samples do not appear to have been compromised or tampered with.	True	
Samples were received on ice.	True	
Cooler Temperature is acceptable.	True	
Cooler Temperature is recorded.	True	
COC is present.	True	
COC is filled out in ink and legible.	True	
COC is filled out with all pertinent information.	True	
Is the Field Sampler's name present on COC?	False	Received project as a subcontract.
There are no discrepancies between the containers received and the COC.	True	
Samples are received within Holding Time (excluding tests with immediate HTs)	True	
Sample containers have legible labels.	True	
Containers are not broken or leaking.	True	
Sample collection date/times are provided.	True	
Appropriate sample containers are used.	True	
Sample bottles are completely filled.	True	
Sample Preservation Verified.	N/A	
There is sufficient vol. for all requested analyses, incl. any requested MS/MSDs	True	
Containers requiring zero headspace have no headspace or bubble is <6mm (1/4").	N/A	
Multiphasic samples are not present.	True	
Samples do not require splitting or compositing.	True	
Residual Chlorine Checked.	N/A	

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D.
Yelena Aravkina, M.S.
Michael Erdahl, B.S.
Vineta Mills, M.S.
Eric Young, B.S.

3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
(206) 285-8282
fbi@isomedia.com
www.friedmanandbruya.com

February 1, 2022

Breeyn Greer, Project Manager
Aspect Consulting, LLC
710 2nd Ave S, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms Greer:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on January 18, 2022 from the SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246 project. There are 41 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days, or as directed by the Chain of Custody document. 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 have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.



Michael Erdahl
Project Manager

Enclosures
c: Aspect Data
ASP0201R.DOC

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on January 18, 2022 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the Aspect Consulting, LLC SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

Laboratory ID	Aspect Consulting, LLC
201246 -01	MW-8-011722
201246 -02	MW-14-011722
201246 -03	MW-12-011722
201246 -04	MW-17-011722
201246 -05	MW-16-011822
201246 -06	MW-160-011822
201246 -07	MW-15-011822
201246 -08	MW-13-011822

The samples were sent to Eurofins for tribuyltin analysis. The report is enclosed.

The 8270E PAH and 8082A PCB containers for sample MW-17-011722 were centrifuged prior to extraction. The data were flagged accordingly.

Several 8270E surrogates failed in the method blank. The affected compounds were qualified accordingly.

All other quality control requirements were acceptable.

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted: 01/19/21
Date Analyzed: 01/19/21

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 Laboratory ID	Diesel Range (C_{10}-C_{25})	Motor Oil Range (C_{25}-C_{36})	Surrogate (% Recovery) (Limit 41-152)
MW-13-011822 201246-08	220 x	<250	145
Method Blank 02-0188 MB	<50	<250	144

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-8-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-01 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-01 x5.163
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	<2.5
Lead	<1
Nickel	2.77
Zinc	6.49

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-14-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-02 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-02 x5.164
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.08
Copper	<2.5
Lead	<1
Nickel	4.96
Zinc	6.09

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-12-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-03 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-03 x5.165
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	2.22
Copper	3.20
Lead	<1
Nickel	10.8
Zinc	6.36

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-17-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-04 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-04 x5.166
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	7.20
Lead	3.43
Nickel	1.36
Zinc	23.1

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-16-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-05 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-05 x5.167
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	2.25
Copper	6.49
Lead	<1
Nickel	7.65
Zinc	4.56

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-160-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-06 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-06 x5.168
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.90
Copper	4.75
Lead	<1
Nickel	5.65
Zinc	3.23

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-15-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-07 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-07 x5.169
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.04
Copper	5.55
Lead	<1
Nickel	7.05
Zinc	4.64

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-13-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	201246-08 x5
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	201246-08 x5.170
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	<2.5
Lead	<1
Nickel	6.57
Zinc	26.0

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	NA	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/25/22	Lab ID:	I2-52 mb
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	I2-52 mb.040
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<0.2
Copper	<0.5
Lead	<0.2
Nickel	<0.2
Zinc	<0.5

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted: 01/24/22
Date Analyzed: 01/25/22

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TOTAL MERCURY USING EPA METHOD 1631E

Results Reported as ug/L (ppb)

Sample ID Laboratory ID	Total Mercury
MW-8-011722 201246-01	<0.01
MW-14-011722 201246-02	<0.01
MW-12-011722 201246-03	<0.01
MW-17-011722 201246-04	<0.01
MW-16-011822 201246-05	0.011
MW-160-011822 201246-06	0.016
MW-15-011822 201246-07	0.010
MW-13-011822 201246-08	<0.01
Method Blank i2-55 MB	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-8-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012011.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	0 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	0 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	69	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	76	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	2 ip	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	92	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0065
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-14-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-02 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012012.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	12	11	65
Phenol-d6	7 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	76	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	77	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	92	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	86	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	0.0081
Acenaphthene	1.3
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.056
Anthracene	0.027
Fluoranthene	0.16
Pyrene	0.12
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-12-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-03 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012013.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	10 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	7 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	74	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	75	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	68	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	86	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0076
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-17-011722 cf	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012014.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	0 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	0 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	81	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	84	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	1 ip	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	83	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0082
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.0055
Pyrene	0.0053
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-16-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-05 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012015.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	7 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	7 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	80	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	84	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	43	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	87	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.010
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.0050
Pyrene	0.0050
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-160-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-06 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/21/22	Data File:	012016.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	0 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	2 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	83	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	84	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	5 ip	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	90	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.010
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.0063
Pyrene	0.0063
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-15-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-07 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/21/22	Data File:	012017.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	3 ip	11	65
Phenol-d6	4 ip	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	73	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	76	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	20	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	76	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	0.0051
Fluorene	0.0058
Phenanthrene	0.025
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	0.012
Pyrene	0.011
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/21/22	Data File:	012018.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	8 vo	11	65
Phenol-d6	8 vo	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	87	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	86	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	43	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	91	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	0.71
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.088
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.62
Acenaphthylene	0.035
Acenaphthene	1.8
Fluorene	0.50
Phenanthrene	0.20
Anthracene	0.029
Fluoranthene	0.035
Pyrene	0.024
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.0083
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.012
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.0073
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank cf	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	02-191 mb2 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012009.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15	11	65
Phenol-d6	8 vo	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	82	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	84	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	87	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	96	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	02-191 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012010.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS12
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	9 vo	11	65
Phenol-d6	5 vo	11	65
Nitrobenzene-d5	49 vo	50	150
2-Fluorobiphenyl	49	44	108
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	47	10	140
Terphenyl-d14	54	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05 js
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05 js
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05 js
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis for Semivolatile Phenols By EPA Method 8270E SIM

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/21/22	Lab ID:	201246-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	012512.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS6
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	12 vo	50	150
Phenol-d6	7 vo	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	105	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Pentachlorophenol	<0.05

Analysis for Semivolatile Phenols By EPA Method 8270E SIM

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/21/22	Lab ID:	02-232 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/25/22	Data File:	012511.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS6
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15 vo	50	150
Phenol-d6	8 vo	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	76	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Pentachlorophenol	<0.05

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-8-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012011.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	31	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-14-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-02 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012012.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	35	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-12-011722	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-03 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012013.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	32	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-17-011722 cf	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012015.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	30	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-16-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-05 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012016.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	39	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-160-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-06 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012017.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	37	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-15-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-07 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012018.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	34	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-011822	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	01/18/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	201246-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012019.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	31	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	02-0190 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012007.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	25	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank cf	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246
Date Extracted:	01/20/22	Lab ID:	02-0190 mb3 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	01/20/22	Data File:	012008.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC7
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	MG

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	47	24	127

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

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

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Diesel Extended	ug/L (ppb)	2,500	112	128	63-142	13

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED METALS USING EPA METHOD 200.8

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Arsenic	ug/L (ppb)	10	96	98	85-115	2
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	95	98	85-115	3
Lead	ug/L (ppb)	10	94	96	85-115	2
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	92	95	85-115	3
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	93	96	85-115	3

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TOTAL MERCURY USING EPA METHOD 1631E

Laboratory Code: 201127-01 (Matrix Spike)

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Sample Result	Percent Recovery MS	Percent Recovery MSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Mercury	ug/L (ppb)	0.01	0.000	92	81	71-125	13

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Mercury	ug/L (ppb)	0.01	97	99	78-125	2

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILES BY EPA METHOD 8270E

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Naphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	80	83	62-90	4
2-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	81	80	64-93	1
1-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	83	82	64-93	1
Acenaphthylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	89	70-130	6
Acenaphthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	86	92	70-130	7
Fluorene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	92	70-130	3
Phenanthrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	94	70-130	5
Anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	89	91	70-130	2
Fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	88	92	70-130	4
Pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	93	94	70-130	1
Benz(a)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	92	93	70-130	1
Chrysene	ug/L (ppb)	5	92	93	70-130	1
Benzo(a)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	86	86	70-130	0
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	95	94	70-130	1
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	95	96	70-130	1
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	98	98	70-130	0
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	103	100	70-130	3
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	102	100	70-130	2

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILE PHENOLS BY EPA METHOD 8270E SIM

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 30)
Pentachlorophenol	ug/L (ppb)	0.63	93	98	70-130	5

Date of Report: 02/01/22
Date Received: 01/18/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 201246

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS AS AROCLOR 1016/1260 BY EPA METHOD 8082A

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Aroclor 1016	ug/L (ppb)	0.063	46	51	25-111	10
Aroclor 1260	ug/L (ppb)	0.063	56	68	23-123	19

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.

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.

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 analyte 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 due to sample matrix effects.

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.

SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

01-18-22

D04/A16

Page # 1 of 1

201246

Report To Breeyn Greer

Company Aspect Consulting

Address 710 2nd Ave Suite 550

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98104

Phone 612.232.7343 Email bgreer@aspectconsulting.com

SAMPLERS (*signature*) Monique Rutte

PROJECT NAME SnoPac

PO # 150054

REMARKS All samples >1,000 us/cm EXCEPT MW-17 & MW-13

Project specific RLs? - Yes / No

INVOICE TO

TURNAROUND TIME

- [x] Standard turnaround
- [ ] RUSH
- Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL


- [ ] Archive samples
- [ ] Other
- Default: Dispose after 30 days

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Type	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	BTEX EPA 8021	NWTPH-HCID	VOCs EPA 8260	6 SIM PAHs EPA 8270	PCB Aroclors EPA 8082	Dissolved Hg 1631E	Low-level PAHs 8270D SIM	Monobutyltin SM 2540D	PCP 8270-SIM	Notes
MW-8-011722	01 A-K	1/17/22	0940	water	8						*						
MW-14-011722	02		1110														
MW-12-011722	03		1255														
MW-17-011722	04		1510														centrifuge for PAH/PCBs
MW-16-011822	05	1/18/22	0915														
MW-160-011822	06		0915														
MW-15-011822	07		1100														
MW-13-011822	08 A-K				11	X										X	* As, Cu, Pb, Ni, Zn


ANALYSES REQUESTED

SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by: Monique Rutte	Monique Rutte	Aspect	1/18/22	1545
Received by:	Eric Clever	FedEx	1/19/22	1045
Relinquished by:				
Received by:		Samples received at 4 °C		

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
Ph. (206) 285-8282




Data File Name	: C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\01-19-22\054F1901.D		
Operator	: TL	Page Number	: 1
Instrument	: GC1	Vial Number	: 54
Sample Name	: 201246-08	Injection Number	: 1
Run Time Bar Code:		Sequence Line	: 19
Acquired on	: 20 Jan 22 04:03 AM	Instrument Method	: DX.MTH
Report Created on	: 20 Jan 22 11:38 AM	Analysis Method	: DEFAULT.MTH



Data File Name : C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\01-19-22\037F1501.D
Operator : TL
Instrument : GC1
Sample Name : 02-0188 mb
Run Time Bar Code:
Acquired on : 19 Jan 22 11:01 PM
Report Created on: 20 Jan 22 11:40 AM

Page Number : 1
Vial Number : 37
Injection Number : 1
Sequence Line : 15
Instrument Method: DX.MTH
Analysis Method : DEFAULT.MTH



Data File Name	: C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\01-19-22\003F0201.D		
Operator	: TL	Page Number	: 1
Instrument	: GC1	Vial Number	: 3
Sample Name	: 500 Dx 65-27F	Injection Number	: 1
Run Time Bar Code:		Sequence Line	: 2
Acquired on	: 19 Jan 22 06:09 AM	Instrument Method	: DX.MTH
Report Created on	: 20 Jan 22 11:41 AM	Analysis Method	: DEFAULT.MTH

eurofins | Environment Testing America



ANALYTICAL REPORT

Eurofins Seattle
5755 8th Street East
Tacoma, WA 98424
Tel: (253)922-2310

Laboratory Job ID: 580-109453-1
Client Project/Site: 201246

For:
Friedman & Bruya
3012 16TH AVENUE WEST
Seattle, Washington 98119-2029

Attn: Michael Erdahl

Authorized for release by:
1/31/2022 11:55:35 AM

Nathan Lewis, Project Manager I
(253)922-2310
Nathan.Lewis@Eurofinset.com

LINKS
Review your project results through TotalAccess
Have a Question? Ask The Expert
Visit us at: www.eurofinsus.com/Env

This report has been electronically signed and authorized by the signatory. Electronic signature is intended to be the legally binding equivalent of a traditionally handwritten signature.

Results relate only to the items tested and the sample(s) as received by the laboratory.

Table of Contents

Cover Page 1
Table of Contents 2
Case Narrative 3
Definitions 4
Client Sample Results 5
QC Sample Results 13
Chronicle 14
Certification Summary 16
Sample Summary 17
Chain of Custody 18
Receipt Checklists 19

Case Narrative

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Laboratory: Eurofins Seattle

Narrative

Job Narrative
580-109453-1

Comments
No additional comments.

Receipt
The samples were received on 1/19/2022 2:40 PM. Unless otherwise noted below, the samples arrived in good condition, and where required, properly preserved and on ice. The temperature of the cooler at receipt was 2.0º C.

GC/MS Semi VOA
Method Organotins: The RPD of the laboratory control sample (LCS) and laboratory control sample duplicate (LCSD) for preparation batch 580-379029 and analytical batch 580-379353 recovered outside control limits for the following analytes: Tributyltin.

No additional analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described above or in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Organic Prep
Method Organotin: Insufficient sample volume was available to perform a matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate/sample duplicate (MS/MSD/DUP) associated with preparation batch 580-379029, so a LCS and LCSD were used instead.

No additional analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described above or in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Definitions/Glossary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Qualifiers

GC/MS Semi VOA

Qualifier	Qualifier Description
*1	LCS/LCSD RPD exceeds control limits.
J	Result is less than the RL but greater than or equal to the MDL and the concentration is an approximate value.

Glossary

Abbreviation	These commonly used abbreviations may or may not be present in this report.
¤	Listed under the "D" column to designate that the result is reported on a dry weight basis
%R	Percent Recovery
CFL	Contains Free Liquid
CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CNF	Contains No Free Liquid
DER	Duplicate Error Ratio (normalized absolute difference)
Dil Fac	Dilution Factor
DL	Detection Limit (DoD/DOE)
DL, RA, RE, IN	Indicates a Dilution, Re-analysis, Re-extraction, or additional Initial metals/anion analysis of the sample
DLC	Decision Level Concentration (Radiochemistry)
EDL	Estimated Detection Limit (Dioxin)
LOD	Limit of Detection (DoD/DOE)
LOQ	Limit of Quantitation (DoD/DOE)
MCL	EPA recommended "Maximum Contaminant Level"
MDA	Minimum Detectable Activity (Radiochemistry)
MDC	Minimum Detectable Concentration (Radiochemistry)
MDL	Method Detection Limit
ML	Minimum Level (Dioxin)
MPN	Most Probable Number
MQL	Method Quantitation Limit
NC	Not Calculated
ND	Not Detected at the reporting limit (or MDL or EDL if shown)
NEG	Negative / Absent
POS	Positive / Present
PQL	Practical Quantitation Limit
PRES	Presumptive
QC	Quality Control
RER	Relative Error Ratio (Radiochemistry)
RL	Reporting Limit or Requested Limit (Radiochemistry)
RPD	Relative Percent Difference, a measure of the relative difference between two points
TEF	Toxicity Equivalent Factor (Dioxin)
TEQ	Toxicity Equivalent Quotient (Dioxin)
TNTC	Too Numerous To Count

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-8-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:40
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-1
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.36		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 12:39	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*19*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 12:39*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-14-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 11:10
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-2
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.36		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 13:03	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*29*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 13:03*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-12-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 12:55
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-3
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.35		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 13:28	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*33*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 13:28*	*1*

Client Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-17-011722

Date Collected: 01/17/22 15:10
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-4

Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.36		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 13:53	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*38*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 13:53*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-16-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:15
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-5
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.36		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 14:18	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*43*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 14:18*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-160-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:15
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-6
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.35		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 14:43	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*31*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 14:43*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-15-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 11:00
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-7
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.37		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 15:08	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*53*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 15:08*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-13-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 12:50
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-8
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*1	0.37		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 15:33	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*46*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 15:33*	*1*

QC Sample Results

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Lab Sample ID: MB 580-379029/1-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 379353

Client Sample ID: Method Blank
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 379029

Analyte	MB Result	MB Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.30		ug/L		01/22/22 09:19	01/26/22 11:24	1

Surrogate	*MB %Recovery*	*MB Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*26*		*10 - 150*	*01/22/22 09:19*	*01/26/22 11:24*	*1*

Lab Sample ID: LCS 580-379029/2-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 379353

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 379029

Analyte			Spike Added	LCS Result	LCS Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits		
Tributyltin			1.79	0.236	J	ug/L		13	11 - 150		

Surrogate	*LCS %Recovery*	*LCS Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*18*		*10 - 150*

Lab Sample ID: LCSD 580-379029/3-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 379353

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample Dup
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 379029

Analyte			Spike Added	LCSD Result	LCSD Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec. Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Tributyltin			1.79	0.350	*1	ug/L		20	11 - 150	39	35

Surrogate	*LCSD %Recovery*	*LCSD Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*42*		*10 - 150*

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-8-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-1
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:40
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 12:39	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-14-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-2
Date Collected: 01/17/22 11:10
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 13:03	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-12-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-3
Date Collected: 01/17/22 12:55
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 13:28	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-17-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-4
Date Collected: 01/17/22 15:10
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 13:53	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-16-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-5
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:15
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 14:18	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-160-011722
Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-6
Date Collected: 01/17/22 09:15
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 14:43	TL1	FGS SEA

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Client Sample ID: MW-15-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 11:00
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-7
Matrix: Water

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 15:08	TL1	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-13-011722
Date Collected: 01/17/22 12:50
Date Received: 01/19/22 14:40

Lab Sample ID: 580-109453-8
Matrix: Water

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			379029	01/22/22 09:19	RJL	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	379353	01/26/22 15:33	TL1	FGS SEA

Laboratory References:

FGS SEA = Eurofins Seattle, 5755 8th Street East, Tacoma, WA 98424, TEL (253)922-2310

Accreditation/Certification Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Laboratory: Eurofins Seattle

All accreditations/certifications held by this laboratory are listed. Not all accreditations/certifications are applicable to this report.

Authority	Program	Identification Number	Expiration Date
Alaska (UST)	State	20-004	02-19-22
ANAB	Dept. of Defense ELAP	L2236	01-19-25
ANAB	Dept. of Energy	L2236	01-19-25
ANAB	ISO/IEC 17025	L2236	01-19-25
California	State	2954	01-30-22
Florida	NELAP	E87575	06-30-22
Louisiana	NELAP	03073	06-30-22
Maine	State	2020012	05-02-22
Montana (UST)	State	NA	04-14-27
New Jersey	NELAP	WA014	06-30-22
New York	NELAP	11662	04-01-22
Oregon	NELAP	4167	07-07-22
US Fish & Wildlife	US Federal Programs	058448	05-31-22
USDA	US Federal Programs	P330-20-00031	02-10-23
Washington	State	C788	07-13-22
Wisconsin	State	399133460	08-31-22

Sample Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 201246

Job ID: 580-109453-1

Lab Sample ID	Client Sample ID	Matrix	Collected	Received
580-109453-1	MW-8-011722	Water	01/17/22 09:40	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-2	MW-14-011722	Water	01/17/22 11:10	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-3	MW-12-011722	Water	01/17/22 12:55	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-4	MW-17-011722	Water	01/17/22 15:10	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-5	MW-16-011722	Water	01/17/22 09:15	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-6	MW-160-011722	Water	01/17/22 09:15	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-7	MW-15-011722	Water	01/17/22 11:00	01/19/22 14:40
580-109453-8	MW-13-011722	Water	01/17/22 12:50	01/19/22 14:40

SUBCONTRACT SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

109453

Send Report To Michael Erdahl

Company Friedman and Bruya, Inc.

Address 3012 16th Ave W

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98119

Phone # (206) 285-8282 merdahl@friedmanandbruya.com

SUBCONTRACTER
Eurofins

PROJECT NAME/NO.	PO #
20126	C-30

REMARKS

Aspect EDD

Page # 1 of 1

TURNAROUND TIME
☒ Standard TAT
☐ RUSH
Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL
☐ Dispose after 30 days
☐ Return samples
☐ Will call with instructions

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Type	# of Jars	ANALYSES REQUESTED: Tributyltin											Notes
MW-8-011722		1/17/2022	940	Water	1	X											
MW-14-011722		1/17/2022	1110	Water	1	X											
MW-12-011722		1/17/2022	1255	Water	1	X											
MW-17-011722		1/17/2022	1510	Water	1	X											
MW-16-011722		1/17/2022	915	Water	1	X											
MW-160-011722		1/17/2022	915	Water	1	X											
MW-15-011722		1/17/2022	1100	Water	1	X											
MW-13-011722		1/17/2022	1250	Water	1	X											

580-109453 Chain of Custody

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282
Fax (206) 283-5044

	SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by:		Michael Erdahl	Friedman & Bruya	1/19/22	0945
Received by:		Ashton Greene	EFGS	1/19/22	1440
Relinquished by:					
Received by:					

4g Bl/gel/tub IR8 2.0/1.8

01 Dr

Login Sample Receipt Checklist

Client: Friedman & Bruya

Job Number: 580-109453-1

Login Number: 109453
List Number: 1
Creator: Blankinship, Tom X

List Source: Eurofins Seattle

Question	Answer	Comment
Radioactivity wasn't checked or is </= background as measured by a survey meter.	True	
The cooler's custody seal, if present, is intact.	True	
Sample custody seals, if present, are intact.	True	
The cooler or samples do not appear to have been compromised or tampered with.	True	
Samples were received on ice.	True	
Cooler Temperature is acceptable.	True	
Cooler Temperature is recorded.	True	
COC is present.	True	
COC is filled out in ink and legible.	True	
COC is filled out with all pertinent information.	True	
Is the Field Sampler's name present on COC?	False	Received project as a subcontract.
There are no discrepancies between the containers received and the COC.	True	
Samples are received within Holding Time (excluding tests with immediate HTs)	True	
Sample containers have legible labels.	True	
Containers are not broken or leaking.	True	
Sample collection date/times are provided.	True	
Appropriate sample containers are used.	True	
Sample bottles are completely filled.	True	
Sample Preservation Verified.	N/A	
There is sufficient vol. for all requested analyses, incl. any requested MS/MSDs	True	
Containers requiring zero headspace have no headspace or bubble is <6mm (1/4").	N/A	
Multiphasic samples are not present.	True	
Samples do not require splitting or compositing.	True	
Residual Chlorine Checked.	N/A	

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D.
Yelena Aravkina, M.S.
Michael Erdahl, B.S.
Vineta Mills, M.S.
Eric Young, B.S.

3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
(206) 285-8282
fbi@isomedia.com
www.friedmanandbruya.com

May 16, 2022

Breeyn Greer, Project Manager
Aspect Consulting, LLC
710 2nd Ave S, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104


Dear Ms Greer:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on April 14, 2022 from the SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225 project. There are 39 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days, or as directed by the Chain of Custody document. 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 have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.



Michael Erdahl
Project Manager

Enclosures
c: Aspect Data
ASP0516R.DOC

CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on April 14, 2022 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the Aspect Consulting, LLC SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

Laboratory ID	Aspect Consulting, LLC
204225 -01	MW-08-041322
204225 -02	MW-14-041322
204225 -03	MW-12-041322
204225 -04	MW-17-041322
204225 -05	MW-16-041422
204225 -06	MW-160-041422
204225 -07	MW-15-041422
204225 -08	MW-13-041422

The samples were sent to Eurofins for tributyltin analysis. The report is enclosed.

The 8082 laboratory control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate failed the relative percent difference for Aroclor 1260. PCBs were not detected, therefore the data were acceptable.

All other quality control requirements were acceptable.

Date of Report: 05/16/22
Date Received: 04/14/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted: 04/15/22
Date Analyzed: 04/15/22

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 Laboratory ID	Diesel Range (C_{10}-C_{25})	Motor Oil Range (C_{25}-C_{36})	Surrogate (% Recovery) (Limit 41-152)
MW-13-041422 204225-08	210 x	<250	119
Method Blank 02-916 MB2	<50	<250	123

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-08-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/18/22	Lab ID:	204225-01
Date Analyzed:	04/18/22	Data File:	204225-01 .087
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	<3
Lead	<1
Nickel	1.63
Zinc	<5

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-14-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/18/22	Lab ID:	204225-02
Date Analyzed:	04/18/22	Data File:	204225-02 .088
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	<3
Lead	<1
Nickel	3.43
Zinc	<5

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-12-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/18/22	Lab ID:	204225-03
Date Analyzed:	04/18/22	Data File:	204225-03 .089
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	2.09
Copper	<3
Lead	<1
Nickel	4.24
Zinc	<5

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-17-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/18/22	Lab ID:	204225-04
Date Analyzed:	04/18/22	Data File:	204225-04 .090
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.03
Copper	<3
Lead	<1
Nickel	1.98
Zinc	<5

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-16-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/18/22	Lab ID:	204225-05
Date Analyzed:	04/18/22	Data File:	204225-05 .091
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.39
Copper	3.27
Lead	<1
Nickel	4.90
Zinc	18.3

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-160-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/18/22	Lab ID:	204225-06
Date Analyzed:	04/18/22	Data File:	204225-06 .092
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	1.38
Copper	3.22
Lead	<1
Nickel	4.85
Zinc	14.3

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-15-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/18/22	Lab ID:	204225-07
Date Analyzed:	04/18/22	Data File:	204225-07 .095
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	5.28
Copper	3.92
Lead	<1
Nickel	9.51
Zinc	<5

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	MW-13-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/18/22	Lab ID:	204225-08
Date Analyzed:	04/18/22	Data File:	204225-08 .096
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	<3
Lead	<1
Nickel	2.92
Zinc	6.45

Analysis For Dissolved Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	NA	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/18/22	Lab ID:	I2-293 mb
Date Analyzed:	04/18/22	Data File:	I2-293 mb.049
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	ICPMS2
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	SP

Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Arsenic	<1
Copper	<3
Lead	<1
Nickel	<1
Zinc	<5

Date of Report: 05/16/22
Date Received: 04/14/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted: 04/21/22
Date Analyzed: 04/25/22

RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED MERCURY USING EPA METHOD 1631E

Results Reported as ug/L (ppb)

Sample ID Laboratory ID	Dissolved Mercury
MW-08-041322 204225-01	<0.01
MW-14-041322 204225-02	<0.01
MW-12-041322 204225-03	<0.01
MW-17-041322 204225-04	<0.01
MW-16-041422 204225-05	<0.01
MW-160-041422 204225-06	<0.01
MW-15-041422 204225-07	<0.01
MW-13-041422 204225-08	<0.01
Method Blank i2-303 MB	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-08-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/19/22	Lab ID:	204225-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041915.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15	10	60
Phenol-d6	10	10	49
Nitrobenzene-d5	67	15	144
2-Fluorobiphenyl	72	25	128
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	91	10	142
Terphenyl-d14	99	41	138

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-14-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/19/22	Lab ID:	204225-02 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041916.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	17	10	60
Phenol-d6	11	10	49
Nitrobenzene-d5	78	15	144
2-Fluorobiphenyl	80	25	128
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	97	10	142
Terphenyl-d14	100	41	138

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	0.0068
Acenaphthene	1.1
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.053
Anthracene	0.028
Fluoranthene	0.21
Pyrene	0.16
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-12-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/19/22	Lab ID:	204225-03 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041917.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	16	10	60
Phenol-d6	12	10	49
Nitrobenzene-d5	74	15	144
2-Fluorobiphenyl	70	25	128
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	55	10	142
Terphenyl-d14	88	41	138

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	0.0060
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	0.0077
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-17-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/19/22	Lab ID:	204225-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041918.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	13	10	60
Phenol-d6	10	10	49
Nitrobenzene-d5	63	15	144
2-Fluorobiphenyl	70	25	128
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	83	10	142
Terphenyl-d14	83	41	138

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-16-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/19/22	Lab ID:	204225-05 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/20/22	Data File:	041919.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	14	10	60
Phenol-d6	10	10	49
Nitrobenzene-d5	71	15	144
2-Fluorobiphenyl	75	25	128
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	91	10	142
Terphenyl-d14	101	41	138

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-160-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/19/22	Lab ID:	204225-06 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/20/22	Data File:	041920.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	15	10	60
Phenol-d6	11	10	49
Nitrobenzene-d5	71	15	144
2-Fluorobiphenyl	72	25	128
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	84	10	142
Terphenyl-d14	95	41	138

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-15-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/19/22	Lab ID:	204225-07 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/20/22	Data File:	041921.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	17	10	60
Phenol-d6	14	10	49
Nitrobenzene-d5	81	15	144
2-Fluorobiphenyl	66	25	128
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	66	10	142
Terphenyl-d14	90	41	138

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/19/22	Lab ID:	204225-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/20/22	Data File:	041922.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	11	10	60
Phenol-d6	10	10	49
Nitrobenzene-d5	50	15	144
2-Fluorobiphenyl	55	25	128
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	36	10	142
Terphenyl-d14	93	41	138

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	0.37
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.072
Acenaphthylene	0.012
Acenaphthene	0.55
Fluorene	0.050
Phenanthrene	0.027
Anthracene	0.011
Fluoranthene	0.013
Pyrene	0.010
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.0056
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis For Semivolatile Compounds By EPA Method 8270E

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/19/22	Lab ID:	02-961 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041914.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	13	10	60
Phenol-d6	11	10	49
Nitrobenzene-d5	65	15	144
2-Fluorobiphenyl	81	25	128
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	37	10	142
Terphenyl-d14	98	41	138

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Naphthalene	<0.05
2-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
1-Methylnaphthalene	<0.05
Acenaphthylene	<0.005
Acenaphthene	<0.005
Fluorene	<0.005
Phenanthrene	<0.005
Anthracene	<0.005
Fluoranthene	<0.005
Pyrene	<0.005
Benz(a)anthracene	<0.005
Chrysene	<0.005
Benzo(a)pyrene	<0.005
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	<0.005
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	<0.005
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	<0.005
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	<0.005
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	<0.01

Analysis for Semivolatile Phenols By EPA Method 8270E SIM

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/20/22	Lab ID:	204225-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/20/22	Data File:	042021.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS6
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	17 vo	50	150
Phenol-d6	11 vo	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	97	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Pentachlorophenol	<0.05

Analysis for Semivolatile Phenols By EPA Method 8270E SIM

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/20/22	Lab ID:	02-970 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/20/22	Data File:	042018.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GCMS6
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
2-Fluorophenol	20 vo	50	150
Phenol-d6	12 vo	50	150
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	77	50	150

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Pentachlorophenol	<0.05

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-08-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/15/22	Lab ID:	204225-01 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041839.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	22 ip	25	160

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-14-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/15/22	Lab ID:	204225-02 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041840.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	31	25	160

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-12-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/15/22	Lab ID:	204225-03 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041841.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	45	25	160

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-17-041322	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/15/22	Lab ID:	204225-04 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041842.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	49	25	160

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-16-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/15/22	Lab ID:	204225-05 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041843.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	50	25	160

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-160-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/15/22	Lab ID:	204225-06 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041844.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	40	25	160

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-15-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/15/22	Lab ID:	204225-07 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041845.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	26	25	160

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	MW-13-041422	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	04/14/22	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/15/22	Lab ID:	204225-08 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041846.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	38	25	160

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Analysis For PCBs By EPA Method 8082A

Client Sample ID:	Method Blank	Client:	Aspect Consulting, LLC
Date Received:	Not Applicable	Project:	SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225
Date Extracted:	04/15/22	Lab ID:	02-953 mb 1/0.25
Date Analyzed:	04/19/22	Data File:	041838.D
Matrix:	Water	Instrument:	GC9
Units:	ug/L (ppb)	Operator:	VM

Surrogates:	% Recovery:	Lower Limit:	Upper Limit:
TCMX	31	25	160

Compounds:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Aroclor 1221	<0.005
Aroclor 1232	<0.005
Aroclor 1016	<0.005
Aroclor 1242	<0.005
Aroclor 1248	<0.005
Aroclor 1254	<0.005
Aroclor 1260	<0.005
Aroclor 1262	<0.005
Aroclor 1268	<0.005

Date of Report: 05/16/22
Date Received: 04/14/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225

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

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Diesel Extended	ug/L (ppb)	2,500	108	96	63-142	12

Date of Report: 05/16/22
Date Received: 04/14/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED METALS USING EPA METHOD 200.8

Laboratory Code: 204172-10 (Matrix Spike)

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Sample Result	Percent Recovery MS	Percent Recovery MSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Arsenic	ug/L (ppb)	10	96.1	71	79	70-130	11
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	<5	78	78	70-130	0
Lead	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	89	89	70-130	0
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	<1	79	79	70-130	0
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	<5	78	78	70-130	0

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Acceptance Criteria
Arsenic	ug/L (ppb)	10	93	85-115
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	101	85-115
Lead	ug/L (ppb)	10	99	85-115
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	99	85-115
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	100	85-115

Date of Report: 05/16/22
Date Received: 04/14/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR DISSOLVED MERCURY USING EPA METHOD 1631E

Laboratory Code: 204225-02 (Matrix Spike)

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Sample Result	Percent Recovery MS	Percent Recovery MSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Mercury	ug/L (ppb)	0.01	<0.0008	113	117	71-125	4

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Mercury	ug/L (ppb)	0.01	104	105	78-125	1

Date of Report: 05/16/22
Date Received: 04/14/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILES BY EPA METHOD 8270E

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Naphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	78	80	66-94	3
2-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	86	68-98	2
1-Methylnaphthalene	ug/L (ppb)	5	84	86	67-97	2
Acenaphthylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	88	91	70-130	3
Acenaphthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	87	89	70-130	2
Fluorene	ug/L (ppb)	5	91	93	70-130	2
Phenanthrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	90	95	70-130	5
Anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	92	95	70-130	3
Fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	97	101	70-130	4
Pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	93	97	70-130	4
Benz(a)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	94	96	70-130	2
Chrysene	ug/L (ppb)	5	94	96	70-130	2
Benzo(a)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	95	99	70-130	4
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	95	97	62-130	2
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ug/L (ppb)	5	95	98	70-130	3
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ug/L (ppb)	5	99	105	70-130	6
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ug/L (ppb)	5	104	107	70-130	3
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ug/L (ppb)	5	101	106	70-130	5

Date of Report: 05/16/22
Date Received: 04/14/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR SEMIVOLATILE PHENOLS BY EPA METHOD 8270E SIM

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 30)
Pentachlorophenol	ug/L (ppb)	0.63	74	92	70-130	22

Date of Report: 05/16/22
Date Received: 04/14/22
Project: SnoPac 150054, F&BI 204225

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS AS AROCLOR 1016/1260 BY EPA METHOD 8082A

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample 1/0.25

Analyte	Reporting Units	Spike Level	Percent Recovery LCS	Percent Recovery LCSD	Acceptance Criteria	RPD (Limit 20)
Aroclor 1016	ug/L (ppb)	0.25	52	62	25-165	18
Aroclor 1260	ug/L (ppb)	0.25	52	74	25-163	35 vo

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.

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.

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 analyte 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 due to sample matrix effects.

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.

204225

SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

04-14-22

C03 / E03 / A15

Page # 1 of 1

Report To Breeya Green

Company Aspect Consulting

Address 710 2nd Ave, Ste 550

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA, 98104

Phone _____ Email byreen@aspectconsulting.com

SAMPLERS (*signature*) BCM

PROJECT NAME: Sno Pac

PO #: 150054

REMARKS

Project specific RLs? (Yes) No

INVOICE TO


TURNAROUND TIME
- [x] Standard turnaround
- [ ] RUSH
- Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL
- [ ] Archive samples
- [ ] Other
- Default: Dispose after 30 days


Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Type	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	BTEX EPA 8021	NWTPH-HCID	VOCs EPA 8260	Dissolved PAHs EPA 8270	PCB Aroclors PCBs EPA 8082	Dissolved Hg	Low-level PAHs	Tributyltin	PCP	Notes
MW-08-041322	01 A-H	4/13/22	0910	GW	8					*	X	X	X	X	X		SC > 1000 µS/cm
MW-14-041322	02		1040														
MW-12-041322	03		1220														
MW-17-041322	04		1430														
MW-16-041422	05	4/14/22	0920														
MW-160-041422	06		0920														
MW-15-041422	07		1240														SC > 1000 µS/cm
MW-13-041322	08 A-K		1405		11	X										X	one bottle high turbidity, Lab filtered
041422 per BNE 4/15/22																	* As, Cu, Pb, Ni, Zn

SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by: BCM	Breeya Green	Aspect	4/14/22	1645
Received by: Hong Nguyen	HONG NGUYEN	FBI	4/14/22	16:45
Relinquished by:				
Received by:		Samples received at 4 °C		


Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
Ph. (206) 285-8282



Data File Name	: C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\04-15-22\055F1301.D		
Operator	: TL	Page Number	: 1
Instrument	: GC1	Vial Number	: 55
Sample Name	: 204225-08	Injection Number	: 1
Run Time Bar Code:		Sequence Line	: 13
Acquired on	: 15 Apr 22 11:39 PM	Instrument Method	: DX.MTH
Report Created on	: 18 Apr 22 09:22 AM	Analysis Method	: DEFAULT.MTH



Data File Name	: C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\04-15-22\051F1301.D		
Operator	: TL	Page Number	: 1
Instrument	: GC1	Vial Number	: 51
Sample Name	: 02-916 mb2	Injection Number	: 1
Run Time Bar Code:		Sequence Line	: 13
Acquired on	: 15 Apr 22 10:40 PM	Instrument Method	: DX.MTH
Report Created on	: 18 Apr 22 09:23 AM	Analysis Method	: DEFAULT.MTH



Data File Name : C:\HPCHEM\1\DATA\04-15-22\003F0201.D
Operator : TL
Instrument : GC1
Sample Name : 500 Dx 65-122D
Run Time Bar Code:
Acquired on : 15 Apr 22 06:10 AM
Report Created on: 18 Apr 22 09:23 AM

Page Number : 1
Vial Number : 3
Injection Number : 1
Sequence Line : 2
Instrument Method: DX.MTH
Analysis Method : DEFAULT.MTH

eurofins | Environment Testing America



ANALYTICAL REPORT

Eurofins Seattle
5755 8th Street East
Tacoma, WA 98424
Tel: (253)922-2310

Laboratory Job ID: 580-112702-1
Client Project/Site: 204225

For:
Friedman & Bruya
3012 16TH AVENUE WEST
Seattle, Washington 98119-2029

Attn: Michael Erdahl

Kristine D. Allen

Authorized for release by:
5/13/2022 1:14:31 PM
Kristine Allen, Client Service Manager
(253)433-0390
Kristine.Allen@et.eurofinsus.com

Designee for

Tracy Dutton, Client Relations Manager
(253)380-6574
Tracy.Dutton@et.eurofinsus.com

LINKS

Review your project results through TotalAccess

Have a Question? Ask The Expert

Visit us at:
www.eurofinsus.com/Env

This report has been electronically signed and authorized by the signatory. Electronic signature is intended to be the legally binding equivalent of a traditionally handwritten signature.

Results relate only to the items tested and the sample(s) as received by the laboratory.

Table of Contents

Cover Page 1
Table of Contents 2
Case Narrative 3
Definitions 4
Client Sample Results 5
QC Sample Results 13
Chronicle 14
Certification Summary 16
Sample Summary 17
Chain of Custody 18
Receipt Checklists 19

Case Narrative

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Laboratory: Eurofins Seattle

Narrative

Job Narrative
580-112702-1

Comments
No additional comments.

Receipt
The samples were received on 4/15/2022 11:05 AM. Unless otherwise noted below, the samples arrived in good condition, and where required, properly preserved and on ice. The temperature of the cooler at receipt was 0.2º C.

GC/MS Semi VOA
Method Organotins: The laboratory control sample and duplicate (LCS/LCSD) for preparation batch 580-388157 and analytical batch 580-388951 recovered outside acceptance limits, low-biased, for Tributyltin (4%, >11% required) as well as Tripentyltin surrogate. There was insufficient sample to perform a re-extraction or re-analysis; therefore, the data have been reported.

Method Organotins: MW-08-041322 (580-112702-1), MW-14-041322 (580-112702-2), MW-12-041322 (580-112702-3) and MW-17-041322 (580-112702-4) were prepared outside of preparation holding time due to oversight.

Method Organotins: Surrogate recovery for the following sample was outside of acceptance limits: MW-14-041322 (580-112702-2). There was insufficient sample to perform a re-extraction; therefore, the data have been reported.

No additional analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described above or in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Organic Prep
No analytical or quality issues were noted, other than those described in the Definitions/Glossary page.

Definitions/Glossary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Qualifiers

GC/MS Semi VOA

Qualifier	Qualifier Description
*-	LCS and/or LCSD is outside acceptance limits, low biased.
H	Sample was prepped or analyzed beyond the specified holding time
J	Result is less than the RL but greater than or equal to the MDL and the concentration is an approximate value.
S1-	Surrogate recovery exceeds control limits, low biased.

Glossary

Abbreviation	These commonly used abbreviations may or may not be present in this report.
¤	Listed under the "D" column to designate that the result is reported on a dry weight basis
%R	Percent Recovery
CFL	Contains Free Liquid
CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CNF	Contains No Free Liquid
DER	Duplicate Error Ratio (normalized absolute difference)
Dil Fac	Dilution Factor
DL	Detection Limit (DoD/DOE)
DL, RA, RE, IN	Indicates a Dilution, Re-analysis, Re-extraction, or additional Initial metals/anion analysis of the sample
DLC	Decision Level Concentration (Radiochemistry)
EDL	Estimated Detection Limit (Dioxin)
LOD	Limit of Detection (DoD/DOE)
LOQ	Limit of Quantitation (DoD/DOE)
MCL	EPA recommended "Maximum Contaminant Level"
MDA	Minimum Detectable Activity (Radiochemistry)
MDC	Minimum Detectable Concentration (Radiochemistry)
MDL	Method Detection Limit
ML	Minimum Level (Dioxin)
MPN	Most Probable Number
MQL	Method Quantitation Limit
NC	Not Calculated
ND	Not Detected at the reporting limit (or MDL or EDL if shown)
NEG	Negative / Absent
POS	Positive / Present
PQL	Practical Quantitation Limit
PRES	Presumptive
QC	Quality Control
RER	Relative Error Ratio (Radiochemistry)
RL	Reporting Limit or Requested Limit (Radiochemistry)
RPD	Relative Percent Difference, a measure of the relative difference between two points
TEF	Toxicity Equivalent Factor (Dioxin)
TEQ	Toxicity Equivalent Quotient (Dioxin)
TNTC	Too Numerous To Count

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Client Sample ID: MW-08-041322
Date Collected: 04/13/22 09:10
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-1
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	H *-	0.32		ug/L		04/21/22 13:39	04/29/22 19:39	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*21*		*10 - 150*	*04/21/22 13:39*	*04/29/22 19:39*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Job ID: 580-112702-1
Project/Site: 204225

Client Sample ID: MW-14-041322
Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-2
Date Collected: 04/13/22 10:40
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	H *-	0.33		ug/L		04/21/22 13:39	04/29/22 20:04	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*7*	*S1-*	*10 - 150*	*04/21/22 13:39*	*04/29/22 20:04*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Client Sample ID: MW-12-041322
Date Collected: 04/13/22 12:20
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-3
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	H *-	0.32		ug/L		04/21/22 13:39	04/29/22 20:30	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*44*		*10 - 150*	*04/21/22 13:39*	*04/29/22 20:30*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Client Sample ID: MW-17-041322
Date Collected: 04/13/22 14:30
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-4
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	H *-	0.33		ug/L		04/21/22 13:39	04/29/22 20:56	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*41*		*10 - 150*	*04/21/22 13:39*	*04/29/22 20:56*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Client Sample ID: MW-16-041422
Date Collected: 04/14/22 09:20
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-5
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*-	0.31		ug/L		04/21/22 13:39	04/29/22 21:21	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*21*		*10 - 150*	*04/21/22 13:39*	*04/29/22 21:21*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Client Sample ID: MW-16O-041422
Date Collected: 04/14/22 09:20
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-6
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*-	0.32		ug/L		04/21/22 13:39	04/29/22 21:47	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*53*		*10 - 150*	*04/21/22 13:39*	*04/29/22 21:47*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Job ID: 580-112702-1
Project/Site: 204225

Client Sample ID: MW-15-041422
Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-7
Date Collected: 04/14/22 12:40
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*-	0.32		ug/L		04/21/22 13:39	04/29/22 22:13	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*38*		*10 - 150*	*04/21/22 13:39*	*04/29/22 22:13*	*1*

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Client Sample ID: MW-13-041422
Date Collected: 04/14/22 14:05
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-8
Matrix: Water

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Analyte	Result	Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND	*-	0.31		ug/L		04/21/22 13:39	04/29/22 22:38	1

Surrogate	*%Recovery*	*Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*10*		*10 - 150*	*04/21/22 13:39*	*04/29/22 22:38*	*1*

Method: Organotins - Organotins, PSEP (GC/MS)

Lab Sample ID: MB 580-388157/1-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 388842

Client Sample ID: Method Blank
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 388157

Analyte	MB Result	MB Qualifier	RL	MDL	Unit	D	Prepared	Analyzed	Dil Fac
Tributyltin	ND		0.32		ug/L		04/21/22 13:39	04/28/22 20:12	1

Surrogate	*MB %Recovery*	*MB Qualifier*	*Limits*	*Prepared*	*Analyzed*	*Dil Fac*
Tripentyltin	*16*		*10 - 150*	*04/21/22 13:39*	*04/28/22 20:12*	*1*

Lab Sample ID: LCS 580-388157/2-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 388951

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 388157

Analyte			Spike Added	LCS Result	LCS Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec Limits		
Tributyltin			1.94	0.0829	J *-	ug/L		4	11 - 150		

Surrogate	*LCS %Recovery*	*LCS Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*8*	*S1-*	*10 - 150*

Lab Sample ID: LCSD 580-388157/3-A
Matrix: Water
Analysis Batch: 388951

Client Sample ID: Lab Control Sample Dup
Prep Type: Total/NA
Prep Batch: 388157

Analyte			Spike Added	LCSD Result	LCSD Qualifier	Unit	D	%Rec	%Rec Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Tributyltin			2.03	0.0840	J *-	ug/L		4	11 - 150	1	35

Surrogate	*LCSD %Recovery*	*LCSD Qualifier*	*Limits*
Tripentyltin	*36*		*10 - 150*

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Client Sample ID: MW-08-041322
Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-1
Date Collected: 04/13/22 09:10
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			388157	04/21/22 13:39	D1N	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	388951	04/29/22 19:39	JCM	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-14-041322
Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-2
Date Collected: 04/13/22 10:40
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			388157	04/21/22 13:39	D1N	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	388951	04/29/22 20:04	JCM	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-12-041322
Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-3
Date Collected: 04/13/22 12:20
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			388157	04/21/22 13:39	D1N	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	388951	04/29/22 20:30	JCM	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-17-041322
Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-4
Date Collected: 04/13/22 14:30
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			388157	04/21/22 13:39	D1N	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	388951	04/29/22 20:56	JCM	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-16-041422
Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-5
Date Collected: 04/14/22 09:20
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			388157	04/21/22 13:39	D1N	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	388951	04/29/22 21:21	JCM	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-16O-041422
Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-6
Date Collected: 04/14/22 09:20
Matrix: Water
Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			388157	04/21/22 13:39	D1N	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	388951	04/29/22 21:47	JCM	FGS SEA

Lab Chronicle

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Client Sample ID: MW-15-041422

Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-7

Date Collected: 04/14/22 12:40

Matrix: Water

Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			388157	04/21/22 13:39	D1N	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	388951	04/29/22 22:13	JCM	FGS SEA

Client Sample ID: MW-13-041422

Lab Sample ID: 580-112702-8

Date Collected: 04/14/22 14:05

Matrix: Water

Date Received: 04/15/22 11:05

Prep Type	Batch Type	Batch Method	Run	Dilution Factor	Batch Number	Prepared or Analyzed	Analyst	Lab
Total/NA	Prep	Organotin			388157	04/21/22 13:39	D1N	FGS SEA
Total/NA	Analysis	Organotins		1	388951	04/29/22 22:38	JCM	FGS SEA

Laboratory References:

FGS SEA = Eurofins Seattle, 5755 8th Street East, Tacoma, WA 98424, TEL (253)922-2310

Accreditation/Certification Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Laboratory: Eurofins Seattle

All accreditations/certifications held by this laboratory are listed. Not all accreditations/certifications are applicable to this report.

Authority	Program	Identification Number	Expiration Date
Alaska (UST)	State	20-004	02-19-25
ANAB	Dept. of Defense ELAP	L2236	01-19-25
ANAB	Dept. of Energy	L2236	01-19-25
ANAB	ISO/IEC 17025	L2236	01-19-25
California	State	2954	07-07-22
Florida	NELAP	E87575	06-30-22
Louisiana	NELAP	03073	06-30-22
Maine	State	2020012	05-02-22
Montana (UST)	State	NA	04-14-27
New Jersey	NELAP	WA014	06-30-22
New York	NELAP	11662	04-01-23
Oregon	NELAP	4167	07-07-22
US Fish & Wildlife	US Federal Programs	058448	05-31-22
USDA	US Federal Programs	P330-20-00031	02-10-23
Washington	State	C788	07-13-22
Wisconsin	State	399133460	08-31-22

Sample Summary

Client: Friedman & Bruya
Project/Site: 204225

Job ID: 580-112702-1

Lab Sample ID	Client Sample ID	Matrix	Collected	Received
580-112702-1	MW-08-041322	Water	04/13/22 09:10	04/15/22 11:05
580-112702-2	MW-14-041322	Water	04/13/22 10:40	04/15/22 11:05
580-112702-3	MW-12-041322	Water	04/13/22 12:20	04/15/22 11:05
580-112702-4	MW-17-041322	Water	04/13/22 14:30	04/15/22 11:05
580-112702-5	MW-16-041422	Water	04/14/22 09:20	04/15/22 11:05
580-112702-6	MW-16O-041422	Water	04/14/22 09:20	04/15/22 11:05
580-112702-7	MW-15-041422	Water	04/14/22 12:40	04/15/22 11:05
580-112702-8	MW-13-041422	Water	04/14/22 14:05	04/15/22 11:05

SUBCONTRACT SAMPLE CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Send Report To Michael Erdahl

Company Friedman and Bruya, Inc.

Address 3012 16th Ave W

City, State, ZIP Seattle, WA 98119

Phone # (206) 285-8282 merdahl@friedmanandbruya.com

SUBCONTRACTER
Eurofins

PROJECT NAME/NO.: 204225

PO #: C-148

REMARKS
Aspect EDD

Page # 1 of 1

TURNAROUND TIME
☒ Standard TAT
☐ RUSH
Rush charges authorized by:

SAMPLE DISPOSAL
☐ Dispose after 30 days
☐ Return samples
☐ Will call with instructions

Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Type	# of Jars	ANALYSES REQUESTED: Tributyltin	Notes
MW-08-041322		4/13/22	0910	water	1	X	
MW-14-041322			1040		1	X	
MW-12-041322			1220		1	X	
MW-17-041322			1430		1	X	
MW-16-041422		4/14/22	0920		1	X	
MW-160-041422			0920		1	X	
MW-15-041422			1240		1	X	
MW-13-041322 041422 ME			1405		1	X	

580-112702 Chain of Custody

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.
3012 16th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119-2029
Ph. (206) 285-8282

	SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
Relinquished by:		Michael Erdahl	Friedman & Bruya	4/15/22	0800
Received by:	Tom Blankinship	Blankinship	EETN	4/15/22	1105
Relinquished by:					

Fed Ex Priority wet/sub IR8 0.2/0.4 w/o

5/13/2022

Login Sample Receipt Checklist

Client: Friedman & Bruya

Job Number: 580-112702-1

Login Number: 112702

List Source: Eurofins Seattle

List Number: 1

Creator: Vallelunga, Diana L

Question	Answer	Comment
Radioactivity wasn't checked or is </= background as measured by a survey meter.	N/A	
The cooler's custody seal, if present, is intact.	True	
Sample custody seals, if present, are intact.	N/A	
The cooler or samples do not appear to have been compromised or tampered with.	True	
Samples were received on ice.	True	
Cooler Temperature is acceptable.	True	
Cooler Temperature is recorded.	True	
COC is present.	True	
COC is filled out in ink and legible.	True	
COC is filled out with all pertinent information.	True	
Is the Field Sampler's name present on COC?	True	
There are no discrepancies between the containers received and the COC.	True	
Samples are received within Holding Time (excluding tests with immediate HTs)	True	
Sample containers have legible labels.	True	
Containers are not broken or leaking.	True	
Sample collection date/times are provided.	True	
Appropriate sample containers are used.	True	
Sample bottles are completely filled.	True	
Sample Preservation Verified.	True	
There is sufficient vol. for all requested analyses, incl. any requested MS/MSDs	True	
Containers requiring zero headspace have no headspace or bubble is <6mm (1/4").	N/A	
Multiphasic samples are not present.	True	
Samples do not require splitting or compositing.	True	
Residual Chlorine Checked.	N/A	