

2815 2nd Avenue, Suite 540 | Seattle, WA 98121 | 206 858 7620 | www.maulfoster.com

August 18, 2023 Project No. M0615.20.008

Steve Teel, LHG, Cleanup Project Manager/Hydrogeologist Washington State Department of Ecology Toxics Cleanup Program, Southwest P.O. Box 47775 Olympia, WA 98504

Re: Supplemental Investigation, Port Parcel 110 Taylor Way and Alexander Avenue Fill Area

Dear Steve Teel:

On behalf of the Port of Tacoma (the Port), Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc. (MFA), has prepared this investigation report to describe the field activities performed and data collected to support the ongoing data gaps investigation at the Taylor Way and Alexander Avenue Fill Area Site (TWAAFA site) (Facility/Site ID No. 1403183; Cleanup Site ID No. 4692). This report describes investigation activities at the Port-owned Parcel 110 property, located at 3401 Lincoln Avenue in Tacoma, Washington (the Parcel 110 Property) (see Figure 1).

MFA performed field activities at the Parcel 110 Property consistent with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)-approved *Supplemental Investigation Work Plan* (MFA 2023).

#### Purpose

The investigation activities described in this report were conducted in response to Ecology's November 9, 2022, comments (Ecology 2022) on quarterly groundwater monitoring results at the TWAAFA site. First and second quarter 2022 groundwater monitoring data at CCW-1A showed concentrations of trichloroethene (TCE) exceeding Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) Method B groundwater vapor intrusion (VI) screening levels for commercial workers (DOF 2022a,b). Ecology requested additional investigation of "soil vapor and/or groundwater" southeast of monitoring well CCW-1A (Ecology 2022).

The field investigation activities described in this report included investigation on the Parcel 110 Property for chlorinated volatile organic compounds (CVOCs) in soil and groundwater hydraulically downgradient from monitoring well CCW-1A. MFA also assessed CVOCs in soil and soil gas near the historical sampling location SG-3, where TCE was previously detected above sub-slab soil gas MTCA Method C non-cancer screening levels.

#### Background

#### **Property Description**

The Parcel 110 Property (Pierce County tax parcel number 321351051) is an approximately 9-acre lot located southeast-adjacent to the TWAAFA site (see Figures 1 and 2). Parcel 110 is occupied by

the Port's tenant, Article, a furniture manufacturer that uses a building on the Parcel 110 Property for warehousing and shipping furniture. A wood-framed structure referred to as the Educator Building (Floyd Snider 2007) formerly existed on Parcel 110 and was demolished between 2018 and 2019.

The Parcel 110 Property is generally flat and situated approximately 10 to 15 feet above mean sea level (Floyd Snider 2007). At nearby monitoring wells CCW-1A, CCW-1B, and CCW-8B, located on the CleanCare parcel within the TWAAFA site, groundwater elevation fluctuates seasonally with groundwater often encountered at less than 5 feet below ground surface (bgs) in the winter and spring; CCW-1A has been observed as dry during summer monitoring events (DOF 2022c).

#### **Property History and Previous Investigations**

In 2007, Floyd Snider prepared a Phase I environmental site assessment for the Parcel 110 Property that identified recognized environmental conditions including potential groundwater contamination originating from a landfill at the adjacent CleanCare property (Floyd Snider 2007).

In 2010, Environmental Partners, Inc., prepared a site assessment and closure report documenting the cleanup of soil impacted by motor oil released from a railcar at the railroad spur east of the Parcel 110 Property (EPI 2010). Soil samples did not exhibit concentrations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), fuel additives, or petroleum compounds above MTCA Method A screening levels.

In 2018, Floyd Snider collected soil, reconnaissance groundwater, and soil gas samples from the Parcel 110 Property as part of a Phase II environmental site assessment (Floyd Snider 2018) (see Figure 2). VOCs were non-detect in soil and groundwater samples except for one detection of vinyl chloride in groundwater at 0.21 micrograms per liter (ug/L). Soil gas samples from three locations (SG-1 through SG-3) were analyzed for VOCs. The following VOCs (locations) exceeded the sub-slab soil gas MTCA Method C non-cancer screening level:

- Acetaldehyde (SG-1)
- Acrolein (SG-1 and SG-2)
- TCE (SG-3)

Floyd Snider noted that acetaldehyde and acrolein were associated with former operations at the Educator Building and the sources of these chemicals ceased when former tenant operations ceased. Sources of TCE near location SG-3 were not identified.

In 2018, a stormwater line originating from the adjacent CleanCare property was encountered and capped (Ecology 2018) and two underground storage tanks (USTs) (an 8,000-gallon heavy heating oil UST and a 400-gallon diesel heating oil UST) were encountered and removed during demolition of the Educator Building (ES 2018). A total of 65 tons of diesel impacted soil was removed during the excavation. Confirmation sampling was conducted around both USTs and the results indicated petroleum hydrocarbon concentrations remained below MTCA Method A screening levels.

In 2019, the current warehouse building with a dedicated stormwater system was constructed on the Parcel 110 Property. The building was constructed with a 6-inch-thick concrete slab-on-grade foundation, with a sub-slab vapor barrier beneath the office areas (see Figure 2).

### **Field Investigation Activities**

On June 27 and 28, 2023, MFA conducted fieldwork activities in accordance with the Ecologyapproved Supplemental Investigation Work Plan (MFA 2023). Investigation and sampling methods were performed consistent with the Final Data Gaps Sampling and Analysis Plan and Soil Vapor Sampling and Analysis Plan (Appendixes K and M, respectively, of the Final Data Gaps Work Plan [DOF 2020]). Field photographs from the investigation are provided in Attachment A.

MFA coordinated public and private utility locates to identify subsurface utilities in the proposed investigation areas on the Parcel 110 Property. Under MFA oversight, Anderson Environmental Contracting, LLC, of Kelso, Washington, advanced two borings (TWA-11 and TW-14) using direct-push drilling methods (see Figure 3). Boring TWA-11 was advanced to 12 feet bgs near the northwestern side of the Parcel 110 Property, hydraulically downgradient from monitoring well CCW-1A. BoringTW-14 was advanced to 10 feet bgs near the northeast corner of the Parcel 110 Property, near historical soil-gas sampling location SG-3. Neither boring penetrated the silt layer separating the shallow and deep aquifers that have been observed beneath the TWAAFA site. Locations were recorded in the field using a handheld GPS device.

MFA prepared geologic boring logs for each location under the direct supervision of a geologist licensed in the State of Washington (see Attachment B). Soil types were described; visual and olfactory observations recorded; and soil headspace screened for VOCs using a photoionization detector. A piece of textile (potentially a geotextile or landscaping fabric) was observed at 2.5 feet bgs in the soil core retrieved from TWA-11. Soil conditions during drilling generally consisted of sandy silty gravel/silty sandy gravel to approximately 6 feet bgs overlaying a unit of silty sand/sandy silt to a maximum observed depth of 12 feet bgs. No visual or olfactory indications of contamination were observed in soil from either location.

#### **Soil Sampling**

At TWA-11, field staff collected one soil sample from the capillary fringe immediately above the water table (between 6.4 and 6.6 feet bgs). Groundwater was not encountered at TW-14, so MFA field staff collected two soil samples (a primary and a field duplicate) between 5.9 and 6.1 feet bgs. TW-14 was backfilled with hydrated bentonite and the ground surface was restored to match existing grade.

All soil samples were collected with a disposable core sampler operated using a gloved hand and were transferred directly into labeled, laboratory-supplied containers to analyze for CVOCs.

#### **Groundwater Sampling**

Following soil sample collection, TWA-11 was converted to a permanent monitoring well. The well was constructed from a 2-inch-diameter polyvinyl chloride well casing with a 5 foot well screen set from 7 to 12 feet bgs. MFA field staff developed the well using a bailer and removed approximately 7 gallons of water until turbidity was visibly reduced. Field staff continued purging with a peristaltic pump set at a low flow rate (i.e., less than 500 milliliters per minute). During purging, volume removed, water levels, and water quality parameters (pH, temperature, specific conductance, and turbidity) were recorded on a well development form (see Attachment C). MFA ceased purging when the minimum well bore volume was removed and water quality field parameters stabilized within the acceptance criteria specified in Appendix L of the *Final Data Gaps Work Plan* (DOF 2020).<sup>1</sup> In total, approximately 10.6 gallons of water were removed during purging.

Approximately 24 hours after well development, MFA field staff collected two groundwater samples (a primary and a field duplicate) from TWA-11. MFA purged the well using a peristaltic pump, and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Acceptance criteria for new monitoring well development states that at least three well volumes have been removed and water quality parameters have stabilized for three consecutive readings: turbidity is below 5 nephelometric turbidity units, specific conductivity within 10 percent of previous reading, and pH within 0.5 standard units of the previous reading (DOF 2020).

purge volumes, water levels, and water quality parameters (pH, temperature, specific conductance, dissolved oxygen, oxygen-reduction potential, and turbidity) were recorded on a water field sampling data sheet (see Attachment D). Once water quality parameters stabilized within acceptance criteria, field staff collected groundwater samples directly into laboratory-supplied containers for analysis for CVOCs.

Groundwater was not encountered at TW-14 and therefore a reconnaissance groundwater sample was not collected.

### **Soil Gas Sampling**

Because groundwater at TW-14 was sufficiently low to expose the vadose zone (i.e., greater than 5 feet bgs), a soil gas sample (TWSV-1) was collected at 5 feet bgs from a stepped-out location approximately 1 foot from TW-14 (see Figure 3 and photograph 5 in Attachment A). Soil gas sampling used the post-run tubing methodology described in the *Supplemental Investigation Work Plan* (MFA 2023). Initially, field staff encountered issues setting the vapor pin and achieving a satisfactory seal with a new 0-ring. Once successfully set and sealed, an equilibration period longer than 60 minutes was observed.

After the equilibration period, the line was purged, and purge and leak tests were performed. Helium was introduced as the leak-check compound. After successful completion of the purge and leak tests, a soil gas sample was collected into a laboratory-supplied 1-liter stainless steel Summa canister for analysis for CVOCs. Field data before and after sampling, including start and stop times and initial and final canister vacuum readings, were recorded on a soil gas sampling data sheet (see Attachment E).

#### **Management of Investigation-Derived Waste**

Investigation-derived waste (i.e., soil cuttings and purge water) was drummed, labeled, and stored on the Parcel 110 Property in Washington State Department of Transportation-approved containers, pending offsite disposal.

### Analytical Methods and Quality Control/Quality Assurance

All samples were submitted to Friedman & Bruya, Inc., a Washington-State accredited laboratory located in Seattle, Washington. Samples were analyzed for the following, consistent with the Ecology-approved Supplemental Investigation Work Plan:

- Soil samples from TWA-11 and TW-14 were analyzed for CVOCs by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 8260D
- Groundwater samples from TWA-11 were analyzed for CVOCs by EPA Method 8260D
- The soil gas sample from TWSV-1 was analyzed for CVOCs by EPA Method Toxic Organics-15 and helium by ASTM International Method D1946

The analytical laboratory reports are provided as Attachment F. Sample analytical data and the laboratory's internal quality assurance and quality control data were reviewed to assess whether they met project-specific data quality objectives. A data validation memorandum summarizing data evaluation procedures, data usability, and deviations from specific field and/or laboratory methods is included as Attachment G. The data are considered acceptable for their intended use, with appropriate data qualifiers assigned.

### Results

#### Soil

Soil samples from TWA-11 and TW-14 were screened against site-specific screening levels (DOF 2020), which include MTCA Method A for unrestricted land use and Method B values. A summary of soil analytical results is provided in Table 1. Nearly all CVOCs were non-detect in soil samples collected from TWA-11 and TW-14. The only CVOC detection in soil was tetrachloroethene at TWA-11, which was detected at a concentration of 0.0031 milligrams per kilogram, an order of magnitude below the MTCA Method A screening level of 0.05 milligrams per kilogram.

#### Groundwater

A summary of groundwater analytical results is provided in Table 2. The groundwater samples from TWA-11 were screened against site-specific screening levels, which include MTCA Method A and Method B values. The groundwater samples from TWA-11 were also screened against MTCA Method B groundwater VI screening levels to qualitatively evaluate the VI risk to building occupants at the Parcel 110 Property. Nearly all CVOCs were non-detect in groundwater samples collected from TWA-11. The only CVOC detection in groundwater was vinyl chloride, which was detected at a concentration of 0.021 ug/L,<sup>2</sup> below all screening levels, including the most stringent MTCA Method B screening level of 0.029 ug/L.

First and second quarter 2022 groundwater monitoring at CCW-1A (located approximately 60 feet north-northwest of the warehouse on the Parcel 110 Property) exhibited concentrations (up to 24 ug/L) of TCE above MTCA Method B groundwater VI screening levels for commercial workers (DOF 2022a,b). At TWA-11, TCE was non-detect in groundwater at a method reporting limit below the MTCA Method B groundwater VI screening level.

#### Soil Gas

A summary of soil gas analytical results is provided in Table 3. The soil gas sample from TWSV-1 was screened against MTCA Method B and Method C sub-slab soil gas VI screening levels. TCE concentrations in soil gas were also compared to the short-term action level of 250 micrograms per cubic meter (ug/m<sup>3</sup>). Nearly all CVOCs were non-detect in the soil gas sample collected from TWSV-1. The only CVOC detections in soil gas were cis-1,2-dichloroethene and TCE, which were detected at concentrations below MTCA Method B and C screening levels and the short-term action level for TCE. Helium was not detected in the soil gas sample, confirming that no leaks were detected in the sample train.

In 2018, TCE exceeded the sub-slab soil gas MTCA Method C non-cancer screening level at a concentration of 210 ug/m<sup>3</sup> at sample location SG-3 (see Figure 3). However, as noted in the *Supplemental Investigation Work Plan* (MFA 2023), Floyd Snider collected the sample using post-run tubing methodology at a depth shallower than 5 feet bgs, likely due to the shallow groundwater table. The shallow sampling depth increases the likelihood for ambient air to be drawn into the sampling train. Further, Floyd Snider did not use a leak-check compound to evaluate sample train leaks or ambient air infiltration. During this 2023 investigation, TCE was detected at TWSV-1 at a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Vinyl chloride was detected in the field duplicate sample from TWA-11 at a concentration of 0.026 ug/L.

concentration of 6.5  $ug/m^3$ , well below the 2018 detection at SG-3, below the MTCA Method B and MTCA Method C screening levels, and below the short-term action limit.

#### Summary

As requested by Ecology, soil and groundwater samples were collected to evaluate whether CVOCs (observed in the nearby CleanCare monitoring well CCW-1A) present a potential VI risk to the building located on the Parcel 110 Parcel Property. A soil gas sample was also collected near a historical sampling location that exhibited TCE concentrations above MTCA Method C screening levels.

Soil and groundwater collected from the downgradient boring/well advanced on Parcel 110 Property (TWA-11) did not exhibit CVOC concentrations above screening levels, including VI screening levels for groundwater.

Additionally, CVOCs in the soil gas sample collected near the northeast corner of the Parcel 110 Property (in the vicinity of historical soil gas sample SG-3) were below screening levels; the historical exceedance near this location is not representative of current conditions.

In 2019, the existing building was constructed with a 6-inch-thick concrete slab and vapor barriers installed beneath the offices of the building. Based on the data collected during this investigation and the existing vapor mitigation measures, contaminated groundwater from the CleanCare parcel does not appear to present a VI risk to occupants of the building located on the Parcel 110 Property.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact us.

Sincerely,

Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc.

8/18/2023

Carolyn Wise, LHG Project Hydrogeologist

Audrey Hackett Senior Environmental Scientist

#### Attachments

- References
- Limitations
- Figures
- Tables
- A-Photograph Log
- **B**—Boring Logs
- C–Well Development Form
- D–Water Field Sampling Data Sheet
- E-Soil Gas Sampling Data Sheet
- F-Analytical Laboratory Reports
- G-Data Validation Memorandum

cc: Scott Hooton, Port of Tacoma Tasya Gray, Dalton Olmsted & Fuglevand Kim Seely, Coastline Law Group PLLC Douglas Steding, Northwest Resource Law PLLC

## References

- DOF. 2020. Final Data Gaps Work Plan, Taylor Way and Alexander Avenue Fill Area Site, Tacoma, Washington. Dalton, Olmsted & Fuglevand, Inc.: Seattle, WA. July.
- DOF. 2022a. First Quarter 2022 Groundwater Data Analysis Report, Taylor Way and Alexander Avenue Fill Area Site, Tacoma, Washington. Dalton, Olmsted, & Fuglevand Inc.: Seattle, WA. May 6.
- DOF. 2022b. Second Quarter 2022 Groundwater Data Analysis Report, Taylor Way and Alexander Avenue Fill Area Site, Tacoma, Washington. Dalton, Olmsted, & Fuglevand Inc.: Seattle, WA. August 10.
- DOF. 2022c. Third Quarter 2022 Groundwater Data Analysis Report, Taylor Way and Alexander Avenue Fill Area Site, Tacoma, Washington. Dalton, Olmsted, & Fuglevand Inc.: Seattle, WA. November 23.
- Ecology. 2018. Steve Teel, LHG, Washington State Department of Ecology. *Clean Care—Storm Line Sketch.* Email to Drew Zaborowski, Avenue 55; Caroline Cress, Washington State Attorney General; and Scott Hooton, Port of Tacoma. July 16.
- Ecology. 2022. Steve Teel, LHG, Washington State Department of Ecology. *Comments on TWAAFA Reports and Request for Work Plan.* Email to Scott Hooton, Port of Tacoma. November 9.
- EPI. 2010. *Railcar Oil Release Site Assessment/Closure Report.* Prepared for Emerald Services, Inc. Environmental Partners, Inc.: Issaquah, WA. July 21.
- ES. 2018. Heating Oil Storage Tank Removals, Site Assessment, Remediation and Closure Report, Portside 55 Demolition Project. Environmental Specialties: Puyallup, Washington. November 15.
- Floyd Snider. 2007. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Educator Building*. Prepared for Avenue 55, LLC. Floyd | Snider: Seattle, WA. October 5.
- Floyd Snider. 2018. *Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Educator Building*. Prepared for Avenue 55, LLC. Floyd | Snider: Seattle, WA. September.
- MFA. 2023. Supplemental Investigation Work Plan, Port Parcel 110 and Potter Property, Taylor Way and Alexander Avenue Fill Area. Prepared for the Port of Tacoma. Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc.: Seattle, WA. February 21.

## Limitations

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

Opinions and recommendations contained in this report apply to conditions existing when services were performed and are intended only for the client, purposes, locations, time frames, and project parameters indicated. We are not responsible for the impacts of any changes in environmental standards, practices, or regulations subsequent to performance of services. We do not warrant the accuracy of information supplied by others, or the use of segregated portions of this report.

# **Figures**





8/10/2023

Print Date

MAUL FOSTER ALONGI p. 971 544 2139 | www.maulfoster.com



#### Legend



## Parcel 110 Property



Data Sources U.S. Geological Survey (2021) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle: Tacoma, Washington. Township 21 North, Range 3 East, Section 35. Tax parcel obtained from Pierce County Assessor. TWAAFA site boundary obtained from Exhibit A of Agreed Order No. DE 14260.

# Figure 1 Property Location

Port of Tacoma Parcel 110 3401 Lincoln Avenue Tacoma, Washington





$\bigcirc$	Soil Boring
<b></b>	Soil Gas Boring
$\bigcirc$	Soil and Soil Gas Boring
	Soil and Reconnaissance Groundwater Boring
	Vapor Barrier/Office Area
]	Former UST
	TWAAFA Site Boundary
_	Dereal 110 Property Dounde





#### Figure 3 Sample Locations

Port of Tacoma Parcel 110 3401 Lincoln Avenue Tacoma, Washington

#### Legend

- 1994 CleanCare Monitoring Well (Pacific Groundwater Group)
- 2018 Soil Gas Boring (Floyd Snider)
- 2023 Soil Gas Boring
- 2023 Soil Boring
- 2023 Monitoring Well
- Vapor Barrier/Office Area
- TWAAFA Site Boundary
- Parcel 110 Property Boundary

#### Notes

0

 $\diamond$ 

4

Sample locations were measured in the field using a differential GPS device. Only detected CVOCs and associated concentrations are shown. Analytical data summaries are provided in Tables 1-3. CVOC = chlorinated volatile organic compound. DCE = dichloroethene. DOF = Dalton, Olmsted & Fuglevand, Inc. mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram. PCE = tetrachloroethene. TCE = trichloroethene. TWAAFA = Taylor Way and Alexander Avenue Fill Area. ug/L = micrograms per liter.  $ug/m^3 = micrograms$  per cubic meter. VC = vinyl chloride.Feet

#### Data Sources

Data Sources Aerial photographs obtained from Esri; parcels obtained from Pierce County Assessor; 1994 monitoring well locations obtained from the DOF 2022 Final Data Gaps Report; 2018 soil gas boring locations obtained from Figure 3.1 of the 2018 Floyd Snider Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Report; vapor barrier locations obtained from the June 2018 Avenue 55 site plan.



This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for, or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. Users of this information should review or consult the primary data and information sources to ascertain the usability of the information.

# **Tables**





#### MAUL FOSTER ALONGI

#### Table 1 **Summary of Soil Analytical Results** Parcel 110 Supplemental Investigation, Port of Tacoma

Location:			TWA-11	TW	-14
Sample Name:	MTCA Method A,	MTCA Method	TWA-11_6.4- 6.6_0627	TW-14_5.9- 6.1_0627	TW-9-14_5.9- 6.1_0627
Sample Date:	Land Use <sup>(1)</sup>	and Use <sup>(1)</sup> $B^{(a)(1)}$	06/27/2023	06/27/2023	06/27/2023
Sample Type:			N	Ν	FD
Sample Depth (ft bgs):			6.4-6.6	5.9-6.1	5.9-6.1
VOCs (mg/kg)					
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	2	160,000	0.002 U	0.002 U	0.002 U
1,1-Dichloroethane	NV	180	0.002 U	0.002 U	0.002 U
1,1-Dichloroethene	NV	4,000	0.002 U	0.002 U	0.002 U
1,2-Dichloroethane	NV	11	0.002 U	0.002 U	0.002 U
Chloroethane	NV	NV	0.1 U	0.1 U	0.1 U
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	NV	160	0.002 U	0.002 U	0.002 U
Methylene chloride	0.02	94	0.2 U	0.2 U	0.2 U
Tetrachloroethene	0.05	480	0.0031	0.002 U	0.002 U
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	NV	1,600	0.002 U	0.002 U	0.002 U
Trichloroethene	0.03	12	0.002 U	0.002 U	0.002 U
Vinyl chloride	NV	0.67	0.002 U	0.002 U	0.002 U

#### Notes

Detected results were compared with screening criteria. There were no exceedances.

FD = field duplicate sample.

ft bgs = feet below ground surface.

mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram.

MTCA = Model Toxics Control Act.

N = normal environmental sample.

NV = no value.

U = result is non-detect at the method reporting limit.

VOC = volatile organic compound.

<sup>(a)</sup>Lower of cancer and noncancer values are shown.

#### Reference

<sup>(1)</sup>Ecology. 2023. Cleanup Levels and Risk Calculation (CLARC) table. Washington State Department of Ecology, Toxics Cleanup Program: Union Gap, WA. January.

#### Table 2



#### Summary of Groundwater Analytical Results Parcel 110 Supplemental Investigation, Port of Tacoma

Location:				TW	A-11
Sample Name:	MTCA Method	MTCA Method B <sup>(a)(1)</sup>	MTCA Method B,	TWA-11_7- 12_0628	TWA-9-11_7- 12_0628
Sample Date:	A <sup>(1)</sup>		Groundwater <sup>(a)(1)</sup>	06/28/2023	06/28/2023
Sample Type:			Groundwater	Ν	FD
Sample Depth (ft bgs):				10	10
VOCs (ug/L)					
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	200	16,000	5400	1 U	1 U
1,1-Dichloroethane	NV	7.7	11	1 U	1 U
1,1-Dichloroethene	NV	400	130	1 U	1 U
1,2-Dichloroethane	5	0.48	3.5	0.2 U	0.2 U
Chloroethane	NV	NV	15,000	1 U	1 U
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	NV	16	180	1 U	1 U
Methylene chloride	5	5.8	780	5 U	5 U
Tetrachloroethene	5	21	25	1 U	1 U
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	NV	160	77	1 U	1 U
Trichloroethene	5	0.54	1.4	0.5 U	0.5 U
Vinyl chloride	0.2	0.029	0.33	0.021	0.026

#### Notes

Detected results were compared with screening criteria. There were no exceedances.

FD = field duplicate sample.

ft bgs = feet below ground surface.

MTCA = Model Toxics Control Act.

N = normal environmental sample.

NV = no value.

U = result is non-detect at the method reporting limit.

ug/L = micrograms per liter.

VOC = volatile organic compound.

<sup>(a)</sup>Lower of cancer and noncancer values are shown.

#### Reference

<sup>(1)</sup>Ecology. 2023. *Cleanup Levels and Risk Calculation (CLARC) table.* Washington State Department of Ecology, Toxics Cleanup Program: Union Gap, WA. January.



# Table 3Summary of Soil Gas Analytical ResultsParcel 110 Supplemental Investigation, Port of Tacoma

Location:	MTCA Method B,	MTCA Method C,	Short-Term Action	TWSV-1	
Sample Name:	Sub-Slab Soil Gas <sup>(a)(1)</sup>	Sub-Slab Soil Gas <sup>(a)(1)</sup>	Soil Gas, Nonresidential <sup>(2)</sup>	TWSV-1-062723	
Sample Date:				06/27/2023	
VOCs (ug/m <sup>3</sup> )					
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	76,000	170,000	NV	4.7 U	
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	3	6.7	NV	0.48 U	
1,1-Dichloroethane	52	520	NV	3.5 U	
1,1-Dichloroethene	3,000	6,700	NV	3.4 U	
1,2-Dichloroethane	3.2	32	NV	0.35 U	
Chloroethane	150,000	330,000	NV	23 U	
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	610	1,300	NV	5.5	
Tetrachloroethene	320	1,300	NV	59 U	
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	610	1,300	NV	3.4 U	
Trichloroethene	11	67	250	6.5	
Vinyl chloride	9.5	95	NV	2.2 U	

#### Notes

Detected results were compared with screening criteria. There were no exceedances.

MTCA = Model Toxics Control Act.

NV = no value.

U = result is non-detect at the method reporting limit.

 $ug/m^3$  = micrograms per cubic meter.

VOC = volatile organic compound.

<sup>(a)</sup>Lower of cancer and noncancer values are shown.

#### Reference

<sup>(1)</sup>Ecology. 2023. *Cleanup Levels and Risk Calculation (CLARC) table.* Washington State Department of Ecology, Toxics Cleanup Program: Union Gap, WA. January.

<sup>(2)</sup>Ecology. 2022. *Guidance for Evaluating Vapor Intrusion in Washington State*. Publication No. 09-09-047. Washington State Department of Ecology, Toxics Cleanup Program: Olympia, WA. March.

Attachment A

Photograph Log





#### Photo No. 1.

#### Description

Geoprobe drill rig at location TWA-11 near the northern corner of 3401 Lincoln Avenue, Tacoma, Washington (the Parcel 110 Property). Photograph taken during field activities on June 27, 2023.

## **Photographs**

Project Name: Project Number: Location:

Supplemental Investigation, Port Parcel 110
 m0615.20.008
 3401 Lincoln Avenue, Tacoma, Washington



#### Photo No. 2.

#### Description

Unknown material (potentially a piece of textile fabric) observed at 2.5 feet below ground surface (bgs) from soil boring taken from TWA-11 on the northern portion of the Parcel 110 Property. Photograph taken during field activities on June 27, 2023.





#### Photo No. 3.

#### Description

Soil core from 0 to 12 feet bgs taken from location TWA-11 on the northern portion of the Parcel 110 Property. Photograph taken during field activities on June 27, 2023.

## **Photographs**

Project Name: Project Number: Location:

Supplemental Investigation, Port Parcel 110r: M0615.20.0083401 Lincoln Avenue, Tacoma, Washington



#### Photo No. 4.

#### Description

Soil core from 0 to 10 feet bgs taken from location TW-14 on the southeast portion of the Parcel 110 Property. Photograph taken during field activities on June 27, 2023.





#### Photo No. 5.

#### Description

Soil vapor sample train at location TWSV-1 (stepped out approximately 1 foot from soil boring TW-14) on the southeast portion of the Parcel 110 Property. Photograph taken during field activities on June 27, 2023.

## **Photographs**

Project Name: Project Number: Location:

Supplemental Investigation, Port Parcel 110 r: M0615.20.008 3401 Lincoln Avenue, Tacoma, Washington



#### Photo No. 6.

#### Description

Investigation-derived waste (IDW) container locations on the eastern portion of the Parcel 110 Property. Photograph taken during field activities on June 27, 2023.





#### Photo No. 7.

#### Description

IDW drum label for soil cuttings. Photograph taken during field activities on June 27, 2023.

# Photographs

Project Name: Project Number: Location:

Supplemental Investigation, Port Parcel 110r: M0615.20.0083401 Lincoln Avenue, Tacoma, Washington



#### Photo No. 8.

#### Description

IDW drum label for water. Photograph taken during field activities on June 27, 2023.





#### Photo No. 9.

#### Description

Groundwater sample collection set up at monitoring well TWA-11 on the northern portion of the Parcel 110 Property. Photograph taken during groundwater sampling on June 28, 2023.

## **Photographs**

Project Name: Project Number: Location:

Supplemental Investigation, Port Parcel 110 r: M0615.20.008 3401 Lincoln Avenue, Tacoma, Washington



**Attachment B** 

**Boring Logs** 



		1	2.5			Drain at Nk			Borehole Log	<u>Ohaat</u>
🥭 м	MAUL FOSTER ALONG Project Name Project Location Start/End Date Driller/Equipment Geologist/Engineer Sample Method MAUL FOSTER ALONG Parcel 110 Invest 3401 Lincoln Av 6/27/2023 to 6/2 Anderson Envir A. Bixby Core Barrel			ALONG		Project Nu M0615.20	imber <b>).008</b>	vveii T <b>i</b>	Number VA-11	Sheet 1 of 1
Project I Project I Start/En Driller/E Geologi Sample				cel 110 Inves 1 Lincoln Av 7/2023 to 6/27 lerson Enviro Sixby e Barrel	tigation enue, Ta 7/2023 onmenta	coma, WA I Contracti	ng, LLC/Direct	TOC Elevation (feet) Surface Elevation (feet) Northing Easting Total Depth of Borehole 12. Outer Hole Diam 4.2		
(S)	Well		λ.	Sample Da	nta	ic			Soil Description	
Depth (feet, bg		Levels	Percent Recovei	Sample ID	(mqq)	PID (ppm) Column				
			60		0.0		0.0 to 0.2 feet. 0.2 to 3.0 feet. 30% sand medium d @ 1.7 feet: Gr @ 2.5 feet: W 3.0 to 5.0 feet.	100% organic m SANDY SILTY ( , fine to coarse; ense; no odor; m ay concrete chur hite textile liner. NO RECOVER	aterial (mulch); no c GRAVEL (GM); gray 50% gravel, fine to n oist. hk.	odor; moist. ish brown; 20% fines, low plasticity; nedium, subangular to subrounded;
5 6 7 8 9		⊻ ⊻	54	TWA-11_6.4 6.6_0627	0.0 0.0 0.0		5.0 to 5.8 feet. 30% sand medium d 5.6 feet: 100% 5.8 to 6.6 feet. 6.6 to 7.7 feet. sand, fine 0.7.0 feet: Be 7.7 to 10.0 feet	SANDY SILTY ( , fine to coarse; s ense; no odor; m organic materia SILTY SAND (S o moist. SAND WITH SI to coarse; trace comes wet. t: NO RECOVER	GRAVEL (GM); gray oist. (woody debris); bla M); brown; 20% fine T (SW-SM); black; orange-red speckles	ish brown; 20% fines, low plasticity; redium, subangular to subrounded; ck. s, low plasticity; 80% sand, fine; no 10% fines, low plasticity; 90% s; no odor; moist.
10 10 11 11			100	TWA-11_7- 12_0628	0.0		10.0 to 12.0 fe sand, fine	et: SAND WITH to coarse; trace	SILT (SW-SM); blac orange-red speckles	k; 10% fines, low plasticity; 90% — s; no odor; wet.
			·				Total Depth =	12.0 feet bgs		
NOTES:           1. Depth:           detector:           Borehol           0.0 to 12           0.0 to 2.0           2.0 to 6.1           0.0 to 2.0           2.0 to 6.1           0.0 to 2.0           Washing           Traffic gi           0.0 to 12           Washing           Traffic gi           0.0 to 12           Value           Value	s are rela 5. ppm = <u>e Comple</u> .0 feet bg feet bgs: E 0 feet bgs: ton State rade, flush 0 feet bg 2.25 feet: 2.25 feet:	tive t = part <u>etion</u> s: 2.: Com : Cor Bento : 2-in : 2-in : 2-in : 2-in	o fee s per <u>Deta</u> 25-in pletid pareta vartme vartme ch di inch di ch-di ch-di xxima	t below groun million. a <u>ils</u> ch borehole. on Details chips hydrate Colorado silic ent of Ecology monitoring v ameter, sche diameter, sche diameter, flush-	d surface d with po a sand fili Well No. vell monu dule 40, F edule 40, threaded	e. 2. bgs = b table water. fer pack. BNM694 ment. PVC blank r 0.010-inch PVC end c	nelow ground su riser pipe. machine slot P rap.	Irface. 3. ID = ide VC, prepacked w	ntification. 4. PID = , rell screen (12/20 Co was 7.51 feet hos a	photoionization blorado silica sand). t 10:40 on 6/28/2023
	roundwat	ter sa	amplii	ng.						

						Geologic Borehole Log							
~	M	AUL	FOSTER AL	ONG		Project Number <b>M0615.20.008</b>	Well N TV	lumber <b>/-14</b>	Sheet <b>1 of 1</b>				
Project Name     Parcel 110 Investor       Project Location     3401 Lincoln A       Start/End Date     6/27/2023 to 6/2       Driller/Equipment     Anderson Envi       Geologist/Engineer     A. Bixby       Sample Method     Core Barrel					stigation       TOC Elevation (feet)         venue, Tacoma, WA       Surface Elevation (feet)         :7/2023       Northing         ronmental Contracting, LLC/Direct-Push Probe       Easting         Total Depth of Borehole       10.0 fe         Outer Hole Diam       2 25 ir				rehole 10.0 feet 2.25 inch				
s)	, 	×	Sample Data		U	Soil Description							
Depth (feet, bg.	Water Le vels	Percent Recover	Sample ID	(mqq) DIA	Lithologi Column	Column							
3		54		0.0 ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( (		<ul> <li>Q 0.0 to 0.2 feet: Asphalt; Q 0.2 to 1.1 feet: SILTY SAND fine to coarse; 50% grad odor; dry.</li> <li>Q 0.7 feet: Becomes moist 1.1 to 1.5 feet: CONCRETE 1.5 to 2.7 feet: SILTY SAND fine to coarse; 50% grad odor; dry.</li> <li>Q 0.7 to 5.0 feet: NO RECOV</li> </ul>	gray; no odor; dry. DY GRAVEL (GM, wel, fine to mediul ; ; gray; pulverized DY GRAVEL (GM, wel, fine to mediul ERY.	; brownish gray; 30 m, subangular to su ; dry ; brownish gray; 30 m, subangular to su	D% fines, low plasticity; 20% sand, lorounded; medium dense; no       I         ubrounded; medium dense; no       I         0% fines, low plasticity; 20% sand, lorounded; medium dense; no       I         0% fines, low plasticity; 20% sand, lorounded; medium dense; no       I         0% fines, low plasticity; 20% sand, lorounded; medium dense; no       I				
5 6 7 8 9		52	TWSV- 1_062723 TW-14_5.9- 6.1_0627 TW-9-14_5.9- 6.1_0627	0.0		<ul> <li>5.0 to 5.7 feet: SILTY SANL fine to coarse; 50% gra odor; dry.</li> <li>5.7 to 6.5 feet: SANDY GR. sand, fine to coarse; 20 odor; moist.</li> <li>6.5 to 7.0 feet: SILTY GRA sand, fine to coarse; 20 no odor; moist.</li> <li>@ 6.8 feet: Trace organic m 7.0 to 7.6 feet: Blackish bro 7.6 to 10.0 feet: NO RECO</li> </ul>	NDY GRAVEL (GM); brownish gray; 30% fines, low plasticity; 20% sand, gravel, fine to medium, subangular to subrounded; medium dense; no RAVELLY SILT (ML); dark brownish gray; 60% fines, low plasticity; 20% 20% gravel, fine to coarse, subangular to subrounded; medium dense; no RAVELLY SAND (SM); blackish brown; 30% fines, low plasticity; 50% 20% gravel, fine to medium, subangular to subrounded; medium dense; c material (wood). prown; 100% organic material (wood).						
						Total Depth = 10.0 feet bgs							
NO 1. L detu 5-fc <u>Boi</u> 0.0 <u>Boi</u> 0.0	TES: Depths ector. to trad to 10. rehole to 10.	s are r 5. ppr lius of <u>e <b>Con</b></u> 0 feet 0 feet	elative to feet be n = parts per mil TWA-14. bgs: 2.25-inch t ndonment Deta Borehole backt	low grou lion. 6. S porehole. <u>ill</u> ed with	und surfac Soil gas sa n bentonite	e. 2. bgs = below ground su ample TWSV-1_062723 was e.	rface. 3. ID = iden collected at 5.0 fe	tification. 4. PID =   eet bgs from an adj	photoionization acent boring within a				

MFA BOREHOLE W/WELL W/IGINT/GINTW/PROJECTS/0615.20.008/PARCEL 110 INVESTIGATION.GPJ 8/9/23

Attachment C

**Well Development Form** 





Project No.:	M0615.20.008				Date:	6/27/2023			
Site Location:	Parcel 110; 34	01 Lincoln A	venue, Taco	ma, WA	Well:	TWA-11			
Name:	J. Lenahansen				Initial DTB:	11.92 ft		Final DTB: 1	11.93 ft
Development N	: Method: Surge and purge				Initial DTW:	7.51 ft		Final DTW: 7	7.51 ft
Total Water Re	moved:	10.6 gallons			Pore Volume:		1.26 gallons		
Water Containe	ed:	5-gallon buc	kets		Casing Diame	ter:	2 inches		
Time	Cumltv. Vol Removed (gal)	Turbidity (NTU)	рН	Conductivity (uS/cm)	Temp (°C)	DO (mg/L)	ORP		Comments
10:00	7.25	309	6.86	0.73	17.6				
10:15	8	18.1	6.91	0.75	16.9				
10:30	9.0	6.42	6.91	0.75	16.8				
10:40	9.5	3.30	6.89	0.75	16.8				
10:45	9.8	2.73	6.93	0.75	16.8				
10:50	10.0	2.34	6.91	0.74	16.8				
10:55	10.3	2.29	6.91	0.74	16.8				
11:00	10.6							Stop purging v	vell.

#### Notes:

PID reading prior to well development was 0.0 parts per million.

Cumltv. = cumulative.

DO = dissolved oxygen.

DTB = depth to bottom.

DTW = depth to water.

ft = feet.

gal = gallon.

mg/L = milligrams per liter.

NTU = nephelometric turbidity unit.

ORP = oxygen reduction potential.

PID = photoionization detector.

uS/cm = microsiemens per centimeter.

## Attachment D

## Water Field Sampling Data Sheet





#### Water Field Sampling Data Sheet Parcel 110—Port of Tacoma

#### 3401 Lincoln Avenue, Tacoma, Washington

Client Name			Port of Taco	oma	Sampling Lo	ocation	TWA-11			
Project #			M0615.20.00	28	Sampling D	ate	06/28/2023			
Project Nar	ne		Parcel 110 Su Investigation	Ibsurface	Sampler(s)		A. Bixby			
Sampling Event			June 2023		Commis No.					
Sub Area			Parcel 110		sample Nar	ne	TWA-11_7-12_0628			
FSDS QA			F. Bellows		Sample Dep	oth	10.0			
Hydrology/	Level Measu	urements			Purge Meth	od	Peristaltic p	ump		
	Date		Time	DT-Bottom	DT-Product	DT-Water	DTP-DTW	DTB-DTW	Pore Volume	
	06/28/2023		10:40	11.93		7.51		4.42	1.26	
		All de	pths measu	red from top	o of casing o	f monitoring	well.			
				Water Qu	ality Data	5.0 1				
Time	Purge Volume	Water Level	Flowrate (L/min)	рН	Temp (C)	E Cond (uS/cm)	DO (mg/L)	ORP (mV)	Turbidity	
BEGAN PURC	<b>GE AT:</b> 10:45; a	llowed to clea	ar prior to taki	ng readings v	vith water qua	ality meter.				
11:15	1.5	7.54	0.3	6.91	16.2	730	0.36	-237.0	6.52	
11:18	1.6	7.54	0.3	6.91	16.2	729	0.34	-250.1	6.32	
11:21	1.7	7.55	0.3	6.91	16.2	727	0.33	-257.6	6.17	
11:24	1.9	7.55	0.3	6.92	16.3	720	0.35	-265.6	5.78	
11:27	2.0	7.55	0.3	6.89	16.2	720	0.31	-261.7	5.31	
11:30	2.2	7.55	0.3	6.91	16.2	722	0.29	-266.3	5.49	
Water Qual	ity Observat	ions:								
Initially slig	htly turbid, the	en clear; no tir	nt; no odor; n	o sheen.						
Sample Info	ormation:									
Sampling	g Method	Sample	е Туре	Sampli	ng Time	Container Code/Preservative		#	Filtered	
Peristalt	ic pump	Ground	dwater	11	:40	VOA	Glass	3	N	
						Ambe	r Glass			
						Yellov	w Poly			
						Gree	n Poly			
						Red Io	ital Poly			
						Total		2		
General Sa	mpling Com	ments <sup>.</sup>				Total	Dotties	3	]	
Casing dia	imeter = 2 inc	hes: well bore	hole diamete	er = 4.25 inche	es.					
Field dupli	cate TWA-9-1	1 7-12 0628 co	ollected here							
Equipment	Used:									
		Water L	evel Meter:	Solinst Mo	del 101 P7; Se	erial No. 531	501			
		Water Qu	ality Meter:	YSI Pro Plu	s; Serial No. 1	I9M100460			•	
		Turb	oidity Meter:	Hach 2100	)P; Serial No.	0405000363	30		_	
Total purge	volume pric	or to sampling	g:	2.2 gallons						

Attachment E

Soil Gas Sampling Data Sheet





#### Soil Gas Sampling Data Sheet Parcel 110—Port of Tacoma 3401 Lincoln Avenue, Tacoma, Washington

Shi		Shut-in	Shut-in			Purge				Helium		Sample			
Sample ID	Date	Test Pass/ Fail	Summa Canister ID	Manifold ID	Canister Size (L)	Begin Time	End Time	Volume (L)	Helium (ppm)	Indoor Ambient Air (ppm)	Under Shroud (%) (ideal = 40)	Begin Time	End Time	Initial Pressure ("Hg)	Final Pressure ("Hg)
TWSV-1- 062723	6/27/2023	Pass	3230	301	1	16:37	16:42	1	17,125	0	49.9	16:51	16:56	-29.5	-5
TWSV-2- 062723 <sup>(a)</sup>	6/27/2023	Pass	3281	241	1	17:40	17:45	1	17,000	0	41.7	17:47	17:52	-30+	-5

#### Notes:

To avoid data rejection during validation, the amount of helium in the sample must be less than 5% of the helium concentration under the shroud. For example, if there is 50% helium in the shroud, your sample may contain up to 2.5%, (25,000 ppm) helium.

1% = 10,000 ppm.

"Hg = inches of mercury.

ID = identification.

L = liter.

ppm = parts per million.

<sup>(a)</sup>Soil gas sample TWSV-2-062723 was collected as a contingency in case soil gas sample TWSV-1-062723 did not pass the helium quality assurance check. TWSV-1-062723 was non-detect for helium; therefore, TWSV-2-062723 was not analyzed.

## Attachment F

## **Analytical Laboratory Reports**



#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D. Yelena Aravkina, M.S. Michael Erdahl, B.S. Vineta Mills, M.S. Eric Young, B.S. 5500 4th Avenue South Seattle, WA 98108 (206) 285-8282 fbi@isomedia.com www.friedmanandbruya.com

August 3, 2023

Audrey Hackett, Project Manager Maul Foster Alongi 2815 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave, Suite 540 Seattle, WA 98121

Dear Ms Hackett:

Included is the amended report from the testing of material submitted on June 28, 2023 from the Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306442 project. Per your request, two sample IDs have been amended.

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

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

al

Michael Erdahl Project Manager

Enclosures c: Amanda Bixby, Fiona Bellows MFA0707R.DOC

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D. Yelena Aravkina, M.S. Michael Erdahl, B.S. Vineta Mills, M.S. Eric Young, B.S. 5500 4th Avenue South Seattle, WA 98108 (206) 285-8282 fbi@isomedia.com www.friedmanandbruya.com

July 7, 2023

Audrey Hackett, Project Manager Maul Foster Alongi 2815 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave, Suite 540 Seattle, WA 98121

Dear Ms Hackett:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on June 28, 2023 from the Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306442 project. There are 13 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 should have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

Nelf

Michael Erdahl Project Manager

Enclosures c: Amanda BixbyMFA0707R.DOC

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

#### CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on June 28, 2023 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306442 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

<u>Laboratory ID</u>	<u>Maul Foster Alongi</u>
306442 -01	TWA-11_6.4-6.6_0627
306442 -02	TWA-11_10.9-11.1_0627
306442 -03	TW-14_5.9-6.1_0627
306442 -04	TW-9-14_5.9-6.1_0627
306442 -05	Trip Blank 1-0627
306442 -06	TWA-11_7-12_0628
306442 -07	TWA-9-11_7-12_0628

All quality control requirements were acceptable.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 07/07/23 Date Received: 06/28/23 Project: Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306442 Date Extracted: NA Date Analyzed: 06/29/23

#### RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF THE SOIL SAMPLES FOR PERCENT MOISTURE USING ASTM D2216-98

<u>Sample ID</u> Laboratory ID	<u>% Moisture</u>
$TWA-11\_6.4-6.6\_0627$	11
${\rm TW-14\_5.9-6.1\_0627}_{\rm 306442-03}$	9
$TW-9-14_5.9-6.1_0627$	5

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	TWA-11_6. 06/28/23 07/03/23 07/03/23 Soil mg/kg (ppm	4-6.6_0627 n) Dry Weight	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008 306442-01 1/0.5 070310.D GCMS13 MD
			Lower	Upper
Surrogates:		% Recovery:	Limit:	Limit:
1,2-Dichloroethane-	·d4	104	84	120
Toluene-d8		101	73	128
4-Bromofluorobenze	ene	95	57	146
		Concentration		
Compounds:		mg/kg (ppm)		
Vinyl chloride		< 0.002		
Chloroethane		< 0.1		
1,1-Dichloroethene		< 0.002		
Methylene chloride		< 0.2		
trans-1,2-Dichloroe	thene	< 0.002		
1,1-Dichloroethane		< 0.002		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethe	ene	< 0.002		
1,2-Dichloroethane	(EDC)	< 0.002		
1,1,1-Trichloroetha	ne	< 0.002		
Trichloroethene		< 0.002		
Tetrachloroethene		0.0031		

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	TW-14_5.9- 06/28/23 07/03/23 07/03/23 Soil mg/kg (ppm	6.1_0627 ) Dry Weight	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008 306442-03 1/0.5 070311.D GCMS13 MD
			Lower	Upper
Surrogates:		% Recovery:	Limit:	Limit:
1,2-Dichloroethane-	·d4	99	84	120
Toluene-d8		102	73	128
4-Bromofluorobenze	ene	96	57	146
		Concentration		
Compounds:		mg/kg (ppm)		
Vinyl chloride		< 0.002		
Chloroethane		< 0.1		
1,1-Dichloroethene		< 0.002		
Methylene chloride		< 0.2		
trans-1,2-Dichloroe	thene	< 0.002		
1,1-Dichloroethane		< 0.002		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethe	ene	< 0.002		
1,2-Dichloroethane	(EDC)	< 0.002		
1,1,1-Trichloroetha	ne	< 0.002		
Trichloroethene		< 0.002		
Tetrachloroethene		< 0.002		

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	TW-9-14_5. 06/28/23 07/03/23 07/03/23 Soil mg/kg (ppm	9-6.1_0627 n) Dry Weight	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008 306442-04 1/0.5 070312.D GCMS13 MD
			Lower	Upper
Surrogates:		% Recovery:	Limit:	Limit:
1,2-Dichloroethane-	·d4	100	84	120
Toluene-d8		102	73	128
4-Bromofluorobenzene		99	57	146
		Concentration		
Compounds:		mg/kg (ppm)		
Vinyl chloride		< 0.002		
Chloroethane		< 0.1		
1,1-Dichloroethene		< 0.002		
Methylene chloride		< 0.2		
trans-1,2-Dichloroet	thene	< 0.002		
1,1-Dichloroethane		< 0.002		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethe	ene	< 0.002		
1,2-Dichloroethane	(EDC)	< 0.002		
1,1,1-Trichloroetha	ne	< 0.002		
Trichloroethene		< 0.002		
Tetrachloroethene		< 0.002		

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	Method Blank Not Applicabl 07/03/23 07/03/23 Soil mg/kg (ppm) I	e Dry Weight	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008 03-1525 mb 1/0.5 070309.D GCMS13 MD
			Lower	Upper
Surrogates:	(	% Recovery:	Limit:	Limit:
1,2-Dichloroethane-	d4	99	84	120
Toluene-d8		102	73	128
4-Bromofluorobenze	ene	98	57	146
	$\mathbf{C}$	oncentration		
Compounds:	r	ng/kg (ppm)		
Vinyl chloride		< 0.002		
Chloroethane		< 0.1		
1,1-Dichloroethene		< 0.002		
Methylene chloride		< 0.2		
trans-1,2-Dichloroe	thene	< 0.002		
1,1-Dichloroethane		< 0.002		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethe	ene	< 0.002		
1,2-Dichloroethane	(EDC)	< 0.002		
1,1,1-Trichloroetha	ne	< 0.002		
Trichloroethene		< 0.002		
Tetrachloroethene		< 0.002		

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	Trip Blank 06/28/23 07/05/23 07/05/23 Water ug/L (ppb)	1-0627	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008 306442-05 070512.D GCMS13 MD
Surrogates: 1,2-Dichloroethane- Toluene-d8 4-Bromofluorobenze	d4 ene	% Recovery: 100 101 100	Lower Limit: 71 68 62	Upper Limit: 132 139 136
Compounds:		Concentration ug/L (ppb)		
Vinyl chloride Chloroethane 1,1-Dichloroethene Methylene chloride trans-1,2-Dichloroeth cis-1,2-Dichloroethane 1,2-Dichloroethane 1,1,1-Trichloroethane Trichloroethene Tetrachloroethene	thene ene (EDC) ne	<0.02 <1 <1 <5 <1 <1 <1 <0.2 <1 <0.5 <1		

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	TWA-11_7-3 06/28/23 07/05/23 07/05/23 Water ug/L (ppb)	12_0628	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008 306442-06 070513.D GCMS13 MD
Surrogates: 1,2-Dichloroethane- Toluene-d8 4-Bromofluorobenze	d4 ene	% Recovery: 92 91 100	Lower Limit: 71 68 62	Upper Limit: 132 139 136
Compounds:		Concentration ug/L (ppb)		
Vinyl chloride Chloroethane 1,1-Dichloroethene Methylene chloride trans-1,2-Dichloroethane cis-1,2-Dichloroethane 1,2-Dichloroethane 1,1,1-Trichloroethane Trichloroethene Tetrachloroethene	thene ene (EDC) ne	0.021 <1 <1 <5 <1 <1 <1 <0.2 <1 <0.5 <1		

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	TWA-9-11_7 06/28/23 07/05/23 07/05/23 Water ug/L (ppb)	7-12_0628	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008 306442-07 070514.D GCMS13 MD
Surrogates: 1,2-Dichloroethane- Toluene-d8 4-Bromofluorobenze	d4 ene	% Recovery: 98 103 98	Lower Limit: 71 68 62	Upper Limit: 132 139 136
Compounds:		Concentration ug/L (ppb)		
Vinyl chloride Chloroethane 1,1-Dichloroethene Methylene chloride trans-1,2-Dichloroeth cis-1,2-Dichloroethane 1,2-Dichloroethane 1,1,1-Trichloroethane Trichloroethene Tetrachloroethene	thene ene (EDC) ne	0.026 <1 <1 <5 <1 <1 <1 <0.2 <1 <0.5 <1		

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Extracted: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	Method Bla Not Applica 07/05/23 07/05/23 Water ug/L (ppb)	nk ble	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:	Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008 03-1532 mb 070507.D GCMS13 MD
Surrogates: 1,2-Dichloroethane- Toluene-d8 4-Bromofluorobenze	d4 ene	% Recovery: 91 94 95	Lower Limit: 71 68 62	Upper Limit: 132 139 136
Compounds:		Concentration ug/L (ppb)		
Vinyl chloride Chloroethane		<0.02 <1		
1,1-Dichloroethene		<1		
Methylene chloride		<5		
trans-1,2-Dichloroet	thene	<1		
1,1-Dichloroethane		<1		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethe	ene	<1		
1,2-Dichloroethane	(EDC)	< 0.2		
1,1,1-Trichloroetha	ne	<1		
Trichloroethene		<0.5		
Tetrachloroethene		<1		

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

#### Date of Report: 07/07/23 Date Received: 06/28/23 Project: Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306442

#### QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF SOIL SAMPLES FOR VOLATILES BY EPA METHOD 8260D

Laboratory Code: 306440-03 (Matrix Spike)

<b>3 - - - - - - - - - -</b>	(						
			Sample	Percent	Percent		
	Reporting	Spike	Result	Recovery	Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	(Wet wt)	MS	MSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Vinyl chloride	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.05	78	79	10-138	1
Chloroethane	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.5	58	59	10-176	2
1,1-Dichloroethene	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.05	85	88	10-160	3
Methylene chloride	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.5	81	83	10-156	2
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.05	94	95	14 - 137	1
1,1-Dichloroethane	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.05	92	92	19-140	0
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.05	94	95	25 - 135	1
1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.05	94	95	12 - 160	1
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.05	97	96	10-156	1
Trichloroethene	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.02	95	97	21 - 139	2
Tetrachloroethene	mg/kg (ppm)	2	< 0.025	95	97	20 - 133	2

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

	-		Percent	
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Acceptance
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	Criteria
Vinyl chloride	mg/kg (ppm)	2	81	22 - 139
Chloroethane	mg/kg (ppm)	2	60	10-163
1,1-Dichloroethene	mg/kg (ppm)	2	91	47 - 128
Methylene chloride	mg/kg (ppm)	2	92	10-184
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	mg/kg (ppm)	2	97	64 - 132
1,1-Dichloroethane	mg/kg (ppm)	2	96	64 - 135
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	mg/kg (ppm)	2	100	64 - 135
1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	mg/kg (ppm)	2	98	56 - 135
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	mg/kg (ppm)	2	102	62 - 131
Trichloroethene	mg/kg (ppm)	2	98	63 - 139
Tetrachloroethene	mg/kg (ppm)	2	95	68 - 128

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 07/07/23 Date Received: 06/28/23 Project: Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306442

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

Laboratory Code: 307013-03 (Matrix Spike)

-				Percent	
	Reporting	Spike	Sample	Recovery	Acceptance
Analyte	Units	Level	Result	MS	Criteria
Vinyl chloride	ug/L (ppb)	10	< 0.02	104	16 - 176
Chloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	119	50 - 150
1,1-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	107	50 - 150
Methylene chloride	ug/L (ppb)	10	<5	100	40-143
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	105	50 - 150
1,1-Dichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	101	50 - 150
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	104	50 - 150
1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	ug/L (ppb)	10	< 0.2	102	50 - 150
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	10	<1	102	50 - 150
Trichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	10	< 0.5	106	43-133
Tetrachloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	10	11	107 b	50 - 150

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

	Reporting	Snike	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	LCSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Vinyl chloride	ug/L (ppb)	10	102	103	43-149	1
Chloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	10	118	119	59 - 157	1
1,1-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	10	106	107	67 - 138	1
Methylene chloride	ug/L (ppb)	10	96	98	29-192	2
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	10	103	104	70-130	1
1,1-Dichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	10	102	102	70-130	0
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	10	104	104	70-130	0
1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	ug/L (ppb)	10	104	103	70-130	1
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ug/L (ppb)	10	103	103	70-130	0
Trichloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	10	106	107	70-130	1
Tetrachloroethene	ug/L (ppb)	10	106	107	70-130	1

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

#### **Data Qualifiers & Definitions**

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

**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, biased low; or, the calibration results for the analyte were outside of acceptance criteria, biased high, with a detection for the analyte in the sample. 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 standard reporting limit. The value reported is an estimate.

 ${\rm J}$  - 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.

 $k-\mbox{The calibration results}$  for the analyte were outside of acceptance criteria, biased high, and the analyte was not detected in the sample.

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.

 $\rm pc$  - 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.

442 306 <del>433</del> 007				SAMPLE	CHAIN	OF (	CUS	то	DY		04		28/	(د'	υ	ωZ	/ N	2ຸ	
Parant To Audrey Har	rbot	-		SAMPL	ERS (signo	uture)	1	1	Л	Q.						{	Page #	of	
General Maril Ford	arl	Alani	·	PROJEC	PROJECT NAME PO				0#	O # Standard turnaround									
$\frac{1}{2916} \frac{2916}{2916} \frac{2916}{2916} \frac{4}{2916} 4$		morg,		Parcel	110				Mo	615	5.2	0.0	08		R	RUS Lush d	3H charge	es authorized	d by:
Address 2015 2nd A	<u>ve ;</u>	012 540		- REMAR	KS	<u></u>				IN	<u>IVO</u>	ICE	TO				SAMJ	PLE DISPOS	SAL 1
City, State, ZIP <u>Seaffle, WA</u> 78121			X=ana O=hold	1y2e.				acc	w.nt	`.~y	0				□ Archive samples □ Other				
Phone 206)331-1835 Email a hacket f@maulfustz			Jinaulfuster.	Project s	specific RL	<u>s? - Ye</u>	s /	No	Ma	しけっ	512	ur.c	c M			Defau	ilt: D	ispose after	30 days
ANALYSES REQUES						ESTE	D												
Sample ID		Lab ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Type	# of Jars	NWTPH-Dx	NWTPH-Gx	3TEX EPA 8021	NWTPH-HCID	/OCs EPA 8260	PAHs EPA 8270	PCBs EPA 8082	Vocshy EPA 8260				Not	es
TWA-11_6.4-6.6_0	627	DI A-D	6127123	10.36	S	4					_			X				08/02/23 MI	E E
TWA-11_10.9 -111.	_0(27	02	6/27/23	1635	5	4								0					:
TW#14_5.9-6.1_00	627	03	6127123	1230	5	4								X				TW-14_5.9-0	6.1_0627
TWA-9-14_5.9-6.1_0	27	04	6127123	1230	S	4		-						X				TW-9-14_5.9	9-6.1_0627
Trip Blank#1-062	7	05 A B	6127123	NA	W	2					:			X	1. 				
TWA-11_7-12-06:	z8	06A-C	6128123	1140	W	3								Х					
TWA-9-11_7-12-0	628	07-A-C	6128123	1140	W	3								Х					
<i>.</i>																			
			•,		, 					_			\$	Sam	ple <b>s</b>	rec	ived	at <u>4</u>	∘C
		SI	GNATURE		. :	PRIN	IT N	AMI	Ξ				0	COM	PAN	Y		DATE	TIME
Friedman & Bruya, Inc. Ph. (206) 285-8282	Relind	quished by:	That By	ly.	Am	anda	В	ixt	'Y				N	IFA	4			6128/23	1300
(200) 200 0202	Receiv	ved by:	Ny mi		10h	hn i	ph	hi				FEBT				06/28/23	1300		
	Receiv	yuisned by: ved by:	•																

۰.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D. Yelena Aravkina, M.S. Michael Erdahl, B.S. Vineta Mills, M.S. Eric Young, B.S. 5500 4th Avenue South Seattle, WA 98108 (206) 285-8282 fbi@isomedia.com www.friedmanandbruya.com

July 17, 2023

Audrey Hackett, Project Manager Maul Foster Alongi 2815 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave, Suite 540 Seattle, WA 98121

Dear Ms Hackett:

Included is the amended report from the testing of material submitted on June 28, 2023 from the Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306443 project. Sample IDs have been updated from TW-SV-1-062723 and TW-SV-2-062723 to TWSV-1-062723 and TWSV-2-062723.

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

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

Michael Erdahl Project Manager

Enclosures c: Amanda Bixby MFA0707R.DOC

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D. Yelena Aravkina, M.S. Michael Erdahl, B.S. Vineta Mills, M.S. Eric Young, B.S. 5500 4th Avenue South Seattle, WA 98108 (206) 285-8282 fbi@isomedia.com www.friedmanandbruya.com

July 7, 2023

Audrey Hackett, Project Manager Maul Foster Alongi 2815 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave, Suite 540 Seattle, WA 98121

Dear Ms Hackett:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on June 28, 2023 from the Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306443 project. There are 7 pages included in this report.

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

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

Cale

Michael Erdahl Project Manager

Enclosures c: Amanda Bixby MFA0707R.DOC

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

#### CASE NARRATIVE

This case narrative encompasses samples received on June 28, 2023 by Friedman & Bruya, Inc. from the Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306443 project. Samples were logged in under the laboratory ID's listed below.

<u>Laboratory ID</u>	<u>Maul Foster Alongi</u>
306443 -01	TWSV-1-062723
306443 -02	TWSV-2-062723

All quality control requirements were acceptable.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

#### Analysis For Volatile Compounds By Method TO-15

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Collected: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	TWSV 06/28/2 06/27/2 06/29/2 Air ug/m3	-1-062723 23 23 23 23	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:		Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008 306443-01 1/8.7 062835.D GCMS7 bat
Surrogates: 4-Bromofluorobenz	ene	% Recovery: 113	Lower Limit: 70	Upper Limit: 130	
		Conce	ntration		
Compounds:		ug/m3	ppbv		
Vinyl chloride		<2.2	< 0.87		
Chloroethane		<23	<8.7		
1,1-Dichloroethene		<3.4	< 0.87		
trans-1,2-Dichloroe	thene	<3.4	< 0.87		
1,1-Dichloroethane		<3.5	< 0.87		
cis-1,2-Dichloroeth	ene	5.5	1.4		
1,2-Dichloroethane	(EDC)	< 0.35	< 0.087		
1,1,1-Trichloroetha	ne	<4.7	< 0.87		
Trichloroethene		6.5	1.2		
1,1,2-Trichloroetha	ne	< 0.48	< 0.087		
Tetrachloroethene		<59	<8.7		

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

#### Analysis For Volatile Compounds By Method TO-15

Client Sample ID: Date Received: Date Collected: Date Analyzed: Matrix: Units:	Metho Not Aj Not Aj 06/28/2 Air ug/m3	d Blank oplicable oplicable 23	Client: Project: Lab ID: Data File: Instrument: Operator:		Maul Foster Alongi Parcel 110 M0615.20.008 03-1467 MB 062817.D GCMS7 bat
Surrogates: 4-Bromofluorobenze	ene	% Recovery: 89	Lower Limit: 70	Upper Limit: 130	
		Conce	ntration		
Compounds:		ug/m3	ppbv		
Vinyl chloride		< 0.26	< 0.1		
Chloroethane		<2.6	<1		
1,1-Dichloroethene		< 0.4	< 0.1		
trans-1,2-Dichloroe	thene	< 0.4	< 0.1		
1,1-Dichloroethane		< 0.4	< 0.1		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethe	ene	< 0.4	< 0.1		
1,2-Dichloroethane	(EDC)	< 0.04	< 0.01		
1,1,1-Trichloroetha	ne	< 0.55	< 0.1		
Trichloroethene		< 0.11	< 0.02		
1,1,2-Trichloroetha	ne	< 0.055	< 0.01		
Tetrachloroethene		<6.8	<1		

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 07/07/23 Date Received: 06/28/23 Project: Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306443 Date Extracted: 07/05/23 Date Analyzed: 07/05/23

#### RESULTS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF AIR SAMPLES FOR HELIUM USING METHOD ASTM D1946

Results Reported as % Helium

<u>Sample ID</u> Laboratory ID	<u>Helium</u>
TWSV-1-062723 <sup>306443-01</sup>	<0.6
Method Blank <sup>03-1534 MB</sup>	<0.6

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 07/07/23 Date Received: 06/28/23 Project: Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306443

#### QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF AIR SAMPLES FOR VOLATILES BY METHOD TO-15

Laboratory Code: 306421-01 1/5.1 (Duplicate)

	Reporting	Sample	Duplicate	$\operatorname{RPD}$
Analyte	Units	Result	Result	(Limit 30)
Vinyl chloride	ug/m3	<1.3	<1.3	nm
Chloroethane	ug/m3	<13	<13	nm
1,1-Dichloroethene	ug/m3	<2	<2	nm
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/m3	<2	<2	nm
1,1-Dichloroethane	ug/m3	<2.1	<2.1	nm
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ug/m3	<2	<2	nm
1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	ug/m3	< 0.21	< 0.21	nm
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ug/m3	<2.8	<2.8	nm
Trichloroethene	ug/m3	< 0.55	< 0.55	nm
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ug/m3	< 0.28	< 0.28	nm
Tetrachloroethene	ug/m3	<35	<35	nm

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

		Percent	
Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Acceptance
Units	Level	LCS	Criteria
ug/m3	35	108	70-130
ug/m3	36	115	70-130
ug/m3	54	107	70 - 130
ug/m3	54	109	70-130
ug/m3	55	113	70 - 130
ug/m3	54	108	70-130
ug/m3	55	109	70-130
ug/m3	74	112	70 - 130
ug/m3	73	105	70 - 130
ug/m3	74	106	70 - 130
ug/m3	92	110	70-130
	Reporting Units ug/m3 ug/m3 ug/m3 ug/m3 ug/m3 ug/m3 ug/m3 ug/m3 ug/m3 ug/m3 ug/m3	Reporting Units         Spike Level           ug/m3         35           ug/m3         36           ug/m3         54           ug/m3         55           ug/m3         55           ug/m3         54           ug/m3         55           ug/m3         54           ug/m3         54           ug/m3         54           ug/m3         74           ug/m3         74           ug/m3         74           ug/m3         74           ug/m3         92	Reporting         Spike         Recovery           Units         Level         LCS           ug/m3         35         108           ug/m3         36         115           ug/m3         54         107           ug/m3         54         109           ug/m3         55         113           ug/m3         54         109           ug/m3         54         109           ug/m3         54         109           ug/m3         74         112           ug/m3         73         105           ug/m3         74         106           ug/m3         92         110

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 07/07/23 Date Received: 06/28/23 Project: Parcel 110 M0615.20.008, F&BI 306443

#### QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF AIR SAMPLES FOR HELIUM USING METHOD ASTM D1946

Laboratory Code:	306443-01 (dup)	licate)		
	Sample	Duplicate	Relative	
Analyte	Result	Result	Percent	Acceptance
	(%)	(%)	Difference	Criteria
Helium	<6	<6	nm	0-20

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

#### **Data Qualifiers & Definitions**

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

**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, biased low; or, the calibration results for the analyte were outside of acceptance criteria, biased high, with a detection for the analyte in the sample. 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 standard reporting limit. The value reported is an estimate.

 ${\rm J}$  - 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.

 ${\bf k}-{\bf The}$  calibration results for the analyte were outside of acceptance criteria, biased high, and the analyte was not detected in the sample.

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.

 $\rm pc$  - 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.

$306344 306$ Report To <u>MudPey</u> Company <u>MAUL</u> FOS Address $2815 2^{NO}$ A City, State, ZIP <u>SEA</u> TT Phone $106 - 331 - 1836$ Er	HACE STEP VE E NE M	5 E Л E Агол STE 540 JA 93121 hackete@	zr1 Nau/fo⊳	SAMPL SAMPI PROJE PAPCE 3401 NOTES	E CHAIL LERS (sign CCT NAME L 110 LINCOLD A S: 1-2 on h	N OF bature) C & ADI NE, TA sid	CUST DRESS	ODY In C	Moc IN Occo Maui	4 /2 PO 15.7 VOIC	# 20.0 TET ar.c			P T Star RUS Cush o Defa fina Hold	Page # FURN Indard SH charg SAM SAM I repo	NAROUND Des authori PLE DISP Clean follow ort deliver may apply	of <u>1</u> TIME zed by: OSAL ving y y):
SAMPLE INFORMATION	<u> </u>	r	r		r	T		r - 1	·····	ANA	LYS	SIS R	EQL	JEST	ED		
Sample 105 updated per F.B. 7/12/23	Lab	Canister	Flow Cont.	Reporting Level: IA=Indoor Air SG=Soil Gas	Date	Initial Vac.	Field Initial	Final Vac.	Field Final	TO15 Full Scan	TO15 BTEXN	T015 cVOCs	APH	Helium			
Sample Name	ID	ID	ID	(Circle One)	Sampled	("Hg)	Time	("Hg)	Time							N	otes
TW-SV-1-062723	01	3230	301	IA / SG	6127/23	-29.5	ilusi	-5	1450			X		X			
TWSV TW-SV-2-062723	02	3287	241	IA / 6G)	6/27/23	-30+	1747	-5	1752			$\otimes$		Q		8 = H	torD
······································				IA / SG													
	1			IA / SG					· · · · · ·								
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1			IA / SG	, 1							<b> </b>					
				IA / SG		-										·	
				IA / SG	1						-						
				IA / SG													
7		<b>.</b>		*		1	L	<b>.</b>	~	<b></b>		<u>.                                    </u>	ł		·		
Friedman & Bruya, Inc.		SIG	NATUR	RE		PRIN	JT NAM	Ē	r		- <u>C</u> C	)MP	ANY			DATE	TIN
=	L				+	- + • • •											t

Friedman & Bruya, Inc.	SIGNATURE	PRINT NAME	COMPANY	DATE	TIME
5500 4th Avenue South	Relinquished by: Munt hill	Amanda Bixby	MFA	6/28/23	1300
Scattle, WA 98108	Received by: maken ano	Whan Plan	Fesi	6/28/23	1300
Ph. (206) 285-8282	Relinquished by:				
Fax (206) 283-5044	Received by:		Samples receive	ed at 24	°C
FORMS\COC\COCTO-15 DOC		· ·			

Attachment G

**Data Validation Memorandum** 



## Data Quality Assurance/Quality Control Review

#### Project No. M0615.20.008 | August 3, 2023 | Port of Tacoma

Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc. (MFA), conducted an independent review of the quality of analytical results for groundwater, soil, soil vapor, and associated quality control samples collected on June 27 and 28, 2023. Samples were collected in the Taylor Way and Alexander Avenue Fill Area at Parcel 110, 3401 Lincoln Avenue, Tacoma, Washington.

Friedman & Bruya, Inc. (F&B), performed the analyses. MFA reviewed F&B report numbers 306442 and 306443. The analyses performed and the samples analyzed are listed in the following tables. Samples submitted on hold are indicated below. Not all analyses were performed on all samples.

Analysis	Reference
Helium	ASTM D1946
Percent moisture	ASTM D2216-98
Volatile organic compounds (soil and groundwater)	EPA 8260D
Volatile organic compounds (soil vapor)	EPA TO-15

Notes

ASTM = ASTM International.

EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

TO = toxic organics.

Samples Analyzed					
Report 306442					
TWA-11_6.4-6.6_0627	Trip Blank 1-0627				
TWA-11_10.9-11.1_0627 (hold)	TWA-11_7-12_0628				
TW-14_5.9-6.1_0627	TWA-9-11_7-12_0628				
TW-9-14_5.9-6.1_0627					
Report 306443					
TWSV-1-062723	TWSV-2-062723 (hold)				

#### **Data Qualification**

Analytical results were evaluated according to applicable sections of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidelines for data review (EPA 2020) and appropriate laboratory- and method-specific guidelines (EPA 1986, F&B 2022).

Data validation procedures were modified, as appropriate, to accommodate quality control requirements for methods that EPA data review procedures do not specifically address (e.g., ASTM International [ASTM] Method D1946).

Based on the results of the data quality review procedures described below, the data, with the appropriate final data qualifiers assigned, are considered acceptable for their intended use. Final data qualifiers represent qualifiers originating from the laboratory and accepted by the reviewer, and data qualifiers assigned by the reviewer during validation.

Final data qualifier:

• U = result is non-detect at the method reporting limit (MRL).

The reviewer confirmed that soil vapor samples were collected under a helium shroud to detect leaks in the collection system. Sample TWSV-1-062723 was non-detect for helium by ASTM Method D1946 in report 306443. Sample TWSV-2-062723 was submitted on hold.

#### **Sample Conditions**

#### Sample Custody

Sample custody was appropriately documented on the chain-of-custody forms accompanying the reports.

#### **Holding Times**

Extractions and analyses were performed within the recommended holding times.

#### **Preservation and Sample Storage**

The samples were preserved and stored appropriately.

#### **Reporting Limits**

The laboratory evaluated results to MRLs. Samples that required dilutions because of high analyte concentrations, matrix interferences, and/or dilutions necessary for preparation and/or analysis were reported with raised MRLs.

#### Blanks

#### **Method Blanks**

Laboratory method blanks are used to assess whether laboratory contamination was introduced during sample preparation and analysis. Laboratory method blank analyses were performed at the required frequencies. For purposes of data qualification, the laboratory method blanks were associated with all samples prepared in the analytical batch.

All laboratory method blank results were non-detect to MRLs.

#### **Equipment Rinsate Blanks**

Equipment rinsate blanks are used to evaluate field equipment decontamination. These blanks were not required for this sampling event, as all samples were collected using dedicated, single-use equipment.

#### Trip Blanks

Trip blanks are used to evaluate whether volatile organic compound contamination was introduced during sample storage and during shipment between the sampling location and the laboratory.

A trip blank (Trip Blank 1-0627) was submitted with the sample delivery group 306442 for EPA Method 8260D analysis.

The trip blank was non-detect to MRLs for all target analytes.

#### Laboratory Control Sample and Laboratory Control Sample Duplicate Results

A laboratory control sample (LCS) and a laboratory control sample duplicate (LCSD) are spiked with target analytes to provide information about laboratory precision and accuracy.

F&B reported LCS results for EPA Method TO-15 and EPA Method 8260D soils, and LCS and LCSD results for EPA Method 8260D groundwater; the LCS and LCSD were extracted and analyzed at the required frequency. F&B did not report LCS or LCSD results for ASTM D1946, as these are not required by the method; the reviewer confirmed with the laboratory that initial calibration and continuing calibration passed for this method.

All LCS and LCSD results were within acceptance limits for percent recovery and relative percent difference (RPD).

#### Laboratory Duplicate Results

Laboratory duplicate results are used to evaluate laboratory precision. F&B did not report laboratory duplicate results for EPA Method 8260D; laboratory precision was evaluated using LCS and LCSD or matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) results for this method. The EPA Method T0-15 and ASTM Method D1946 laboratory duplicate samples were prepared and analyzed at the required frequency.

Laboratory duplicate results greater than five times the MRL were evaluated using laboratory RPD control limits. Laboratory duplicate results less than five times the MRL, including non-detects, were evaluated using a control limit of the MRL of the parent sample; the absolute difference of the laboratory duplicate sample result and the parent sample result, or the MRL for non-detects, was compared to the MRL of the parent sample.

All laboratory duplicate results met the acceptance criteria.

#### Matrix Spike and Matrix Spike Duplicate Results

MS and MSD results are used to evaluate laboratory precision, accuracy, and the effect of the sample matrix on sample preparation and analysis.

F&B reported MS and MSD results for EPA Method 8260D soils, and MS results for EPA Method 8260D groundwater; the MS and MSD were extracted and analyzed at the required frequency. F&B did not report MS or MSD results for EPA Method TO-15 or ASTM D1946, in accordance with the methods.

When MS and MSD were prepared from samples with high concentrations of target analytes, associated MS and/or MSD percent recovery and/or RPD control limit exceedances did not require qualification because spike concentrations could not be accurately quantified. High concentrations of target analytes are defined as four times the spike amount for all analyses.

When MS and MSD were prepared with samples from unrelated projects, the MS and/or MSD percent recovery and/or RPD control limit exceedances did not require qualification because these sample matrices were not representative of project sample matrices.

All MS and MSD results were within acceptance limits for percent recovery and RPD.

#### **Surrogate Recovery Results**

The samples were spiked with surrogate compounds to evaluate laboratory performance of individual samples for organic analyses.

All surrogate results were within percent recovery acceptance limits.

#### **Field Duplicate Results**

Field duplicate samples measure both field and laboratory precision. The following field duplicate and parent sample pairs were submitted for analysis:

Report	Parent Sample	Field Duplicate Sample
206442	TW-14_5.9-6.1_0627	TW-9-14_5.9-6.1_0627
306442	TWA-11_7-12_0628	TWA-9-11_7-12_0628

MFA uses acceptance criteria of 100 percent RPD for results that are less than five times the MRL or 50 percent RPD for results that are greater than five times the MRL. RPD was not evaluated when both results in the sample pair were non-detect.

All field duplicate results met the RPD acceptance criteria.

#### Data Package

The data package was reviewed for transcription errors, omissions, and anomalies.

According to report 306442, sample "Trip Blank#1-0627" was reported by F&B as Trip Blank 1-0627. The reviewer confirmed with the laboratory that this is due to system limitations that do not allow special characters in sample names. The original sample names provided on the chain-of-custody form will be used in MFA's electronic database and for reporting.

At MFA's request, report 306443 was revised on July 17, 2023, to update the sample names.

At MFA's request, report 306442 was revised on August 3, 2023, to include ASTM D2216-98 percent moisture results for soil samples and to update some sample names.

No other issues were found.

#### References

- EPA. 1986. Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods. EPA publication SW-846. 3rd ed. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Final updates I (1993), II (1995), IIA (1994), IIB (1995), III (1997), IIIA (1999), IIIB (2005), IV (2008), V (2015), VI phase I (2017), VI phase II (2018), VI phase III (2019), VII phase I (2019), and VII phase II (2020).
- EPA. 2020. National Functional Guidelines for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review. EPA 540-R-20-005. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation: Washington, DC. November.
- F&B. 2022. Quality Assurance Manual. Rev. 18. Friedman & Bruya, Inc.: Seattle, WA. December 9.