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## 1 Introduction

This document presents the Engineering Design Report - Levee Zone Interim Action for Cleanup (EDR) for the Levee Zone and part of the Northwest Developed Zone of the BNSF Railway Company's Former Maintenance and Fueling Facility located in Skykomish, Washington, prepared by The RETEC Group, Inc. (RETEC) for the BNSF Railway Company (BNSF). The EDR is one in a series of documents required under the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA; Revised Code of Washington 70.105D; Washington Administration Code 173-340) cleanup process. The Remedial Investigation (RI) (RETEC, 1996) and the Supplemental RI (RETEC, 2002) presented the results of investigations of the nature and extent of contamination at the site. The Feasibility Studies (RETEC, 1999 and 2005) evaluated the extent of impacts and the feasibility of remedial alternatives for the site. BNSF completed the RI, Supplemental RI and the FS pursuant to Agreed Order No. DE 91TCN213.

A site-wide Cleanup Action Plan (CAP) is being written by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and that document will guide all remedial actions of the Former BNSF Railway Maintenance and Fueling Facility. BNSF submitted a Draft CAP Outline to Ecology on September 16, 2005, pursuant to Agreed Order No. DE 91TC-N213.

BNSF and Ecology initiated discussions early in 2005 regarding a mutually acceptable final cleanup action for Skykomish; these discussions are on-going. BNSF voluntarily began early design, access and permitting work so that remediation of the Levee Zone might proceed in 2006 as the initial phase of a final cleanup action that is acceptable to BNSF, Ecology and the community. This initial phase of work will be an Interim Action for Cleanup performed by BNSF at Ecology's direction pursuant to an Agreed Order. This work will take place in the Levee Zone and part of the Northwest Developed Zone of the Former BNSF Maintenance and Fueling Facility (referred to as the Project Area throughout this document). This document is BNSF's engineering design for final remedial actions at the levee and South Fork Skykomish River. These actions consist of temporary relocation of five residences, excavation of the levee, underlying soils and sediments along the south bank of the South Fork Skykomish River, reconstruction of the levee, and restoration of natural resources, private property and public infrastructure that are disturbed by the remedial action.

### 1.1 Site Background and History

The Former BNSF Maintenance and Fueling Facility (site) in the east King County town of Skykomish is owned and operated by BNSF. The location of Skykomish (Town) and the BNSF facility is shown on Figures C-1 and C-3. Historical activities since the facility opened in the late 1890s included refueling and maintaining locomotives and operating an electrical substation
for electric engines. Some of these activities released contaminants to the surrounding environment. BNSF has accepted responsibility for cleaning this historical contamination at the site consistent with MTCA.

Bunker and diesel fuel were stored in above and underground storage tanks at the site until 1974, when BNSF discontinued most fuel handling activities at the Skykomish facility. The BNSF facility is currently used as a base of operations for track maintenance and snow removal crews.

Railroad Avenue separates BNSF property from the main commercial district of the Town. In early 1991, Ecology designated the Former BNSF Fueling and Maintenance Facility as a high priority cleanup site. Later that year, BNSF indicated a desire to initiate a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) in accordance with MTCA. At that time, formal negotiations for Agreed Order No. DE 91TC-N213 were initiated. Negotiations were completed in mid-1993. Following a public comment period, the Agreed Order, which includes detailed work plans for the RI/FS process and early interim action for cleanup work, was signed by Ecology and BNSF. BNSF and Ecology signed a separate agreed order (No. DE 01TCPNR-2800) in 2001 for additional interim action for cleanup work near the South Fork Skykomish River and the levee west of Fifth Street. The work required by the 2001 order is now complete.

Portions of the commercial and residential zones including 13 historic buildings and the Skykomish Bridge are registered in the National Register of Historic Places. The levee remediation will involve moving one historic building-the Teacherage-located near West River Road to allow for the excavation and levee reconstruction. Portions of the school yard may be used as staging areas.

The levee itself was built by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and is currently owned by the Town and maintained by King County. King County will continue to maintain the levee during and after levee remediation. The Town of Skykomish owns and will continue to own the levee and the land beneath the levee. BNSF and the Town are currently negotiating access. BNSF and/or Ecology will pursue access agreements with the property owners affected by this phase of cleanup. Washington State owns the sediments below the ordinary high water mark, defined as the annual high water mark of 922.0 ft NAVD88. The Department of Natural Resources manages the sediments for the state.

### 1.2 Existing Levee Conditions

This section describes the existing conditions in the project area including the existing levee, groundwater hydraulics, contamination, and barrier wall. The existing levee, forming the south bank of the South Fork Skykomish River, was designed by the USACE in 1951 (Drawing No. E-2-6-74). It consists of

6,900 cubic yards (cy) of embankment material (assumed to be sand and gravel) placed on existing ground and of 2,000 cy of armor rock (12-inch minus rock) placed as a 2 -foot thick layer over the embankment material on a 2:1 slope.

### 1.2.1 Levee Topography

The top of the levee is at approximate elevation 930 feet (NAVD88). The levee is approximately 550 feet long and slopes down to the river with a $2: 1$ slope to a swale at elevation 916.5 feet. A bank-parallel river bar rises to about elevation 917 feet and is about 10 feet wide, before sloping into the river. A topographic survey was completed by Bush, Roed, \& Hitchings, Inc. in May 2005. The resulting survey data are shown on Figure C-3.

### 1.2.2 Subsurface Soil Conditions

Lithologic information for the site is presented in the Supplemental RI report (RETEC, 2002). The primary soil units in Skykomish consist of at least 50 feet (corresponding to total depth of deep borings) of sand and gravelly sand with discontinuous silty and clayey lenses. The local lithology can be broken up into three distinct units within the shallow Quaternary deposits found underlying the site: (1) upper topsoil and fill (1 to 2 feet thick); (2) gravelly sand and sandy gravel (11 to 22 feet thick); and (3) lower silt (3 to 10.5 feet thick where encountered).

Subsurface soil lithology encountered during the installation of the barrier wall beneath West River Road and parallel to the levee are illustrated on the as-built drawing included in Appendix A. As shown on the as-built drawings, the subsurface soils in the barrier wall area consisted of mostly sand, gravel and cobbles, with scattered boulders and discontinuous silt deposits. The most significant silt deposit was encountered at a depth of approximately 6 feet below ground surface (bgs) between Station $1+20$ and Station 2+50, shown in Figure 3-2 of Appendix A. This silt deposit corresponds to and is consistent with the product-free zone typically shown on the light nonaqueous phase liquid (LNAPL) plume maps for the site (for example, Figure 3-1 of the FS). Generally, boulders were present at deeper zones of the barrier wall trench. Free product was encountered at depths between 4 and 8 feet bgs between Station $2+20$ and Station $5+10$. Locations of the free product encountered during excavation appeared to be consistent with the recent 2005 and 2006 site data.

Subsurface conditions encountered during investigation of the levee and river bottom are illustrated on cross-sections A-A' (Figure 4-2) and B-B' (Figure 4-3) included in the River and Levee Supplemental Site Investigation Report (Appendix B).

Based on the USACE levee construction as-built drawings (USACE, 1951), the levee embankment was constructed on native soils. Fill materials were placed above the pre-existing ground surface where the elevations were lower than the design levee elevations. The fill materials are comprised of mostly sand and gravel. Pre-existing sewer and storm drain pipes were shown to extend through the embankment to the river side, although pre-trenching operations associated with the barrier wall demonstrated the existence of only two storm sewer lines penetrating through the levee.

### 1.2.3 Hydrology

The watershed of the South Fork Skykomish River above the Project Area is approximately 242 square miles. The river headwaters are on the western flanks of the Cascade Mountains of eastern King and Snohomish Counties. The river flow mostly results from rain in the fall and snowmelt in the winter and spring. The river stage (water level elevation) at the levee site is measured by a sonic gage mounted on the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge (The John Glick Henry Memorial Bridge 2/115A). Stages are measured and recorded by the Snohomish County Department of Public Works - Surface Water Management. The period for the gage is from May 12, 1999 to the present. The correction from river stage to elevation is zero (0.0) feet on the river stage gage equals 914.2 feet NAVD88.

### 1.2.4 Hydraulics

The water stage at the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge gage can be correlated with the flow in the South Fork of the Skykomish River at the levee by extrapolating flood study data. The flood study data (FEMA, 2001) include elevations and peak discharges for the 10 -year, 50 -year, 100 -year, and 500 -year flood levels. River peak discharge and flood stage are assumed to be directly related (see Appendix C).

### 1.2.5 Riverbed

The riverbed is composed of sand, gravel, and cobbles. Based on a visual inspection of the riverbed, the estimated median grain size (D50) is 2 inches ( $50 \mathrm{~mm}, 0.17$ feet). The coarse, cohesionless nature of the riverbed material suggests that the riverbed should support in-river cofferdams (necessary for levee excavation) without significant settlement. The riverbed load is assumed to be subject to some transport during flood stages of the river and the distribution of the bed load is assumed to change seasonally in response to river flow.

The riverbed in front of the levee slopes from 917.11 feet (NAVD88) just downstream of the bridge to 915.64 feet at 550 feet downstream of the bridge. This is a slope of $0.0028\left(1.47\right.$ feet $/ 530$ feet $\left.=0.28 \mathrm{ft} / 100 \mathrm{ft}=0.16^{\circ}\right)$.

Localized scour may occur in the riverbed due to flood flows and a cofferdam restricting the river cross-section. Calculations indicate that during flood flows in excess of $12,000 \mathrm{cfs}$ the local scour is on the order of 2 feet (see Appendix D).

Sediments are defined at this site as the solids which directly underlie the area beneath and waterward of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM). The OHWM was estimated based on the average annual mean high water mark (MHW) based on historic river gauge and flow measurements. The MHW has been identified as 922 feet in elevation, but which remains somewhat dependent upon the elevation measurement location. Generally, the MHW at the eastern end of the levee is approximately 926 feet in elevation, and the MHW at the western end of the levee is approximately 921 feet in elevation.

### 1.2.6 Contamination

The contamination in the levee area consists of free petroleum product (LNAPL). The free product acts as sources for both soil and sediment contamination and dissolved hydrocarbons in groundwater. Free product is also seeping into the South Fork Skykomish River adjacent to the upland plumes.

BNSF's remedial approach for the levee involves excavating portions of the levee and upgradient areas to remove free product and contaminated soil and, excavating surface and subsurface sediment along and within the South Fork Skykomish River at the base of the levee. The need for further groundwater treatment (i.e., air sparging) will depend on the scope, nature and timing of additional upland remediation activities.

### 1.2.7 Habitat

The current shoreline along the levee provides low velocity, seasonal aquatic edge habitat for juvenile salmon. The shoreline habitat along the base of the existing levee provides edges of large armor rock and cobble substrate of approximately $1-2$ feet in height. This habitat is seasonally available when river flows are above approximately 2,500 cfs, typically from November through January, and again from May through July.

This shoreline edge habitat offers rearing and refuge habitat to juvenile salmonids. The larger armor rock and boulders also reduce flow velocities near the bank by creating eddies where water flows around these larger substrates. Low-velocity areas are also present within the interstices of the larger boulders and armor rock.

Overhanging vegetation present throughout the Project Area provides some cover for juvenile salmonids and provides shade that contributes to decreased water temperatures. It also offers foraging opportunities when insects fall from the vegetation. Overhanging vegetation in this area typically consists of
young willow (Salix spp.) and pacific ninebark (Physocarpus capitatus), with young red alder (Alnus rubra) and black cottonwood (Populus balsamifera) present.

Salmonid species found in the Project Area include chinook, coho, pink, and chum salmon, and steelhead and bull trout (Pentec, 1999). Suitable spawning habitat for salmonids does not exist within the Project Area; however, river sockeye salmon were recently identified to be spawning within the Project Area. In addition, several species of juvenile salmonids utilize the Project Area for migration, rearing, and refuge habitat. Several of these species would be expected to utilize the shoreline edge of the Project Area for rearing habitat.

Outmigrating coho and bull trout juveniles could also be expected to use this habitat, although their use is limited in extent given these species typically rear for one year or more in upstream areas before emigrating. Data on bull trout use of the Project Area is limited. Data on juvenile chinook use of South Fork habitats above Sunset Falls is also scarce; however, use of Project Area habitat for rearing is likely for chinook juveniles from Beckel, Foss, and Tye Rivers (Pentec, 1999). Additional information on fish species present in the South Fork Skykomish River is included in the Draft Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (RETEC, 2003) and Skykomish Levee Remediation Project Biological Evaluation (BE) (Grette Associates, 2005).

The riparian zone along the levee is of low quality for other terrestrial species due to the extent of development close to the shoreline. Animals that may use the shoreline habitat include, but are not limited to, common crow, coyote, raccoon, and mink.

### 1.3 Upland Area

The site is located within the Skykomish River valley. The glaciofluvial sediments filling the valley consist mainly of poorly- to moderately-sorted sand, gravel, and cobbles. The base of the sediments is estimated to be located 200 to 250 feet bgs. The upper 50 feet of subsurface soils have been described in the subsurface soil conditions section above.

The aquifer at the site is unconfined to a depth of at least 47 feet bgs based on previous investigations. The hydraulic conductivities of aquifer materials at the site were determined via slug tests to range from 0.4 feet per day $(1.42 \times$ $10^{-4} \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$ ) to 79 feet per day ( $2.79 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$ ) during the remedial site investigation (RI; RETEC, 1996). An average hydraulic conductivity of 50 feet per day has been used in previous groundwater modeling work performed for the site.

Groundwater occurs at a shallow depth beneath the site (generally 5 to 15 feet bgs). Groundwater elevations are the highest at the southeast corner of the site
and decrease northwestward toward the Skykomish River, indicating groundwater flow is generally from the southeast to the northwest. Historic gauging data indicate the seasonal variation in groundwater elevation ranged from about 2.5 to 10.5 feet bgs in the area where the barrier wall was constructed.

Groundwater levels are generally higher during late fall, winter, and spring (November to April) and lower in the summer and early fall (June to early November). For a potentiometric surface map showing the groundwater gradient in April 1998 and a figure showing the groundwater gradient in September 1998, please see Figures 6-8 and 6-9 from the Supplemental Remedial Investigation (RETEC, 2002). These figures are representative of the typical seasonal high and low groundwater levels, respectively, at the site and are consistent with more recent gauging data.

### 1.3.1 Barrier Wall

A continuous subsurface barrier wall was constructed parallel to the South Fork Skykomish River in August 2001 as part of the interim action for cleanup to block free product from entering the river. The alignment of the barrier wall is shown on the as-built drawing in Appendix A. Several wing walls were added for protection against LNAPL flow around the downgradient (i.e., west) end of the wall and to enhance product recovery. The barrier wall was constructed using cement-bentonite (CB) slurry wall method. Based on the completion report (RETEC, 2002b), the barrier wall is 572 feet long, and extends approximately 15 feet bgs vertically from near the ground surface (above the water table) to below the seasonal low table. The barrier wall was constructed of materials that are compatible with, and capable of, withstanding long-term exposure to bunker C and diesel petroleum hydrocarbons present in the LNAPL plume. The average hydraulic conductivity of the barrier wall is $9.0 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{sec}$. The wet density of the CB slurry ranged from 74 to 85 pounds per cubic foot (pcf), with an average density of approximately 80 pcf .

### 1.3.2 Utilities

Overhead power and telephone lines are present within the Project Area. These utilities will be relocated prior to the commencement of construction work by the utilities. The utilities within the proposed levee remediation area will be located by using public utility locating services (e.g., Washington Underground Utility Location Center at 1-800-424-5555) and private utility locating services to ensure that all utilities are addressed.

Based on the barrier wall completion report (RETEC, 2002b), during the barrier wall construction in August 2001, one water supply line and a previously damaged storm sewer pipe were located along West River Road corridor. The locations of the pipes are shown on the as-built drawing in

Appendix A. These pipes will be replaced as part of this interim action for cleanup.

### 1.4 Public Access

Public access to the levee is currently not provided. A dirt path is located immediately west of the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge, but blackberry bushes and other vegetation covers much of the top (flat) portion of the levee restricting access. Also, signs are posted along W. River Road stating "Oil discharge to river. Do not access." During cleanup work, public access will be controlled to prevent exposure to hazardous substances and minimize physical safety hazards. Additionally, five residences will be temporarily relocated to facilitate the excavation.

### 1.5 Overview of Interim Action for Cleanup

The Levee Zone Interim Action for Cleanup is one component of the overall, final cleanup action for the site. This interim action for cleanup is intended to be the final cleanup for the levee zone and will be consistent with Ecology's Cleanup Action Plan to be completed along with a Consent Decree in the fall of 2006. The interim action for cleanup will consist of excavating and replacing the flood control levee and underlying contaminated sand and gravel, excavating contaminated sediment and the underlying impacted sand and gravel adjacent to the levee and in the riverbed to the extent practical given the site conditions, and excavation of upland (Northwest Developed Zone) areas. The interim action for cleanup also includes restoration of the Levee Zone including replacement foundations and temporary septic systems for the temporarily relocated residences, a replacement stormwater sewer system, and replacement of the levee. The EDR is one of many documents being prepared to guide this work. Other documents that will guide the work include the contractor specifications and plans and the Technical Execution Plan that will be prepared by the contractor.

## 2 Regulatory Framework

### 2.1 MTCA Design Requirements

This remedial design is being implemented in accordance with the Washington Administration Code (WAC) 173-340-400 - Implementation of the Cleanup Action. This chapter is a part of WAC 173-340 also known as the MTCA Cleanup Regulations. Site-specific cleanup levels (CULs) and remediation levels (RLs) were developed by Ecology and are presented in the FS (RETEC, 2005a) and in Table 2-1. These criteria define the extent of remediation required to prevent public and ecological receptor exposure to impacted areas of the site.

## Table 2-1 Remediation Levels and Cleanup Levels

| Environmental Medium | Remediation Level | Cleanup Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Soil | 3,400 mg/kg NWTPH-Dx | $22 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx and VPH/EPH |
| Groundwater | $477 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ EPH/VPH and NWTPH-Dx beneath residential and commercial areas | $208 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ NWTPH-Dx and VPH/EPH |
| Sediment | NA | Bioassay Pass/Fail or 40.9 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx and VPH/EPH |
| Surface Water | NA | $208 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ NWTPH-Dx and VPH/EPH |

NA - Not applicable

### 2.2 Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements

Other regulatory requirements include health and safety regulations, stormwater management, noise and odor control, waste characterization, hauling of excavated materials, zoning and land use, historic preservation, solid waste management, excavation, backfilling, grading, endangered species protection, air and water quality, and relocation of residents. These are described further in Sections 2.2.1 through 2.2.9.

### 2.2.1 Health and Safety Regulations

Health and safety regulations are specified in the Washington Administrative Code, Title 296-Department of Labor \& Industries, Chapter 296-155WAC. This code specifies health and safety standards for responding to releases or substantial threats of releases of hazardous substances at hazardous waste sites. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) specifies health and safety requirements for hazardous waste sites (29 CFR 1910.120).

All operating personnel and all operations will be subject to compliance with OSHA and Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act (WISHA) health and safety requirements. All personnel will be required to receive the necessary training and supervision, and follow the applicable health and safety protocols. Construction activities will be conducted within the guidelines established in a site-specific health and safety plan for this project.

Applicable health and safety regulations and publications include, but are not limited to, the following:

- OSHA, Title 29 CFR Part 1910, Occupational Safety and Health Standards, and Title 29 CFR Part 1926, Safety and Health Regulations for Construction
- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), Flammable and Combustible Liquids Code, NFPA 30, most recent revision
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Standard Operating Safety Guidelines, July 1988
- United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), "Manual of Analytical Methods," $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Edition, Volumes I and II, DHHS (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health [NIOSH]) Publication 84-100
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI), Practices for Respiratory Protection, Z88.2, most recent version
- ANSI, Emergency Eyewash and Shower Equipment, Z358.1, most recent version
- ANSI, Protective Footwear Z41.1, most recent version
- ANSI, Respirator Use Physical Qualification for Personnel, Z88.6, 1984
- ANSI, Practice for Occupational and Educational Eye and Face Protection, Z87.1, most recent version
- NIOSH/OSHA/United States Coast Guard (USCG)/USEPA, Occupational Safety and Health Guidance Manual for Hazardous Waste Site Activities, DHHS/Public Health Services (PHS)/Centers for Disease Control (CDC)/NIOSH, October 1985
- NIOSH Pocket Guide to Chemical Hazards, DHHS/PHS/CDC/ NIOSH, June, 2000 or most recent
- USEPA, Health and Safety Requirements for Personnel Engaged in Field Activities, USEPA Order No. 1440.2
- Departments of Transportation (DOT) Standards and Regulations, 49 CFR 171 and 49 CFR 172
- American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH), Threshold Limit Values and Biological Exposure Indices (most recent version)
- Compendium of Methods for the Determination of Toxic Organic Compounds in Ambient Air, USEPA/625/R-96/010b, January 1999
- Washington Department of Labor and Industries, WAC 296-155.

Where two or more regulations/documents conflict the one(s) offering the greatest degree of protection will be applied. The on-site contractor(s) will comply with any and all state and local ordinances and regulations. A sitespecific Health and Safety Plan will be implemented.

Personnel involved in the construction of the project will be required to comply with the health and safety training requirements commensurate with the task(s) they are performing. Prior to initiating the construction work, the contractor(s) and subcontractor(s) will provide documentation of employee and applicable sub-subcontractor training and medical certifications required by 20 CFR 1910.120, or other regulations as appropriate for the specific tasks to be performed. Additionally, if a specific contractor will access BNSF property as part of their work, they must provide documentation that they have received BNSF Contractor Safety Orientation training available at the Internet Web site: http://contractororientation.com/new site/default.asp.

### 2.2.2 Stormwater Management

Stormwater management must adhere to the substantive requirements of both the General Permit to Discharge Stormwater Associated with Construction and the General Stormwater Permit for Industrial Facilities. Both of the stormwater permits are National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permits and are incorporated into the Individual National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit that dictates discharges from the construction water treatment system. As part of the requirements for the Construction NPDES permit, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be prepared that includes Best Management Practices (BMPs) for managing stormwater during remedial activities. These BMPs are outlined in the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington (Ecology, 2005). A site-specific Operations and Monitoring Plan for the temporary water treatment system will be prepared 30 days from the date the NPDES is issued.

### 2.2.3 Noise Control

The Washington Noise Control Act (RCW 70.107; WAC 173-60) provides maximum permissible decibel (dB) levels for all site activities, construction equipment and portable powered equipment in temporary locations. Site activities will comply with these regulations and the Town's Noise Ordinance (347).

### 2.2.4 Waste Characterization

Waste generated during remediation will be characterized as dangerous (hazardous) or non-hazardous in accordance with WAC 173-303. Based on the historical data for the site, it is anticipated that excavated materials will be classified as non-hazardous.

### 2.2.5 Hauling of Excavated Soils

The Revised Code of Washington (RCW) Title 46, Motor Vehicles, governs the transportation of non-hazardous soils. Transportation of dangerous waste from the site will comply with the RCW 46 code and the requirements of WAC 173-303-240 through WAC 173-303-270. WAC 173-303-240 lists the requirements for transporters, while the other sections detail the requirements for the actual transport and record keeping. The transporter will have a current EPA/State identification number and abide by these codes.

WAC 173-303-190 provides the requirements necessary for preparing dangerous waste for transport. These requirements include specifics for packaging, labeling, marking and placarding.

### 2.2.6 Solid Waste Management

Requirements for solid waste management are applicable to the nonhazardous waste generated during remedial activities that is to be disposed of off-site. WAC 173-350 outlines the requirements that will be followed for the proper handling of all solid waste materials. A Solid Waste Management Plan is being developed in accordance with the NPDES Permit.

### 2.2.7 Air Quality

The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and Ecology (WAC 173-460) provide air emissions criteria for the site. Measures will be provided to suppress any fugitive dust generated during site excavation and grading that exceeds these criteria. Reasonable measures as outlined in PSCAA Regulation I Section 9.15 include:

- The use of control equipment, enclosures, and wet (or chemical) suppression techniques, as practical, and curtailment during high winds
- Surfacing roadways and parking areas with asphalt, concrete, or gravel
- Treating temporary, low-traffic areas (e.g., construction sites) with water or chemical stabilizers, reducing vehicle speeds, constructing pavement or riprap exit aprons, and cleaning vehicle undercarriages before they exit to prevent the track-out of mud or dirt onto paved public roadways
- Covering or wetting truck loads or allowing adequate freeboard to prevent the escape of dust-bearing materials.

The Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan and air monitoring plan will evaluate acceptable levels of particulates and organic vapors in the air that are protective of site workers and adjacent residents during remediation efforts based on organics and metal concentrations found in site soils and the potential for this material to become airborne. The air monitoring plan will include perimeter air monitoring protocols and action levels.

### 2.2.8 Oil and Hazardous Substance Releases to Surface Water

Section 311 of the Clean Water Act addresses pollution from oil and hazardous substance releases, providing EPA and the U.S. Coast Guard with the authority to establish a program for preventing, preparing for, and responding to oil spills that occur in waters of the United States. RCW 90.56 outlines plans, standards, and penalties associated with oil and hazardous substance spill prevention and response. All work will comply with these federal and state regulations. A Spill Response contractor will be on-call for the duration of the remedial action. The Spill Response Contractor will be responsible for developing the spill response plan for the interim action for cleanup. Additionally, the general contractor will be required to keep a minimum amount of spill response materials such as absorbent booms and pads on-site for immediate deployment in the event of a release to the South Fork Skykomish River. The general contractor will not have the capabilities to fully respond to a significant spill in the South Fork Skykomish River but will be able to respond immediately to a small release.

### 2.2.9 Guidelines for Temporary Relocation of Residents

EnviroIssues (acting for BNSF) and Ecology have developed guidelines for the temporary relocation of residents from the Project Area and are referenced in the Agreed Order Exhibit D. These guidelines were drawn from Federal and State laws applicable to the relocation of residents and include:

- Provide adequate and timely notification to temporarily relocated residents.
- Identify and provide comparable temporary housing for affected residents for the duration of the project.
- Reimburse eligible affected residents of reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with the temporary relocation, including the cost of moving to and from the temporary housing, the monthly rent and utility costs of the temporary housing, and storage of residents' personal property for the duration of the project.
- Provide temporary relocation of residential dwellings as outlined in the project plan. Determine appropriate and agreeable options for returning residential dwellings to real estate property. This will include documentation of original conditions and specifying what can be salvaged or replaced in kind.
- Provide regular communications to temporarily displaced residents. Develop a process for reporting and addressing complaints and concerns including meetings with affected home owners as needed.
- Payment for eligible claims will be made as soon as possible following a move or receipt of documentation to support the claim. Advance payments will be considered for residents who demonstrate a need.

These guidelines will be implemented throughout the cleanup.

### 2.2.10 Historical and Archeological Cultural Resources

Northwest Archeological Associates, Incorporated (NWAA) completed a cultural resource assessment for the site. In the cultural resource assessment, NWAA identified areas where there is a potential for historical and archeological cultural resources to be encountered. During ground disturbing activities in these areas, an archeologist will be on-site. NWAA is currently developing a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Discovery plan that will be implemented prior to and during the cleanup.

### 2.3 Permitting

Certain federal permits are required for the levee remediation (levee remediation permits). All proposed work will be conducted at Ecology's direction under a MTCA Order. In accordance with Ecology Policy 130B
(Permit Exemptions for Remedial Actions under MTCA, February 17, 1995), and MTCA (RCW 70.105D.090), work conducted pursuant to a MTCA order is exempt from the procedural requirements of state and local permits, including chapters 70.94, 70.95, 70.105, 75.20 (Hydraulic Permit), and 90.58 (Shorelands) RCW. Chapter 90.48 (Water Quality) will not be exempted by Ecology due to the potential of significant water quality impacts. Ecology and BNSF must ensure that all local and state substantive requirements are addressed during remedial design, in lieu of obtaining local and state permits that are normally required.

For the levee remediation, federal permits will be required from the following agencies:

- USACE for a 404 Permit (Section 404 of the Clean Water Act), either individual or Nationwide 38 permit. The USACE will initiate consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), with respect to federally-listed threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitat prior to issuing a 404 Permit (Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act).
- Ecology (as the delegated federal authority) for a 401 Water Quality Certification (Section 401 of the Clean Water Act), unless the work is authorized under a nationwide 38 permit.
- Ecology (as the delegated federal authority) for National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits (Section 402 of the Clean Water Act).

A Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA) was submitted by BNSF to the Corps and Ecology as well as the appropriate state and local agencies. The application was submitted to the state and local agencies to assist those agencies in identifying applicable substantive requirements for Ecology and BNSF.

### 2.3.1 Federal Permits

## Section 404 Permit

Activities requiring Section 404 permits include placing a structure, excavating (including land clearing), or discharging dredged or fill material in waters of the United States, including wetlands. This permit will be required because dredging (excavation) is planned for material waterward of the ordinary high water mark in the South Fork Skykomish River. The ordinary high water mark at this site is based on a vegetation survey.

The Section 404 permit may either be an individual permit or a Nationwide 38 permit, which is a permit designed for cleanup of hazardous and toxic waste. Generally, permitting times for Nationwide 38 permits are reduced.

## Endangered Species Act Section 7 Compliance

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) outlines the procedures for federal agencies (such as the USACE, called Action Agencies) to cooperate in order to conserve federally-listed threatened and endangered species (listed species) and designated critical habitats. ESA requires Action Agencies to consult or confer with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and/or the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (the Service Agencies) if a project requires federal approval or utilizes federal funding.

ESA Section 7 consultation applies to listed species and designated critical habitats. There are three types of consultations:

1) Conferencing - An informal process to determine listed species and a project's potential impact to that species.
2) Informal Consultation - A more formal process whereby NMFS and USFWS determine whether there may be impacts to listed species. A determination of no effect may occur and terminate the process. If there is a determination of an effect, then the process goes to the third type of consultation.
3) Formal Consultation - Under this consultation NMFS and the USFWS must issue a biological opinion in which the listed species are either in or not in jeopardy from the project. If there is a determination of jeopardy, then there will be a series of requirements in order to obtain an Incidental Take Permit (take permit).

The Biological Evaluation (BE) concluded that the project will cause "no jeopardy" or "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" species that are listed under the ESA (Grette, 2005). It also found that critical habitat for ESA listed species will experience "no destruction or adverse modification." Therefore, based on the findings in the BE, the project will be reviewed by the Service Agencies as an Informal Consultation.

## NPDES Permit

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits regulate the discharge of pollutants into the state's surface waters. Ecology issues these permits under authority delegated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This permit is typically issued to a commercial or industrial facility, or municipality for discharge of any pollutant to surface waters. This remedial action will require discharge of treated wastewater into the South

Fork Skykomish River. Therefore, an Individual NPDES permit will be required for the project. In addition, other NPDES permits covered by the individual permit described above include a general stormwater construction permit and a general industrial stormwater permit.

General construction stormwater permits are required for all construction activities (including grading) on sites one acre or larger and when there is a discharge of stormwater to a surface water (e.g., wetlands, creeks, rivers, marine waters, ditches, estuaries) and/or storm drains that discharge to a surface water. Ecology issued the final general permit for 1- to 5-acre construction sites on November 16, 2005. The permit is subject to public notice and SEPA requirements must be met. The applicant must also complete a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to starting construction.

However, a general construction stormwater permit is not required for stormwater from any site that is covered under an NPDES individual permit in which stormwater management and/or treatment requirements are included for all stormwater discharges associated with construction activity.

Similarly, for general industrial stormwater permits, any facility authorized to discharge stormwater under an existing NPDES individual or other general permit is excluded from the requirements of a general industrial stormwater permit. General industrial stormwater permits cover discharge of stormwater to a surface waterbody or to a municipal storm sewer system for existing and new facilities. Ecology can require permit coverage of any facility on a case-by-case basis in order to protect waters of the state.

An NPDES application was submitted by BNSF to Ecology on October 3, 2005, along with a Draft Engineering Report on July 20, 2005 and an Addendum to the Engineering Report on November 9, 2005. A letter was received from Ecology dated January 4, 2006 stating that the application is complete. As mentioned above, Ecology intends to issue one NPDES permit, which will contain conditions for the general construction and general industrial stormwater permits.

## 401 Water Certification

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act specifies that water quality certifications are issued for projects that require Section 404 permits (described above), unless the Corps issues a Nationwide permit. The work is expected to be approved under a Nationwide 38 permit (Cleanup of Hazardous and Toxic Waste). By issuing a Nationwide 38 permit, the Corps is responsible for the water quality certificate and has a general set of criteria that applies. Ecology may impose additional site specific criteria required by Washington State, which may be added as an administrative order or other means.

If an individual Section 404 permit is required rather than a Nationwide 38 permit, issuance of a certification by Ecology means that Ecology anticipates that the applicant's project will comply with water quality standards and other aquatic resource protection requirements under Ecology's authority. The 401 Certification can cover both the construction and operation of the proposed project. Conditions of the 401 Certification become conditions of the Federal permit or license. Specific certification requirements may include a mixing zone with turbidity limits downstream from the Project Area, in addition to other criteria.

Ecology's Shoreline and Environmental Assistance Office within each regional office conducts the review of the 401 Water Certification application. Regional staff members review the applications for completeness and send out a letter or call if additional information is needed. Once the application is considered complete, the regional staff starts reviewing the project to recommend approval or denial. Modifications to plans submitted may be required. A site visit may also be required as part of the process.

401 Certification becomes part of the Federal permit or license. The duration of the 401 Certification would be in effect for the same time period as the permit or license, however Ecology issues 401 Certifications as 90.48 administrative orders, so they may have conditions that apply to the project longer than the Federal permit or license.

Individual 401 certification requires a minimum twenty days of public notice and may take up to one year to approve, condition, or deny. The process usually takes less than three months.

### 2.3.2 State Permits

## Hydraulic Project Approval

Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) is required from the State Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) for any work that uses, diverts, obstructs, or changes the natural flow or bed of any fresh water or saltwater of the state, except for cleanup projects conducted under MTCA by administrative order. As stated above, a HPA is not formally required because the cleanup is being performed under an order with Ecology; however, the project must meet the substantive requirements of the HPA.

A complete application package for an HPA must include a completed Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA) form, general plans for the overall project, and complete plans and specifications of the proposed work within the ordinary high water line in fresh waters of the state, complete plans and specifications for the protection of fish life, and notice of compliance with any applicable requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

A determination of substantive requirements should be issued by DFW within 45 calendar days after the complete application is received. Processing of an application can be placed on hold if applicant cannot be reached, if project site is inaccessible, or the applicant requests it.

## State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

The Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) provides a way to identify and mitigate probable environmental impacts that may result from governmental decisions. These decisions may be related to issuing permits for private projects, constructing public facilities, or adopting regulations, policies or plans. Information provided during the SEPA review process helps agency decision-makers, applicants, and the public understand how a proposal will affect the environment. This information can be used to change a proposal to reduce likely impacts, or to condition or deny a proposal when adverse environmental impacts are identified.

For this project, Ecology is the lead agency responsible for issuing all SEPA determinations. The SEPA review process is a tool to help agencies identify and evaluate the likely environmental consequences of a proposal. The elements of the environment evaluated include the natural environment (earth, air, water, plants and animals, energy and natural resources) and the built environment (environmental health, land and shoreline use, transportation, public services and utilities).

The threshold determination process is the process used to evaluate the environmental consequences of a proposal and determine whether the proposal is likely to have any "significant adverse environmental impact." This determination is made by the lead agency and is documented in either a determination of nonsignificance (DNS), or a determination of significance (DS) and subsequent preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). As described below, a DS has been issued for this site.

## Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Ecology issued a DS for the levee interim cleanup action in Skykomish in January 2006 stating that a focused EIS is required. An EIS has been prepared by Ecology. The document provides an impartial discussion of significant environmental impacts, reasonable alternatives, and mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize significant adverse impacts that the proposed levee interim action for cleanup is likely to have on the natural and built environment. The EIS was presented along with the Draft EDR and other documents needed for the cleanup work for formal public comment in March 2006. The final EIS was issued on April 27, 2006.

### 2.3.3 Town of Skykomish Permits

## Shoreline Development

A Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is a written permit issued by local government for development on shorelines, as required under the state Shoreline Management Act. Many types of development are exempt from this permit requirement. After completion of the local process the permits are sent to Ecology for filing but Ecology does not have authority to approve or deny them when the permits are consistent with an existing shoreline management plan that has been previously approved by Ecology. Because this work is under a MTCA Order, no formal permit is required, but the substantive requirements of the Town's shoreline management plan must be met. The Town will also review the proposed work, determine whether the work complies with the substantive requirements of its shoreline program and regulations, and recommend mitigation measures to Ecology based on the Town's existing substantive requirements in its shoreline program. Ecology will determine whether the proposed work complies with the substantive requirements of the Town's shoreline program.

## Land Use and Zoning

Each local government has land use and zoning regulations that govern construction, excavation and demolition activities within its jurisdiction. Because this work will be subject to an agreed order with Ecology, no formal zoning or land use permits are required, but the substantive land use and zoning requirements of the Town of Skykomish must be met. The Town will also review the proposed work, determine whether the work complies with the substantive requirements of its land use and zoning ordinances, and recommend mitigation measures to Ecology based on the Town's existing substantive requirements in its land use and zoning ordinances. Ecology will determine whether the proposed work complies with the substantive requirements of these ordinances.

## Floodplain Management

Local governments participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) are required to review proposed development projects to determine if they are in identified floodplains as shown on the FEMA maps. If a project is located in a mapped 100-year floodplain (A or V zone), the local government must require that a permit be obtained prior to development. Again, because this work is under an agreed order with Ecology, no formal permit is required, but the substantive requirements of the permit must be met.

Proposed projects are reviewed and conditions imposed on any permits issued to reduce the potential for damage from floodwater. Permits are required for any development as well as for filling or grading activities in the floodplain.

Permit processing time varies by jurisdiction and project complexity. Though a public hearing is not normally required, there are exceptions. State law requires that local entities have a local floodplain ordinance that meets or exceeds NFIP requirements.

The Project Area lies within the 100 -year floodplain based on the FEMA Flood Insurance Map for the Town (FEMA, 2001).

## Critical Area Ordinance

The Town of Skykomish developed the Critical Area Ordinance (CAO) to designate and classify environmentally sensitive and hazardous areas and to protect these areas and their values. Critical areas protected in the ordinance include wetlands, geologically hazardous areas, aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife habitats, and flood hazard areas. The ordinance limits development and alteration of the critical areas. The CAO is a requirement of local governments under the state Growth Management Act (GMA) to protect critical area lands. The Town will review the proposed work, determine whether it will adversely affect critical areas as outlined in the CAO, and recommend mitigation measures to Ecology based on the Town's existing substantive requirements in its CAO. Ecology will determine whether the proposed work complies with the substantive requirements of the CAO and other local land use and development standards.

## Clearing and Grading

Under the Town of Skykomish Ordinance Number 267, property owners need to obtain a Clearing and Grading Permit before doing any work in a drainage course, wetlands, environmentally sensitive areas, areas of special flood hazard, or archeological sites.

The backfill placed in the excavated areas will be compacted to a minimum density specified in the Uniform Building Code version most recently adopted by the Town. The Town will also review the proposed work and recommend mitigation measures to Ecology based on the Town's existing substantive requirements in Ord No. 267. Ecology will determine whether the proposed work complies with the substantive requirements of Ord. No. 267.

### 2.3.4 King County

## Special Use Permit

King County owns the current flood control levee, although the Town owns the land underlying the levee. For the use of property in which King County has an ownership interest a Special Use Permit is required. The Special Use Permit is submitted in the form of a letter; there may be fees required for the processing, administration, land use, inspection, and plan review associated with the permit request. Additionally, there may be a requirement to add King

County as an additional insured party on the project insurance policy and/or bonding requirements to reduce King County exposure to liability and damage.

## Sewer System Permitting

Title 13 of the Code of the King County Board of Health, known as the "OnSite Sewage Code," governs the design, construction, use, maintenance and repair of on-site sewage systems throughout King County. These systems are commonly known as septic tank systems. As part of the displacement of residences, existing septic systems will be demolished. Replacement of these septic systems will be performed after excavation is completed in conjunction with restoration of home sites. Septic system replacement must comply with the substantive requirements stipulated in an on-site sewer system construction permit. Since replacement of septic systems in fill material (i.e., backfill material used to fill excavations) is not typically allowed by Title 13, BNSF anticipates that an informational permit application will be rejected as not meeting substantive requirements. Based on meetings with the King County Health Department, BNSF would then submit an Application for Reconsideration of Decision/Order to the King County Sewage Review Committee. An application will need to be completed for each residence and signed by property owners. It is expected that King County will allow septic systems to be constructed in engineered fill on a temporary basis pending implementation of a community-wide septic management plan.

### 2.3.5 Native Sovereign Nations

The Draft EIS scoping were circulated to the Tulalip, Stillaguamish, and Snoqualmie tribes in order to determine if any of these Tribes would be adversely affected. None of these tribes provided comments on the DS, Draft EIS scoping, Draft EIS, and draft EDR. NOAA-Fisheries and the USFWS also reportedly consulted with these tribes during the ESA process.

## 3 Design Criteria

The approval of the design criteria for the reconstructed levee and restored home sites and public rights-of-way will be three-fold:

1) The river face of the levee will meet with existing substantive standards for habitat and resource restoration of Ecology, the Town, DFW, NOAA-Fisheries, USFWS, and USACE
2) The levee interior will meet the existing substantive standards of King County, USACE, and the Town for flood control and public safety
3) The levee crest, back-slope, home sites and public rights-of-way will meet the existing substantive standards of the Town for land use, zoning and building codes.

The criteria are detailed below. The design of the levee itself is simplified by the fact that the existing levee will be replaced in-kind by using the current configuration as a guide during replacement. However, the new levee will include aquatic habitat features and improvements on the river face and recreational/aesthetic features and improvements on the crest and back-slope.

### 3.1 Design Requirements

This section outlines the codes, standards and guidelines applicable to the design of the new levee and the restoration of home sites and public rights-ofway.

### 3.1.1 Codes

The Town of Skykomish Building Code is to be used and is found in Title 15 of the Skykomish Municipal Code adopted under Ordinance 360. This document is primarily for buildings, but details fences and other appurtenances may be relevant to the levee design. "Design Guidelines for Skykomish, WA," sponsored by the Town of Skykomish Design Review Board, was written with a grant from the King County Landmarks and Heritage Commission 1995 King County Arts and Heritage Initiative, December 1996. These guidelines were adopted under Ordinances 259, 351, and 234 and should also be used.

The Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties issued by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior are relevant and appropriate because 13 historic buildings and the Skykomish Bridge have been designated a cultural resource worthy of preservation by the National Register of Historic Places, and some of the residences subject to temporary relocation are designated historic buildings.

### 3.1.2 Standards and Guidelines

Guidelines for levee design and/or restoration can be found in federal, state, and county publications. The publications to be consulted on this project are listed below.

Federal design guidelines for levees and for excavation shoring can be found in:

- Design and Construction of Levees. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Manual EM 1110-2-1913, 30 April 2000
- Retaining and Flood Walls. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Manual EM 1110-2-2502, 29 September 1989
- Gravity Dam Design. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Manual EM 1110-2-2200, 30 June 1995.

State design guidelines for levees and streambanks can be found in:

- Integrated Streambank Protection Guidelines. Washington State Aquatics Habitat Guidelines Program, 2003
- California Bank and Shore Rock Slope Protection Design. State of California Department of Transportation, Engineering Service Center, Final Report No. FHWA-CA-TL-95-10, Caltrans Study No. F90TL03, October 2000.

County design standards and guidelines for levees and roads can be found in:

- Guidelines for Bank Stabilization Projects in the Riverine Environments of King County. King County Department of Public Works, Surface Water Management Division, Seattle, Washington, June 1993.
- King County Road Standards 1993. King County Department of Transportation, Road Services Division, King County, Washington, 1993.

Other guidelines, plans and recommendations will be referenced as they are used or quoted.

### 3.2 South Fork Skykomish River

The South Fork Skykomish River forms in the Cascade Mountains and flows westward. Near Monroe, it joins with the Snoqualmie River, becomes the Snohomish River and empties into Puget Sound at Everett.

### 3.2.1 River Levels during Construction Months

Anticipated river levels during construction were used to determine the cofferdam design and to assess the dewatering needs. Construction below the ordinary high water mark will be limited to the "fish window" from July $1^{\text {st }}$ to August $31^{\text {st }}$ but may be as late as September $15^{\text {th }}$, based on the final decision of the Department of Fish and Wildlife regarding fish window start and end dates. The maximum water level in the river during the fish window is needed to select the design height of the top of the cofferdam. The minimum water level is provided for reference.

An evaluation of river stage and discharge is included in Appendix C. River stages of the South Fork Skykomish River are measured by a sonic gauge on the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge. Mean monthly stage statistics are available for the years 2000 through 2004, for a total of five years, as shown in Table 3-1. To determine whether these stages are representative of the typical range of river stages, the data were compared to the mean monthly discharges of the South Fork Skykomish River at Gold Bar, for which data was available for the years 1929 through 2004, for a total of 76 years. Based on the evaluation presented in Appendix C, the years 2001 and 2003 represent "dry" years fairly consistently (i.e., low river stage). The years 2000 and 2002 represent fairly "wet" years (i.e., high river stage) for June and July, and the years 2000 and 2004 represent "wet" years for August and September. To be conservative, the maximum stage statistics for the year 2000 will be used to guide design of the cofferdam height. If maximum stage statistics for the year 2000 are exceeded, the adequacy of the cofferdam height and procedures for construction will be evaluated to assess whether changes need to be made to proceed safely with construction.

## Table 3-1 Mean Monthly Stages of the South Fork of the Skykomish River at the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge

| Year and Month | Minimum (ft) | Mean (ft) | Maximum (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 June | 5.8 | 6.6 | 8.2 |
| 2001 June | 4.7 | 5.2 | 6.0 |
| 2002 June | 5.9 | 7.2 | 8.7 |
| 2003 June | 4.4 | 5.4 | 6.8 |
| 2004 June | 4.4 | 5.4 | 6.4 |
| 2000 July | 4.2 | 4.9 | 6.0 |
| 2001 July | 3.6 | 4.1 | 4.9 |
| 2002 July | 4.2 | 5.5 | 6.7 |
| 2003 July | 3.2 | 4.0 | 4.8 |
| 2004 July | 3.4 | 4.0 | 4.7 |


| Year and Month | Minimum (ft) | Mean (ft) | Maximum (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 August | 3.2 | 3.8 | 4.4 |
| 2001 August | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.9 |
| 2002 August | 3.3 | 3.9 | 4.6 |
| 2003 August | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.6 |
| 2004 August | 3.2 | 3.8 | 5.9 |
| 2000 September | 2.9 | 3.7 | 7.6 |
| 2001 September | 2.7 | 3.2 | 3.5 |
| 2002 September | 2.9 | 3.4 | 3.9 |
| 2003 September | 2.7 | 3.2 | 3.8 |
| 2004 September | 3.5 | 4.6 | 7.0 |

### 3.2.2 Flooding Events

The water stage at the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge gage can be correlated with the flow in the South Fork Skykomish River at the levee by extrapolating flood study data. The flood study data (FEMA, 2001) include elevations and peak discharges for the 10 -year, 50 -year, 100 -year, and 500 -year flood levels. River peak discharge and flood stage are assumed to be directly related. Correlation of river elevation and peak discharge for three sections along the river in front of the levee are given in Table 3-2. Table 3-2 also shows the river stage at the gage on the bridge. Flooding in the South Fork Skykomish River typically occurs October through June, not during the anticipated construction period of July through September.

## Table 3-2 Flood Frequency Elevations and Discharges at the Town of Skykomish

| Location | Flood Frequency | Elevation, ft NGVD29* | Elevation, ft NAVD88 | Peak <br> Discharge, cfs | River Stage, Gage ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| At $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge | 1-yr** | 921.9 | 926.0 | 20,500 | 11.8 |
|  | 2-yr** | 922.6 | 926.6 | 24,000 | 12.4 |
|  | 5-yr** | 923.5 | 927.6 | 30,000 | 13.4 |
|  | 10-yr | 924.1 | 928.2 | 32,200 | 14.0 |
|  | 50-yr | 925.7 | 929.8 | 47,400 | 15.6 |
|  | 100-yr | 926.3 | 930.4 | 54,300 | 16.2 |
| 320 Ft Downstream of Bridge | 1-yr** | 920.2 | 924.2 | 20,500 | N/A |
|  | 2-yr** | 921.0 | 925.0 | 24,000 | N/A |
|  | 5-yr** | 922.0 | 926.0 | 30,000 | N/A |
|  | 10-yr | 922.8 | 926.8 | 32,200 | N/A |
|  | 50-yr | 924.6 | 928.6 | 47,400 | N/A |
|  | 100-yr | 925.4 | 929.4 | 54,300 | N/A |


| Location | Flood <br> Frequency | Elevation, ft <br> NGVD29* | Elevation, ft <br> NAVD88 | Peak <br> Discharge, $\mathbf{c f s}$ | River Stage, <br> Gage ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 650 Ft <br> Downstream <br> of Bridge | $1-\mathrm{yr}^{* *}$ | 918.5 | 922.6 | 20,500 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
|  | $2-\mathrm{yr} \mathrm{r}^{* *}$ | 919.5 | 923.6 | 24,000 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
|  | $5-\mathrm{yr} \mathrm{y}^{* *}$ | 920.8 | 924.8 | 30,000 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
|  | $10-\mathrm{yr}$ | 921.8 | 925.8 | 32,200 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
|  | $50-\mathrm{yr}$ | 924.2 | 928.4 | 47,400 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
|  | $100-\mathrm{yr}$ | 925.2 | 929.2 | 54,300 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

* Per FEMA Flood Study, 2001.
** Extrapolated, based on semi-log plot of 10-yr., 50-yr., and 100-yr. for elevations and loglog plot for discharges.

There is a possibility that the river will be at such a high stage at the anticipated start of construction that it will make construction impossible given the amount of work that needs to occur within the short fish window. Should the river stage be unseasonably high on June $1^{\text {st }}$, discussions with Ecology will be held to determine how best to complete the in-river work as outlined in Section 4.3 below.

### 3.2.3 Fish

Measures that are intended to reduce the potential for short-term effects on fish from in-water construction activities and long-term effects from habitat change will be incorporated into the design. These provisions include timing of construction and temporary exclusion from the work area to avoid direct effects to fish, implementation of construction best management practices (BMPs), and restoration of the area following construction.

The following conservation measures will be implemented in order to reduce the effects on fish during and following construction:

## Fish Window

Work below the ordinary high-water mark must occur between July 1 and September 15. Other timing restrictions that may be established by the Corps, NOAA Fisheries, USFWS, or WDFW would also be strictly observed.

## BMPs

- Project construction will be completed in compliance with Washington water quality standards (WAC 173-201a).
- Corrective actions will be taken in the event of any discharge of oil, fuel, or chemicals into the South Fork Skykomish River.
- Ecology has requested that tertiary containment be used to isolate the excavation and construction work from the river. A primary temporary river exclusion wall (cofferdam) will be placed waterward of the proposed excavated prism. The cofferdam will
be placed within the south portion of the river channel, and will prevent water from entering the construction site in the event of high flows. The wall will also exclude migrating fish from entering the construction area. A second cofferdam will be located just beyond the primary cofferdam to provide secondary containment to ensure that soil, sediment and organic contaminants are not released to the river. Tertiary containment will consist of oil absorbent booms placed outside of the second cofferdam. Since a construction water treatment plant will be available on site as part of the project facilities, there will also be provisions for pumping of water as necessary (and as treatment capacity allows) in the event contaminants are released beyond the primary cofferdam. Additional contingencies could also include the placement of sorbent material between the two cofferdams.
- Booms and silt screens may be used as contingencies adjacent to the excavation area to prevent any oily sheen or suspended sediments from reaching surface waters during construction. These materials will be listed in the Spill Prevention and Emergency Cleanup Plan.
- BNSF and its contractors will be required to capture any debris associated with project construction and not allow it to enter the South Fork Skykomish River.
- Any contact water will be treated through a treatment train, as discussed in Section 4.4 and in the NPDES permit application and associated documents. Treated water will then be pumped back into the river channel downstream of the excavation prism at the outfall of the NPDES-permitted water treatment system.


## Restoration Activities

- After completion of the excavation, sediment substrate of comparable type and gradation to existing materials will be replaced.
- Once the new levee is constructed, native vegetation will be replanted along the face. The newly planted vegetation will provide cover and foraging opportunities for migrating juvenile salmonids along the toe of the new levee. Additionally, the configuration of the toe of the levee will provide habitat complexity, which will include placement of large woody debris (LWD) and root wads. Large boulders will be placed upstream of the LWD for protection.


### 3.3 Shoring

The excavation shoring design will be completed by the contractor to federal and state standards and will be stamped by a contractor-selected licensed Washington state professional engineer prior to excavation. The shoring will consist of driven sheet piles with lagging or an alternate approved by the engineer.

The general concept of shoring is that it will be installed along the southern end of the excavation to facilitate continuation of the remedy to the south in future phases of the work. Shoring is also intended to be used on a contingency measure if excavation depths deeper than that shown on the plans cannot be accommodated by sloping.

### 3.4 Cofferdam

Five design options were analyzed for the cofferdam construction:

- Curtain
- Bladder
- Block/jersey barriers
- Flexible intermediate bulk containers
- Elongated bags.

The curtain cofferdam is an impervious fabric membrane supported by a free standing, welded, tubular steel framework support system (see http://www.portadam.com). The literature claims that this system can retain water up to 100 percent of its height up to 12 feet.

The bladder cofferdam is a water-inflated tube (see http://www.aqua barrier.com or http://www.wippsystem.com) that can be inflated up to a height of 8 feet. However, this type of structure is only capable of retaining water heights that are 75 percent of the tube height (i.e. an 8 -foot high tube can retain a maximum of 6 feet of water).

The curtain and bladder are proprietary, temporary cofferdam designs with limited height. There are also instability issues for the bladder design should the river overtop the cofferdam during a freshet. These options are not recommended for use on the levee remediation project

Plastic jersey barriers filled with sand or water, and lock-blocks were also considered for the cofferdam. The jersey barriers are limited to a height of 4 feet, may be unstable if overtopped, and required inter-barrier gaps to be plugged. The lock-block wall is stable (see http://www.ultrablock.com) even when overtopped and is not height limited, but takes a relatively long time to assemble when compared to the other options.

Based on their past performance being used in cofferdam construction, the recommended options for this project are the flexible intermediate bulk containers (FIBC) and the elongated bags. Both of the FIBC cofferdams (see http://www.fibca.com) could be filled before July $1^{\text {st }}$ with uncontaminated clean overburden excavated from the levee and placed in the river to divert the water around the excavation area. An impermeable liner will be wrapped around the cofferdams, as shown on Figure C-15. The liner will be below the cofferdams and on both the inside of the inner cofferdam and the outside of the outer cofferdam. Valuable construction time would be saved with the FIBCs filled and ready to be placed when the fish-window opens. Sand bags will be used to tie the cofferdams to the shore in order to prevent leakage or a breach. BNSF is continuing to evaluate options for placement of FIBCs on a level surface on the riverbed and limiting flows under the cofferdams.

Elongated bags, in particular the WALL ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ by Hydrolevee, are trapezoidal bags made of polypropylene fabric with impermeable end skirts and impermeable liners. The bags, when filled, can be up to 12 feet x 10 feet x 2 feet $\times 26$ feet (base width x height x top width x length). They would be placed using a mechanical frame from shore. Since the WALL ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ has an impermeable liner, one does not need to be wrapped around the coffer dams.

### 3.5 Excavation

It is currently anticipated that the existing levee will be removed and excavated to the ground elevations indicated on Figures C-13 and C-14. Work will proceed from upstream to downstream. The excavation prism shown in these drawings is based on soil and sediment investigations conducted in the project area in September and December 2005. The objective of the investigation was to provide adequate data to define the lateral and vertical extent of excavation. Appendix B presents a report with the methodology and results of the investigation. This excavation prism was defined based on the borings along the levee and in the river, as well as previous data collected during remedial investigations at the site. Analytical data from the borings completed in the levee and in the river are provided in Appendix B. The technical memorandum also presents the data analysis that was used to define the excavation prism. The anticipated vertical extent of the excavation is based on the depth at which soil/sediment analytical results indicate TPH concentrations are below the remediation level of $3,400 \mathrm{ppm}$ NWTPH-Dx for soil or the cleanup level of 40.9 ppm NWTPH-Dx for sediments.

Once the planned limits of excavation are achieved, samples will be taken to determine if the applicable remediation or cleanup level has been achieved. Excavations waterward of the OHWM will meet the sediment cleanup level of 40.9 ppm NWTPH-Dx or extend 10 feet below the bottom of the river, whichever is shallower. The uplands excavation 25 feet landward of the OHWM, must be as deep as the sediment excavation in elevation or meet the
soil cleanup level of 22 ppm or the Practical Quantitation Limit as outlined in the Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP [Appendix G]).

The anticipated maximum depth of the excavation is 19.5 feet bgs or an elevation of 905 feet (NAVD88). Contingencies are described below to allow for deeper excavation in isolated areas to elevation 895 feet (NAVD88) based on confirmation sampling results.

### 3.5.1 Excavation Prism

A "maximum extent excavation prism" was shown in engineering design drawings submitted with the JARPA on January 11, 2006 and calls for excavation to depths as great as elevation 895 feet (NAVD88). The anticipated excavation prism shown in Figures C-13 and C-14 is based largely on the December 2005 levee investigation results. The actual extent of excavation may increase beyond that shown in the JARPA or Figures C-13 and C-14 during construction based on: 1) on-site visual inspection, 2 ) confirmation (post-dredge) sampling analytical results, and 3) surface water inspection. Ecology will be present to make in-field decisions re: the extent of excavation.

## Lateral and Vertical Extent of the Levee and River Excavation Prism

The eastern edge of the excavation prism at boring location LEV-9 will be extended as close as practical to the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge (within the structural constraints of the bridge, or 40 feet west of the bridge) and the same depth as that of LEV-8 (approximately 910 feet NAVD88). It is anticipated that the eastern end of the excavation can be accommodated in a stable manner using slopes that are $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ above the anticipated depth of groundwater, and $4 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ below the water table. Driven sheet piles will be used if required by the excavation depth encountered in the field at the time of removal. This shoring design will be approved prior to the start of excavation.

The western extent of the excavation prism at boring location LEV-1 will extend to a depth of 907 feet NAVD88. However, an additional boring may be advanced west of LEV-1 in January 2006 that may impact the final design. The excavation depth at LEV-2, LEV-3 and LEV-4 will be 910, 910 and 905 feet NAVD88, respectively. As stated above, all excavation "extents" will also be subject to laboratory confirmation that the appropriate standards have been met. Field conditions may dictate the maximum extents of excavation as described below in Section 3.5.3.

## Lateral and Vertical Extent in the Upland Portion

The lateral extent of the upland excavation needs to be sufficient to allow for a reasonable work zone. This work zone will include removal or demolition of five residences to provide adequate space.

Vertical excavation will need to be sufficient to meet the direct contact cleanup level ( $3,400 \mathrm{ppm}$ TPH NWTPH-Dx, or the remediation level) in soil a minimum of 15 feet bgs, as well as meet the groundwater remediation levels. This may require excavation to elevation 908 NAVD88 where there is a significant subsurface silt layer present beneath residences located on the south side of West River Road near $5^{\text {th }}$ and $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Streets. Sediments will have to meet the sediment cleanup level of 40.9 ppm TPH NWTPH-Dx.

### 3.5.2 Excavation Dewatering

It is anticipated that the bulk of the excavation will be completed under wet conditions or "in the wet," depending on the river level and excavation depth using a combination of excavator and drag line technologies. It is anticipated that some pumping of water from the excavation will be required to create a gradient toward the excavation pit, and away from the river or surface water. A nominal 500 gpm (maximum $1,000 \mathrm{gpm}$ ) treatment system is currently being permitted to handle dewatering and other water generated during construction. Calculations predicting the water inflow are in Appendix E. All saturated material removed from the excavation pits must be dewatered prior to final transport. Saturated soils and sediment removed from the excavation can be placed on top of the ground surface (designated for excavation) at the edge of the excavation to allow water to drain back into the excavation prior to transport to a contained stockpile area on the railyard. All water from the contaminated stockpiles must be controlled and collected within a containment area and transferred into the NPDES-permitted treatment system. Trucks will be lined as necessary with watertight material to prevent spillage both before and after dewatering has occurred, as material will still be moist. Any accidental spillage will be identified and immediately remedied. Additional details will be presented in the Dewatering Plan (part of the Technical Execution Plan from the contractor).

### 3.5.3 Contingencies

Increased side-sloping, shoring or other methods will be used in limited areas if it is determined that excavation below those shown on the drawings is required based on visual inspection and/or soil/dredge confirmation results. Provisions will be available on the site at the time of soil removal to facilitate soil excavation down to elevation 895 feet NAVD 88 in limited areas. A combination of locally increased side slopes (still maintaining side slope stability) and driven/trenched sheet pile shoring will be used as conditions warrant.

Another contingency measure that will be considered in the event excavation can not safely be completed to the required depths within the fish window time constraints is that of soil mixing. Soil could be mixed in place to release sediment-affixed contaminants into the water for removal and treatment (via the NPDES-permitted treatment system) below the excavation depth achieved via conventional excavation/shoring/dredging, down to the maximum required
depth to remove documented contaminants to the concentrations required. This is considered a "last resort" option and will be approved by Ecology only in the event that other techniques fail to provide adequate resolution. The contaminants released into the water column would be removed by a skimming or vacuum process for treatment.

A spill plan will be developed by the on-call spill response contractor that will address contingencies to be implemented in the event of a breach of the cofferdams and downstream escape of contamination.

### 3.6 Upland Source Control

Measures to control upland sources that will remain following the levee cleanup have been evaluated for the inclusion in the final design. Options considered included installation of a recovery trench along the southern boundary of the excavation, installation of sheet piles to form a physical barrier, or use of any shoring used along the southern excavation face in a funnel-and-gate array to control lateral flow and allow directed recovery of contaminants pending upland remediation. A sheet pile barrier along the southern excavation face will be used to control the upland sources and to minimize the potential for re-contamination of newly placed fill. Based on groundwater flow modeling performed during the design of the barrier wall and fluid level gauging behind the barrier wall, less than 1 foot of groundwater mounding is expected behind the sheet pile wall. The sheet pile wall will not be impermeable (the joints will not be sealed) and any mounding impacts will be temporary.

### 3.7 Construction Water Treatment

Construction water treatment will be needed during construction for the water that is pumped from the excavation. The treatment system will be located in a lined facility to handle any minor leaks. This water will be treated according to the processes outlined in the Draft Water Treatment Engineering Report (RETEC, 2005b). The nominal capacity of the treatment is 500 gpm , with a maximum flow of $1,000 \mathrm{gpm}$ in accordance with the NPDES permit issued for the project. Decontamination water generated from decontamination procedures will not be treated on-site. Decontamination water will be stored on-site and taken to an off-site licensed facility for disposal or treatment.

### 3.8 Levee Design Sections

Several levee design criteria result from replacement in-kind or have been developed from the site conditions and remedial criteria previously described. These include:

- Levee crest elevation - minimum 930 feet (NAVD88)
- Levee face slope - minimum 2 horizontal to 1 vertical
- Levee embankment material and gradation - sandy gravel
- Levee protection material and gradation - armor rock with median diameter at least 18 inches, or withstand a 100-year peak river flow of 11 fps
- Levee face plantings - 100 percent vegetation cover above ordinary high water mark (OHWM) within three years
- Habitat mitigation or enhancement features - large woody debris and rock stilling ponds or curvilinear groins.

The plan is to recycle as much of the uncontaminated existing levee material as practicable, including the facing armor rock.

### 3.8.1 Levee Materials

The materials used for the levee construction will consist of: (1) excavated clean overburden, (2) clean armor rock rocks, (3) imported backfill for levee and river fill material, and (4) soil for plantings. Armor rock will be washed with high pressure water if contaminated. Water resulting from the steam cleaning will be collected and treated at the NPDES-permitted treatment facility prior to discharge. If the rock is unable to be cleaned, it will be shipped to a Subtitle-D landfill with the rest of the contaminated soil and sediment for disposal. Imported material will be similar to the existing levee and river material as described in the boring logs in Appendix B.

### 3.9 Embankment Slope Protection

Embankment stabilization/slope protection will be accomplished through the use of both armor rock and vegetation. The current face of the levee appears to be stable with the facing of 12 inch nominal armor rocks. The rocks have acquired a green moss covering. Trees, shrubs and grass have taken root on the armor rock face.

### 3.9.1 Armor Rock

The rock size and weight affects the ability of the armor rock to resist the river flow. The armor rock will be designed to resist the maximum river flow velocities. The 100-year average flood velocity at the levee site is 11 feet per second (fps) according to the recent FEMA (2001) flood study results. According to the USACE Engineering Manual-Hydraulic Design of Flood Control Measures (1994), the rock size is calculated based on the estimated river velocities and a minimum factor of safety of 1.1. The rock size calculations are provided in Appendix D. Based on these calculations, the armor rock/armor rock layer will be increased in thickness from the existing 2 feet to a minimum of 3 feet and the median size will be increased from median size of 12 inches in diameter to a median size of at least 18 inches in
diameter. The imported rock will be graded such that $\mathrm{D}_{30} \geq 21$ inches, $\mathrm{D}_{50} \geq$ 28 inches, $\mathrm{D}_{90} \geq 40$ inches. This rock will be mixed with the existing recycled armor rock to achieve a median of 18 inches. The increase in layer thickness will also offset the destabilizing potential of plant roots dislodging stones if and when they fall down or are uprooted by flood currents while an increased rock size will provide a more stable shell under flood conditions. If plant roots or flood currents dislodge armor rock stones, it will be necessary for King County to assess the damage and possibly provide emergency repair. Emergency repair is anticipated to include some form of dumped rock during or immediately after the flood event.

### 3.9.2 Armor Rock Characteristics

## Rock Shape Requirements

The rock used for armor rock shall have sharp, angular, clean edges at the intersections of relatively flat faces and meet the following criteria:

- The rock shall be predominantly angular in shape
- Not more than 30 percent of the rocks distributed throughout the gradation should have a ratio of a/c (the rock dimensions of 'a' and ' $c$ ' are perpendicular to each other and defined as the long and short axes of a rock, respectively) greater than 2.5
- Not more than 15 percent of the rocks distributed throughout the gradation should have a ratio of a/c greater than 3.0
- No rocks should have a ratio of a/c greater than 3.5.


## Rock Size and Weight

The USACE Engineering Manual specifies that a minimum factor of safety of 1.1 and an estimated 100 -year flood river velocity should be used in calculating the size of rock to be used for the armor rock. However, the factor of safety should be increased if the following conditions are considered:

- Impact from River Floating Objects: Impact forces on the armor rock resulting from logs, uprooted trees, ice, vessels and other types of large floating objects. Based on the observations conducted at the site, large trees and logs have been found resting on the armor rock after the high river stage.
- Rock Size Calculations: An increased factor of safety should be applied to compensate for inaccuracies in estimating the parameters in determining the rock size using the equation described above. This compensation should be used to the extent that the accuracy of the rock size is not compromised. Due to the
various degree of sensitivity of the parameters in the equation, the value of each parameter should be carefully selected to determine the rock size and minimize the need to increase the factor of safety.
- Vandalism/Theft: Vandalism and/or theft of the rock armor rock will affect the integrity of the slope protection. This tends to occur in urban areas. The weight of the rock will help prevent theft and vandalism.
- Quality Control: Undersized rocks can be eliminated or minimized by effective quality control to ensure the rocks delivered meet gradation requirements. Prior to placement of the armor rock, the rocks may require stockpiling and additional handling, which could potentially result in undersized rocks due to breakage. A screening process will be established to ensure no undersized rocks be used for the armor rock construction. Armor rock will be a mixture of existing recycled rock of 6 - to 18 -inch rock, with a median size of about 12 inches, and imported rock of 21- to 42inch rock, with a median size of 28 inches. The final mixture should have a rock range from 6 to 42 inches, with a median rock size of at least 18 inches.
- Freeze and Thaw: Higher factor of safety should be used in severe freeze-thaw conditions. The climate in Skykomish is relatively mild and average low temperatures only fall slightly below freezing point during approximately two months per year. Freezethaw should not pose a concern at the site.

Based on the above discussion, the conditions that could affect the factor of safety including impact by floating objects and rock size equation parameters, a factor of safety of 1.3 was selected.

### 3.9.3 Armor Rock Top and End Protection

The proposed armor rock will be installed on the entire length of the riverside slope of the embankment, as shown on Figure C-19. Vertically, the armor rock will extend from below the river scour depth to above the 100-year flood level. The lateral alignment of the revetment will be extended on the upstream and downstream ends to non-eroding velocities and relatively stable banks. A smooth transition from the end of the revetment to the end protection zones will be provided. See EM 1110-2-1601, Plate 41 for end protection design.

### 3.9.4 Armor Rock Toe Protection

Revetment toe scour depth is estimated using the design charts (Plate 42). The toe protection will be provided by installing armor rock rocks to the estimated maximum scour depth, as shown on Figure C-19. The rocks will be
installed before the removal of the cofferdam. At the toe of the embankment, the armor rock will extend into the riverbed as show on Figure C-19.

### 3.9.5 Delivery and Placement

Delivery and placement of the armor rocks must meet the following requirements:

- Machine placing will be used as the primary placement method of the armor rock. Hand placing will be used as secondary method to assist the machine placement to ensure the long axes of the rocks are oriented perpendicular to the bank.
- When using machine placement, only small increments of rocks should be placed to the final positions to avoid additional handling of the rocks. Any additional handling required due to the large quantity of armor rock being placed on the side slope can result in segregation and/or breakage of the rocks.
- To avoid breakage, rocks should not be dropped from an excessive height or dumped from the top of the levee.
- After the armor rock has been placed, a layer of soil will be added over the rock and worked into the interstices hydraulically (by spray hosing the soil into the spaces between the rocks). This allows control over the final thickness of the soil on top.


### 3.9.6 Quality Control

Specific requirements for sampling and testing of the rock size and gradation were described in the bidding specification documents. Provisions will be established for the loading, transporting, stockpiling, and placing the armor rock materials. Inspections and observations by qualified personnel will be completed during the placement of the armor rock to demonstrate that the armor rock meets specifications.

### 3.10 Cleanup Standards

The design criteria include cleanup/remediation levels and construction performance standards. Approval of the design criteria for the river face of the levee will be determined by Ecology, USACE, and USF\&W. RETEC will approve the design criteria of the interior of the levee and the Town of Skykomish will review and comment on the levee crest and back slope design.

Cleanup levels under MTCA are defined as the concentrations of hazardous substances that are protective of human health and the environment under exposure conditions. Site-specific cleanup levels (CULs) and remediation levels (RLs) were developed by Ecology and are presented in the FS (RETEC,

2005a). Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) by both NWTPH-Dx and VPH/EPH analytical methods are driving the cleanup of the site. However, cleanup levels have also been developed for associated carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and PCBs, lead and arsenic. TPH was used as the surrogate for the PAHs in developing cleanup levels for some media and exposure pathways including soil direct contact and sediment protective of benthic organisms. TPH will therefore be the surrogate compound during the interim action for cleanup of the levee zone. PAH concentrations are not expected to exceed the applicable cleanup levels in soil containing NWTPH-Dx concentrations meeting the remediation level of 3,400 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$.

The levee zone interim action for cleanup is intended to protect benthic and aquatic receptors in the river, the quality of water in the river, as well as humans who may come into contact with surface and subsurface soils, the levee and adjacent water through recreational activities. The objective of this cleanup action is to eliminate product seeps into the river, remove the contaminated sediment impacting aquatic receptors, and prevent dissolved petroleum in the groundwater from contaminating surface water and sediment. To achieve these goals, the groundwater flowing into the river must meet a cleanup level of $208 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ NWTPH-Dx and VPH/EPH.

Remediation levels may be used at sites where a combination of interim actions for cleanup are used to achieve cleanup levels at the point of compliance. Remediation levels are not the same as cleanup levels. Remediation levels under MTCA are defined as a concentration (or other method of identification) of a hazardous substance in soil, water, air, or sediment above which a particular cleanup action component will be required as part of a cleanup action at a site. Cleanup levels under MTCA are concentrations of a hazardous substance in soil, water, air, or sediment that is determined to be protective of human health and the environment under specified exposure conditions. Remediation and cleanup levels are summarized in Table 2-1.

### 3.10.1 Soil

Soil within the Project Area will be removed to address free product and to remove soil with concentrations above $3,400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx. Soil 25 feet landward of the OHWM will be removed up to a depth of 10 feet if concentrations exceed the soil cleanup level of $22 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx. This 25 foot wide and 10 foot deep buffer area is to prevent recontamination of the sediments. Excavation to this remediation level will remove soil with the potential to impact groundwater to above the cleanup level, and will also be protective against recontamination of sediments when combined with the uplands cleanup. Excavated soil with concentrations exceeding $3,400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWPTH-Dx will be transported off-site to a licensed commercial landfill for disposal or reuse as daily cover as detailed in Section 4.

### 3.10.2 Groundwater

The cleanup level for groundwater is $208 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ for NWTPH-Dx and VPH/EPH (whichever is more conservative), which will protect sediment and surface water where groundwater discharges to the river.

An air sparging system may be installed in the levee to address remaining dissolved phase groundwater impacts by enhanced biodegradation. This system would include vertical wells to inject the air and associated piping and blowers. This system is considered a contingency. BNSF's calculations in the FS indicate that groundwater will meet the cleanup level of $208 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ where groundwater discharges to surface water. A decision will be made prior to completion of the final design whether or not to include subsurface infrastructure such as wells or piping for a potential future air sparging system. The operation of an air sparging system would be part of the sitewide cleanup action and is beyond the scope of this interim action for cleanup.

### 3.10.3 Sediments

The anticipated excavation area encompasses the area identified in the FS as requiring surface sediment removal based on bioassay testing. The area is estimated to be 440 feet long and 20 feet wide, and will include subsurface sediments. Sediment within the Project Area will be removed to the cleanup level of $40.9 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx.

### 3.10.4 Surface Water

As with the groundwater, the cleanup level for surface water is $208 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ for NWTPH-Dx and VPH/EPH.

### 3.11 Community Amenities

The Town of Skykomish led a visioning project to identify and describe a Vision for the future of Skykomish (Berryman \& Henigar \& University of Washington, August 2005). As part of the Vision, the Town passed Resolution No. 212 on July 11, 2005 to make recommendations for the levee design. Resolution No. 213 was passed on September 12, 2005, and replaced Resolution No. 212 with recommendations for the levee design. The overall vision for the levee is to create a "park-like area that affords views and access to the river." Most of the recommendations included in Resolution No. 213 are associated with landscaping and river access to achieve their park-like vision for the levee. BNSF and the Town are currently negotiating the conditions under which BNSF would pay to incorporate some or all of the concepts articulated in Resolution No. 213 as part of BNSF's individual settlement agreements. The following nine elements were recommended by the Town for inclusion in the final design of the levee:

- Multi-disciplinary design team of both engineers and landscape architects.
- West River Road from $6^{\text {th }}$ Street to the end of the school grounds will be closed during construction. A right of way west of the school grounds will be opened temporarily to provide access to residences at the south end of W. River Road.
- Direct water access should be provided at $5^{\text {th }}$ Street, just west of the bridge to facilitate hand launching of boats and kayaks, as well as fishing and nature viewing.
- A trail should be provided along the length of the top of the levee for foot travel, extending from the end of the levee just west of the school grounds, and culminating at the river access area at the eastern tip of the levee near the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge.
- Access to the levee trail should be provided at a minimum of three points - at the west end of the levee just beyond the school property, at the north of $6^{\text {th }}$ Ave., and at the eastern end of the levee adjacent to the bridge. The trail access from the end of $6^{\text {th }}$ Ave. should include a ramp meeting ADA accessibility standards.
- A landscape buffer consisting of small shrubs and grasses (to enable unobstructed views) should be planted along the edges of the levee trail. Trees should be planted to selectively enhance landscaping while maintaining view corridors.
- Seating should be provided at occasional points along the levee trail.
- An outlook should be created along the levee trail, at the $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection.
- W. River Road should be maintained between $5^{\text {th }}$ and $6^{\text {th }}$ Streets and widened to at least 20 feet. A retaining wall should be used from the eastern edge of the levee to the point where West River Road narrows, to accommodate the widening of the road.

The Town has made other levee design recommendations through their participation in levee design meetings.

- Levee Infrastructure - the Mayor of Skykomish provided an e-mail dated October 20, 2005 from the Town of Skykomish Planning Commission that requests that consideration of the Town's need for infrastructure be included in the construction plan for the levee. Specifically, the Town requests that underground hand holes and
conduits (with three to four inner ducts and pulling lines preinstalled) be installed. Hand holes are requested at each end of the levee and at any location where present or future access (viewing platform, boat launch, etc.) would be needed. The inner ducts would be used for communications, power, or security as needed. Power for street lights, outdoor electrical outlets, holiday lighting, etc. could be installed in one inner duct and fiber optic cable in the second, which would leave one or two ducts available for future access. The Town also requests placement of all aerial utility and communications (telephone, power and cable TV) cables to underground ducts along Railroad Ave. and any other roads that are affected by future cleanup activities. This request includes the phone and power lines crossing the railyard east of the library. Finally, the Town requests that a sprinkler system be installed to facilitate maintenance of the newly planted vegetation and habitat restoration.
- Levee Aesthetics - The Town has requested that handrails installed at the top of the retaining wall be a dark green color, however, they desire the railings to be low maintenance (i.e., painting not required). Thus a baked on coating or the like should be used. The Town is also interested in coloring the concrete retaining wall (the concrete itself, not a stain applied on the surface to minimize maintenance) and also in having a decorative relief pattern molded on the outer surface of the retaining wall (leaves, fish or similar).

The Town's recommendations will be used as a guide for the design of the levee, and incorporated into the design where technically possible. Specific elements of the Town's recommendations that are not expressly required to meet substantive requirements, standards or regulations, and that are deemed to be more expensive than restoration to current conditions, are currently considered optional by BNSF, and identified as such in the design drawings and throughout this report. BNSF and the Town are currently negotiating the conditions under which BNSF would pay to incorporate some or all of the Town's requests and recommendations as part of BNSF's settlement agreement with the Town.

### 3.12 Construction Safety

The primary safety concern is the traffic flow on West River Road and $6^{\text {th }}$ Street during construction. West River Road will be included as part of the remediation area; therefore, the entire road will not be accessible by the general public, including emergency vehicles. Temporary access roads for the residents living west of the school on West River Road will be required. BNSF will coordinate with the community for temporary access roads to those residential areas. The school entrance and some residential houses are located
on $6^{\text {th }}$ Street. The street will be used as an access and haul road but will remain open throughout the construction.

At least one lane of travel shall be provided along all the streets (except West River Road) within the Town limits throughout the construction period. Signage related to the project will be that typical of a road construction project with traffic controls and authorized personnel access. A traffic plan has been prepared for review by all affected agencies and persons including fire department, police department (county and state), residents and the school and is included as Figure C-11. Additionally, the contractor will prepare a Traffic Plan as part of the Technical Execution Plan.

In addition to the contractor personnel, at least one RETEC or BNSF project supervisor representative will be on-site at all times when field work is in progress. This field representative or supervisor may be the site health and safety officer, and will endeavor to restrict access to the active work zone by any unauthorized personnel.

Air quality monitoring will be done for the duration of this remedial action to ensure the safety of both the on-site contractor personnel and the public. This monitoring will be done in accordance with the air monitoring plan that will be developed.

### 3.13 Survey Control

Existing Site information and construction of the levee remediation are based on survey control markers in the area and on recent topographic surveys of the levee and hydrographic surveys of the river. There are three control markers (monument and bench mark) near the site. The marker IDs and locations are shown on Figure C-3.

The National Geodetic Survey (NGS) marker is in the park next to the railroad tracks in the center of the Town of Skykomish. A description and coordinates (latitude, longitude, and elevation) of the marker are given on the Data Sheet for "Z58 1934 931.438" available at internet website http://www.ngs.noaa.gov /cgi-bin/ds mm.prl. Information on this marker is also available on a Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Survey Mark Report available at the Internet website http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Monument/ report.cfm?monumentid=2762.

There is a discrepancy in the elevation given by the two reports. The NGS Data Sheet reports an elevation of 285.164 meters or 935.58 feet relative to the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88), whereas the WSDOT Survey Mark Report gives an elevation of 285.140 meters (NAVD88), which is an elevation of 935.50 feet using U.S. Survey Feet. The resolution of the discrepancy is discussed below.

WSDOT has a marker next to Highway Route 2 about 2,500 feet downstream of the bridge. A description and coordinates (latitude, longitude, and elevation) of the marker " 2761 " are given on WSDOT Survey Marker Report available at internet website http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Monument/report.cfm? monumentid=2761.

King County has a marker in the sidewalk between the bridge and Town. Information for marker "GPS 88231995 " is available from King County.

Resolution of the survey marker discrepancies and verification of the marker coordinates was done by using the King County marker "GPS 8823 1995" as the primary reference mark. Survey traverses were run to the NGS marker "Z58 1934 931.438" and the WSDOT marker "2761." Washington State Plane coordinates per North American Datum of 1983/1991 and elevations per NAVD88 were corrected. The results are reported in the table on Figure C-3. These markers, with the corrected coordinates, will be used as survey control for the levee remediation.

### 3.14 EDR Amendment Protocol

Should Ecology or BNSF determine that this EDR needs to be amended due to field conditions following Ecology approval of this document, the EDR Amendment Form (Appendix F) will be used. This form requires Ecology approval of any modifications to this EDR or the SAP (Appendix G). Other stakeholders involved in the interim action for cleanup of the levee zone must go through Ecology in order to amend the EDR or SAP.

## 4 Scope of Work

### 4.1 Approach

The design process involves identification and pre-qualification of up to five contractors that have the ability to do the levee remediation and provide input on the final design. BNSF issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) based on the design drawings that were included in the Draft EDR. Responses to RFP will be evaluated and a contractor will be selected to become part of the design team. In addition to the main contractor, a contractor specializing in house moving will also be selected. RETEC will continue to lead the design process and coordination between Ecology and BNSF.

### 4.1.1 Solicitation Package

A solicitation package consisting of detailed plans and specifications for prospective BNSF contractors was prepared to accompany the Draft EDR. In most respects, the solicitation package was a summary of the Draft EDR; however, it differed from the content of the Draft EDR in that it focused on the work that the contractor will be expected to accomplish during the construction period.

### 4.1.2 Drawings

Drawings were prepared in an iterative process. The permit drawings, considered as conceptual ( $30 \%$ ) drawings, were completed and submitted by BNSF with the permit applications. As the Town of Skykomish and the agencies voiced opinions and concerns, the drawings have been modified and additions made to result in the drawings that accompany this report.

### 4.2 Permits

As outlined in Section 2.3, this work is exempt from the procedural requirements of state and local permits. Substantive requirements for all state and local permits will be met and federal permit applications will be completed as required.

### 4.3 Weather Related Contingency Plan

Prior to mobilization of equipment to the site, river levels, precipitation levels, weather forecasts and snow melt predictions need to be carefully evaluated. Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 describe historic river levels and trends and also define a river level at or above which project implementation is not possible. If river levels are unseasonably high on June 1, 2006, there are unusually wet weather conditions, large snow melt, or similar unusual weather conditions, discussions between BNSF and Ecology will be held to determine what contingencies, such as a delayed start date or modification of project scope
would be appropriate. These contingencies could require an amendment to the Agreed Order.

### 4.4 Mobilization and Site Preparation

Mobilization and site preparation will consist of bringing equipment and materials to the site and preparing the Project Area for the remedial action as described below.

### 4.4.1 Utility Locate

Prior to commencing any on-site activities, all underground public and private lines will be located and marked with paint. Figures C-4 and C-5 show the approximate locations of all known utility lines on the site.

### 4.4.2 Clearing and Grubbing

Clearing and grubbing of the vegetation (including brush and trees) and debris along the existing levee will be done to facilitate remediation activities. If reasonable within the time frame, access will be allowed to the Town so that they can remove a few trees for replanting by the Town outside of the project boundary. Other vegetation and debris will be disposed of at an appropriate municipal landfill.

### 4.4.3 Temporary Relocation of Structures

The levee zone interim action for cleanup involves temporary relocation of five buildings:

- The Teacherage on School property
- The Mackner residence on West River Drive
- The Moore residence on $6^{\text {th }}$ Street
- The two Mitchell residences on the corner of West River Drive and $5^{\text {th }}$ Street.

Prior to relocation of buildings, utilities will be disconnected. This work is typically limited to the confines of the crawl space of the home. The existing sewer, water, gas, and heat ducts will be removed prior to the installation of rigging gear. The buildings will be temporarily relocated within Town during the levee cleanup implementation. It will not be possible for residents to inhabit the structures while they are displaced - the buildings will remain vacant. Any existing foundations, garages, porches, out-buildings, side walks, patios, driveways and landscaping will be cleared and materials disposed of appropriately. BNSF will provide alternative housing and moving expenses pursuant to access agreements with each property owner. Each house will be restored to its original location at the end of the project unless the owner elects
to have BNSF demolish the structure so that the owner can build a new structure consistent with the Town's current zoning, shoreline development, building codes and SEPA ordinance. Building new houses is not part of the proposed action. Any outbuildings demolished because it is unfeasible to move them will be replaced as part of the proposed action.

The process by which buildings are typically moved involves jacking the structure onto large beams that span the length of the structure. The buildings would then be moved in their entirety to an appropriate area somewhere in Town. However, the building would remain on the beams throughout the levee cleanup in anticipation of their restoration to their original locations, orientations, etc. It will not be possible for residents to inhabit the structures while they are displaced - the buildings will remain vacant. To mitigate against potential damage to the historic residential structures by vandalism and theft, security will be provided by fencing, lighting and security personnel.

Any existing foundations, porches, side walks, patios, driveways and landscaping will be cleared and materials disposed of appropriately.

### 4.4.4 Shoring

Shoring is anticipated to be used along the southern edge of the excavation to facilitate continuation of the remediation to the south. It is anticipated that this shoring will consist of driven/trenched sheet piles placed to facilitate a $10-$ foot tall vertical excavation. Sheet pile installation using standard vibratory equipment is expected to difficult due to the possibility of boulders hindering advance of the piles. Removal of the boulders by trenching may be required. Typical anticipated excavation cross sections are shown on the attached drawings.

This same shoring method will be used as a contingency measure if additional excavation depth is required to achieve confirmation requirements outlined in this document and MTCA regulations. The installation of contingency shoring is anticipated to be similar to methods previously described in this section, although the top of the shoring may be at different depths as dictated by the particular situation. Additional sloping will also be used as a contingency measure as required by the particular situation. As detailed above, the contractor will prepare an excavation shoring design prior to excavation. The contractor's design will be presented in the Excavation and Shoring Monitoring Plan as part of the Technical Execution Plan.

The important aspect of the contingency measures will be the ability to determine the appropriate contingency measure(s) and implement them quickly so that progress is not slowed. Sheet pile shoring designs to accommodate a number of conditions will be determined prior to construction
so that they can be enacted when appropriate to accommodate sampling results.

### 4.4.5 Cofferdams

As outlined in Section 3.4. Two parallel cofferdams will be placed in the South Fork Skykomish River to divert the river away from the active excavation.

### 4.4.6 Spill Response

A spill response contractor will be retained to be on-call during the duration of the remedial action. The contractor will mobilize spill response materials such as booms and pads to the Project Area. The contractor will also be responsible for developing a spill response plan in compliance with Section S7 of the NPDES Permit. The Spill Response Plan will be included in the Technical Execution Plan.

### 4.5 Temporary Facilities

Several temporary facilities will be in place during the implementation of the levee remedial action including access and haul roads, construction offices, utilities, fencing, sediment and erosion controls, staging areas, and spill/emergency equipment. Additionally, power, telecommunications, and water will be needed. Water will be supplied by the Town water supply instead of withdrawing water from the river.

### 4.5.1 Access/Haul Roads

The construction access and haul roads to the project site will be selected to ensure the maximum safety and efficient traffic flow. The northern half of the school yard may be used as the construction staging area, with the only available existing access roads to the Project Area being via $6^{\text {th }}$ Street and West River Road. An entrance gate will be established at the south side of the school yard staging area. The proposed access/haul roads on Figure C-11 will be presented to Town officials, emergency personnel, and local residents for comment. It should be noted that construction is planned to not interfere with the school's drain field. The southern extent of remediation and associated shoring are placed so that no activity will occur over the drain field during this interim action for cleanup.

### 4.5.2 Construction Offices

There will be three construction offices: one for RETEC, one for the contractor, and one for Ecology. A temporary RETEC engineering field office will be located in the BNSF house on $5^{\text {th }}$ Street. Contractor and RETEC trailers will be located in the rail yard. Temporary power and a telephone line will need to be installed to the trailers on the railyard. Ecology will establish their construction office location at a later date.

### 4.5.3 Utilities

Utilities in the Project Area include power lines, telephone lines, and a storm drain system. Puget Sound Energy has been contacted to relocate the overhead power lines that are next to the levee excavation area. These lines, as well as the telephone line (Verizon) that runs on the same poles, will either be moved to private property on the south side of West River Road or these utilities will be rerouted through the lines on the south side of the school to the affected homes. The storm drain system in the project area will be replaced as part of this remedial action. The details of the temporary rerouting of utilities and the final permanent establishment of the utilities will be worked out with the utility companies, the Town and associated affected residents (where appropriate) prior to construction.

### 4.5.4 Enclosures and Fencing

Temporary chain link fencing will be installed along the perimeter of the Project Area, and around all stockpile, excavation, staging, and work areas. Warning signs will be posted at every entrance gate and at least every 50 feet along the fence warning the general public that the project site contains physical and chemical hazards and that access is forbidden to unauthorized personnel. Additionally, a security guard will patrol the house storage area regularly and the project area after hours.

### 4.5.5 Sediment and Erosion Controls

The sediment and erosion controls shall meet the following requirements and will be detailed and implemented in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (to be prepared):

- Use ditches, berms, pumps and other methods necessary to divert and drain surface water away from excavations and other work areas.
- Prevent sediment from entering the river, roadways, storm sewers, or catch basins.
- Any storm water coming in direct contact with source material or any other contaminants shall not be allowed to leave the project site.
- Divert seepage water into sumps and pump to storage tank for testing and, if necessary, on-site treatment or disposal at an approved off-site facility.
- Install a temporary outfall from the construction stormwater treatment system to the river as per NPDES requirements.
- Inspect and repair or replace damaged components of temporary erosion and sediment controls on a regular basis as described in the project specifications. Inspect immediately after rain or flooding events, and inspect daily during prolonged rain events.


### 4.5.6 Staging Areas

The staging area(s) will be used to store materials and equipment. There are four possible locations for staging areas. These include the rail yard, either end (east and west) of West River Road, the north end of $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, and the northern half of the school yard. BNSF is currently negotiating with property owners regarding access. All staging areas will be secured with temporary fencing to restrict access to unauthorized personnel.

Since the drain field for the school is under the playground, no heavy materials will be stored near the playground on the drainfield. Heavy equipment will need to be staged in the rail yard. The recyclable levee materials not used in the cofferdam construction and dewatering tanks are the most likely items to be stored on the school yard. If the school yard is used, it will be returned to pre-existing conditions upon project completion, including reinstallation of chain-link fence and grass.

The Town has requested permission to use a portion of the Railyard north of the main line and west of the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street crossing for parking during the annual antique car show scheduled for August 26, 2006. During this time heavy equipment that will usually be staged on the railyard may be staged at the Town's "burn dump," an approximately 1.6-acre area about a five-minute drive from town.

### 4.5.7 Spill/Emergency Response Equipment

Spill and emergency response equipment will be mobilized to the Project Area during the mobilization phase of the remedial action. This equipment will include oil absorbent booms and pads to capture any free-phase petroleum hydrocarbons that are released. The spill response contractor will be responsible for determining the types and quantities of materials and equipment to be kept on-site in the spill response plan. This plan is subject to Ecology approval.

### 4.6 Water Treatment Facilities

The water treatment facility design is outlined in the Draft Engineering Report - Levee Remediation Process Water Treatment and Discharge (RETEC, 2005b) which was submitted to Ecology. The report provides the basis of design and process design considerations for treatment of the excavation water. Water treatment facilities will be operated in accordance with the NPDES permit issued for the treatment system.

### 4.7 Excavation

The armor rock on the existing levee will be removed and the impacted rock will be segregated from the clean rock into separate stockpiles. The contaminated rock may be cleaned on-site using steam wash and reused for the new levee construction. If the impacted rock cannot be satisfactorily cleaned and reused, the rock will be disposed of at a licensed facility.

The levee materials will be removed from the existing levee and the contaminated fill (material with concentrations greater than $3,400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx) will be segregated from the clean fill. The clean excavated embankment material will be stockpiled for reuse in construction of the new levee. Contaminated materials will be transported to the rail yard, stockpiled, placed in rail boxes, gondolas, or trucks and subsequently transported to a licensed Subtitle D landfill for disposal.

The remedial action will remove an estimated 70,000 cubic yards (cy) from the site. It is estimated that on the order of 20 to 30 percent of this total volume will be clean overburden, resulting in 49,000 to 56,000 cy being removed from the Project Area. The excavation area is shown on Figures $\mathrm{C}-13$ and C-14. The impacted area was delineated based on the previous analytical and characterization results performed during the site investigation (Appendix B). The extent of excavation may vary depending upon the field conditions during excavation activities. Dry side slopes are expected to stand at a stable slope somewhere between $1.5 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ (horizontal to vertical) to $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ depending on soil conditions. However, it is anticipated that the bulk of the excavation will be completed in the wet. It is known that underwater angles of repose of unconsolidated sediments are much shallower than in the dry. A slope value of $4 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ has been incorporated into the anticipated excavation prism below anticipated water levels. Debris encountered during excavation will be sampled and disposed of properly.

### 4.7.1 Screening of Oversized Material

Excavation soil is expected to consist of mixtures of silt, sand, gravel, cobbles and boulders. Of these different grain sizes, contaminants are typically trapped in the finer portions of the soil, or in this case, the silt, sand and to a lesser degree the gravel. Unless there is a coating on the oversized material, very little contamination is retained in the coarse gravel, cobbles and boulders that are found in the deposit. BNSF may set up and operate a soil screening operation on the rail yard within the soil handling area to screen out material greater than 2 inches from the finer portions of the soil. The oversized material may be further split up to facilitate screening operations. The oversized material will be characterized in accordance with the SAP, and either disposed of, or cleaned as necessary and blended with backfill in the excavation.

### 4.7.2 Stockpiling Uncontaminated Soil and Sediment

Overburden soil, excavated sediment, and material with TPH concentrations equal to or less than the RL of $3,400 \mathrm{ppm}$ NWTPH-Dx will be stockpiled separately from material with TPH concentrations greater than the RL during the remedial action. Samples will be collected from the stockpiles in accordance with the sampling and analysis plan included in Appendix G. Results of the laboratory analytical testing will be used to determine the handling of the stockpiles. The material will be used as backfill on-site or designated for off-site disposal if the sample indicates concentrations greater than 3,400 ppm NWTPH-Dx. Soils containing concentrations less than 3,400 ppm NWTPH-Dx may be segregated into two piles: soil with concentrations less than 22 ppm NWTPH-Dx and soil with concentrations between 22 and 3,400 ppm NWTPH-Dx. Material with concentrations between 22 and 3,400 ppm NWTPH-Dx will not be placed in the watertable fluctuation zone. This material will not be placed as backfill under residences or the Levee but may be used on the Railyard, if appropriate.

A site layout plan showing areas available for soil stockpiling is included in the drawings. Some of the uncontaminated soil may be used to fill the flexible intermediate bulk containers (FIBCs) as part of the cofferdam. Appropriate erosion and sedimentation controls will be put in place to prevent run-on and run-off.

### 4.7.3 Transportation and Disposal of Contaminated Materials

Excavated contaminated materials (material with TPH concentrations exceeding the soil RL of 3,400 ppm NWTPH-Dx) from the excavation will be loaded into dump trucks and transported to a lined spoils staging area on the railyard. The dump trucks will be lined if necessary to prevent leaks and spills of any liquid, sediment or soil on the Town roadways. The spoils will be amended with fly ash or other stabilizing agent as required to pass the paint filter test prior to being loaded into rail shipping containers or into over-theroad trucks for shipment to a licensed disposal facility.

### 4.7.4 Confirmation Sampling and Testing

Once excavation has proceeded to the required depths using pre-excavation data and on-site inspections, the water in the excavation pits will be allowed to settle ("cleared") while any visible sheen and petroleum products will be removed via skimmer or pump to the NPDES-permitted treatment system. The approximate time for water to clear is expected to be within one hour depending on the size of the pit, and rate of water removal. The reason that water clearing is desired is that silt/clay particles in the water within the pit may be impacted. Extracting a sample from the bottom of the water column and bringing it up through the water column may result in contamination levels in the sample that are higher than the in-place soil due to the influence
of these fine particles that may remain in suspension. An additional consideration is that the surface water may have a constant sheen despite soil and sediment concentrations being below the applicable remediation and cleanup levels. Skimming and pumping operations will be used to address any sheen present.

Once "clearing" has occurred, a post-dredge sample will be collected from the pit (using the excavation equipment) and prepared for analysis. This may be performed at an on-site lab or prepared for expedited shipment for off-site analysis. Logistical considerations must be made for continued excavation of other areas between the time samples are taken and results are obtained. In the event that water in the pit doesn't clear in a reasonable amount of time due to silt or other suspended solids, the sampling plan will be modified. Refer to the SAP provided in Appendix $G$ for additional details of confirmation sampling and testing.

The south sidewall will not attain remediation levels during the levee replacement as the uplands cleanup in the Northwest Developed Zone will be completed as a separate phase of the cleanup.

### 4.7.5 Dewatering

The river stage at the time of construction will dictate the excavation and dewatering methods utilized. It is anticipated that excavation a few feet below the level of the river can be completed in a relatively dry state by pumping from sumps within the excavation. However, it is anticipated that the bulk of the deeper portions of the excavation will be performed in the wet. A nominal water treatment capacity of 500 gpm (maximum 1,000 gpm) will be available for the entire levee cleanup project as per the NPDES permit. Therefore, the contractor will need to select an excavation method and dewatering design and operation within the water treatment capacity constraints. Several intake locations will be provided. The following dewatering standards shall be adhered to:

- Establish a dewatering plan to describe the methods, equipment and operation to collect and store water from disturbed areas.
- Set up site controls to divert and collect water from disturbed areas to allow for remediation activities to be conducted.
- Excavation areas are not expected to be dewatered to maintain a relatively dry work area during the entire period that the excavation remains open. Excavations and backfilling below about 917 feet will likely be done in the wet depending on the river level.
- All dewatering equipment shall be provided and maintained by the Contractor to ensure sufficient capacity to meet the requirements for the removal of water in the disturbed areas.
- BNSF's Contractor shall grade the excavation area using slopes, berms and sumps in conjunction with dewatering systems to channel water away from the immediate work areas to minimize dewatering.
- BNSF's Contractor shall be responsible for preventing impacted water from leaving the site.
- BNSF's Contractor shall monitor the weather and site conditions 24 hours per day, seven days per week and perform dewatering as necessary to prevent impacted water runoff from the site.
- Liquids generated from dewatering processes will be collected.
- The water will be treated using the permitted water treatment system. After treatment to meet the required standards, the water will be returned to the river in accordance with an NPDES permit.
- An operations and maintenance plan will be developed in accordance with the NPDES permit guidelines in Section S4 that will outline around the clock operations, contingencies, and emergency procedures for the water treatment system.


### 4.8 Monitoring

### 4.8.1 Air Monitoring

An air monitoring program will be implemented during construction to ensure the air quality meets the criteria established in the site-specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) and air monitoring plan. The purpose of the air monitoring program will be to ensure protection of site workers and nearby residents from airborne particulates and petroleum vapors. The air monitoring plan will outline perimeter monitoring stations and site-specific action levels for airborne particulates and petroleum vapors.

### 4.8.2 Surface Water and Discharge Monitoring

The effluent from the construction water treatment system must be sampled and submitted for chemical analysis in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Surface water monitoring will be conducted in accordance with 401 Water Quality Conditions (see Section 2.3.1) issued via the Corps Nationwide permit and the Water Quality Significant Requirements under the MTCA Agreed Order for this work.

### 4.8.3 Cofferdam Monitoring

The cofferdams will be monitored during the remedial action to ensure that minimum leakage into or out of the active excavation area occurs. Should a breach of either cofferdam occur, work will immediately be stopped and measures will be taken to repair the dam. The on-call Spill Response contractor will be called in as needed to recover any substances that have accidentally been released.

### 4.8.4 Performance Monitoring

WAC 173-340-410 outlines monitoring for final cleanup actions. This work is an interim action for cleanup and will include protection and performance monitoring. Protection monitoring will be conducted to "confirm that human health and the environment are adequately protected during construction and operation and maintenance period" (WAC 173-340-410). Protection monitoring will consist of air monitoring for workers and neighboring residents. Performance Monitoring will be conducted to "confirm that the ... cleanup action has attained cleanup standards." Soil and sediment samples will be collected at the limits of the excavation to confirm that the applicable remediation and cleanup levels have been attained.

Since the levee cleanup action is a component of the Ecology's overall cleanup plans for the site, a compliance monitoring plan will be developed and implemented in conjunction with the overall site-wide CAP and CD. This compliance monitoring plan will include a long-term sediment and groundwater monitoring plan with contingencies.

### 4.9 Backfilling

Backfilling will take place after the limits of excavation have been reached and applicable cleanup and remediation levels have been attained. In the event that field conditions such as depth of contamination make it infeasible to attain remediation and cleanup levels, backfilling may proceed with Ecology approval. Imported backfill will be analyzed for indicator substances to demonstrate it contains no hazardous substances exceeding MTCA Method A or site-specific cleanup levels, whichever is more conservative. Recycled overburden will meet site-specific cleanup levels. The imported backfill material will be clean, free-draining sandy and/or gravelly soils. Samples of the proposed import backfill will be approved by the site construction engineer-in-charge prior to use. Sediment backfill will consist of material similar to that removed and of appropriate quality for salmon rearing.

Backfill material for the excavation areas will include stockpiled clean excavated soil or approved additional imported soil. Significant compaction of the backfill placed in standing water will not be feasible. Backfill placed in standing water will be free-draining, granular material that can be placed in a fairly compact state in standing water. Larger (4 to 8 inch) rock may be
mixed into the backfill that is placed in standing water that is below residential structures to make sure that the fill performs as desired with minimal settlement.

Backfill above the water table will be placed in maximum loose lifts of one foot and compacted to at least 90 percent maximum dry density as determined by ASTM D-1557 for the material placed in the river and in the levee foundation, and $95 \%$ of ASTM D-1557 for the levee itself for areas below residential structures, and within the upper two feet of fill below the planned roadway surface. There may be isolated areas where backfill has to be placed in the wet in standing water. This backfill shall be placed and compacted to the maximum extent practical. Compaction testing of this material will not be possible. The ground surface of the backfilled excavation areas will be graded to the final elevations indicated on the design drawings.

### 4.10 Replacement and Restoration

Regardless of the type of foundations (basements, concrete foundations, slab on grade, or post and pier foundations) currently existing beneath the five residences to be relocated, new concrete crawl space foundations will be designed and constructed for all of the buildings. Building codes will require this as a minimum due to seismic requirements. Town Ordinance 255 may require existing foundations to be raised for flood protection. BNSF is working with the Town to ensure that all work complies with Town codes and ordinances. Following construction of foundations, the buildings will be moved back to their original locations and placed on top of the new foundations. Utility infrastructure will be restored and utilities will be reconnected. Site features specific to each residence will be restored including but not limited to replacement of topsoil, porches, sidewalks, garages, sheds, patios, driveways and landscaping. Repairs will be made to damage resulting from moving of the buildings such as crack repair and repainting as needed based on documentation of the current condition of the buildings.

Roadways demolished as part of this interim action for cleanup will be replaced according to King County Road Standards (1993) and any damage to existing roadways and sidewalks will be repaired in kind. Utilities including power, telephone, and stormwater drainage along West River Road will be restored to initial or better conditions. Any hard surfaces that are damaged as part of this remediation effort will be replaced in-kind when excavation and backfill is completed. For instance, if an existing asphalt area is damaged during construction, it will be patched with asphalt.

### 4.11 Stormwater Sewer System

The Town's existing stormwater sewer system within the footprint of the excavation will be demolished during the implementation of the remedial
action. A replacement stormwater sewer system has been designed and is detailed in Figures C-22 and C-23. The calculations used in designing the stormwater sewer system are provided in Appendix H, Stormwater System Design.

## 5 Levee Construction Control

This section focuses on the construction phase of the project. The USACE will not require BNSF to prepare a Construction Quality Plan because the work being completed is a MTCA cleanup. The lines and grades of the levee will be controlled by progress surveys to be done by the contractor and periodically checked by RETEC or an independent surveyor under contract to RETEC.

Shoring will be controlled by the contractor, but copies of shop drawings and calculations will be submitted to RETEC for review. All other activities will be controlled as laid out in the plans, specifications, and EDR. RETEC will provide oversight to other BNSF contractors to document conformance with the plans, specifications, and the EDR.

### 5.1 Habitat Restoration

Restoration will occur in the disturbed area of the river as well as along the levee. River bottom substrate will be replaced in the disturbed area and matched to existing substrate types. Amenities will be added to the shoreline that will improve habitat quality for salmon. Improvements include placement of large woody debris (LWD) in the riverbank. The LWD will provide cover for juvenile salmonids and will create areas along the shoreline with slower flows. Boulders will be placed just upstream of the woody debris to protect recreational users of the river from floating into the debris.

Once the new levee is constructed, native vegetation will be replanted along the waterward face. The newly planted vegetation will provide cover and foraging opportunities for migrating juvenile salmonids along the toe of the new levee during high flows. A planting plan is included in the Biological Evaluation submitted to the USACE (Grette Associates, 2005) and in the drawings attached to this document. Vegetation is to be placed above the ordinary high water mark (OHWM). The OHWM is based on the annual, or 1 -year, flood level of 922.0 feet.

Landscape planting on the levee will enhance the environment and help preserve the natural resources. The landscaping must meet all federal, state and local laws and necessary permits must be obtained, if applicable. The design criteria for landscaping on the levee include:

1) Vegetation-Free Zone: The vegetation-free zone is an area provided for access to the levee for maintenance and flood-fighting (i.e. sandbag placement) activities. No vegetation will be planted in this zone.
2) Shrubbery: Shrubs tolerant of flooded conditions will be placed along the levee bench to the top of the levee slope. Clusters of
trees will be placed along the top of the levee slope in areas consistent with view corridors created as part of the design.
3) Topsoil: One foot of topsoil will be placed along the levee face to facilitate plant growth. In addition, a topsoil or topsoil/sand mix will be placed between boulders (upper four feet). Following topsoil placement, coir mesh (which will slowly decompose) will be placed along the levee to prevent erosion.

Safety and stability of the levee structure is the most important consideration of the design. Maintenance of the completed structure should be coordinated through local agencies during planning and design, and it must be determined if the responsible local agency has the capability to maintain the restored levee upon completion of the project. It is BNSF's understanding that King County will maintain the restored levee.

### 5.2 Levee Landscaping and River Access

Where possible, the Town recommendations for the levee design have been included in the EDR. In addition to specific recommendations included in Resolution No. 213, the Town has participated throughout the levee remediation design process and has participated on design decisions throughout the design process. The following amenities and enhancements have been included in the design at the Town's request:

- Direct water access at $5^{\text {th }}$ Street (optional).
- A trail along the length of the top of the levee (optional).
- Access to the levee trail at two points $\left(5^{\text {th }}\right.$ Street \& west of the school grounds) - access at the north end of $6^{\text {th }}$ is not possible while maintaining the King County standard width for West River Road ( 22 feet) and King County surface water management levee width requirements to allow for access by levee maintenance equipment (optional).
- A river outlook structure is provided at $6^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection (optional).
- West River Road will be widened to 22 feet per King County standards. A retaining wall will be used to accommodate the widening of the road.

Other recommendations that are considered optional during the subsequent design phases include a boat launch, professional landscaping, decorative patterns/colored concrete for retaining wall, colored railings, conduits/wires for future installation of electrical, phone and cable infrastructure, installation
of below ground power and telephone lines, and installation of a sprinkler system. With the exception of the sprinkler system these enhancements are considered "optional" because they are not required as part of the cleanup and/or levee reconstruction. It will be at BNSF's discretion whether or not to implement these portions of the Town's vision, or whether the Town will have to fund/complete this work themselves.

### 5.3 Community Concerns

It is BNSF's and Ecology's goal to implement this interim action for cleanup in a manner that addresses public concerns. Concerns identified in this section are in part based on previous experience implementing interim actions and investigation work at the site, and through working closely with Town representatives throughout the design process. The Public Participation Plan (to be revised spring 2006) for the project identifies other methods for obtaining public input, including meetings with the Skykomish Town Council, Skykomish School Board, and the Skykomish Environmental Coalition (SEC). Issues and/or concerns identified by these public involvement efforts are identified in this section. This draft EDR, along with a draft EIS is being provided for public review and comment to help explain the cleanup action and obtain further public input. Should any additional issues/comments/ concerns arise from the public review, they can be addressed in the final design documents.

The following is a summary of issues/concerns and how BNSF is responding to these concerns.

- Disruption to School. The levee remediation construction work will create noise and traffic disruption that can not be avoided to the Skykomish School due to its proximity to the levee. BNSF is working with the Skykomish School District to obtain access to a portion of their playground for use as a staging area. As part of these discussions, the school has generously offered to modify their 2006-2007 school calendar to accommodate the project. Construction work north of the levee (below the high water mark) can not begin until July 1, 2006 based on the "fish window." However, it is likely that equipment mobilization to the site and moving of residences will begin June 1, 2006, and construction work on and south of the levee will begin mid-June 2006, at the latest. Every effort will be made to coordinate the initiation of work in June 2006 with the end of the 2005-2006 school year. All work on and north of the levee must be completed by September 15,2006 unless the entire levee construction is postponed due to unusually high river levels. Equipment demobilization and the majority of the disruptive work should be completed prior to Monday, October 2, 2006. This might be an appropriate date for school to begin for the 2006-2007 school year, if the district is
flexible. Further, since the school yard will likely be needed as a staging area for subsequent remediation work in other parts of Town, it may not be worthwhile restoring the school yard during the fall of 2006. In this event, arrangements will be made to provide the school/students with transportation to an alternate play field (e.g., Skykomish ball field). In addition, a flagger or traffic control officer may be employed and strategically located throughout the duration of the project when school is in session.
- Disruption to Town. The levee remediation construction work will create noise and traffic disruption to the Town that can not be avoided. Also, a portion of Railroad Avenue adjacent to the railyard has been identified as a staging area for the project. A temporary road will be constructed west of the school to provide access for residents located at the west end of West River Road.
- Disruption to Residents. The levee remediation work will create noise and traffic disruption, as well as temporary power shut off, to residents located immediately south of the excavation area. Five residences/families along and near West River Road will be temporarily relocated. Access for emergency response vehicles (fire, ambulance) will be maintained at all times. A temporary road will be constructed west of the school to provide access for residents located at the west end of West River Road. It is anticipated that most construction work will occur during daylight hours, 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. It is also anticipated that the construction water treatment plant may operate 24 hours per day and that some construction activities may extend past daylight hours on occasion. It is currently anticipated that work will occur Monday through Saturday in order to complete work during the fish window.
- Disruption to Business. With previous projects, businesses have indicated concerns regarding disruption and aesthetics. In general, the contractor will be required to maintain a neat and orderly operation within the limits of their work areas. Signage related to the project will be that typical of a road construction project with traffic controls and authorized personnel access.
- Excavated Materials Handling. Excavated materials from the work zone, identified for off-site disposal, will be immediately moved to the railyard for temporary storage prior to rail or truck shipment to the disposal facility. A temporary spoils stockpile area will consist of a lined and bermed storage cell.
- Dust. Excavation work is anticipated to generate dust. Engineering controls, such as application of water, will be used to
minimize dust generation, and the Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan and air monitoring plan (to be prepared under separate cover) will specify air monitoring requirements and limits for nuisance dust. In the event specified limits for nuisance dust and volatile gases are exceeded, the health and safety officer on site will assess the concern and take appropriate action (the on-site health and safety officer will have authority to immediately stop work if necessary and notify Ecology thereafter). No health and safety concerns are anticipated to persons on adjacent properties.
- Restricted Access to Construction Zone. A project exclusion zone will be designated in the Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan. Unauthorized personnel and persons without adequate HAZWOPER training will not be allowed inside the exclusion zone. The exclusion zone will be marked using temporary fencing, caution tape or other appropriate means.
- Traffic. Temporary traffic plans for the West River Road corridor are provided in Figure C-11 for review by all affected agencies and persons including fire department, police department (county and state), residents and the school.
- Use of Local Businesses and Personnel. BNSF and its contractors will use local businesses to the extent practicable. BNSF will encourage use of local motels/hotels, restaurants and supply vendors by personnel involved with the project. The contractor will be encouraged to use local labor to the extent practicable.
- On-Site Personnel. In addition to contractor personnel, at least one RETEC or BNSF project supervisor representative will be on-site at all times that field work is in progress. This supervisor may be the site health and safety officer, and will restrict access to the active work zone by any unauthorized individuals including children. In addition, Ecology personnel or Ecology contractors will be present on site during all times work is in progress, along with public participation personnel (EnviroIssues and/or Ecology) to address public concerns and answer questions about the work.
- Glare. Although it is not anticipated that construction activities will occur outside of daylight hours, portable construction lighting may be necessary due to construction delays or timing constraints that make working during the evening hours necessary. Light and glare impacts caused by portable construction lighting would be directed away from homes and roads as much as possible and focused on the work areas. The lights would be shielded and turned off when not necessary.


### 5.4 Schedule

Construction below the OHWM and all work in the river will take place between July 1st and August $31^{\text {st }}$ to accommodate the fish window. Depending on the final decision by the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the fish window may be extended. This work is anticipated to be completed in 2006. However, if unusually high river levels preclude work in 2006, 2007 will be targeted for the work. The construction method for the levee remediation includes installing primary and secondary cofferdams, shoring, excavation, and backfill. The levee construction is anticipated to proceed in the following sequence:

## To Be Completed Prior to July 1

- Set up temporary facilities and site controls, including fencing, job trailers, staging areas, access roads and other requirements as specified
- Clear and dispose of the debris and vegetation (including brush and trees) on the existing levee
- Relocate utility lines along south side of levee
- Move affected buildings
- Begin removing the armor rock and embankment fill from existing levee down to ordinary high water mark and stockpile
- Fill FIBCs with "recyclable" levee material (or imported materials) for cofferdam construction
- Install the shoring on the south boundary of the excavation.


## To Be Completed Between July 1 and September 15

- Install two parallel cofferdams and tertiary containment (booms) along the north edge of the excavation prism.
- Excavate the levee and underlying contaminated material; the approximate excavation depths have been determined in accordance with the remediation levels described in Section 3 of this report and the results of the field test boring program (Appendix B). The lateral and vertical extent of the excavation prism may be modified at the time of the excavation based on monitoring data collected during the excavation.
- Transport contaminated rock/fill materials via railcar or truck to a Subtitle D landfill for disposal.
- Import material to replace the contaminated material.
- Reconfigure the levee to the lines and grades shown on the drawings and per the specifications, and install retaining wall.
- Install infrastructure requested by Town (under negotiations between BNSF and the Town).


## To Be Completed After Levee Replacement

- Install storm sewer
- Replacement and restoration of affected buildings and install individual replacement septic systems.
- Plant new vegetation on the face of the levee as specified in the design.
- Asphalt patching of damaged portions of W. River Road pending uplands cleanup
- Construction of paths, outlook (under negotiations between BNSF and the Town)
- Installation of lighting (may be necessary to postpone until after cleanup or NWDZ is complete)
- Landscaping of levee crest and town side of levee (under negotiations between BNSF and the Town)
- Demobilize equipment and personnel
- Utility installation.


## 6 Construction Quality Assurance

This section discusses construction quality assurance for the project, including the quality assurance structure, responsibilities and requirements. Quality assurance includes compliance with health and safety requirements and performance standards outlined herein and within the specifications

### 6.1 Quality Assurance Monitoring Structure

All aspects of construction will be performed under the oversight of a RETEC professional engineer registered in the State of Washington or a qualified field technician under the direct supervision of RETEC professional engineer registered in the State of Washington. A BNSF Engineer or qualified representative will be on-site throughout construction and will be responsible for ensuring compliance with the performance standards outlined in Section 5.2.2.

### 6.2 Construction Quality Requirements

### 6.2.1 Health and Safety

As outlined in Section 2.2.1, personnel involved in the construction of the project will be required to comply with the health and safety training requirements commensurate with the task(s) they are performing. BNSF Contractors and subcontractors who may come into contact with hazardous materials are required to use workers trained for hazardous waste work. The contractor personnel will also obtain BNSF Contractor Orientation training to work in the railyard. It is the remedial contractor's responsibility to meet all the requirements of WAC 296-155, Safety Standards for Construction, and the applicable provisions of the hazardous waste operations regulations, WAC 296-62, Part P and 29 CFR 1910.120. The Contractor shall also have a site health and safety (H\&S) officer who will ensure that all contractor personnel adhere to H\&S regulations. Prior to starting work, the BNSF Contractor shall submit an H\&S plan to the BNSF Engineer for review. The plan shall include written documentation of employee training and medical certifications as required under WAC 296-62, Part P. Documentation of the following items is required for each site worker where work falls under the requirements of WAC 296-62, Part P:

- Initial 40 -hour health and safety training and annual 8-hour refresher training
- Eight-hour supervisory training, required for the field supervisor
- Medical clearance from a licensed physician certifying that the worker is fit to participate in field activities and use personal protective equipment
- Current respirator fit test certification
- Current CPR and first aid certification for at least one member of each crew
- Provision of personal protective equipment for each worker at the highest level of protection for this site (Level D).


### 6.2.2 Performance Standards

Performance standards address environmental and public health issues, such as emission control and compliance with environmental regulations. Monitoring efforts of the Engineer will be conducted to demonstrate compliance with performance standards.

The following sections identify performance standards for activities at the site. Table 6-1 lists the construction performance standards and the contractor quality assurance testing requirements.

Table 6-1 Construction Performance Standards

| Standard | Parameter | Level of Performance | Testing Method or Specification | Frequency of Testing | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preconstruction Testing |  |  |  |  |  |
| Backfill | Gradation | Granular material with less than 15\% non-plastic fines (passing the \#200 sieve) will be used above standing water. Granular material with less than $10 \%$ fines will be used below standing water. | ASTM D4318 <br> ASTM D422 | For each source | Backfill not exceeding MTCA Method A CULs. |
| Construction Testing |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grading | Grade | Within 1.5 inches | Field Surveying | Continuous |  |
| Emission Controls | Dust | $\begin{aligned} & <5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3} \\ & \text { OSHA PEL } \end{aligned}$ | MiniRam and Site Perimeter Monitoring | Continuous | Contractor shall provide dust suppression measures |
| Surface Water Quality | Turbidity Oil | No excessive turbidity <br> No sheen outside of containment area | Turbidity Monitoring <br> Visual | Continuous | Implement Permits |
|  |  | Material below the base of the levee and above standing water shall be compacted to at least 90\% ASTM D-1557 density. Material in the levee itself shall be compacted to at least 95\% ASTM D-1557. | ASTM D1557 ASTM D2922 | One test event per 750 CY of fill placed. |  |
| Backfill Compaction | Density | Material outside of the levee and above standing water will be compacted to 90\% ASTM-D-1557, except below residential structures and within 2 feet of the roadway surface where fill will be compacted to 95\% ASTM D-1557. <br> Backfill placed below standing water will be placed as compact as practical, but no testing can be completed. | ASTM D1557 ASTM D2922 | One test event per 750 CY of fill placed. |  |
| Retaining Wall Elements | TBD | To be determined upon final determination of retaining wall type. |  |  |  |

## Backfill

Chemical testing and gradation of backfill will be required for each source. Analytical testing will be performed for selected analytes to ensure that backfill does not exceed MTCA Method A or site-specific cleanup level concentrations. Gradation testing will ensure that the import material is free of deleterious material and is non-plastic. Testing will comply with ASTM D4318 and ASTM D422.

## Emission Controls

Excavation, grading, and capping activities will be carried out in a manner that controls emissions of odors and dust (fugitive emissions). Dust and vapor monitoring will be carried out according to an Ecology approved monitoring plan (to be submitted under a separate cover). This plan will detail the location of perimeter monitoring stations for dust and organic vapors and present action levels that will protect workers and residents surrounding the site. The Contractor will provide measures to suppress fugitive dust generated during site grading that the BNSF deems excessive based on visual and other monitoring criteria.

## Excavation and Shoring Monitoring

An excavation and shoring monitoring plan will be developed and implemented jointly by RETEC and the contractor chosen to perform the work, and will be subject to Ecology review. The plan will address monitoring activities that will be necessary to demonstrate that the excavation slopes and shoring are performing as designed, and mitigation plans that will be required if performance is not as anticipated. This plan is being developed after the contractor is chosen for the work since the contractor will design the shoring and it may differ from the shoring envisioned at this time.

### 6.2.3 Record Keeping and Reporting

Records will be maintained by onsite RETEC/BNSF representatives to document the work performed. These records include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Daily Activity Log. A daily activity $\log$ will be completed to describe general site activity and personnel working on-site. The records may be used to substantiate invoices as related to measurement and payment of site work. Health and Safety levels will also be noted in the daily logs as well as field H\&S monitoring.
- Material Testing Results. All material testing results will be maintained. Material testing logs will, at a minimum, include the
date and time of testing, testing site and location, identification of tester and company, test results, and any relevant comments.
- Completion Report. Upon completion of remedial activities, the Engineer will submit a draft completion report as required in WAC 173-340-400(b)(ii) by March 30, 2007 for work completed prior to December 31, 2006 and another draft report by July 31, 2007 for work completed between January 1, 2007 and June 30, 2007. The reports will include as-built drawings, work accomplished, materials used, inspections and tests conducted, results of inspections and tests, nature of defects found (if any), and corrective actions taken.
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## 1 Introduction

A supplemental soil and sediment investigation was completed in two phases, during September ${ }^{1}$ and December ${ }^{2}$ 2005, to characterize the extent of petroleum hydrocarbon contamination in the bed of the South Fork Skykomish River and the levee along West River Drive to the west of Fifth Street. This Skykomish River and Levee Supplemental Site Investigation (SSI) Report describes the overall scope and objectives for the investigation, and presents the results. This investigation provided data for developing an Engineering Design Report (EDR) for levee remediation.

### 1.1 Background

The former railway maintenance and fueling facility in Skykomish is owned and operated by BNSF. Historical activities since the facility opened in the late 1890s included refueling and maintaining locomotives and operating an electrical substation for electric engines. These activities released contaminants to the surrounding environment. BNSF is investigating and remediating the site consistent with the Model Toxics Control Act, RCW 70.105 D (MTCA).

Fuel was stored in above and below ground storage tanks at the site until 1974, when most fuel handling activities were discontinued at the Skykomish facility. The site is currently used as a base of operations for track maintenance and snow removal crews.

Railroad Avenue separates BNSF property from the main commercial district of the town. Maloney Creek flows south of BNSF property and west to the South Fork of the Skykomish River. The site encompasses an area of about 40 acres and includes BNSF property and adjacent property. The approximate boundaries of the site are as follows: the Skykomish River to the north, approximately the Old Cascade Highway to the south, Maloney Creek to the west, and approximately Fourth Street to the east.

In early 1991, Ecology designated the former maintenance and fueling facility a high priority cleanup site. Later that year, BNSF indicated a desire to initiate a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) in accordance with MTCA. At that time, formal negotiations for a legal agreement (called an Agreed Order) were initiated. Negotiations were completed in mid-1993. Following a public comment period, the Agreed Order, which includes detailed work plans for the RI/FS process and early interim cleanup work, was signed by Ecology and BNSF. BNSF and Ecology signed a second Agreed

[^0]Order in 2001 for additional interim cleanup work near the Skykomish River and the levee west of Fifth Street.

Investigations performed by BNSF in cooperation with Ecology since 1993 have revealed petroleum contamination in soil, groundwater, sediments and surface water. Detailed information about the scope of prior investigations and the results appear in the 1996 Remedial Investigation Report, in the 2002 Supplemental RI Report, and in the Final Feasibility Study that was submitted in March 2005.

In 2001, BNSF installed a subsurface barrier wall along West River Drive, west of Fifth Street pursuant to Agreed Order No. DE 01TCPNR-2800. The wall was installed to reduce the quantity of total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) in the form of mobile free product that seeps into the Skykomish River. Recovery wells were also installed on the upgradient side of the wall and have been recovering oil since installation. Oil seeps have continued since the wall was constructed, and are thought to be from free product contained within the levee behind the barrier wall. The oil seeps occur in the riverbank and are located downgradient from the upland plume. The oil seeps in the river have been restricted to the riverbank and bed within approximately five feet of the riverbank.

Surface sediment samples have been collected from the bank and bed of the South Fork of the Skykomish River; however no deeper samples have been collected. In addition, only two soil samples have been collected from the levee. These samples were collected by Ecology in November 2004.

### 1.2 Purpose and Objectives

This investigation was intended to provide more precise data regarding the nature and extent of TPH contamination in the levee and within the bed of the Skykomish River for defining the excavation prism for remediation of the levee and adjacent areas. Remedial action in the river and levee areas of the site, if approved by federal permitting agencies, will likely consist of extensive excavation. The data obtained from this investigation will be used to help define the vertical and lateral extent of TPH contamination and therefore the extent of excavation required to meet applicable remediation or cleanup levels.

Boreholes were also advanced around the Skykomish School at Ecology's request. These boreholes were intended to more closely define the western boundary of the free product around the school. The results of this additional sampling will be used in developing a clean up action plan for the Site.

### 1.3 SSI Report Organization

This report presents the results of an investigation of the nature and extent of TPH contamination in the levee west of the Fifth Street bridge and in the sediments of the Skykomish River, adjacent to the levee. Section 1 describes the background and the purpose and objectives of the investigation. Section 2 discusses the scope of sampling. Section 3 details of the methods used to complete the investigation. Section 4 discusses the subsurface conditions of the areas investigated. Section 5 discusses the analytical results of the investigation. Section 6 discusses the extent of TPH contamination in the levee, the Skykomish River and the western plume boundary near the school. Section 7 presents conclusions and recommendations. Section 8 provides the references cited in the report.

## 2 Sampling Activities

Subsurface soil and sediment samples were collected for analysis from boreholes advanced through the levee, into the bed of the South Fork Skykomish River, and in areas around the Skykomish School. This section provides the scope of sampling, the rationale behind the borehole locations and the depth of the boreholes and samples.

### 2.1 Levee Sampling

The investigation of TPH extent in, and under, the levee was conducted in two phases. Phase I was conducted in September 2005 and Phase II was conducted during December 2005. Table 2-1 presents the borehole names, depths, dates of installation and investigation phase.

### 2.1.1 Phase I Investigation - September 2005

Soil samples were collected from ten locations along the crest of the levee between September 9 and September 14, 2005 (Figure 2-1). These samples were located downgradient of the known product plumes that are delineated upgradient of the barrier wall and upgradient from the riverbank seeps, within areas on the margins of the plumes, and in areas believed to be outside the plumes.

In boreholes in which contamination was evident from visual observations or odor, the boreholes were advanced to the apparent base of the contamination to determine the vertical extent of TPH contamination. Several samples were taken from each borehole and field analyzed using PetroFLAG field-screening test kits to estimate TPH. In general, once the field analysis estimated the depth at which the PetroFLAG test indicated that TPH was at approximately one half of the sediment remediation level, a sample was collected for laboratory verification using NWTPH-Dx analysis to determine depth of TPH exceeding remediation goals. In order to gather additional TPH data, some additional analytical testing was performed from some of the boreholes.

Boreholes in which no contamination was apparent from visual observations or odor were also advanced to approximately the same distance as adjacent borings. Soil samples were collected for analysis from the interval exhibiting the highest PetroFLAG TPH detections.

### 2.1.2 Phase II - December 2005

An additional seven boreholes were advanced between December 19 and December 22, 2005; four of these boreholes were co-located with Phase I boreholes, while the remaining three boreholes were advanced between previously advanced boreholes.

This second phase of investigation was conducted to supplement the existing dataset obtained from Phase I of the Investigation and provide additional design data for the EDR. The PetroFLAG data and the analytical results (NWTPH-Dx) obtained during Phase I showed a weak correlation with each other and the existing dataset did not provide adequate certainty regarding the total depth of contamination above remediation levels.

During Phase II, soil samples were collected from 2.5 to 5 -foot intervals from near the top of the smear zone, to the base of the contamination (or to the depth at which NWTPH-Dx analyses performed under Phase I of the investigation indicate that the TPH contamination is less than the direct contact remediation level $(3,400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg})$. Soil samples were not fieldscreened using PetroFLAG during Phase II.

### 2.2 South Fork Skykomish River

Sediment samples were collected from 20 boreholes (Figure 2-1) advanced in the bed of the South Fork Skykomish River on September 13 and 14, 2005. These boreholes were located in areas that are submerged during some of the year but were outside the river channel at the time of drilling.

The timing of the investigation was constrained by the regulatory fish window, which permitted activities in the river through September 15, 2005. The river level typically drops to the seasonal low after the fish window ends, and therefore, the drilling and sampling was scheduled for the end of the fish window. However, due to recent precipitation immediately prior to and during the investigation, the extent of available sample locations along the river was limited due to a small rise in the river level. Twenty boreholes were advanced within 50 feet from the toe of the levee; these were located as close as possible to the toe of the levee ${ }^{3}$.

Field observations, including visual observations and/or hydrocarbon odor, and PetroFLAG field screening test kits were used to estimate the degree of contamination within the borehole samples. Generally boreholes were profiled by recording observations of visual contamination and any hydrocarbon odor, by collecting soil samples throughout the boring, and by estimating the TPH concentrations in those samples using PetroFLAG field screening test kits. Approximately one verification sample was collected and submitted to Test America (formerly, North Creek Analytical Laboratories, Inc.) for NWTPH-Dx analysis; this sample was typically collected from the depth with the highest apparently concentration of TPH.

If no contamination was apparent from visual or olfactory observations, the boring was field screened for TPH using PetroFLAG test kits. One soil

[^1]sample was typically collected for analysis from the estimated smear zone interval.

Three in-river borings were selected for additional data collection. Samples were collected from near the center of the potential excavation prism, and from the east and west ends of the prism. These data were collected for input in site-specific calculations regarding the migration of contaminated materials and the scouring of cap materials should the need arise to cap any of the sediments either in the river or under the new levee. In the 3 borings sediment samples were collected for analysis of NWTPH-Dx, total organic carbon (TOC), specific gravity and dry weight (or percent solids). The overall boring depth was determined by estimating the elevation in which contamination appeared in the adjacent borings in the levee.

### 2.3 Skykomish School

Soil samples were collected from three designated boreholes and two contingency boreholes advanced around the school (Figure 2-1). These boreholes are identified in Table 2-1.

Boreholes located within these plume areas were advanced to the apparent base of the contamination to determine the vertical extent of TPH contamination. Several samples were taken from each borehole and PetroFLAG field-screening test kits were used to estimate TPH. Once the field analysis estimated the depth at which the TPH was at approximately one half of the sediment remediation level, a sample was collected for laboratory verification. In order to determine additional depth information, field analysis was generally conducted from at least two additional depths per borehole.

Soil samples were also collected from the surface soils near the school for lead analysis.

## 3 Methodology

This section provides the methodology used to advance the boreholes and collect the subsurface soil and sediment samples.

### 3.1 Drilling Sampling

Soil and sediment samples were collected for description and analysis from boreholes advanced using a minisonic drill rig. Sonic drilling was identified as the most suitable drilling technology for the investigation based on the past success with sonic drilling at the site, the ability of the method to provide highly representative continuous core samples, and because the method enables drilling without introducing drilling fluids. The track-mounted minisonic rig was the most suitable sonic rig for the investigation because of the portability of the rig and its ability to reach difficult to access locations while causing minimal disturbance to the natural surroundings.

The minisonic rig was used to collect continuous soil or sediment samples from each borehole. All drilling equipment was decontaminated between impacted boreholes. The borehole samples were logged and described by a RETEC field geologist, and samples were collected for analysis from select intervals, as described in Section 2. Copies of the boring logs are presented in Appendix A. All drilling locations were exposed (i.e. below OHWM but above the river level) and access to those locations was over dry land and dry riverbed.

Upon completion of Phase I boring activities, a registered land surveyor calculated the coordinates and elevation of the borings in relation to a USGS benchmark. A copy of the survey results are presented in Appendix B. The Phase II boreholes have not been surveyed yet because additional investigation activities are scheduled for January 2006; the Phase II boreholes will be surveyed upon completion of this work.

### 3.2 PetroFLAG Analysis

The PetroFLAG field portable test method was used for determining TPH concentrations in soil at the site during Phase I of the investigation. This test method was proposed for use at the Site by Ecology because it can determine hydrocarbon contamination levels in real time to help facilitate on site decisions.

The test was performed in three steps: extraction, filtration, and analysis. In the first step a solvent system was used to extract hydrocarbons from the recovered subsurface material. Moisture content had no effect on extraction efficiency. The second step involves filtering out all suspended materials from the extract so that they don't interfere with the test results. Finally, a developing solution was added and the solution extract developed a response
in proportion to the amount of hydrocarbons contained in the soil sample. Within ten minutes the developing solution equilibrated and a reading was obtained using the analyzer. If the type of hydrocarbon is known, then the specific response factor could be selected from the on-board menu to calibrate for the analyte; the response factor selected for PetroFLAG analysis was for diesel range hydrocarbons.

If the reading was above the range detectible by the analyzer then the amount of sample collected was reduced for a diluted reading. Dilution multiplication factors of 2 and 10 times were used at the site. If the sample reading continued to be above the detectible range after 10 times dilution the sample was assumed to have a concentration of greater than $100,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$. When PetroFLAG analysis was complete, the date, time, dilution factor and results were recorded on a field sheet. A copy of the field sheets are presented in Appendix C.

### 3.3 Laboratory Analysis

The selected verification soil samples collected during drilling activities were logged onto an chain-of-custody form and delivered by RETEC field personnel to Test America (Formerly, North Creek Analytical Laboratories, Inc. (NCA)) for NWTPH-Dx analysis ${ }^{4}$. Select samples were also submitted for analysis of lead and total organic carbon (TOC). A copy of the laboratory analytical results is presented in Appendix D.

In addition, samples of contaminated sediment were collected and retained for use, by prospective vendors, for treatability testing in support of the water treatment processes that may be employed during the remediation activities during summer 2006. These samples have been archived for future use, as necessary.

### 3.4 Investigation Derived Waste

One of the benefits of sonic drilling is that little waste was generated. All drill cuttings, decontamination water and other investigation-derived waste were drummed and labeled. The drums were transported to a staging area on the railyard, and the drums will remain at the staging area pending disposal.
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## 4 Subsurface Conditions

Subsurface conditions were further defined in the levee and river during the SSI. This information was used to construct east-west cross sections along the levee and adjacent to the levee, under the Skykomish River channel. The locations of the cross sections are presented in Figure 4-1.

### 4.1 Levee Subsurface

The upper layer of sediment of the levee subsurface consists of well-graded coarse gravel to cobble sized fill material. This layer varies in depth from approximately 10 to 25 feet bgs. Sample recovery was generally poor in this unit. Underneath this layer discontinuous lenses of silt and clay exist within sand and gravel.

A layer of silt was present within the sand and gravel; however, it did not appear to extend continuously throughout the levee. This layer of silt varies in thickness from 1 to 10 feet and is present from approximately 15 to 35 feet below ground surface.

During the Phase I investigation, groundwater was encountered in the boreholes at depths ranging from 17 feet (LEV-1) to 33 feet (LEV-5). This wide range is due to the variations in surface elevation and lithologic heterogeneities. A cross section of the levee is presented on Figure 4-2.

### 4.2 River Subsurface

Surficial observations of the South Fork Skykomish River indicated the riverbed surface was armored by cobbles and large boulders. Below the armor, the subsurface sediment is mostly well-graded gravel. A discontinuous silt or clay-rich layer is present at an elevation that varies from 900 to 910 feet msl; this layer varies in thickness to greater than 5 feet. Thin clay, silt and sand discontinuous interbeds are also present within the predominant gravel above and below the silt zone. A cross section of the river is presented on Figure 4-3.

### 4.3 School Subsurface

The observations of the subsurface near the school were consistent with previous investigations at the site. The soils consisted mainly of sand and gravel, and underneath a generally thin layer of topsoil. There were also discontinuous lenses of silt and clay within the sand and gravel. Little variance occurred in depth to groundwater in this area of the investigation. Depths to groundwater ranged from 8-10 feet below ground surface.

## 5 Soil Analytical Results

Soil samples were collected and analyzed using PetroFLAG and Laboratory analysis during the field investigation. PetroFLAG and Laboratory analytical results are presented in this section. Laboratory analytical data has not yet been validated.

### 5.1 Levee Analytical Results

### 5.1.1 PetroFLAG Results

Fifty-five soil samples were collected for PetroFLAG analysis in the nine borings advanced in the levee. The results of the field screening analysis are summarized in Table 5-1 and plotted on Figure 5-1.

Hydrocarbons were detected in fifty of the fifty-five samples. The reported detected concentrations ranged from $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ to greater than $100,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$.

### 5.1.2 Laboratory Analytical Results

Ten soil samples were collected for laboratory analysis of TPH by NWTPHDx during Phase I of the Investigation and 73 samples were collected during Phase II. The Phase I and II analytical results are summarized in Table 5-2 and 5-3, respectively, and plotted on Figure 5-1. TPH concentrations ranged from concentrations below the method reporting limit (MRL) to 33,500 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$. The remediation level for TPH was exceeded in eleven soil samples collected from elevations between 916.5 and 907 feet below mean sea level (ft-msl).

### 5.2 River Sediment Analytical Results

### 5.2.1 PetroFLAG Results

Sixty-five sediment samples were collected for PetroFLAG analysis in the twenty borings advanced in bank of the river. The results of the field screening analysis are summarized in Table 5-1 and plotted on Figure 5-2.

### 5.2.2 Laboratory Analytical Results

Twenty-five sediment samples were collected for laboratory analysis of TPH by NWTPH-Dx. The results of samples collected for laboratory analysis are summarized in Table 5-2 and plotted on Figure 5-2.

TPH concentrations ranged from concentrations below the MRL to 576 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$. The remediation level for TPH was not exceeded in any sample; the cleanup level ( $22 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) was exceeded in six samples.

Six sediment samples were collected for Total Organic Carbon (TOC) analysis. The results of samples collected for laboratory analysis are summarized in Table 5-2. TOC ranged from $1,560 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ to $5,930 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$.

### 5.3 School Soil Analytical Results

### 5.3.1 PetroFLAG Results

Thirty-one soil samples were collected for PetroFLAG analysis in the five borings advanced around the Skykomish school. The results of the field screening analysis are summarized in Table 5-1.

### 5.3.2 Laboratory Analytical Results

Seven soil samples were collected for laboratory analysis of TPH by NWTPH-Dx. The results of samples collected for laboratory analysis are summarized in Table 5-2.

TPH concentrations ranged from 22.9 to $3,800 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$. The remediation level for TPH was exceeded one sample that was collected from 15 to 20 feet bgs from 5-B-8.

Two soil samples were collected, from 5-B-11, for laboratory analysis of lead by EPA 6000/7000 series methods. The results of samples collected for laboratory analysis are summarized in Table 5-2. Lead was detected below cleanup level ( $250 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) in the two samples. Lead was detected at 103 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ in the soil sample collected from 0 to 1 feet bgs and at $41.9 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ in the sample collected from 2 to 4 feet bgs.

### 5.4 Correlation of PetroFLAG and NWTPH-Dx

In general, PetroFLAG results were significantly higher (in some instances over an order of magnitude) than the corresponding laboratory analyzed sample. A statistical analysis was performed to determine if the PetroFLAG data correlated with the laboratory confirmation samples. The results of the analysis are presented in Figure 5-3.

The best correlation was obtained with a power series, using the following equation:
$y=4.3399 x^{0.9346}$
The correlation ( $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ ) using this power series was 0.6783 . This indicates a weak correlation between the PetroFLAG field screening data and the laboratory confirmation samples.

The reason for the poor correlation is unclear. One explanation for the higher detections of TPH in the PetroFLAG analysis is the presence of naturally
occurring hydrocarbons in soil which can cause high readings with PetroFLAG. Whatever the reasons, any conclusions drawn from PetroFLAG data will be highly speculative, and for this reason, use of the PetroFLAG data in defining the extent of TPH contamination has been minimal.


## 6 Extent of Contamination

The data obtained from this investigation has been used to define the vertical and lateral extent of TPH contamination beneath the levee and the Skykomish River, and provide data for the Levee Remediation EDR.

The subsurface sediment samples from around the Skykomish School were collected to more closely define the western boundary of the free product around the school.

### 6.1 Vertical and Lateral Extent of TPH in the Skykomish Levee

The extent of TPH in the Skykomish Levee has been defined largely based on laboratory analyses using NWTPH-Dx. As described in Section 5.4, the PetroFLAG data have a weak correlation with NWTPH-Dx and as such cannot be used with confidence. Physical observations of the soil samples collected during drilling also provide useful qualitative information regarding the extent of contamination, however the quantitative results obtained from NWTPH-Dx data are the highest quality data and are accordingly given the most weight.

The data indicate that the NWTPH-Dx concentrations appear to be below the direct contact remediation level below $905 \mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{msl}$, and throughout much of the length of the levee, the impacts are restricted to higher elevations. Also, there is an area of the levee that does not appear to be contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons at concentrations above the remediation level; this area includes boreholes LEV-6A and LEV-7.

The depth of excavation within the levee has been defined, for design purposes, based on the NWTPH-Dx data obtained from this investigation. Further details are provided in the EDR for Levee Remediation.

### 6.2 Vertical and Lateral Extent of TPH in the Skykomish River

The extent of TPH along the bank of the Skykomish River has been defined based on visual observations and NWTPH-Dx analyses. As described in Section 5.4, the PetroFLAG data have a weak correlation with NWTPH-Dx and as such cannot be used with confidence. Physical observations of the soil samples collected during drilling also provide useful qualitative information regarding the extent of contamination, however the quantitative results obtained from NWTPH-Dx data are the highest quality data and are accordingly given the most importance.

The investigation data indicates that TPH contamination appears to be restricted to the riverbed within 10 feet of the toe of the levee as shown by LEV-10 and LEV-3, and a limited area on the west end of the levee, as defined by RIV-2 and RIV-3. NAPL was observed in the upper four inches in LEV-2, LEV-3 and LEV-10 and elevated TPH concentrations were detected in some deeper sediment samples from these boreholes.


## 7 Conclusions and Recommendations

The data obtained during this investigation have been used to define the vertical and lateral extent of TPH contamination beneath the levee, the Skykomish River, and to provide additional definition of contamination around the margin of the Skykomish School.

The levee investigation was performed in two phases because the initial phase of the investigation, conducted during September 2005, yielded ambiguous data, primarily due to a weak correlation between the majority of the TPH data that was provided by a field screening test (PetroFLAG) and NWTPH-Dx samples. The data from the two phases were combined to provide a more complete understanding of the vertical and lateral extent of TPH underlying the levee. The data show that TPH concentrations in excess of the remediation level may extend to a minimum elevation of $905 \mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{msl}$ under the western half of the levee, and that this contamination is separated from contamination under the eastern quarter of the levee by a relatively clean zone that corresponds to the un-impacted upland area that is immediately upgradient from the levee. TPH contamination above the remediation level in the eastern quarter of the levee appears to extend to a minimum elevation of approximately 910 to $915 \mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{msl}$.

The analysis of data collected from the riverbed concluded that NAPL was present in the upper four inches of sediment in RIV-2, RIV-3 and RIV-10; however testing did not measure TPH at a concentration exceeding the RL in any sediment samples. Generally, TPH concentrations in the riverbed are less than the cleanup levels, and there are no signs of contamination. However, TPH impacts at concentrations above the CUL are suspected in some discrete areas of the riverbed. These areas include the following: (1) an area just west of the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street bridge encompassing RIV-2 and RIV-3. This area contains TPH impacts (above the CUL) to an elevation of approximately $907 \mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{msl}$; (2) the area around RIV-10, this borehole also showed TPH impacts above the CUL to an approximate elevation of $907 \mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{msl}$.

Finally, a borehole advanced beneath the bridge (RIV-20) contained TPH at a concentration ( $43 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) greater than the soil CUL in the top one foot of sediment. The source of this TPH is unknown, since sediment in this area may be impacted by stormwater runoff from a nearby culvert that drains portions of the Town of Skykomish and discharges into the river near the bridge. This borehole location is outside the currently-proposed remediation area.
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## Tables

## Table 2-1 Borehole Details

| Borehole ID | Investigation Area | Total Depth (ft) | Installation Date | Investigation Phase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEV-1 | Levee | 20 | 9/9/2005 | Phase I |
| LEV-2 | Levee | 20 | 9/9/2005 | Phase I |
| LEV-3 | Levee | 35 | 9/9/2005 | Phase I |
| LEV-4 | Levee | 50 | 9/12/2005 | Phase I |
| LEV-5 | Levee | 60 | 9/11/2005 | Phase I |
| LEV-5B | Levee | 55 | 9/16/2005 | Phase I |
| LEV-6 | Levee | 50 | 9/14/2005 | Phase I |
| LEV-7 | Levee | 50 | 9/15/2005 | Phase I |
| LEV-8 | Levee | 52 | 9/15/2005 | Phase I |
| LEV-9 | Levee | 50 | 9/15/2005 | Phase I |
| LEV-2A | Levee | 40 | 12/22/2005 | Phase II |
| LEV-4A | Levee | 35 | 12/22/2005 | Phase II |
| LEV-5C | Levee | 35 | 12/21/2005 | Phase II |
| LEV-6A | Levee | 45 | 12/21/2005 | Phase II |
| LEV-7A | Levee | 35 | 12/20/2005 | Phase II |
| LEV-8A | Levee | 35 | 12/19/2005 | Phase II |
| LEV-8B | Levee | 35 | 12/20/2005 | Phase II |
| 5-B-7 | School | 35 | 9/10/2005 | Phase I |
| 5-B-8 | School | 35 | 9/10/2005 | Phase I |
| 5-B-9 | School | 30 | 9/10/2005 | Phase I |
| 5-B-11 | School | 30 | 9/11/2005 | Phase I |
| 5-B-12 | School | 35 | 9/11/2005 | Phase I |
| RIV-1 | River | 10 | 9/12/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-2 | River | 10 | 9/12/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-3 | River | 12 | 9/12/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-4 | River | 23 | 9/12/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-5 | River | 15 | 9/13/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-6 | River | 15 | 9/13/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-7 | River | 15 | 9/13/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-8 | River | 15 | 9/13/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-9 | River | 15 | 9/13/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-10 | River | 25 | 9/13/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-11 | River | 15 | 9/13/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-12 | River | 25 | 9/13/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-13 | River | 15 | 9/13/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-14 | River | 15 | 9/14/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-15 | River | 15 | 9/14/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-16 | River | 15 | 9/14/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-17 | River | 15 | 9/14/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-18 | River | 15 | 9/14/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-19 | River | 15 | 9/14/05 | Phase I |
| RIV-20 | River | 15 | 9/14/05 | Phase I |

Table 5-1 Summary of PetroFLAG Field Screening Results

| Sample Location | ```PetroFLAG Result (mg/Kg)``` | Sample Location | $\begin{gathered} \text { PetroFLAG } \\ \text { Result } \\ \text { (mg/Kg) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Sample Location | ```PetroFLAG Result (mg/Kg)``` | Sample Location | $\begin{gathered} \text { PetroFLAG } \\ \text { Result } \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Sample Location | $\begin{gathered} \text { PetroFLAG } \\ \text { Result } \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-B-7-6-7' | > 100,000 | LEV-3-15.5-19.5' | 10,310 | LEV-7-38' | 50 | RIV-6-0-3' | 32 | RIV-16-1' | 50 |
| 5-B-7-10-13' | 10,280 | LEV-3-21-25' | 110 | LEV-7-45' | 48 | RIV-6-3-5' | 21 | RIV-16-9' | 30 |
| 5-B-7-15-20' | 578 | LEV-4-15' | > 100,000 | LEV-7-47' | 29 | RIV-7-0-5' | 155 | RIV-16-15' | 12 |
| 5-B-7-20-25' | 1898 | LEV-4-25-30' | 11,000 | LEV-7-50' | 16 | RIV-7-5-10' | 10 | RIV-17-1' | 7 |
| 5-B-7-25-28' | 342 | LEV-4-30-35' | 7,640 | LEV-8-10 | 21,320 | RIV-7-10-13' | 72 | RIV-17-7' | 26 |
| 5-B-7-28-30' | 38 | LEV-4-35-39' | 1,650 | LEV-8-12 | 47 | RIV-7-13-15' | 48 | RIV-17-15' | 5 |
| 5-B-8-8' | 7,550 | LEV-4-39-40' | 0 | LEV-8-16 | > 100,000 | RIV-8-0-2' | 31 | RIV-18-1' | 13 |
| 5-B-8-12' | 9,720 | LEV-4-40-45' | 3 | LEV-8-25 | 14,450 | RIV-8-4-6' | 12 | RIV-18-10' | 9 |
| 5-B-8-15-20' | 7,600 | LEV-4-45-50' | 8 | LEV-8-35 | 3,160 | RIV-8-15' | 95 | RIV-18-15' | 61 |
| 5-B-8-20-25' | 990 | LEV-5 - 29-30' | 7,010 | LEV-8-43 | 77 | RIV-9-0-5' | 0 | RIV-19-1' | 27 |
| 5-B-8-29-30' | 27 | LEV-5-32-35' | 119 | LEV-8-50' | 80 | RIV-9 - 5-10' | 38 | RIV-19-11' | 66 |
| 5-B-9-7' | 2,751 | LEV-5-35-40' | 3,270 | LEV-9-14' | 26 | RIV-9-12-15' | 18 | RIV-19-15' | 35 |
| 5-B-9-12' | 1,130 | LEV-5-42' | 212 | LEV-9-23' | 1,168 | RIV-10-10-12' | 17 | RIV-20-1' | 79 |
| 5-B-9-17' | 4,770 | LEV-5-45' | 409 | LEV-9-25' | 61 | RIV-10-12-14' | 35 | RIV-20-8' | 5 |
| 5-B-9-22' | 1,186 | LEV-5-50-55' | 130 | LEV-9-33' | 269 | RIV-10-15-20' | 17 | RIV-20-15' | 0 |
| 5-B-9-26' | 564 | LEV-5 - 55-60' | 126 | LEV-9 - 41' | 342 | RIV-10-20-21' | 33 |  |  |
| 5-B-9-29' | 53 | LEV-5B - 15' | > 100,000 | LEV-9-46' | 465 | RIV-10-21-25' | 16 |  |  |
| 5-B-11-5-10' | 49 | LEV-5B - 20' | > 100,000 | LEV-9-50' | 24 | RIV-11-5-10' | 3 |  |  |
| 5-B-11-10-15' | 85 | LEV-5B-25' | 3,050 | RIV-2-0-1' | 5,700 | RIV-11-10-13' | 75 |  |  |
| 5-B-11-15-20' | 269 | LEV-5B-30' | 150 | RIV-2-10' | 18 | RIV-11-13-15' | 29 |  |  |
| 5-B-11-20-25' | 57 | LEV-5B - 33' | 0 | RIV-3-0-5' | 1,750 | RIV-12-5' | 10 |  |  |
| 5-B-11-25-27' | 0 | LEV-5B-38' | 702 | RIV-3-5-10' | 4,880 | RIV-12-10' | 585 |  |  |
| 5-B-11-27-30' | 0 | LEV-5B - 43' | 6,730 | RIV-3-15' | 44 | RIV-12-14' | 19 |  |  |
| 5-B-12-6-10' | 11,890 | LEV-5B-46' | 1 | RIV-4-0-4' | 201 | RIV-12-16' | 0 |  |  |
| 5-B-12-13' | 2,830 | LEV-5B - 55' | 0 | RIV-4-4-10' | 143 | RIV-12-25' | 9 |  |  |
| 5-B-12-15' | 17 | LEV-6-5' | 7 | RIV-4-10-15' | 144 | RIV-13-3' | 4 |  |  |
| 5-B-12-15-20' | 580 | LEV-6-28' | 0 | RIV-4-15-18' | 139 | RIV-13-15' | 1 |  |  |
| 5-B-12-20-25' | 3,490 | LEV-6-30' | 25 | RIV-4 - 18-20' | 0 | RIV-14-1' | 109 |  |  |
| 5-B-12-25-30' | 940 | LEV-6-33' | 9,190 | RIV-4-20-23' | 0 | RIV-14-9' | 7 |  |  |
| 5-B-12-30-33' | 1,260 | LEV-6-43' | 12 | RIV-5-0-3' | 6 | RIV-14-15' | 6 |  |  |
| 5-B-12-34-35' | 0 | LEV-6-47' | 57 | RIV-5-3-5' | 90 | RIV-15-1' | 219 |  |  |
| LEV-1-16-19' | 2,330 | LEV-7-7' | 27 | RIV-5-5-10' | 182 | RIV-15-6' | 9 |  |  |
| LEV-2-18' | 9,400 | LEV-7-23' | 106 | RIV-5 - 13-14' | 42 | RIV-15-8' | 0 |  |  |
| LEV-2-19' | 5,820 | LEV-7-33' | 52 | RIV-5 - 14-15' | 15 | RIV-15-15' | 86 |  |  |

Table 5-2 Summary of Laboratory Analytical Results - Phase I Investigation

|  |  | LEV-1 18-19' | LEV-2 19' | LEV-3 21-25' | LEV-4 35-39' | LEV-5 35-40' | LEV-5B 39' | LEV-5B 43' | LEV-6 47' | LEV-8 35' | LEV-9 23' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compound | Method | 9/9/2005 | 9/9/2005 | 9/9/2005 | 9/12/2005 | 9/11/2005 | 9/16/2005 | 9/16/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/15/2005 | 9/15/2005 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-Dx | 1740 | 1430 | 380 | 95.9 | ND | 186 | 961 | 8.13 | 311 | 367 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-Dx | 2010 | 1770 | 475 | 130 | 4.43 | 234 | 1160 | 9.33 | 386 | 487 |
| Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-Dx | 3750 | 3200 | 855 | 225.9 | 4.43 | 420 | 2121 | 17.46 | 697 | 854 |
| Lead | 6000/7000 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total Organic Carbon | APHA/EPA Average | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

River Analytical Results

|  |  | RIV-2 0-1' | RIV-3 5-10' | RIV-4 15-18' | RIV-5 0-3' | RIV-6 0-3' | RIV-7 0-5' | RIV-8 0-2' | RIV-9 0-5' | RIV-10 10-12' | RIV-11 5-10' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compound | Method | 9/12/2005 | 9/12/2005 | 9/12/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-DX | 201 | 41.2 | ND | 2.54 | 1.6 | 2.43 | ND | ND | 11.1 | 3.55 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-DX | 375 | 91.2 | 5.03 | 5.14 | 3.19 | 7 | ND | 3.29 | 12.4 | 5.31 |
| Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-Dx | 576 | 132.4 | 5.03 | 7.68 | 4.79 | 9.43 | ND | 3.29 | 23.5 | 8.86 |
| Lead | 6000/7000 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total Organic Carbon | APHA/EPA Average | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |


|  |  | RIV-12 0-5' | RIV-12 ${ }^{\prime}$ | RIV-12 14' | RIV-13 3' | RIV-14 1' | RIV-15 1' | RIV-16 1' | RIV-17 1' | RIV-17 ${ }^{\prime}$ | RIV-17 13' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compound | Method | 9/14/2005 | 9/13/2005 | 9/13/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-DX | 5.28 | 2.28 | ND | 1.76 | 2.23 | 4.1 | 1.85 | ND | ND | 1.96 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-DX | 6.43 | 8.03 | 6.63 | ND | 7.18 | 16.8 | 4.27 | ND | ND | 5.48 |
| Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-Dx | 11.71 | 10.31 | 6.63 | 1.76 | 9.41 | 20.9 | 6.12 | ND | ND | 7.44 |
| Lead | 6000/7000 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total Organic Carbon | APHA/EPA Average | NA | 2280 | 3660 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2100 | 4380 |


|  |  | RIV-18 1' | RIV-19 1' | RIV-20 1' | RIV-20 3' | RIV-20 13' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compound | Method | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 | 9/14/2005 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-DX | 2.88 | 2.03 | 8.04 | 5.64 | 3.04 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-DX | 7.4 | 5.34 | 35.4 | 16.8 | 10.7 |
| Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-Dx | 10.28 | 7.37 | 43.44 | 22.44 | 13.74 |
| Lead | 6000/7000 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total Organic Carbon | APHA/EPA Average | NA | NA | NA | 2800 | 5490 |


|  |  | 5-B-7 20-25' | 5-B-8 15-20' | 5-B-9 22' | 5-B-11 0-1' | 5-B-11 2-4' | 5-B-11 15-20' | 5-B-12 30-33' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compound | Method | 9/10/2005 | 9/10/2005 | 9/10/2005 | 9/11/2005 | 9/11/2005 | 9/11/2005 | 9/11/2005 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-DX | 383 | 1550 | 282 | 10.9 | 15.7 | 3.21 | 36.9 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-DX | 567 | 2250 | 366 | 86.8 | 62.9 | 19.7 | 92.6 |
| Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons | NWTPH-Dx | 950 | 3800 | 648 | 97.7 | 78.6 | 22.91 | 129.5 |
| Lead | 6000/7000 | NA | NA | NA | 103 | 41.9 | NA | NA |
| Total Organic Carbon | APHA/EPA Average | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Table 5-3 Summary of Laboratory Analytical Results - Phase II Investigation

| ID | Sample Date | Depth | NWTPH-Dx (mg/Kg) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | TPH-D | TPH-O | NWTPH-Dx |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 10 | 161 | 231 | 392 |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 15 | 10800 | 13500 | 24300 |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 17.5 | 1600 | 1650 | 3250 |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 20 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 22.5 | 83.4 | 105 | 188.4 |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 25 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 30 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 32.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 35 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 37.5 | 108 | 126 | 234 |
| LEV2A | 12/22/2005 | 40 | 40.3 | 54.4 | 94.7 |
| LEV4A | 12/22/2005 | 10 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV4A | 12/22/2005 | 15 | 47 | 89.3 | 136.3 |
| LEV4A | 12/22/2005 | 17.5 | 2780 | 2270 | 5050 |
| LEV4A | 12/22/2005 | 20 | 1990 | 1910 | 3900 |
| LEV4A | 12/22/2005 | 22.5 | 2090 | 1940 | 4030 |
| LEV4A | 12/22/2005 | 25 | 385 | 378 | 763 |
| LEV4A | 12/22/2005 | 27.5 | 21.7 | ND | 21.7 |
| LEV4A | 12/22/2005 | 30 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV4A | 12/22/2005 | 32.5 | 40.3 | 44.9 | 85.2 |
| LEV4A | 12/22/2005 | 35 | 23.7 | ND | 23.7 |
| LEV5C | 12/21/2005 | 10 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV5C | 12/21/2005 | 15 | 18900 | 14600 | 33500 |
| LEV5C | 12/21/2005 | 17.5 | 4620 | 3910 | 8530 |
| LEV5C | 12/21/2005 | 20 | 9740 | 8290 | 18030 |
| LEV5C | 12/21/2005 | 22.5 | 124 | 118 | 242 |
| LEV5C | 12/21/2005 | 25 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV5C | 12/21/2005 | 27.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV5C | 12/21/2005 | 30 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV5C | 12/21/2005 | 32.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV5C | 12/21/2005 | 35 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 10 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 15 | 33.5 | 75.8 | 109.3 |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 17.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 20 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 22.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 25 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 27.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 30 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 32.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 35 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 37.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 40 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 42.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV6A | 12/21/2005 | 45 | ND | ND | ND |

Table 5-3 Summary of Laboratory Analytical Results - Phase II Investigation

|  |  |  | NWTPH-Dx (mg/Kg) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Sample Date | Depth | TPH-D | TPH-O | NWTPH-Dx |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEV7A | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 10 | 963 | 2270 | 3233 |
| LEV7A | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 15 | 2080 | 2490 | 4570 |
| LEV7A | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 17.5 | 1770 | 1440 | 3210 |
| LEV7A | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 20 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV7A | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 22.5 | 17.4 | ND | 17.4 |
| LEV7A | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 25 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV7A | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 27.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV7A | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 30 | 129 | 130 | 259 |
| LEV7A | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 32.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV7A | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 35 | ND | ND | ND |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEV8A | $12 / 19 / 2005$ | 10 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV8A | $12 / 19 / 2005$ | 15 | 47.2 | 54.9 | 102.1 |
| LEV8A | $12 / 19 / 2005$ | 17.5 | 879 | 866 | 1745 |
| LEV8A | $12 / 19 / 2005$ | 20 | 3070 | 2540 | 5610 |
| LEV8A | $12 / 19 / 2005$ | 25 | 60.2 | 54.4 | 114.6 |
| LEV8A | $12 / 19 / 2005$ | 30 | 18.1 | ND | 18.1 |
| LEV8A | $12 / 19 / 2005$ | 32.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV8A | $12 / 19 / 2005$ | 35 | 35 | 30 | 65 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEV8B | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 10 | 48.6 | 107 | 155.6 |
| LEV8B | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 15 | 1320 | 1420 | 2740 |
| LEV8B | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 17.5 | 3140 | 2660 | 5800 |
| LEV8B | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 20 | 11.9 | ND | 11.9 |
| LEV8B | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 22.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV8B | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 25 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV8B | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 27.5 | 12.9 | ND | 12.9 |
| LEV8B | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 30 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV8B | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 32.5 | ND | ND | ND |
| LEV8B | $12 / 20 / 2005$ | 35 | ND | ND | ND |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\frac{\text { Note: }}{\text { ND }}$ Not Detected at the Method Reporting Limit

Figures





LEGEND

$\stackrel{\nabla}{=}$ water leve

| THE BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY <br> SKYKOMISH, WASHINGTON <br> BNO50-16423-522 | CROSS-SECTION A-A' |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| DATE: 01/16/06 | DRYN: A.S./SEA |  |  |



3) Retec

ORIZONTAL SCALE IN FEET


Figure 5-3
Field Screening Results (PetroFlag) vs NWTPH-Dx
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## Appendix A

## Soil Boring Logs

|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | Boring \＃：5－B－7 Sheet 1 of 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location：Skykomish，WA |  |  |
| Project \＃：BN050－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Mini－Sonic |  |  | Northing：259307．2 Easing：1510204．2 |  |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation： 925.47 |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： |  |  | Total Depth：35＇ |  |  |
| Start Date \＆Time．9／10／05 1000 |  |  |  |  | Blt Type：Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal：Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time9／10／05 1200 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 inch |  |  | Logged By：Jim Schneidor |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | 䓂皆 | $\frac{⿳ 亠 二 口 犬 灬 心 ~}{0}$ | Soil and Rock Description Classlification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  | Comments |
| Depth Range （fi） | Recovery | Depth | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PetrofLAG } \\ & (\mathrm{ppm}) \end{aligned}$ | NWTPH－Dx $(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg})$ |  |  |  |  | 闍 |  |



| ks | Surveyors BRH．Inc．NAD83／91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec（f） <br> $S=$ Slough Rec（t t$)$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft） |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． <br> 1011 SW Klickitat Way，Sulte 207 <br> Seattle，WA 88134－1162 <br> Phone：（206） 624.9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Retec

| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{5}{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depth Range (fi.) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflat (ppm) | NWTPH-Dx ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: |  | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec (fl) <br> $N=$ Native Rec ( f ) <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, inc. 1011 SW Kllckital Way, Sulte 207 Seattle, WA 98134-1162 Phone: (206) 624-9349 Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( $f$ t, |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Boring Log

| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \#: EN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259300.5 Easting:1510145.7 |  |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 925.14 |  |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: 35' |  |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time:9/10/05 1730 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal: Hole Plug |  |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/10/05 1800 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schneider |  |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | 镸 | Soll and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |  |
| Depth Range (ft) | Recovery | Depth | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PetrofLAB } \\ & (\mathrm{ppm}) \end{aligned}$ | NWTPH-Dx ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH. Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (t) <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{t})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kilckitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phono: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Retec

## Boring Log

| Sample |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{4}{2} \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{5}{\circ}$ | Soll and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depth Range (ft.) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { NWTPH-Dx } \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Kilckitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seatte, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Remarks and Datum Used: | Su | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $N=$ Native Rec ( f ) <br> $S=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(f t)$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Kllekltat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Soatte, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) $624-9349$ <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | \#\#: <br> 1 of | B-11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aokaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259221.4 Easting: 1510120.4 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 925.02 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $30^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time.9/11/05 1100 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carblde |  |  | Seal; Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/11/05 1230 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schnelder |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | 兵 | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USGS/ASTM |  |  | Comments |
| Depth Range (ft.) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NWTPH-Dx } \\ & (\text { ( } \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 安 |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes $T=$ Total Rec (ft) <br> $N=$ Native Rec ( ft ) <br> $S=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(f t)$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( ft .) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1014 SW KIIckita Wey Sule 207 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seattie. WA 881341162 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVDB8 | Notes <br> $T=T o t a l \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec ( f ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kllckitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) $624-9349$ <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259182.3 Easting:1510235.9 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 925.67 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $35^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| Star Date \& Time9/1 1/05 0830 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal: Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/11/05 1030 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 Inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | $\times \frac{4}{\frac{2}{2}}$ | 會 | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range ( f .) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | NWTPH-Dx ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec (ft) <br> $N=$ Native Rec ( t ) <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{f})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1014 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 Seatile, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( ft .) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: |  | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $S=$ Slough Rec (fi) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group. Inc. <br> 1011 SW Kilckitat Way, Suite 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( t .) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Retec

Boring Log

Boring \#: LEV-1
Sheet 1 of 1

| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Jim Robinson |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: MIni-Sonle |  |  | Northing:259299.1 Easting:1509905.0 |  |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 925.72 |  |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: 20' |  |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time:9/9/05 1330 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carblde |  |  | Seal: Hole Plug |  |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/9/05 1430 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 Inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schneider |  |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | 言 | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |  |
| Depth Range (fi) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | NWTPH-Dx <br> ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum U | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seattie, WA 98134-1162 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone: (206) 624-9349 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fax: (206) 624 -2839 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Jim Robinson |  |  | Location：Skykomish，WA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \＃：BN050－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Mini－Sonlc |  |  | Northing： 259351.7 Easting： 1510003.5 |  |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation：930．01 |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： |  |  | Total Depth： $20{ }^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \＆Time：9／9／05 1430 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type：Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal：Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time9／9／05 1530 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 inch |  |  | Logged By：Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | 突害 | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （f．） | Recovery | Depth | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PetrofLAG } \\ & (\mathrm{ppm}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 年 | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum Used： |  | Notes$T=$ Total Rec $(\mathrm{ft})$$\mathrm{N}=$ Native $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$$\mathrm{S}=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． 1011 SW KIlckltat Way，Suite 207 Seattle，WA 98134－1162 <br> Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（208）624－2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft） |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | 敖： <br> 1 of |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Jim Roblnson |  |  | Location：Skykomish，WA |  |  |
| Project \＃：BN050－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Minl－Sonic |  |  | Northing：259373．4 Easting：1510056．6 |  |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation： 930.35 |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： |  |  | Total Depth：35＇ |  |  |
| Start Date \＆Time9／9／05 1630 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type：Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal：Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time9／9／05 1830 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 Inch |  |  | Logged By：Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} \frac{0}{{ }_{2}^{6}} \\ \times \frac{0}{0} \\ 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ⿳亠丷厂犬心會 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Soll and Rock Description Classification Scheme：USCSIASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （ft） | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag （ppm） | NWTPH－Dx （ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ） |  |  |  |  | 亭畐 | Comments |



| arks and Datum Used： | Surveyors BRH，Inc．NAD83／91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（ft） <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec（f） <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}$（f） | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． <br> 1011 SW Kilckitat Way，Suite 207 <br> Seattle，WA 98134－1162 <br> Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft．） |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| narks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft$)$ <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec ( f ) <br> $S=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(t)$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kilckitaf Way, Sulte 207 Seattie, WA 00134-1162 Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| RETEC Boring Log <br> Sheet 1 of |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Jim Robinson |  |  | Location：Skykomish，WA |  |  |
| Project \＃\＃：BN050－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Mini－Sonic |  |  | Northing：259400．9 Easting： 1510107.2 |  |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation：930．54 |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： |  |  | Total Depth：50＇ |  |  |
| Start Date \＆Time：9／12／05 7：45 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type：Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal：Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time9／1 2／05 10：00 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 Inch |  |  | Logged By：Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{5}{⿳ 亠 丷 厂 犬 心 ㇒ ~}$ | Soll and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （ft） | Recovery | Depth | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PetrofLaG } \\ & \text { (ppm) } \end{aligned}$ | NWTPH－DX <br> （ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ） |  |  |  |  | 恶 | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum Used； | Surveyors BRH．Inc．NAD83／91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（ft） <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec（ft） <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec（ft） | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft．） |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． 1011 SW KHekitat Way，Sulte 207 Seattle，WA 98134－1152 <br> Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Sample |  |  |  |  | $x \frac{0}{2}$ | $\frac{\text { 言合 }}{}$ | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depth Range (ft.) | Recovery | Depth | $\begin{gathered} \text { PetrofLAG } \\ (\mathrm{ppm}) \end{gathered}$ | NWTPH-Dx ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( t ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (fi) <br> $S=$ Slough Rec ( ft ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & T=\text { Total } \operatorname{Rec}(f t) \\ & N=\operatorname{Native} \operatorname{Rec}(f) \\ & S=\text { Slough } \operatorname{Rec}(f t) \end{aligned}$ | Date | Time | Depth ( ft ) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207 Seatte, WA 98134-1162 Phone: (206) $624-9349$ Fax: (208) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  |  | Notes <br> $\mathrm{T}=$ Total Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $S=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, inc. NAD83/81 and NAV |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Khickitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seattle, WA 08134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| QRetec |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  | Boring \＃：LEV－5 Sheet 3 of 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ample |  | U |  |  | \％\％気 |  |
| Depth Range （ft） | Recovery | Depth | $\begin{gathered} \text { PotrofLAG } \\ (p p m) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{5}{⿳ 亠 二 口 犬 彡 心 ~} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme：USCSIASTM |  | Comments |
| 55－60 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T } 3.5^{\prime} \\ & \text { N } 3.5^{\prime} \\ & \text { S } 0.0^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | 55－60 | 126 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Remarks and Datum Used： | Surveyors BRH．Inc．NAD83／91 and NAVD88 | Notes $\mathrm{T}=$ Total Rec（ f ） $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec（ft） $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec（ft） | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft．） |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． 1011 SW Kilckteat Wey Sulte 207 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seattle，WA 98134－1162 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone：（206） $624-9349$ <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Survayors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=T o t a l \operatorname{Rec}$ ( ft ) <br> $N=$ Native $\operatorname{Rec}(f t)$ <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kilckitat Way, Suito 207 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seattle, WA 98134-1162 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |


| - Retec |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  | Boring \#: LEV-5B Sheet 2 of 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depth Range (ft.) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag $(\mathrm{ppm})$ | $\begin{array}{\|} \mathrm{NWTPH}-\mathrm{Dx} \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{array}$ | 등 |  | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCSIASTM |  | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=T o t a l \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough}$ Rec (ft) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| The RETEC Group, inc. 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | $19 \text { 炭: }$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aakaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259443.2 Easting: 1510196.8 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 930.34 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $50^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time.9/14/05 1530 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal: Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/14/05 1830 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | $\text { 鲐 } 9$ |  | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range (ft.) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | NWTPH-D <br> ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |



| marks and Datum Used: |  | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Surveyors BRH, inc. NADB3/91 and NAVD88 |  | Date | Time | Depth (tt) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1014 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) $\mathbf{6 2 4 - 2 8 3 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | R |  |  |  | Boring Log |  | Boring \#: L <br> Sheet 2 of 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | 長氖 | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  | Comments |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Dapth } \\ \text { Range } \\ (\mathrm{fL}) \end{gathered}$ | Recovery | Depth | Potroflag <br> (ppm) |  |  |  |  |  |



| emarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec ( f ) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec (ft) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Remarks and Datum Used. |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (t.) |
| The RETEC Group, inc. 1011 SW Kllckitat Way, Sulte 207 Seattio, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Boring Log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259481.0 Easting:1510283.1 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 931.37 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $50^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time.9/15/05 0730 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal. Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/15/05 0930 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | 关 | $\frac{5}{\circ} \mathrm{~A}$ | Soll and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Ranga (ft.) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NWTPH-DX } \\ & \left(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{g}}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 年 | Comments |



| marks and Datum Used; | Surveyors BRH، Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native $\operatorname{Rec}$ (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{tt})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( $f$ t.) |
| The RETEC Group, inc. <br> 1011 SW Klickltat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624.9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: |  | $\quad$ Notes$T=$ Total Rec $(\mathrm{ft})$$\mathrm{N}=\operatorname{Native} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$$\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW KIlckitat Way, Suite 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (205) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | g \#: <br> 1 of |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259543.6 Easting:1510387.2 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 931.80 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: 52* |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time.9/15/05 1200 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal: Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/15/05 1600 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{20} 0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range ( f .) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NWTPH-Dx} \\ & (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 管 | Comments |



| marks and Datum Used: |  | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $N=$ Native Rec (f) <br> $S=$ Slough Rec ( f ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Kllckitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $N=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec ( f ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( ft ) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seattie, WA 98134-1162 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) $\mathbf{6 2 4 - 2 8 3 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | ng \# <br> 1 of |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aokaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259543.6 Easting: 1510475.0 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 932.51 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $50^{+}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time9/15/05 1630 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal: Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/15/05 1845 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 Inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | 言 | Soll and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCSIASTM |  |  | Comments |
| Depth Range (ft) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | NWTPH-DX <br> ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  | 管 |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> $S=$ Slough Rec ( ft ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft) |
| The RETEC Group, inc. <br> 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seatte, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) $624-9349$ <br> Fax: (206) 524 -2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH. Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( f ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec ( f ) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec (ft) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kilckitat Way, Sulte 207 Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( ft ) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Boring Log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator，Justin Aakaret |  |  | Location：Skykomish，WA |  |  |
| Project\＃：BN050－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Mini－Sonic |  |  | Northing：259614．3 Easting：1510457．8 |  |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation： 917.40 |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： |  |  | Total Depth； $10^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \＆Time：9／12／05 11：30 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type：Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal：Native Material |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time9／12／05 13：00 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 Inch |  |  | Logged By．Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | 这品 | $\frac{\text { 今 }}{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （fi） | Recovery | Depth | PetrofLAG （ppm） | NWTPH－Dx （ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ） |  |  |  |  | 需 | Comments |




| m Used： | Surveyors BRH，Inc．NAD83／91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（ ft ） <br> $N=$ Native Rec（H） <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth（tt） |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． 1011 SW Kilckttat Way，Suito 207 Seattle，WA 98134－1162 Phone：（206）624－9349 Fax：（208）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{} \& \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Boring Log} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Boring 茾: RIV-2 Sheet 1 of 1} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Project:BNSF Skykomish} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Operator: Justin Agkaret/Boart Longyear} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Location: Skykomish, WA} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Project \#: BNO50-16423-522} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Northing: 259604.1 Easting: 1510399.5} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Client: BNSF} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Method: Sonic Drilling} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Ground Elevation: 917.18} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Contractor: Holt Drilling} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Casing ID:} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Total Depth: 10'} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Start Date \& Time:9/12/05 13:30} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seal: Native Material} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Finish Date \& Times/12/05 13:50} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Boring ID: 4 Inch} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Logged By: Jim Schneider} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Sample} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\frac{5}{\circ}
\]} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Soil and Rock Description \\
Classification Scheme: USCSIASTM
\end{tabular}}} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Comments} \\
\hline Dapth Range (fi) \& Recovery \& Depth \& Petroflag (ppm) \& \begin{tabular}{l}
NWTPH-Dx \\
( \(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}\) )
\end{tabular} \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\(0-5^{\prime}\)

$5-10$} \& \multirow{4}{*}{$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{T} 1.0^{0} \\
& \mathrm{~N} 1.0 \\
& \mathrm{SO} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$} \& \multirow{3}{*}{0.10} \& \multirow{3}{*}{5.700} \& \multirow{7}{*}{576} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{7}{*}{}} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{Brown coarse grained sandy gravel (1-10 cm poorly sorted), very loose, wet, strong odor, NAPL present near top of boring}} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{} <br>

\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>

\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{4}{*}{| Brown coarse grained sandy gravel (1-10 cm poorly sorted). very loose, wet, strong odor and sheen from 5-6.5' less odor and sheen with depth. |
| :--- |
| Brown well sorted coarse grained sand, very loose, wet, no odor, no staining. |}} \& \& <br>

\hline \& T3.0' \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 5-10 \& - \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& $10^{\circ}$ \& 18 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

| Remarks and Datum Used: |  | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec ( f ) <br> $S=$ Slough Rec ( ft ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624.9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | g \#: <br> 1 of |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aakaret |  |  | Location: Skykomlsh, WA |  |  |
| Project \#: BN050-18423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259580.4 Easting: 1510382.4 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 917.38 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $\mathbf{1 5}^{+}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time.9/12/05 1430 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carblde |  |  | Seal: Native Material |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/12/05 1530 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | $\frac{9}{2}$ <br> $\frac{0}{6}$ <br> $\frac{0}{6}$ |  | Soll and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  | Comments |
| Dapth Range (fi.) | Recover | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | NWTPH-D $x$ <br> ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH. Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes$T=$ Total Rec ( f$)$$\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft)$\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec ( ft$)$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kilckitat Way, Sulte 207 Seattie, WA 98134-1162 Phone: (206) 624-9349 Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( $f$.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Boring Log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Justin Aakaret |  |  | Location：Skykomlsh，WA |  |  |  |
| Project \＃：BNO50－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Minl－Sonic |  |  | Northing： 259565.9 Easting： 1510332.0 |  |  |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation：017．33 |  |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： |  |  | Total Depth： $23{ }^{\text {²}}$ |  |  |  |
| Start Date \＆Time：9／12／05 1730 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type：Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal：Native Material |  |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time9／12／05 1830 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 inch |  |  | Logged By：Jim Schneider |  |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{5}{⿳ 亠 丷 厂 犬 灬 心}$ | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （fi．） | Recovery | Depth | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PetrofLAG } \\ & \text { (ppm) } \end{aligned}$ | NWTPH－Dx （ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum Used： | Surveyors BRH，Inc．NAD83／91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（ t ） <br> $N=$ Native Rec（ ft ） <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec（ft） | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． 1011 SW Klickthat Way，Sulte 207 Seattle，WA 98134－1162 Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft．） |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Boring Log
Boring \#: RIV-5
Sheet 1 of 1

| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Minl-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259549.6 Easting: 1510313.1 |  |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 917.02 |  |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $\mathbf{1 5}^{\circ}$ |  |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time:9/13/05 0800 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal: Native Material |  |  |  |
| Finlsh Date \& Time9/13/05 0830 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 Inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schnaider |  |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | 或 | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |  |
| Dapth Ranga (ft) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | NWTPH-DX $\left(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $\mathrm{T}=$ Total Rec ( f ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec ( t ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kilckltat Way Sulte 207 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seattle, WA 98134-1162 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |

Boring Log

| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \#i: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259545.0 Easting:1510240.5 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Driling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 916.60 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $\mathbf{1 5}^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time:9/13/05 0830 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carblde |  |  | Seal: Native Material |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/13/05 0900 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schnelder |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | 長 | Soll and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range ( $\mathrm{f} . \mathrm{I}$ ) | Recovery | Dopth | Petroflag (ppm) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NWTPH}-\mathrm{Dx} \\ & (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |




| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH. Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $\mathrm{T}=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (f) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec ( f ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW KIlckitat Way, Sulte 207 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soattle, WA 98134-1162 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Retec

Boring Log
Boring ": RIV-7
Sheet 1 of 1

| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aakaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \#: BNO50-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259544.5 |  |  | Easting: 1510240.5 |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 916.50 |  |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing iD: |  |  | Total Depth: $\mathbf{1 5}^{\circ}$ |  |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time:9/13/05 0900 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carblde |  |  | Seal: Native Material |  |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/13/05 0930 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schnelder |  |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |  |
| Depth Range (ft.) | Recovery | Dapth | Petroflag (ppm) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { NWTPH-Dx } \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}) \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |



| Ramarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec ( t ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Remarks and Datum Used. |  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( ft ) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kilckitat Way, Sulte 207 Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| emarks and Datum Used: |  | Notes <br> $\mathrm{T}=$ Total Rec ( t ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec $(\mathrm{f})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kllckitat Way, Suite 207 Seattie, WA $98134-1162$ <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( ft .) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH. Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec ( f ) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec ( f ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kilcklta! Way, Sulte 207 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seatte, WA 98434.1162 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone: (206) $624-9349$ <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |




| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=T o t a l \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{f})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Klickitnt Way, Suite 207 <br> Seattie, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## －Retec

## Boring Log

Boring \＃：RIV－11
Sheet 1 of 1

| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location：Skykomlsh，WA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \＃：BN050－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Mini－Sonic |  |  | Northing： $\mathbf{2 5 9 4 9 1 . 7}$ Easting： $\mathbf{1 5 1 0 1 2 2 . 3}$ |  |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation： 916.17 |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： |  |  | Total Depth： $\mathbf{1 5}{ }^{\text { }}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \＆Time．9／13／05 1300 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type：Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal：Native Material |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time9／13／05 1330 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 Inch |  |  | Logged By：Jim Schnelder |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | $\times \frac{0}{\frac{1}{2}} \times \frac{1}{0}$ | $\frac{⿳ 亠 二 口 犬 灬 ~}{\circ}$ | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （ft．） | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag （ppm） | NWTPH－Dx <br> （ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ） |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |



| m Used | Sur | Notes <br> $\mathrm{T}=$ Total Rec（ft） <br> $N=$ Native Rec（ $f$ t） <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Used | Sur |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft） |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． <br> 1011 SW Kllckitat Way，Sulte 207 <br> Seattle，WA $98134-1162$ <br> Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（205）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | Boring \＃：RIV－12 Sheet 1 of 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Justin Agkaret |  |  | Location：Skykomish，WA |  |  |
| Project \＃：BNO50－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Mini－Sonic |  |  | Northing：259479．0 Easting： 1510086.8 |  |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation： 916.58 |  |  |
| Contractor：Hott Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： |  |  | Total Depth： $25^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| Stant Date \＆Time．9／13／05 1430 |  |  |  |  | Blt Type：Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal：Native Material |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time9／13／05 1530 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 Inch |  |  | Logged By：Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | 落 | 咅き | Soll and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme：USCSIASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （ft．） | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag （ppm） | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NWTPH-Dx } \\ & \left(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{g}}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 皆 | Comments |



| marks and Datum Used： | Surveyors BRH，Inc．NAD83／91 and NAVDB8 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（ t ） <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec（ft） <br> $S=$ Slough Rec（fi） | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． 1011 SW Klickitat Way，Sulte 207 Seattle，WA 98134－1162 <br> Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft．） |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ng \#: } \\ & t 1 \text { of } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{V}-13$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| Project \#: BNO50-18423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259439.1 Easting: 1510007.4 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 916.08 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing 1D: |  |  | Total Deptr: 15 |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time9/13/05 1630 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal: Native Material |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/13/05 1700 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By, Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | $=\frac{0}{\frac{0}{2}} \times$ | $\frac{5}{\circ}$ | Soll and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range (ft.) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | NWTPH-Dx <br> ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  | 罭 | Comments |



| emarks and Datum Used: |  | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (tt) <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}$ ( ft ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Kilickitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Sestle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | Boring \#: RIV-14 Sheet 1 of 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| Projoct \#: BNO50-18423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259429.3 Easting: 1509971.7 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 916.29 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $\mathbf{1 5}^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time:9/44/05 0930 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal: Native Material |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/14/05 1000 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schneider |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | 镸 | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Ranga ( t .) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | NWTPH-Dx <br> ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  | 芜 | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $\mathrm{T}=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec (ft) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207 Seatte, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec (ft) <br> $N=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Siough $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW KIlckitat Way, Suite 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (it.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | Boring \#: RIV-16 Sheet 1 of 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259400.6 Easting: 1509916.4 |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 916.27 |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Deililing/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $\mathbf{1 5}^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time:9/14/05 1040 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal: Native Material |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/14/05 1110 |  |  |  |  | Boring 1D: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schnelder |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | 殓 | Soll and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  | Comments |
| Depth Range (ft) | Recovery | Depth | PetrofLAG <br> (ppm) | NWTPH-Dx ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ) |  |  |  |  | 㙖 |  |



| marks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $\mathrm{T}=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $N=$ Native Rec (f) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seattie, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624.9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | urveyors ERH, Inc. NAD83/91 and Naver | Notes <br> $T=$ Total $\operatorname{Rec}(f t)$ <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec (ft) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Sulto 207 <br> Seatile, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 524-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | g $\begin{aligned} & \text { \＃} \\ & \text { ：}\end{aligned}$ <br> 1 of | $\mathrm{V}-18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project：BNSF Skykornish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Justin Aokaret |  |  | Location：Skykomish，WA |  |  |
| Project 矣：BN050－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Mini－Sonic |  |  | Northing：259599．8 Easting：1510367．3 |  |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation： 817.31 |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： |  |  | Total Depth： $\mathbf{1 5}^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Start Date \＆Time：9／14／05 1315 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type：Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal：Native Material |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time9／14／05 1345 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 inch |  |  | Logged By：Jim Schnoldor |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | $\times \begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{2} \\ & \times \frac{0}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | 會 | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （ f ） | Recovery | Depth | Petroflac （ppm） | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NWTPH-D } \\ & (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 橆 | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum Used： |  | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（ ft ） <br> $N=$ Native Rec（t） <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． 1011 SW Klickitat Way，Sulte 207 Seattie，WA 98134－1162 <br> Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft．） |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | Boring \#: RIV-19 Sheet 1 of 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aekaret |  |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |  |
| Project \#: BNOSO-18423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  |  | Northing: 259618.8 Easting: 1510393.2 |  |  |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  |  | Ground Elevation: 916.90 |  |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: |  |  | Total Depth: $\mathbf{1 5}^{\text { }}$ |  |  |  |
| Start Date \& Times/14/05 1400 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  |  | Seal: Hole Plug |  |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time9/14/05 1430 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  |  | Logged By: Jim Schneider |  |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | 吴 | $\frac{5}{\circ}$ | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |  |
| Depth Range (ft) | Recovery | Depth | Petroflag (ppm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NWTPH-Dx } \\ & (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 皆 |  | Comments |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH. Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec (tt) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native $\operatorname{Rec}$ (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Kilakitut Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seartie, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (fi.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| marks and Datum Used: | Surveyors BRH, Inc. NAD83/91 and NAVD88 | Notes <br> $\mathrm{T}=$ Total Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec ( $\mathrm{t} \mathbf{t}$ ) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec ( f ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| marks and Datum Used. |  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Kilckitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Soattle, WA 99134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Notes <br> $T=T o t a l \operatorname{Rec}(f 1)$ <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough $\operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 Seattle, WA 98134-1162 Phone: (206) 624-9349 Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log | Boring \#: LEV-2A Sheet 2 of 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample |  |  |  | $\frac{\stackrel{y}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 등영 | Soll and Rock Description <br> Classification Scherne: USCSIASTM |  |  |
| Dapth Range (f.) | Recovery | Depth (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NWTPH-DX } \\ & (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 旁 |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec ( f ) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kllckitat Way, Sulto 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |




| Remarks and Datum Used: | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( f ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec (ft) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| S-RETEC |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | Boring \#: LEV-4A Sheet 2 of 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample |  |  |  | $\frac{0}{5}$ <br> $\frac{2}{0}$ <br> $\frac{0}{0}$ <br> 0 | 彭区 | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { Depth } \\ \text { Range } \\ \text { (it. } \end{array}$ | Recovery | Depth (it) | NWTPH-Dx ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{g}}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |


| 25-35' | $19^{\prime \prime}$ | $27.5^{\prime}$ <br> $30^{\prime}$ <br> $32.5^{\prime}$ <br> 35' | $\begin{gathered} 21.7 \\ 80 L \\ 85.2 \\ 23.7 \end{gathered}$ |  | Sandy gravel, GP, sand fine to coarse, gravel to $3^{\prime \prime}, 60 \%$ gravel, $40 \%$ sand, then clay, CL-CH, very soft, wet, blue gray-tan-tan, soupy, no odor. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Remarks and Datum Used: | Notes <br> $\mathrm{T}=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Kilckitat Way, Suite 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## RRRTEC

Boring Log
Boring \＃：LEV－5C
Sheet 1 of 2

| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Justin Aekaret |  | Location：Skykomlsh，WA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \＃：BN050－18423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Mini－Sonic |  | Northing：Easting： |  |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  | Ground Elevation： |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： 6 inch |  | Total Depth：35＇ |  |  |
| Start Date \＆Time：12／21／05 1330 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type：Tungsten Carbide |  | Seal：Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time12／21／05 1615 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 Inch |  | Logged By：Stephen Howard |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | 眞 | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （ft．） | Recovery | Depth （f） | NWTPH－Dx <br> （ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{g}}$ ） | 高蒠 |  |  |  |  | 感 |



| Remarks and Datum Used： | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（ ft ） <br> $N=$ Native Rec（ft） <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec（ft） | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft．） |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． 1011 SW Kllickltat Way，Sulte 207 Seattle，WA 98134－1162 <br> Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| SRETEC |  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  | Boring \＃：LEV－5C <br> Sheet 2 of 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample |  |  |  | 黄䒼 | 言き | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  |  | 言会䔍 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Depth } \\ \text { Range } \\ \text { (ti) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Recovery | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Depth } \\ \text { (ik) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{NWTPH}-\mathrm{Dx} \\ \left(\mathrm{ma} / \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{g}}\right) \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 25－30 | $27.5^{\circ}$ | BDL | $\left\|\begin{array}{ll}\because \because \\ \because & 0\end{array}\right\|$ | Gravel，fine to coarse，sub rounded to rounded． $80 \%$ sand，fine； $2 \%$ silt． <br> Gray hard dry friableforitile sandy gravel，SW．Appearance of weathered diorite．Slight odor．No visual contamination．Hard coarse gravel clasts present． $50 \%$ gravel， $30 \%$ sand， $20 \%$ sitt．Dense． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30－35＇ | $30^{\prime}$ | BDL | $\div 30$ | Brown，wet，gravelly sand． $10 \%$ gravel，sub rounded，med（ 1 －inch）； $89 \%$ sand，med； $1 \%$ sitt．One cobble present．Occasionally more silty （10\％）．No odor or visual contamination． |
|  | 32．5 ${ }^{\prime}$ |  |  | As above．Slight odor． |
|  |  | BDL |  | Clay，slighty silty，gray to orange／brown，firm |
|  | $35^{\prime}$ | BDL |  | Silt，slighty clayey，brown，no odor or visual contamination |
|  |  |  |  | As above becoming sandy w／fine sand．Very slight odor |


| Remarks and Datum Used： | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（fi） <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec（ft） <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec（ft） | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ ft ．） |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． 1011 SW Kllckitat Way，Sulte 207 Seatte，WA 98134－1162 Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Boring Log

| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aakaret |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  | Northing: | Easting: |  |
| Cllent: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  | Ground Elevation: |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: 6 inch |  | Total Depth; 45' |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time:12/21/05 845 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  | Seal: Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Time12/21/05 1230 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 inch |  | Logged By: Staphen Howard |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{2} \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \frac{5}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{5}{\circ}$ | Soll and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range (ft.) | Recovery | Depth <br> (h.) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NWTPH-Dx } \\ & (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 並 |




| Remarks and Datum Used: | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( t .) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| $\angle-$ ReTEC |  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  |  |  | Boring \#: LEV-6A Sheet 2 of 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample |  |  |  |  |  | Soll and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Depth } \\ \text { Range } \\ \text { (ft.) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Recovery | Depth (ft.) | NWTPH-Dx $(m g / \mathrm{g})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec (ft) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (f) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec (fi) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| Tha RETEC Group, Inc. <br> 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Sulte 207 <br> Seattle, WA 98134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  | Boring \＃：LEV－7A Sheet 1 of 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Justin Aekaret |  | Location：Skykomish，WA |  |  |
| Project \＃：BN050－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Minl－Sonic |  | Northing： | Easting： |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  | Ground Elevation： |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： 6 Inch |  | Total Depth；35＇ |  |  |
| Start Date \＆Time：12／20／05 1320 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type：Tungsten Carbide |  | Seal：Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time12／20／05 1505 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 inch |  | Logged By：Cliff Baines |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | $\frac{5}{⿳ 亠 丷 厂 彡 心 ㇒ ~}$ | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme：USCSIASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （ f. ） | Recovery | Depth （it） | NWTPH－Dx （ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ） |  |  |  |  |  | 皆范 |



| emarks and Datum Used： | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（ft） <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec（ft） <br> $S=$ Slough Rec（ft） | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft．） |
| The REIEC Group，Inc． |  |  |  |  |
| Seattle，WA 98134－1162 |  |  |  |  |
| Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |


| MRETEC |  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  | Boring \＃：LEV－7A <br> Sheet 2 of 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample |  |  |  | 曹皆荌 | 言き | Soil and Rock Description Classification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  |
| Dapth Range （ft．） | Recovery | Dopth <br> （ ft ） | NWTPH-Dx $\left(m g / K_{g}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Daturn Used： | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（ ft ） <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec（fi） <br> $S=$ Slough Rec（ ft ） | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft．） |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． 1011 SW Klickltat Way，Sulte 207 Seatte，WA 98134－1162 <br> Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log |  | Boring \＃：LEV－8A Sheet 1 of 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project：BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator：Justin Aokaret |  | Location：Skykomish，WA |  |  |
| Project \＃：BN050－16423－522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type：Mini－Sonic |  | Northing： | Easting： |  |
| Client：BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method：Sonic Drilling |  | Ground Elevation： |  |  |
| Contractor：Holt Drilling／Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID： 6 Inch |  | Total Depth：35＇ |  |  |
| Stan Date \＆Time：12／19／05 1515 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type：Tungsten Carbide |  | Seal：Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \＆Time ${ }^{\text {2／2／12／05 } 1600}$ |  |  |  |  | Boring ID： 4 inch |  | Logged By：Stephen Howard |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  |  | 言會至 | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme：USCS／ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range （f．） | Recovery | Depth <br> （th．） | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NWTPH-Dx } \\ & (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 㮩 |



| Remarks and Datum Used： | Notes$\begin{aligned} & T=\text { Total } \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft}) \\ & N=\text { Native } \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft}) \\ & S=\text { Slough } \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{ft}) \end{aligned}$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ft．） |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． <br> 1011 SW Klickitat Way，Sulte 207 <br> Seattle，WA 98134－1162 <br> Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Sample |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \frac{0}{2} \\ \text { 豪 } \\ 0 \\ \hline 0 \end{array}$ | 言灾 | Soll and Rock Description Classification Scheme：USCSIASTM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dopth Range （f．） | Recovery | Depth （ t ） | NWTPH－Dx （ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ） |  |  |  |  |


| 25－30 | $27.5^{\prime}$ | $12.9$ |  |  | 素－26 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30－35＇ | $30^{\prime}$ <br> $32.5^{\circ}$ <br> $35^{\prime}$ | BDL <br> BDL <br> BDL |  | Gravel， $50 \%$ fine to coarse，brown．wet， $10 \%$ cobbles， $25 \%$ sand（fine to coarse）， $15 \%$ silt，no odor or visual contamination <br> Clay，brown，soft to firm，no odor or visual contamination，silghtly sandy， silty | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 圭-30 } \\ & \text { 圭-31 } \\ & \text { 圭-32 } \\ & \text { 責-33 } \\ & \text { 圭-34 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Remarks and Datum Used： | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec（f） <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec（ft） <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough} \operatorname{Rec}(\mathrm{f})$ | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth（ fL ） |
| The RETEC Group，Inc． <br> 1011 SW Kllckitat Way，Sulte 207 <br> Seattle，WA 98134－1162 <br> Phone：（206）624－9349 <br> Fax：（206）624－2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## 2 RETEC

Boring Log
Boring \#: LEV-8B Sheet 1 of 2

| Project:BNSF Skykomish |  |  |  |  | Operator: Justin Aakaret |  | Location: Skykomish, WA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project \#: BN050-16423-522 |  |  |  |  | Drill Rig Type: Mini-Sonic |  | Northing: | Easting: |  |
| Client: BNSF |  |  |  |  | Method: Sonic Drilling |  | Ground Elevation: |  |  |
| Contractor: Holt Drilling/Boart Longyear |  |  |  |  | Casing ID: 6 inch |  | Total Depth: 35' |  |  |
| Start Date \& Time:12/20/05 0950 |  |  |  |  | Bit Type: Tungsten Carbide |  | Seal: Hole Plug |  |  |
| Finish Date \& Times2/20/05 1230 |  |  |  |  | Boring ID: 4 mach |  | Logged By: Cliff Baines |  |  |
| Sample |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{9}{2} \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{0}=1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 長き | Soil and Rock Description <br> Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |  |
| Depth Range (ft.) | Recovery | Depth <br> (fl.) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NWTPH-Dx } \\ & (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Remarks and Daturn Used: | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec ( f ) <br> $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Slough}$ Rec (ft) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth (ft.) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kilckitat Way, Sulte 207 Seattie, WA 96134-1162 <br> Phone: (206) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Boring Log | Boring \#: LEV-8B Sheet 2 of 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{y}{2} \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | 등す | Soll and Rock Description Classification Scheme: USCS/ASTM |  |  |
| Dapth Range (ft) | Recovery | Depth <br> (fi) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NWTPH-Dx } \\ & \left(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{g}}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 霛 |



| Remarks and Datum Used: | Notes <br> $T=$ Total Rec ( ft ) <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ Native Rec (fi) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ Slough Rec (fi) | Groundwater |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Time | Depth ( $f$.) |
| The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Kllckitat Way, Sulte 207 Seattie, WA 98134 -1162 Phone: (208) 624-9349 <br> Fax: (206) 624-2839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix B

## Surveyors Report

## BUSH, ROED \& HITCHINGS, INC.

## Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors

October 4, 2005

Mr. Steve Howard
Retec Corporation
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134-1162

Re: BRH Job No. 95280.11
Skykomish
New Boreholes surveyed on September 10, 2005

| Borehole | Northing | Easting | Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| riv-1 | 259614.3 | 1510457.8 | 917.4 |
| riv-2 | 259604.1 | 1510399.5 | 917.2 |
| riv-18 | 259599.8 | 1510367.3 | 917.3 |
| riv-19 | 259618.8 | 1510393.2 | 916.9 |
| riv-3 | 259580.4 | 1510382.4 | 917.4 |
| riv-4 | 259565.9 | 1510332.0 | 917.3 |
| riv-6 | 259545.0 | 1510275.3 | 916.6 |
| riv-5 | 259549.6 | 1510313.1 | 917.0 |
| riv-7 | 259544.5 | 1510240.5 | 916.5 |
| riv-8 | 259530.3 | 1510205.6 | 916.6 |
| riv-9 | 259514.7 | 1510175.7 | 916.7 |
| riv-11 | 259491.7 | 1510122.3 | 916.2 |
| riv-10 | 259470.4 | 1510154.1 | 916.6 |
| riv-12 | 259479.0 | 1510086.8 | 916.6 |
| riv-16 | 259463.4 | 1510037.4 | 916.3 |
| riv-13 | 259439.1 | 1510007.4 | 916.1 |
| riv-14 | 259429.3 | 1509971.7 | 916.3 |
| riv-15 | 259400.6 | 1509916.4 | 916.3 |
| riv-17 | 259374.1 | 1509877.9 | 915.5 |

RETEC CORPORATION
BUSH, ROED \& HITCHINGS, INC.
Mr. Steve Howard
October 4, 2005
Page 2 of 2

| Borehole | Northing | Easting | Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| riv-20 | 259627.9 | 1510515.8 | 918.0 |
| lev-9 | 259543.6 | 1510475.0 | 932.5 |
| lev-8 | 259524.2 | 1510387.2 | 931.8 |
| lev-7 | 259481.0 | 1510283.1 | 931.4 |
| lev-6 | 259443.2 | 1510196.8 | 930.3 |
| lev-5 | 259417.8 | 1510143.1 | 930.8 |
| lev-4 | 259400.9 | 1510107.2 | 930.5 |
| lev-3 | 259373.4 | 1510056.6 | 930.3 |
| lev-2 | 259351.7 | 1510003.5 | 930.0 |
| lev-5B | 259421.3 | 1510146.4 | 930.8 |
| lev-1 | 259299.1 | 1509905.0 | 925.7 |
| 5-b-12 | 259182.3 | 1510235.9 | 925.7 |
| 5-b-9 | 259242.0 | 1510226.7 | 925.5 |
| 5-b-7 | 259307.2 | 1510204.2 | 925.5 |
| 5-b-8 | 259300.5 | 1510145.7 | 925.1 |
| 5-b-11 | 259221.4 | 1510120.4 | 925.0 |

Sincerely,
BUSH, ROED \& HITCHINGS, INC.

Johann G. Wassermann, P.L.S.
Project Manager
JGW/ekk

## Appendix C

## PetroFLAG Field Sheets

## 

## Hydrocarbon Test Kit - Field Data Sheet

Date: 9/11/2005
Operator: Ell Leavertom Location: Skykomish

Calibration Time/Date:
Calibration Temperature:
copied from field book

${ }^{1} \mathrm{DF}=$ Dilution Factor, e.g., for 5 gram soil sample $\mathrm{DF}=10 \mathrm{~g} / 5 \mathrm{~g}=2$, and actual concentration equals reading times DF (reading ( ppm ) $\times \mathrm{DF}=$ actual concentration).
${ }^{2} \mathrm{RF}=$ Response Factor, selected for the hydrocarbon contamination at the site.

## PetrōㄷㄴAG ${ }^{\circ}$

## Hydrocarbon Test Kit - Field Data Sheet

Date: 9-12-05
Operator: Elly Leaverton Location: Skykomish

Calibration Time/Date: 8:20am/9-12-05 Calibration Temperature: $\qquad$

| No. | Sample ID | Weight | Time/Date | Reading (ppm) | DF' | $\mathrm{RF}^{2}$ | Actual (ppm) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | LEV-4-39-40 | 10 g | 9:47 | 0 | 1.0 |  | 0 |  |
| 2 | LEV4-40.45 | 10 g | 9:48 | 3 | 1.0 |  | 3 |  |
| 3 | LEV4 - 45.50 | 109 | $9: 49$ | 8 | 1.0 |  | 8 |  |
| 4 | CEVU - 25.30 | 19 | $10: 03$ | 1100 | 10.0 |  | 11,000 |  |
| 5 | LEU4.30.35 | 109 | 10:04 | EEEE | 1.0 |  | - |  |
| 6 | LEV4-35-39 | 19 | 10.05 | 165 | 10.0 |  | 1,650 |  |
| 7 | LEV4-15 | 59 | $10: 18$ | EEEE | 2.0 |  | $\underline{\square}$ |  |
| 8 | LEV4-15 | 19 | 10:30 | EEEE | 10.0 |  | $\square$ |  |
| 9 | LEIT-3035 | 19 | 10.31 | 764 | 10.0 |  | 7,640 |  |
| 10 | RIV 0-1 | 19 | 14:19 | 570 | 10.0 |  | 5,700 |  |
| 11 |  | 109 | 14:20 | 18 | 1.0 |  | 18 |  |
| 12 | RIV3 0.5 | 19 | 16:20 | 175 | 10.0 |  | 1,750 |  |
| 13 | R1V3 5-10 | 19 | $16: 21$ | 488 | 10.0 |  | 4,880 |  |
| 14 | R163 15 | 10.9 | 1622 | 44 | 1.0 |  | 44 |  |
| 15 | RW4 0-4 | 10 g | $19: 26$ | 201 | 1.0 |  | 201 |  |
| 16 | Riv4 4:10 | 10 g | $19: 27$ | 143 | 1.0 |  | 143 |  |
| 17 | Riv4 10-15 | 10 a | 19:28 | 144 | 1.0 |  | 144 |  |
| 18 | $810415-18$ | 10 g | 19.30 | 139 | 1.0 |  | 139 |  |
| 19 | R1V4 $18-20$ | 10 a | 1931 | 0 | 1.0 |  | 0 |  |
| 20 | $R 124$ | 109 | 6932 | 0 | 1.0 |  | 0 |  |

${ }^{1} \mathrm{DF}=$ Dilution Factor, e.g., for 5 gram soil sample $\mathrm{DF}=10 \mathrm{~g} / 5 \mathrm{~g}=2$, and actual concentration equals reading times DF (reading ( ppm ) $\times \mathrm{DF}=$ actual concentration).
${ }^{2} \mathrm{RF}=$ Response Factor, selected for the hydrocarbon contamination at the site.

## PetrōㄷㄴAG ${ }^{\ominus}$

## Hydrocarbon Test Kit - Field Data Sheet

Date: 9-13-05
Operator: Elly Leaverton
Location: Skykomish

Calibration Time/Date: $8: 30 / 9 / 13 / 0 \mathrm{~s}$ Calibration Temperature:

${ }^{1} \mathrm{DF}=$ Dilution Factor, e.g., for 5 gram soil sample $\mathrm{DF}=10 \mathrm{~g} / 5 \mathrm{~g}=2$, and actual concentration equals reading times DF (reading $(\mathrm{ppm}) \times \mathrm{DF}=$ actual concentration).
${ }^{2}$ RF $=$ Response Factor, selected for the hydrocarbon contamination at the site.

## Petrō्रFLAG ${ }^{\oplus}$

## Hydrocarbon Test Kit - Field Data Sheet



Calibration Time/Date: 8;30 $9+3-05$
Calibration Temperature: $\qquad$

| No. | Sample ID | Weight | Time/Date | Reading (ppm) | $\mathrm{DF}^{1}$ | $\mathrm{RF}^{2}$ | Actual (ppm) | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | R1090-5 | 109 | 1519 | 0 | 1.0 |  | 0 |  |
| 2 | R19 $95-10$ | 109 | 1520 | 38 | $1: 0$ |  | 38 |  |
| 3 | R10912-15 | 109 | 1521 | 18 | 1.0 |  | 18 |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{DF}=$ Dilution Factor, e.g., for 5 gram soil sample $\mathrm{DF}=10 \mathrm{~g} / 5 \mathrm{~g}=2$, and actual concentration equals reading times DF (reading ( ppm ) $\times \mathrm{DF}=$ actual concentration).
${ }^{2} \mathrm{RF}=$ Response Factor, selected for the hydrocarbon contamination at the site.

## Petrō$\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ LAG

## Hydrocarbon Test Kit - Field Data Sheet

Date: 9 -14-2005
Operator: Slily Leaverto a Location: Skykomish

Calibration Time/Date: 13:21 9-14-05
Calibration Temperature:

${ }^{1} \mathrm{DF}=$ Dilution Factor, e.g., for 5 gram soil sample $\mathrm{DF}=10 \mathrm{~g} / 5 \mathrm{~g}=2$, and actual concentration equals reading times DF (reading (ppm) $\times \mathrm{DF}=$ actual concentration).
${ }^{2}$ RF $=$ Response Factor, selected for the hydrocarbon contamination at the site.

## PetrōㄷㄴAG ${ }^{\circ}$

## Hydrocarbon Test Kit - Field Data Sheet

Date: $9-14-2005$
Operator: Fly Leaverton Location: Skykumish

Calibration Time/Date: 13:21 9-14-05
Calibration Temperature: $\qquad$

${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{DF}=$ Dilution Factor, e.g., for 5 gram soil sample $\mathrm{DF}=10 \mathrm{~g} / 5 \mathrm{~g}=2$, and actual concentration equals reading times DF (reading ( ppm ) $\times \mathrm{DF}=$ actual concentration).
${ }^{2} \mathrm{RF}=$ Response Factor, selected for the hydrocarbon contamination at the site.

## Petrō$\overline{\bar{F}}$ LAG <br> ${ }^{\text {® }}$

## Hydrocarbon Test Kit - Field Data Sheet

Date: $\quad 9-14-200 \mathrm{~s}$
Operator: Fly Leavertom Location: Sky Romish

Calibration Time/Date: 1819 9-14 Calibration Temperature: $\qquad$

| No. | Sample ID | Weight | Time/Date | Reading (ppm) | $\mathrm{DF}^{1}$ | RF $^{2}$ | Actual (ppm) | Comments |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | LEV 6-5 | 109 | 1841 | 7 | 1.0 |  | 7 |  |
| 2 | LEV 6-28 | 109 | 1842 | 0 | 1.0 |  | 0 |  |
| 3 | LEV 6-30 | 109 | 1843 | 25 | 1.0 |  | 25 |  |
| 4 | LEG - 33 | 19 | 1844 | 919 | 10.0 |  | 9,190 |  |
| 5 | LEV 6-43 | 109 | 1845 | 12 | 1.0 |  | 12 |  |
| 6 | LEV 6-47 | 109 | 1846 | 57 | 1.0 |  | 57 |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{DF}=$ Dilution Factor, e.g., for 5 gram soil sample $\mathrm{DF}=10 \mathrm{~g} / 5 \mathrm{~g}=2$, and actual concentration equals reading times DF (reading $(\mathrm{ppm}) \times \mathrm{DF}=$ actual concentration).
"RF = Response Factor, selected for the hydrocarbon contamination at the site.

## Petrō다LG ${ }^{\circ}$

## Hydrocarbon Test Kit - Field Data Sheet

Date: 9-15-05
Operator: Ell Leaver ton Location: Skykomish

Calibration Time/Date: $9: 46 / 9-15-05$
Calibration Temperature: $22.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$

${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{DF}=$ Dilution Factor, e.g., for 5 gram soil sample $\mathrm{DF}=10 \mathrm{~g} / 5 \mathrm{~g}=2$, and actual concentration equals reading times DF (reading ( ppm ) $\times \mathrm{DF}=$ actual concentration).
${ }^{3} R F=$ Response Factor, selected for the hydrocarbon contamination at the site.

## PetrōㄷㄴAG ${ }^{\circ}$

## Hydrocarbon Test Kit - Field Data Sheet



Calibration Time/Date: $9: 46 / 9-15-05$
Calibration Temperature: $22.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$

| No. | Sample ID | Weight | Time/Date | Reading (ppm) | $\mathrm{DF}^{1}$ | RF $^{2}$ | Actual (ppm) | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | LEU9-46 | 109 | 1924 | 465 | 1.0 |  | 465 |  |
| 2 | LEV9-50 | 10 g | 1925 | 24 | 10 |  | 24 |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{DF}=$ Dilution Factor, e.g., for 5 gram soil sample $\mathrm{DF}=10 \mathrm{~g} / 5 \mathrm{~g}=2$, and actual concentration equals reading times DF (reading ( ppm ) $\times \mathrm{DF}=$ actual concentration).
${ }^{2} \mathrm{RF}=$ Response Factor, selected for the hydrocarbon contamination at the site.

# Petrō다AG 

## Hydrocarbon Test Kit - Field Data Sheet

Date: 9-16-2005 Operator: Elly Leaverton Location: Skykomish

Calibration Time/Date: 0820/9-16-2005 Calibration Temperature: $17.9^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$

${ }^{1} \mathrm{DF}=$ Dilution Factor, e.g., for 5 gram soil sample $\mathrm{DF}=10 \mathrm{~g} / 5 \mathrm{~g}=2$, and actual concentration equals reading times DF (reading ( ppm ) $\times \mathrm{DF}=$ actual concentration).
${ }^{2} R F=$ Response Factor, selected for the hydrocarbon contamination at the site.

## Appendix D

## Laboratory Analytical Data

02 October 2005

## Stephen Howard

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

## RE: BNSF-Skykomish-1

Enclosed are the results of analyses for samples received by the laboratory on 09/16/05 12:55. If you have any questions concerning this report, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,


## Kortland Orr For Kate Haney

Project Manager

Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 425.420.9200 fax 425.420.9210

East 11115 Montgomery, Suite B, Spokane, WA 99206-4776
509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290

9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132
503.906.9200 fax 503.906.9210

20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711
541.383.9310 fax 541.382.7588

2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119
907.563.9200 fax 907.563.9210

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Reported:
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
0/02/05 15:29

## ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEV-2-19' | B5I0376-01 | Soil | 09/09/05 11:18 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| LEV-1-18'-19' | B5I0376-02 | Soil | 09/09/05 15:15 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| LEV-3-21'-25' | B5I0376-03 | Soil | 09/09/05 19:30 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| 5-B-9-22' | B5I0376-04 | Soil | 09/10/05 10:50 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| 5-B-7-20'-25' | B5I0376-05 | Soil | 09/10/05 13:00 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| 5-B-8-15'-20' | B5I0376-06 | Soil | 09/10/05 19:45 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| 5-B-12-30'-33' | B5I0376-07 | Soil | 09/11/05 11:40 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| 5-B-11-15'-20' | B5I0376-08 | Soil | 09/11/05 13:41 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| LEV 5-35'-40' | B5I0376-09 | Soil | 09/11/05 18:55 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| LEV 4-35'-39' | B5I0376-10 | Soil | 09/12/05 10:35 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV 2-0'-1' | B5I0376-11 | Soil | 09/12/05 14:40 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV 3-5'-10' | B5I0376-12 | Soil | 09/12/05 16:30 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV 4-15'-18' | B5I0376-13 | Soil | 09/12/05 19:45 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-12-3' | B5I0376-14 | Soil | 09/13/05 16:50 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-12-14' | B5I0376-15 | Soil | 09/13/05 16:50 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-17-3' | B5I0376-16 | Soil | 09/14/05 12:15 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-17-13' | B5I0376-17 | Soil | 09/14/05 12:20 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-5-0'-3' | B5I0376-18 | Soil | 09/14/05 16:20 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-6-0'-3' | B5I0376-19 | Soil | 09/14/05 16:25 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-7-0'-5' | B5I0376-20 | Soil | 09/14/05 16:30 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-8-0'-2' | B5I0376-21 | Soil | 09/14/05 16:35 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-20-3' | B5I0376-22 | Soil | 09/14/05 16:35 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-9-0'-5' | B5I0376-23 | Soil | 09/14/05 16:40 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-10-10'-12' | B5I0376-24 | Soil | 09/14/05 16:45 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-20-13' | B5I0376-25 | Soil | 09/14/05 16:45 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-11-5'-10' | B5I0376-26 | Soil | 09/14/05 18:50 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-12-0'-5' | B5I0376-27 | Soil | 09/14/05 18:55 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| LEV-6-47' | B5I0376-28 | Soil | 09/14/05 19:00 | 09/16/05 12:55 |
| RIV-13-3' | B5I0376-29 | Soil | 09/14/05 20:00 | 09/16/05 12:55 |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Seattle

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RIV-14-1' | B5I0376-30 | Soil | $09 / 14 / 05$ | $20: 05$ |
| RIV-15-1' | B5I0376-31 | Soil | $09 / 16 / 0512: 55$ |  |
| RIV-16-1' | B5I0376-32 | Soil | $09 / 14 / 0520: 10$ | $09 / 16 / 0512: 55$ |
| RIV-17-1' | B5I0376-33 | Soil | $09 / 14 / 0520: 15$ | $09 / 16 / 0512: 55$ |
| RIV-18-1' | B5I0376-34 | Soil | $09 / 14 / 0520: 20$ | $09 / 16 / 0512: 55$ |
| RIV-19-1' | B5I0376-35 | Soil | $09 / 14 / 0520: 25$ | $09 / 16 / 0512: 55$ |
| RIV-20-1' | B5I0376-36 | Soil | $09 / 14 / 0520: 30$ | $09 / 16 / 0512: 55$ |
| LEV8-35' | B5I0376-37 | Soil | $09 / 14 / 0520: 40$ | $09 / 16 / 0512: 55$ |
| LEV9-23' | B5I0376-38 | Soil | $09 / 15 / 0516: 35$ | $09 / 16 / 0512: 55$ |
| 5-B-11-2'-4' | B5I0376-39 | Soil | $09 / 15 / 0519: 30$ | $09 / 16 / 0512: 55$ |
| 5-B-11-0'-1' | B5I0376-40 | Soil | $09 / 11 / 05$ | $14: 00$ |
| LEV 5B-39 | B5I0376-41 | Soil | $09 / 16 / 0512: 55$ |  |
| LEV 5B-43 | B5I0376-42 | Soil | $09 / 11 / 05$ | $14: 16$ |

## North Creek Analytical - Bothell

The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
10/02/05 15:29

# Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) North Creek Analytical - Bothell 

| Analyte | Result | MDL | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEV-2-19' (B5I0376-01) Soil ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Sampled: 09/09/05 11:18 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1430 | 16.0 |  | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 1770 | 31.9 | 250 | " | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $106 \%$ |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $106 \%$ |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV-1-18'-19' (B5I0376-02) Soi | il Sampled: 0 | $0515: 15$ | Receive | 09/16/0 | 12:55 |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1740 | 16.0 |  | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 2010 | 31.9 | 250 | " | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 112 \% |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $113 \%$ |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV-3-21'-25' (B5I0376-03) Soi | il Sampled: 0 | 05 19:30 | Receive | 09/16/0 | 12:55 |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 380 | 3.20 | 20.0 | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 2 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 475 | 6.38 | 50.0 |  | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 80.9 \% |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 99.8 \% |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| 5-B-9-22' (B5I0376-04) Soil Sampled: 09/10/05 10:50 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 282 | 1.60 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 366 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 84.1 \% |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 95.7 \% |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |


| 5-B-7-20'-25' (B5I0376-05) Soil | Sampled: 09/10/05 13:00 | Received: 09/16/05 |  |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | $383 \quad 8.00$ | $50.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 5 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/24/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | $567 \quad 16.0$ | 125 | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 57.0 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $102 \%$ | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

Reported: 10/02/05 15:29

# Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) North Creek Analytical - Bothell 

| Analyte | Result | MDL | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-B-8-15'-20' (B5I0376-06) Soil | Sampled: 09/10/05 19:45 |  | Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1550 | 16.0 |  | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 2250 | 31.9 | 250 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $105 \%$ |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $111 \%$ |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| 5-B-12-30'-33' (B5I0376-07) Soil | Sampled: 09/1 | 05 11:40 | Receive | : 09/16/05 | 12:55 |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 36.9 | 1.60 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 92.6 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 81.4 \% |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 99.3 \% |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

5-B-11-15'-20' (B5I0376-08) Soil Sampled: 09/11/05 13:41 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 3.21 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \mathrm{dry}$ | 1 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 19.7 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 71.2 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 93.5 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV 5-35'-40' (B5I0376-09) Soil Sampled: 09/11/05 18:55 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 4.43 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 74.2 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 99.2 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " |  |  |

LEV 4-35'-39' (B5I0376-10) Soil Sampled: 09/12/05 10:35 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 95.9 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 130 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 77.7 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 95.4 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

Reported: 10/02/05 15:29

# Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) North Creek Analytical - Bothell 

| Analyte | Result MDL | Reporting Limit Units Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RIV 2-0'-1' (B5I0376-11) Soil | Sampled: 09/12/05 14:40 | Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 2011.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 375 | 25.0 " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 76.9 \% | 50-150 | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 95.1 \% | 50-150 | " | " | " | " |  |
| RIV 3-5'-10' (B5I0376-12) Soil | Sampled: 09/12/05 16:30 | Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | $41.2 \quad 1.60$ | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 5 I 20017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 91.2 3.19 | 25.0 " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 82.6\% | 50-150 | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $101 \%$ | 50-150 | " | " | " | " |  |

RIV 4-15'-18' (B5I0376-13) Soil Sampled: 09/12/05 19:45 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 20017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 5.03 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 78.2 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 101 \% |  | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " |  |

RIV-12-3' (B5I0376-14) Soil Sampled: 09/13/05 16:50 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 2.28 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 8.03 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 77.4 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 99.8\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

RIV-12-14' (B5I0376-15) Soil Sampled: 09/13/05 16:50 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120017 | 09/20/05 | 09/22/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 6.63 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 77.5 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 98.2 \% |  | 50-150 |  | $\prime$ | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Analyte | Result |  | MDL | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |  |  |  |  |

## RIV-17-3' (B5I0376-16) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 12:15 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 20019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 93.7 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 96.6\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |

RIV-17-13' (B5I0376-17) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 12:20 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1.96 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | $5 \mathrm{I20019}$ | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 5.48 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.6\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 93.4 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

RIV-5-0'-3' (B5I0376-18) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:20 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 2.54 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 2 20019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 5.14 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 87.5 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 92.4 \% |  | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " |  |

RIV-6-0'-3' (B5I0376-19) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:25 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.9 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 97.3 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |

RIV-7-0'-5' (B5I0376-20) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:30 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 2.43 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 7.00 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 95.7 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 98.9\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Analyte | Result | MDL | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## RIV-8-0'-2' (B5I0376-21) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:35 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | 10.0 | kg dry | 1 | 5 I 20019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.6\% |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 94.9 \% |  | 50-1 |  |  | " | " | " |  |

RIV-20-3' (B5I0376-22) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:35 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 5.64 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | $5 \mathrm{I20019}$ | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 16.8 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 99.6\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 99.5 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

RIV-9-0'-5' (B5I0376-23) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:40 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 3.29 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.7 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 89.5 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| RIV-10-10'-12' (B5I0376-24) Soil | Sampled: | 05 16:45 | Received: 09/16/05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 11.1 | 1.60 | 10.0 mg/kg dry | 1 | 5120019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-09 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 12.4 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.7 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 96.3 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

RIV-20-13' (B5I0376-25) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:45 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 3.04 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 20019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 10.7 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 91.2 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 93.0\% |  | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

Reported: 10/02/05 15:29

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  |  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

RIV-11-5'-10' (B5I0376-26) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 18:50 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 3.55 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 5.31 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.1 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 89.8\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

RIV-12-0'-5' (B5I0376-27) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 18:55 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 5.28 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5I20019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 6.43 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 89.2 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 92.8 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV-6-47' (B5I0376-28) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 19:00 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 8.13 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 9.33 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 86.6 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 87.6\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | , |  |

RIV-13-3' (B5I0376-29) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 20:00 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1.76 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 20019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 95.4 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 95.3 \% |  | 50-150 |  | $\prime$ | " | " | " |  |

RIV-14-1' (B5I0376-30) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 20:05 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 2.23 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 7.18 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 91.8 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 90.2 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

Reported: 10/02/05 15:29

# Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) North Creek Analytical - Bothell 

| Analyte | Result | MDL | porting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

RIV-15-1' (B5I0376-31) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 20:10 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 4.10 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 16.8 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.4 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 94.1 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

RIV-16-1' (B5I0376-32) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 20:15 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1.85 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 20019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 4.27 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.7 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 90.6\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " |  |  |

RIV-17-1' (B5I0376-33) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 20:20 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 20019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 95.7 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 92.0\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |

RIV-18-1' (B5I0376-34) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 20:25 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 2.88 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 20019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 7.40 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 90.9 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 87.5 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

RIV-19-1' (B5I0376-35) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 20:30 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 2.03 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 20019 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 5.34 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 93.8\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 95.6\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

Reported: 10/02/05 15:29

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Analyte | Result | MDL | porting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

RIV-20-1' (B5I0376-36) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 20:40 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | $\mathbf{8 . 0 4}$ | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5120021 | $09 / 20 / 05$ | $09 / 23 / 05$ | NWTPH-Dx | J |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | $\mathbf{3 5 . 4}$ | 3.19 | 25.0 | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ |

LEV8-35' (B5I0376-37) Soil Sampled: 09/15/05 16:35 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 311 | 3.20 | $20.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 2 | 5 I 20021 | 09/20/05 | 09/24/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 386 | 6.38 | 50.0 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 81.0\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 96.6\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV9-23' (B5I0376-38) Soil Sampled: 09/15/05 19:30 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 367 | 3.20 | $20.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 2 | 5 I 20021 | 09/20/05 | 09/24/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 487 | 6.38 | 50.0 | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 87.0 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 101 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |

5-B-11-2'-4' (B5I0376-39) Soil Sampled: 09/11/05 14:00 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 15.7 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 20021 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 62.9 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | D-06 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 75.7 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 82.8 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

5-B-11-0'-1' (B5I0376-40) Soil Sampled: 09/11/05 14:16 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 10.9 | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 2 20021 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 86.8 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " | D-06 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 82.4 \% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 93.0\% |  | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
Reported: 10/02/05 15:29

# Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) North Creek Analytical - Bothell 

| Analyte | Result MDL | Reporting <br> Limit Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEV 5B-39 (B5I0376-41) Soil | Sampled: 09/16/05 10:50 | Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1861.60 | 10.0 mg/kg dry | 1 | 5 L 20021 | 09/20/05 | 09/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 2343.19 | 25.0 | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 84.5 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 98.3\% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV 5B-43 (B5I0376-42) Soil | Sampled: 09/16/05 10:55 | Received: 09/16/05 12 |  |  |  |  |  | D-15 |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | $961 \quad 8.00$ | $50.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 5 | 5120021 | 09/20/05 | 09/24/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | $1160 \quad 16.0$ | 125 | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 93.3\% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $103 \%$ | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
10/02/05 15:29

## Total Metals by EPA 6000/7000 Series Methods <br> North Creek Analytical - Bothell



5-B-11-2'-4' (B5I0376-39) Soil Sampled: 09/11/05 14:00 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Lead | $\mathbf{4 1 . 9}$ | 0.0260 | $0.500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | $5 I 20047$ | $09 / 20 / 05$ | $09 / 21 / 05$ | EPA 6020 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-B-11-0'-1' (B5I0376-40) Soil | Sampled: 09/11/05 14:16 | Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead | $\mathbf{1 0 3}$ | 0.0260 | $0.500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | $5 I 20047$ | $09 / 20 / 05$ | $09 / 21 / 05$ | EPA 6020 |

Seattle

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA Methods North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  |  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

RIV-12-3' (B5I0376-14) Soil Sampled: 09/13/05 16:50 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 2280 | $500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5126053 | 09/19/05 | 09/23/05 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 2430 | 500 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 2110 | 500 | " | " | " | " | " |
| RIV-12-14' (B5I0376-15) Soil Sampled: 09/13/05 16:50 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 3660 | $500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5126053 | 09/19/05 | 09/23/05 | 淐 9060 mod |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 3800 | 500 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 3550 | 500 | " | " | " | " | " |

RIV-17-3' (B5I0376-16) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 12:15 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Total Organic Carbon - Average | $\mathbf{2 1 0 0}$ | $500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | $5 I 26053$ | $09 / 19 / 05$ | $09 / 23 / 05$ | 洫A 9060 mod |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | $\mathbf{3 1 9 0}$ | 500 | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | $\mathbf{1 5 6 0}$ | 500 | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ |

RIV-17-13' (B5I0376-17) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 12:20 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Total Organic Carbon - Average | $\mathbf{4 3 8 0}$ | $500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5129044 | $09 / 20 / 05$ | $09 / 29 / 05$ | 3PA 9060 mod |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | $\mathbf{4 7 8 0}$ | 500 | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | $\mathbf{4 0 1 0}$ | 500 | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ |

RIV-20-3' (B5I0376-22) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:35 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Total Organic Carbon - Average | $\mathbf{2 8 0 0}$ | $500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 29044 | $09 / 20 / 05$ | $09 / 29 / 05$ | 3PA 9060 mod |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | $\mathbf{3 4 5 0}$ | 500 | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | $\mathbf{2 3 5 0}$ | 500 | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ | $"$ |

RIV-20-13' (B5I0376-25) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:45 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 5490 | $500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5 I 29044 | 09/20/05 | 09/29/05 | 3PA 9060 mod |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 5930 | 500 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 5140 | 500 | " | " | " | " | " |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


Seattle

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: } & \text { BNSF-Skykomish-1 } \\ \text { Project Number: } & \text { BN050-16423-522 }\end{aligned}$
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
10/02/05 15:29

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  |  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

LEV-2-19' (B5I0376-01) Soil Sampled: 09/09/05 11:18 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Dry Weight | 87.1 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5 I 22046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEV-1-18'-19' (B5I0376-02) Soil | Sampled: 09/09/05 15:15 | 5 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 90.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5 I 22046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| LEV-3-21'-25' (B5I0376-03) Soil | Sampled: 09/09/05 19:30 | Received | 9/16 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 87.2 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5 I 22046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |
| 5-B-9-22' (B5I0376-04) Soil Sampled: 09/10/05 10:50 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 82.7 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5122046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |
| 5-B-7-20'-25' (B5I0376-05) Soil | Sampled: 09/10/05 13:00 | Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5122046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| 5-B-8-15'-20' (B5I0376-06) Soil | Sampled: 09/10/05 19:45 | Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 94.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5 I 2046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |
| 5-B-12-30'-33' (B5I0376-07) Soil | Sampled: 09/11/05 11:40 | Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 94.0 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5 I 22046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |
| 5-B-11-15'-20' (B5I0376-08) Soil | Sampled: 09/11/05 13:41 | Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 84.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5 I 2046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |
| LEV 5-35'-40' (B5I0376-09) Soil | Sampled: 09/11/05 18:55 | Received | 9/16 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 94.1 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5 I 2046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Seattle

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

| Project: | BNSF-Skykomish-1 |  |
| ---: | :--- | :---: |
| Project Number: | BN050-16423-522 | Reported: |
| Project Manager: | Stephen Howard | $10 / 02 / 0515: 29$ |

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  |  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

LEV 4-35'-39' (B5I0376-10) Soil Sampled: 09/12/05 10:35 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Dry Weight | 92.7 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5 I 22046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RIV 2-0'-1' (B5I0376-11) Soil | Sampled: 09/12/05 14:40 | Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 79.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5 I 22046 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| RIV 3-5'-10' (B5I0376-12) Soil | Sampled: 09/12/05 16:30 | Received: | 16/0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 86.1 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |
| RIV 4-15'-18' (B5I0376-13) Soil Sampled: 09/12/05 19:45 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 92.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |
| RIV-12-3' (B5I0376-14) Soil Sampled: 09/13/05 16:50 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 92.0 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| RIV-12-14' (B5I0376-15) Soil Sampled: 09/13/05 16:50 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 73.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |
| RIV-17-3' (B5I0376-16) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 12:15 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 90.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |
| $\underline{\text { RIV-17-13' (B5I0376-17) Soil }}$ | Sampled: 09/14/05 12:20 | Received: 0 | 6/05 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 68.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |
| RIV-5-0'-3' (B5I0376-18) Soil | Sampled: 09/14/05 16:20 | Received: 0 | 6/05 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.2 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003R1 |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


Seattle

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

| Project: | BNSF-Skykomish-1 |  |
| ---: | :--- | :---: |
| Project Number: | BN050-16423-522 | Reported: |
| Project Manager: | Stephen Howard | $10 / 02 / 0515: 29$ |

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  |  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

## RIV-6-0'-3' (B5I0376-19) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:25 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Dry Weight | 85.4 | 1.00 | \% |  | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RIV-7-0'-5' (B5I0376-20) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:30 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.8 | 1.00 | \% |  | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| RIV-8-0'-2' (B5I0376-21) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:35 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 89.2 | 1.00 | \% |  | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| RIV-20-3' (B5I0376-22) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:35 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 88.6 | 1.00 | \% |  | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| RIV-9-0'-5' (B5I0376-23) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:40 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 84.5 | 1.00 | \% |  | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| RIV-10-10'-12' (B5I0376-24) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 16:45 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 76.3 | 1.00 | \% |  | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| $\underline{\text { RIV-20-13' (B5I0376-25) Soil } \text { Sampled: 09/14/05 16:45 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 72.3 | 1.00 | \% |  | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| RIV-11-5'-10' (B5I0376-26) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 18:50 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 89.4 | 1.00 | \% |  | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |
| RIV-12-0'-5' (B5I0376-27) Soil Sampled: 09/14/05 18:55 Received: 09/16/05 12:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 94.0 | 1.00 | \% |  | 5122047 | 09/22/05 | 09/23/05 | 3OPSPL003RI |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Seattle

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

| Project: | BNSF-Skykomish-1 |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Project Number: | BN050-16423-522 | Reported: |
| Project Manager: | Stephen Howard | $10 / 02 / 0515: 29$ |

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  |  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |



North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


Seattle

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
10/02/05 15:29

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  |  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

## LEV8-35' (B5I0376-37) Soil Sampled: 09/15/05 16:35 Received: 09/16/05 12:55

| Dry Weight | $\mathbf{8 2 . 4}$ | 1.00 | $\%$ | 1 | 5122048 | $09 / 22 / 05$ | $09 / 23 / 05$ | 3OPSPL003RI |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

LEV9-23' (B5I0376-38) Soil Sampled: 09/15/05 19:30 Received: 09/16/05 12:55


North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard 10/02/05 15:29

# Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) - Quality Control North Creek Analytical - Bothell 

|  | Reporting |  |  |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |

## Batch 5I20017: Prepared 09/20/05 Using EPA 3550B

| Blank (5I20017-BLK1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | 10.0 mg/kg |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 3.19 | 25.0 | " |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 6.60 |  |  | " | 8.33 | 79.2 \% | 50-150 |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 8.27 |  | " |  | 8.33 | 99.3 \% | 50-150 |  |  |
| LCS (5I20017-BS1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 59.8 | 1.60 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 | 89.7 | 71-120 |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 6.95 |  |  | " | 8.33 | 83.4 \% | 50-150 |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5I20017-BSD1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 59.0 | 1.60 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 | 88.5 | 71-120 | 1.35 | 40 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.05 |  |  | " | 8.33 | 84.6 \% | 50-150 |  |  |
| Duplicate (5I20017-DUP1) |  |  |  |  | Source: B5I0374-01 |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry |  | ND |  |  | NA | 40 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 3.19 | 25.0 | " |  | ND |  | NA | 40 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 9.29 |  |  | " | 12.2 | 76.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 11.6 |  |  | " | 12.2 | 95.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  |

Batch 5I20019: Prepared 09/20/05 Using EPA 3550B
Blank (5I20019-BLK1)

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 3.19 | 25.0 | " |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.28 |  |  | " | 8.33 | 87.4 \% | 50-150 |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 7.28 |  |  | " | 8.33 | 87.4 \% | 50-150 |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


Seattle

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) - Quality Control North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  | Reporting |  |  |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |

## Batch 5I20019: Prepared 09/20/05 Using EPA 3550B

LCS (5I20019-BS1)

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 59.0 | 1.60 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 | 88.5 | $71-120$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.00 |  | $"$ | 8.33 | $96.0 \%$ | $50-150$ |  |

LCS Dup (5I20019-BSD1)

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 57.8 | 1.60 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 | 86.7 | $71-120$ | 2.05 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.91 |  | $"$ | 8.33 | $95.0 \%$ | $50-150$ |  |  |


| Duplicate (5I20019-DUP1) |  | Source: B5I0376-16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry |  | ND |  |  | NA | 40 |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 3.69 | 3.19 | 25.0 |  | ND |  |  |  | 40 | J |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.12 |  | $"$ | 9.23 |  | 88.0\% | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 8.26 |  | " | 9.23 |  | $89.5 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  |  |

## Batch 5I20021: Prepared 09/20/05 Using EPA 3550B

| Blank (5I20021-BLK1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 1.60 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 3.19 | 25.0 | " |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 6.49 |  |  | " | 8.33 | 77.9 \% | 50-150 |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 8.76 |  |  | " | 8.33 | $105 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  |
| LCS (5I20021-BS1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 77.4 | 1.60 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 | 116 | 71-120 |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 9.39 |  |  | " | 8.33 | $113 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5I20021-BSD1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 68.4 | 1.60 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 | 103 | 71-120 | 12.3 | 40 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.42 |  |  | " | 8.33 | $101 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

# Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) - Quality Control North Creek Analytical - Bothell 

|  |  |  | Reporting |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |

## Batch 5I20021: Prepared 09/20/05 Using EPA 3550B

| Duplicate (5I20021-DUP1) |  | Source: B5I0376-36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 5.49 | 1.60 |  | kg dry |  | 8.04 |  |  | 37.7 | 40 | J |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 27.3 | 3.19 | 25.0 | " |  | 35.4 |  |  | 25.8 | 40 |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.72 |  |  | " | 10.3 |  | 75.0 \% | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 9.38 |  |  | " | 10.3 |  | 91.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207 Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Total Metals by EPA 6000/7000 Series Methods - Quality Control <br> North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  | Reporting |  |  |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |

## Batch 5I20047: Prepared 09/20/05 Using EPA 3050B

| Blank (5I20047-BLK1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lead | ND | 0.0260 | $0.500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCS (5I20047-BS1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead | 38.3 | 0.0260 | $0.500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 39.2 |  | 97.7 | 80-120 |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5I20047-BSD1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead | 35.9 | 0.0260 | $0.500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 37.7 |  | 95.2 | 80-120 | 6.47 | 20 |
| Matrix Spike (5I20047-MS1) |  | Source: B5I0423-01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead | 33.3 | 0.0211 | $0.407 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 33.8 | 1.41 | 94.3 | 29-162 |  |  |
| Matrix Spike Dup (5I20047-MSD1) |  | Source: B5I0423-01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead | 38.2 | 0.0260 | $0.500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 39.6 | 1.41 | 92.9 | 29-162 | 13.7 | 30 |
| Post Spike (5I20047-PS1) |  | Source: B5I0423-01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead | 0.0955 |  | $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{ml}$ | 0.100 | 0.00269 | 92.8 | 75-125 |  |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


Seattle

The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

Reported: 10/02/05 15:29

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA Methods - Quality Control North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  | Reporting |  |  |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |

## Batch 5I26053: Prepared 09/23/05 Using General Preparation

Blank (5I26053-BLK1)

| Total Organic Carbon - Average | ND | 500 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | ND | 500 | $"$ |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | ND | 500 | $"$ |

## LCS (5I26053-BS1)

| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 33600 | 500 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 29900 |  | 112 | 70-130 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 36000 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 120 | 70-130 |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 33700 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 113 | 70-130 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5I26053-BSD1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 31400 | 500 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 29900 |  | 105 | 70-130 | 6.77 | 30 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 32900 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 110 | 70-130 | 9.00 | 30 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 29000 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 97.0 | 70-130 | 15.0 | 30 |  |
| Duplicate (5I26053-DUP1) |  | Source: B5I0276-01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 7650 | $500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry |  | 9580 |  |  |  | 22.4 | 200 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 8650 | 500 | " | 11000 |  |  |  | 23.9 | 200 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 6890 | 500 | " | 7830 |  |  |  | 12.8 | 200 |  |
| Matrix Spike (5I26053-MS1) |  | Source: B5I0376-16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 3130 | 500 | mg/kg dry | 1500 | 2100 | 68.7 | 70-130 |  |  | Q-14 |

## Batch 5I29044: Prepared 09/29/05 Using General Preparation

Blank (5I29044-BLK1)

| Total Organic Carbon - Average | ND | 500 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | ND | 500 | $"$ |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | ND | 500 | $"$ |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
10/02/05 15:29

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA Methods - Quality Control North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  | Reporting |  |  |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |

## Batch 5I29044: Prepared 08/18/05 Using General Preparation

LCS (5I29044-BS1)


Matrix Spike (5I29044-MS1)
Source: B5I0376-22

| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 4160 | $500 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1870 | 2800 | 72.7 | $70-130$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


The RETEC Group, Inc. 1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207 Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
10/02/05 15:29

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods - Quality Control North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  | Reporting |  |  |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | MDL | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |

## Batch 5I22046: Prepared 09/22/05 Using Dry Weight

## Blank (5I22046-BLK1)

| Dry Weight | 99.8 |  | 1.00 | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Batch 5I22047: | Prepared 09/22/05 | Using Dry Weight |  |  |
| Blank (5I22047-BLK1) |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 100 | 1.00 | $\%$ |  |
| Batch 5I22048: | Prepared 09/22/05 | Using Dry Weight |  |  |
| Blank (5I22048-BLK1) |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 99.8 | 1.00 | $\%$ |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 425.420.9200 fax 425.420.9210

East 11115 Montgomery, Suite B, Spokane, WA 99206-4776
East 11115 Montgomery, Suite B,
509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290
509 9249200 fax 509. 924.9290 , Spokane, WA 99206-4776
509.924.9200 fax 509.924 .9290
9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beavert

Portland 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132
503.906.9200 fax 503.906.9210

Bend 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711
541.383.9310 fax 541.382.7588

2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119
907.563.9200 fax 907.563.9210

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish-1
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Notes and Definitions

D-06 The sample chromatographic pattern does not resemble the fuel standard used for quantitation.
D-09 Results in the diesel organics range are primarily due to overlap from a heavy oil range product.
D-15 Hydrocarbon pattern most closely resembles a heavy fuel oil range hydrocarbon product.
J
Q-14 Visual examination indicates the RPD and/or matrix spike recovery is outside the control limit due to a non-homogeneous sample matrix.

DET Analyte DETECTED
ND Analyte NOT DETECTED at or above the reporting limit
NR Not Reported
dry Sample results reported on a dry weight basis
RPD Relative Percent Difference

Chain of Custody Record

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 S.W. Kickitat Way, Suite 207 - Seatte, WA 98134-1162 (206) 624-9349 Phone - (206) 624-2839 Fax wwirretec.com


Chain of Custody Record

$$
\text { No } 101109
$$



The RETEC Group, Inc. (206) 624. 9349 Ph Way, Suite 207 - Seattle, WA 98134-1162 mw.retec.com

- Rete



# CASE NARRATIVE FOR B5L0547 

Client: The RETEC Group, Inc
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
Project Name: BNSF - Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522

### 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF CASE

Eighty soil samples were submitted for the analysis of:

- Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)
- Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA Methods


### 2.0 COMMENTS ON SAMPLE RECEIPT

The samples were received December 22, 2005 by North Creek Analytical Bothell. The temperature of the samples at the time of receipt was 3.5 degrees Celsius. Duplicate samples B5L0547-73 through B5L0547-80 were added December 29, 2005 for Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) analysis per the revised COC.

### 3.0 PREPARATIONS AND ANALYSIS

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

For laboratory batches 5L22069, 5L23010 and 5L27049, the spike recovery of diesel range hydrocarbons in the batch blank spike and/or blank spike duplicate was above the laboratory established control limits of 71-120. It was determined that the spike had concentrated and as a result, the blank spike and blank spike duplicates were high due to the incorrect calculated amount of spike added to the spiked samples. A virtual spike (BS2/BSD2) was created with the correct concentration of diesel range hydrocarbons and uploaded for each diesel range hydrocarbon batch (5L22068, 5L22069, 5L23010 and 5L27049) with passing spike recoveries for diesel range hydrocarbons. The blank spikes were qualified and reported.

No additional anomalies, discrepancies, or issues were associated with sample preparation, analysis and quality control other than those already qualified in the data and described in the Notes and Definitions page at the end of the report.

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA Methods

No additional anomalies, discrepancies, or issues were associated with sample preparation, analysis and quality control other than those already qualified in the data and described in the Notes and Definitions page at the end of the report.


[^3]
# Seattle 

## 10 January 2006

Stephen Howard
The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134
RE: BNSF-Skykomish
RE:BNSFKkkomish

Enclosed are the results of analyses for samples received by the laboratory on 12/22/05 16:55. If you have any questions concerning this report, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,


Kate Haney
Project Manager

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134


Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
01/10/06 17:50

## ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEV8A-10' | B5L0547-01 | Soil | 12/19/05 16:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8A-15' | B5L0547-02 | Soil | 12/19/05 16:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8A-17.5' | B5L0547-03 | Soil | 12/19/05 16:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8A-20' | B5L0547-04 | Soil | 12/19/05 16:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8A-25' | B5L0547-05 | Soil | 12/19/05 16:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8A-30' | B5L0547-06 | Soil | 12/19/05 16:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8A-32.5' | B5L0547-07 | Soil | 12/19/05 16:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8A-35' | B5L0547-08 | Soil | 12/19/05 16:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-10' | B5L0547-09 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-15' | B5L0547-10 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-17.5' | B5L0547-11 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-20' | B5L0547-12 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-22.5' | B5L0547-13 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-25' | B5L0547-14 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-27.5' | B5L0547-15 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-30' | B5L0547-16 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-32.5 ${ }^{\prime}$ | B5L0547-17 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-35' | B5L0547-18 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-10' | B5L0547-19 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-15' | B5L0547-20 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-17.5' | B5L0547-21 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-20' | B5L0547-22 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-22.5' | B5L0547-23 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-25' | B5L0547-24 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-27.5' | B5L0547-25 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-30' | B5L0547-26 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-32.5' | B5L0547-27 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-35' | B5L0547-28 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-10' | B5L0547-29 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

## Project: BNSF-Skykomish

Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
01/10/06 17:50

## ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEV6A-15' | B5L0547-30 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-17.5' | B5L0547-31 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-20' | B5L0547-32 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-22.5' | B5L0547-33 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-25' | B5L0547-34 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-27.5' | B5L0547-35 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-30' | B5L0547-36 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-32.5' | B5L0547-37 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-35' | B5L0547-38 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-37.5' | B5L0547-39 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-40' | B5L0547-40 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-42.5' | B5L0547-41 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-45' | B5L0547-42 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-10' | B5L0547-43 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-15' | B5L0547-44 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-17.5' | B5L0547-45 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-20' | B5L0547-46 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-22.5' | B5L0547-47 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-25' | B5L0547-48 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-27.5' | B5L0547-49 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-30' | B5L0547-50 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-32.5' | B5L0547-51 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-35' | B5L0547-52 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV4A-10' | B5L0547-53 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV4A-15' | B5L0547-54 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV4A-17.5' | B5L0547-55 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV4A-20' | B5L0547-56 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV4A-22.5' | B5L0547-57 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV4A-25' | B5L0547-58 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 425.420.9200 fax 425.420.9210

Spokane 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290

Portland 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 503.906.9200 fax 503.906.9210

Bend 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 541.383.9310 fax 541.382.7588

Anchorage 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 907.563 .9200 fax 907.563.9210

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

## Project: BNSF-Skykomish

Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
01/10/06 17:50

## ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEV4A-27.5' | B5L0547-59 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV4A-30' | B5L0547-60 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV4A-32.5' | B5L0547-61 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV4A-35' | B5L0547-62 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-10' | B5L0547-63 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-15' | B5L0547-64 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-17.5' | B5L0547-65 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-20' | B5L0547-66 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-22.5' | B5L0547-67 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-25' | B5L0547-68 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-30' | B5L0547-69 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-32.5' | B5L0547-70 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-35' | B5L0547-71 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-37.5' | B5L0547-72 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-40' | B5L0547-73 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8A-17.5' DUP | B5L0547-74 | Soil | 12/19/05 16:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV8B-20' DUP | B5L0547-75 | Soil | 12/20/05 11:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV7A-20' DUP | B5L0547-76 | Soil | 12/20/05 16:00 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV6A-20' DUP | B5L0547-77 | Soil | 12/21/05 10:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV5C-22.5' DUP | B5L0547-78 | Soil | 12/21/05 14:30 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV4A-15' DUP | B5L0547-79 | Soil | 12/22/05 10:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |
| LEV2A-22.5' DUP | B5L0547-80 | Soil | 12/22/05 13:15 | 12/22/05 16:55 |

Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522 Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell


LEV8A-17.5' (B5L0547-03) Soil Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 879 | 109 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 866 | 272 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 86.5 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $111 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV8A-20' (B5L0547-04) Soil Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 3070 | 221 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 2540 | 553 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 101 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 120 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | $"$ |  |

LEV8A-25' (B5L0547-05) Soil Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 60.2 | 11.5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 54.4 | 28.8 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 97.6 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $109 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


Kate Haney, Project Manager

| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br> 907.563 .9200 fax 907.563.9210 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: BNSF-Skykomish } & \text { Reported: }\end{aligned}$ Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV8A-30' (B5L0547-06) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/ | /05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 18.1 | 11.5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-06 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 28.8 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 94.3 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $108 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV8A-32.5' (B5L0547-07) Soil Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 11.7 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 29.2 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 93.6 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $108 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV8A-35' (B5L0547-08) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12 | /05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 35.0 | 11.9 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 30.0 | 29.8 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 98.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $111 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV8B-10' (B5L0547-09) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 48.6 | 10.6 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 107 | 26.6 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 99.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 112 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV8B-15' (B5L0547-10) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1320 | 113 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 1420 | 282 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 83.6\% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $113 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Kate Haney, Project Manager

Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: } & \text { BNSF-Skykomish } \\ \text { Project Number: } & \text { BN050-16423-522 }\end{aligned}$ Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV8B-17.5' (B5L0547-11) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 3140 | 225 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 2660 | 564 | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.6 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $114 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV8B-20' (B5L0547-12) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 11.9 | 10.8 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-06 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 27.0 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 96.6 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 111 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV8B-22.5' (B5L0547-13) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.3 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 33.2 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 96.4 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $110 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV8B-25' (B5L0547-14) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 12.7 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 31.7 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 97.2 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $113 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV8B-27.5' (B5L0547-15) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 12.9 | 11.3 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-06 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 28.3 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 97.6\% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 112 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: } & \text { BNSF-Skykomish } \\ \text { Project Number: } & \text { BN050-16423-522 }\end{aligned}$ Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV8B-30' (B5L0547-16) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 | Received: 12/ | /05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 12.8 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/23/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 32.0 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 98.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 111 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV8B-32.5' (B5L0547-17) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.2 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/24/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 32.9 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 95.5 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $110 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV8B-35' (B5L0547-18) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 12.4 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/24/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 31.0 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 95.2 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 110 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV7A-10' (B5L0547-19) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 963 | 105 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/24/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 2270 | 262 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 90.2 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $109 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV7A-15' (B5L0547-20) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 2080 | 114 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L22068 | 12/22/05 | 12/24/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 2490 | 284 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 96.3 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $124 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

## Project: BNSF-Skykomish <br> Project Number: BN050-16423-522 Reported: <br> Project Manager: Stephen Howard <br> \section*{Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)} <br> North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV7A-17.5' (B5L0547-21) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 1 | 22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1770 | 120 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 1440 | 300 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 87.5 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $112 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV7A-20' (B5L0547-22) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.8 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 34.4 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 87.8 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $105 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV7A-22.5' (B5L0547-23) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 17.4 | 12.5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 31.3 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 100 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $119 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV7A-25' (B5L0547-24) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.2 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 33.1 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 91.8 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $110 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV7A-27.5' (B5L0547-25) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 14.3 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 35.7 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 97.5 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 117 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 425.420.9200 fax 425.420 .9210

| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906.9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 |
|  | 07.563.9200 fax 907.563.9210 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

| Project: | BNSF-Skykomish |
| ---: | :---: |
| Project Number: | BN050-16423-522 |
| Project Manager: | Stephen Howard |

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV7A-30' (B5L0547-26) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22 | /05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 129 | 13.3 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 130 | 33.2 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 95.5 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 109 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV7A-32.5' (B5L0547-27) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.9 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 34.7 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 89.7 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $112 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV7A-35' (B5L0547-28) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 12.7 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 31.8 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 99.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 120 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV6A-10' (B5L0547-29) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 10.9 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 27.2 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $103 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 121 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV6A-15' (B5L0547-30) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 33.5 | 11.2 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 75.8 | 28.0 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 91.3 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $107 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Parrors
Kate Haney, Project Manager

Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

## Project: BNSF-Skykomish <br> Project Number: BN050-16423-522 Reported: <br> Project Manager: Stephen Howard <br> \section*{Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)} <br> North Creek Analytical - Bothell



LEV6A-22.5' (B5L0547-33) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.7 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 34.3 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 104 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 122 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV6A-25' (B5L0547-34) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 14.3 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 35.8 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 89.1\% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $110 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV6A-27.5' (B5L0547-35) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.3 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 33.4 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 86.8 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $105 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Kate Haney, Project Manager

Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

## Project: BNSF-Skykomish <br> Project Number: BN050-16423-522 Reported: <br> Project Manager: Stephen Howard <br> \section*{Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)} <br> North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV6A-30' (B5L0547-36) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 12/ | /05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.9 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/27/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 34.8 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 96.6 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $115 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV6A-32.5' (B5L0547-37) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 10.9 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 27.3 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 88.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 106 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| LEV6A-35' (B5L0547-38) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 12 | /05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 10.4 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 26.0 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.6 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 111 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV6A-37.5' (B5L0547-39) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | $11.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 27.5 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $100 \%$ | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $118 \%$ | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| LEV6A-40' (B5L0547-40) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | $10.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L22069 | 12/22/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 27.0 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $91.9 \%$ | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 112 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Kate Haney, Project Manager

| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 $425.420 .9200 \text { fax } 425.420 .9210$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906.9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 |
|  | 907.563.9200 fax 907.563.9210 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: BNSF-Skykomish } & \text { Reported: }\end{aligned}$ Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV6A-42.5' (B5L0547-41) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 1 | 22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 10.8 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 26.9 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 83.3 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 102 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV6A-45' (B5L0547-42) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | $10.6 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 26.4 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 86.4 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 107 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| LEV5C-10' (B5L0547-43) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | $10.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 27.0 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 88.8\% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $106 \%$ | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV5C-15' (B5L0547-44) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 18900 | 1040 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 50 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 14600 | 2600 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $N D$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " | S-01 |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $N D$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " | S-01 |

LEV5C-17.5' (B5L0547-45) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 4620 | 246 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 3910 | 615 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 88.8 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $115 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Kate Haney, Project Manager

| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 $425.420 .9200 \text { fax } 425.420 .9210$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906.9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 |
|  | 907.563.9200 fax 907.563.9210 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: BNSF-Skykomish } & \text { Reported: }\end{aligned}$ Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV5C-20' (B5L0547-46) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/ | /05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 9740 | 348 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 8290 | 871 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 96.9 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 120 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV5C-22.5' (B5L0547-47) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 124 | $10.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 118 | 27.0 | " | " | " | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.4 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 107 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV5C-25' (B5L0547-48) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | $12.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 31.7 | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 83.4 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $106 \%$ | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV5C-27.5' (B5L0547-49) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | $11.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 27.4 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 86.5 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $106 \%$ | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| LEV5C-30' (B5L0547-50) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | $11.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 28.8 | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 87.2 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $106 \%$ | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Kate Haney, Project Manager

Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: } & \text { BNSF-Skykomish } \\ \text { Project Number: } & \text { BN050-16423-522 }\end{aligned}$ Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Analyte | Result | Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method |

LEV5C-32.5' (B5L0547-51) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 11.7 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 29.3 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 83.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 103 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV5C-35' (B5L0547-52) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 12.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 29.9 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 80.0 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 99.5 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV4A-10' (B5L0547-53) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 10.9 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 27.2 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 87.3 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $105 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV4A-15' (B5L0547-54) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 47.0 | 10.5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 89.3 | 26.3 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 90.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $109 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV4A-17.5' (B5L0547-55) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 2780 | 122 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 5 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 2270 | 304 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 86.2 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 107 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br> 907.563 .9200 fax 907.563 .9210 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

| Project: | BNSF-Skykomish |
| ---: | :---: |
| Project Number: | BN050-16423-522 |
| Project Manager: | Stephen Howard |

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV4A-20' (B5L0547-56) Soil | Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1990 | $112 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 01/03/06 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 1910 | 280 | " | " | " | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 72.7 \% | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $110 \%$ | 50-150 |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV4A-22.5' (B5L0547-57) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 2090 | 105 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 5 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 01/03/06 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 1940 | 262 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 75.4 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $109 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV4A-25' (B5L0547-58) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 385 | 22.7 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 2 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 01/03/06 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 378 | 56.7 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 87.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $112 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV4A-27.5' (B5L0547-59) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 21.7 | 10.6 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-06 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 26.6 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 85.5 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $108 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV4A-30' (B5L0547-60) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 12.7 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L23010 | 12/23/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 31.7 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 70.5 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 78.0 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Kate Haney, Project Manager

| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br> 907.563 .9200 fax 907.563.9210 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

| Project: | BNSF-Skykomish |  |
| ---: | :--- | :---: |
| Project Number: | BN050-16423-522 | Reported: |
| Project Manager: | Stephen Howard | $01 / 10 / 0617: 50$ |

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV4A-32.5' (B5L0547-61) Soil | Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 | Received: 1 | 22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 40.3 | 11.4 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 44.9 | 28.6 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $105 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $110 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV4A-35' (B5L0547-62) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 23.7 | 14.5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 36.2 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $117 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 124 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV2A-10' (B5L0547-63) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 161 | 10.7 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 231 | 26.8 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $114 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $119 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV2A-15' (B5L0547-64) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 10800 | 1110 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 50 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 13500 | 2790 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $N D$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " | S-01 |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $N D$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " | S-01 |

LEV2A-17.5' (B5L0547-65) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1600 | 106 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 5 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 1650 | 264 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $117 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $126 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Kate Haney, Project Manager

Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

## Project: BNSF-Skykomish <br> Project Number: BN050-16423-522 Reported: <br> Project Manager: Stephen Howard <br> \section*{Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)} <br> North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV2A-20' (B5L0547-66) Soil | Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 | Received: 12/ | 2/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 33.8 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $100 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $105 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV2A-22.5' (B5L0547-67) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 83.4 | 14.1 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 105 | 35.3 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $100 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $108 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV2A-25' (B5L0547-68) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 14.3 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/29/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 35.7 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $108 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $119 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV2A-30' (B5L0547-69) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.6 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/29/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 34.0 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 98.2 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $111 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV2A-32.5' (B5L0547-70) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 11.5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/29/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 28.7 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | $101 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $111 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Kate Haney, Project Manager

| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br> 907.563 .9200 fax 907.563.9210 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: } & \text { BNSF-Skykomish } \\ \text { Project Number: } & \text { BN050-16423-522 }\end{aligned}$
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV2A-35' (B5L0547-71) Soil | Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 | Received: 12/ | /05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 11.8 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/29/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 29.5 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 93.7 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $108 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV2A-37.5' (B5L0547-72) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 108 | 14.5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/29/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 126 | 36.4 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 101 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $106 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV2A-40' (B5L0547-73) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 40.3 | 12.2 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L27049 | 12/27/05 | 12/29/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 54.4 | 30.6 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 95.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 111 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV8A-17.5' DUP (B5L0547-74) Soil Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1540 | 111 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 10 | 5L29040 | 12/29/05 | 12/31/05 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 1500 | 278 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 99.1 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $103 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV8B-20' DUP (B5L0547-75) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 19.4 | 10.8 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L29040 | 12/29/05 | 12/31/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 27.0 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 91.7 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $103 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Kate Haney, Project Manager

Seattle 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

## Project: BNSF-Skykomish <br> Project Number: BN050-16423-522 Reported: <br> Project Manager: Stephen Howard <br> \section*{Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up)} <br> North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV7A-20' DUP (B5L0547-76) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 13.7 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L29040 | 12/29/05 | 12/31/05 | NWTPH-Dx |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 34.2 | " | " | " | " | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 93.0\% 50 | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $104 \% 50$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV6A-20' DUP (B5L0547-77) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 14.9 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L29040 | 12/29/05 | 12/31/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 37.2 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 89.5 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 101 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

LEV5C-22.5' DUP (B5L0547-78) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 138 | 11.3 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L29040 | 12/29/05 | 01/03/06 | NWTPH-Dx | D-15a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 136 | 28.3 | " | " | " | " | " | " | D-15 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 92.0\% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $104 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV4A-15' DUP (B5L0547-79) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 34.3 | 10.7 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L29040 | 12/29/05 | 01/03/06 | NWTPH-Dx | D-09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 79.7 | 26.8 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 87.8 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $103 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |  |

LEV2A-22.5' DUP (B5L0547-80) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 26.2 | 14.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 5L29040 | 12/29/05 | 12/31/05 | NWTPH-Dx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 35.1 | " | " | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 91.5 \% | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | $104 \%$ | 50-150 |  |  | " | " | " | " |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br> $\quad$907.563.9200 fax 907.563.9210 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522 Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Analyte | Reporting |  | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Result | Limit Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEV8A-10' (B5L0547-01) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 5850 | $564 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A09026 | 12/27/05 | 01/06/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 6560 | 564 | " | " | " | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 5210 | 564 | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV8A-35' (B5L0547-08) Soil S | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 2190 | $597 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A09026 | 12/27/05 | 01/06/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 2580 | 597 " | " | " | " | " | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 1500 | 597 | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV8B-10' (B5L0547-09) Soil S | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 8140 | $532 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A09026 | 12/27/05 | 01/06/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 9160 | 532 | " | " | " | " | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 6800 | 532 " | $"$ | " | " | $"$ | " |  |
| LEV8B-35' (B5L0547-18) Soil S | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 4780 | $620 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A09026 | 12/27/05 | 01/06/06 | EPA 9060 mod. |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 5500 | 620 " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 4140 | 620 | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV7A-10' (B5L0547-19) Soil S | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 20500 | $524 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A09026 | 12/27/05 | 01/06/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 24700 | 524 " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 16900 | 524 " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV7A-35' (B5L0547-28) Soil S | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 2150 | $647 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A09026 | 12/27/05 | 01/06/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 2300 | 647 | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 2020 | 647 | " | " | " | " | " |  |



The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522 Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV6A-40' (B5L0547-40) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 |  | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | e 2970 | 547 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A10032 | 12/27/05 | 01/09/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 3680 | 547 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 2220 | 547 | " | " | * | " | " | " |  |
| LEV5C-10' (B5L0547-43) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12 | /05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | e 3390 | 542 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A10032 | 12/27/05 | 01/09/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 3460 | 542 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 3340 | 542 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV4A-10' (B5L0547-53) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | e 4200 | 548 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A10032 | 12/27/05 | 01/09/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 5180 | 548 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 3520 | 548 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV4A-35' (B5L0547-62) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | e 3870 | 725 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A10032 | 12/27/05 | 01/09/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 4250 | 725 | " | " | " | " | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 3370 | 725 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV2A-10' (B5L0547-63) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | e 9010 | 544 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A10032 | 12/27/05 | 01/09/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 11200 | 544 | " | " | " | " | " | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 6650 | 544 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |
| LEV2A-35' (B5L0547-71) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | e 1750 | 596 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1 | 6A10032 | 12/27/05 | 01/09/06 | EPA 9060 mod . |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 1920 | 596 | " | " | " | " | " | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 1590 | 596 | " | " | " | " | " | " |  |



| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br>  |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV8A-10' (B5L0547-01) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 88.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27043 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8A-15' (B5L0547-02) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.2 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27043 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8A-17.5' (B5L0547-03) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 92.0 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27043 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8A-20' (B5L0547-04) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 90.4 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27043 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8A-25' (B5L0547-05) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 86.8 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27043 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8A-30' (B5L0547-06) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 86.8 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27043 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8A-32.5' (B5L0547-07) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 85.7 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27043 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8A-35' (B5L0547-08) Soil | Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 83.8 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8B-10' (B5L0547-09) Soil S | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 94.0 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV8B-15' (B5L0547-10) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 88.7 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8B-17.5' (B5L0547-11) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 | Received: 1 | 0516 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 88.7 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8B-20' (B5L0547-12) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 92.7 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8B-22.5' (B5L0547-13) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 | Received: 1 | 0516 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 75.4 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8B-25' (B5L0547-14) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 78.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8B-27.5' (B5L0547-15) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 | Received: 1 | 0516 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 88.2 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8B-30' (B5L0547-16) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 78.2 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8B-32.5' (B5L0547-17) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 | Received: 1 | 0516 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 75.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8B-35' (B5L0547-18) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 80.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV7A-10' (B5L0547-19) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 95.4 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV7A-15' (B5L0547-20) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 88.1 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV7A-17.5' (B5L0547-21) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 83.2 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV7A-20' (B5L0547-22) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 71.4 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV7A-22.5' (B5L0547-23) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 79.5 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV7A-25' (B5L0547-24) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 75.5 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV7A-27.5' (B5L0547-25) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 70.0 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV7A-30' (B5L0547-26) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 74.2 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV7A-32.5' (B5L0547-27) Soil | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | 0 Received: | 0516 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 70.8 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27044 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br>  |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: } & \text { BNSF-Skykomish } \\ \text { Project Number: } & \text { BN050-16423-522 }\end{aligned}$
Reported:
Seattle, WA 98134
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
01/10/06 17:50

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV7A-35' (B5L0547-28) Soil S | Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 77.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-10' (B5L0547-29) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.5 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-15' (B5L0547-30) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 88.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-17.5' (B5L0547-31) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | O Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 87.0 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-20' (B5L0547-32) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 67.5 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-22.5' (B5L0547-33) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: | 0516 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 72.7 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-25' (B5L0547-34) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 12 | 5 16:5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 69.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-27.5' (B5L0547-35) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 1 | 0516 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 74.2 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-30' (B5L0547-36) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 12 | 5 16:5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 71.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br>  |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: } & \text { BNSF-Skykomish } \\ \text { Project Number: } & \text { BN050-16423-522 }\end{aligned}$
Reported:
Seattle, WA 98134
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
01/10/06 17:50

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV6A-32.5' (B5L0547-37) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 90.4 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-35' (B5L0547-38) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 94.5 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-37.5' (B5L0547-39) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: 1 | /05 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 89.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-40' (B5L0547-40) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.4 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-42.5' (B5L0547-41) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 | Received: | 0516 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.4 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-45' (B5L0547-42) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 93.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV5C-10' (B5L0547-43) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 92.2 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV5C-15' (B5L0547-44) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 92.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV5C-17.5' (B5L0547-45) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 81.8 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br>  |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: } & \text { BNSF-Skykomish } \\ \text { Project Number: } & \text { BN050-16423-522 }\end{aligned}$
Reported:
Seattle, WA 98134
Project Manager: Stephen Howard
01/10/06 17:50

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV5C-20' (B5L0547-46) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 82.8 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV5C-22.5' (B5L0547-47) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 92.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27045 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV5C-25' (B5L0547-48) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 78.7 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV5C-27.5' (B5L0547-49) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 90.0 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV5C-30' (B5L0547-50) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 86.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| $\underline{\text { LEV5C-32.5' (B5L0547-51) Soil }}$ | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 85.0 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV5C-35' (B5L0547-52) Soil | Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 84.1 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV4A-10' (B5L0547-53) Soil | Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.2 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV4A-15' (B5L0547-54) Soil | Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 | Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 93.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br>  |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV4A-17.5' (B5L0547-55) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 81.1 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV4A-20' (B5L0547-56) Soil | Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 | Received: 12 | 5 16:5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 88.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV4A-22.5' (B5L0547-57) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 92.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV4A-25' (B5L0547-58) Soil | Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 | Received: 12 | 5 16:5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 86.7 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV4A-27.5' (B5L0547-59) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 92.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| $\underline{\text { LEV4A-30' (B5L0547-60) Soil }}$ | Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 | Received: 12 | 5 16:5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 78.0 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| $\underline{\text { LEV4A-32.5' (B5L0547-61) Soil }{ }^{\prime} \text { Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 87.4 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV4A-35' (B5L0547-62) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 69.0 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV2A-10' (B5L0547-63) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br>  |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV2A-15' (B5L0547-64) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 89.1 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV2A-17.5' (B5L0547-65) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV2A-20' (B5L0547-66) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 73.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| $\underline{\text { LEV2A-22.5' (B5L0547-67) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 70.1 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27046 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV2A-25' (B5L0547-68) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 69.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27047 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV2A-30' (B5L0547-69) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 72.6 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27047 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV2A-32.5' (B5L0547-70) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 86.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27047 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| $\underline{\text { LEV2A-35' (B5L0547-71) Soil }{ }^{\prime} \text { Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 83.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27047 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV2A-37.5' (B5L0547-72) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 68.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27047 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134


Project Number: BN050-16423-522
Reported:
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| LEV2A-40' (B5L0547-73) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 81.7 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L27047 | 12/27/05 | 12/28/05 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8A-17.5' DUP (B5L0547-74) Soil Sampled: 12/19/05 16:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 88.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L30045 | 12/30/05 | 01/03/06 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV8B-20' DUP (B5L0547-75) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 11:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 91.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L30045 | 12/30/05 | 01/03/06 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV7A-20' DUP (B5L0547-76) Soil Sampled: 12/20/05 16:00 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 72.8 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L30045 | 12/30/05 | 01/03/06 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV6A-20' DUP (B5L0547-77) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 10:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 66.4 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L30045 | 12/30/05 | 01/03/06 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV5C-22.5' DUP (B5L0547-78) Soil Sampled: 12/21/05 14:30 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 87.9 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L30045 | 12/30/05 | 01/03/06 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV4A-15' DUP (B5L0547-79) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 10:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 94.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L30045 | 12/30/05 | 01/03/06 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |
| LEV2A-22.5' DUP (B5L0547-80) Soil Sampled: 12/22/05 13:15 Received: 12/22/05 16:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 70.3 | 1.00 | \% | 1 | 5L30045 | 12/30/05 | 01/03/06 | BSOPSPL003R08 |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Sea | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 $425.420 .9200 \text { fax } 425.420 .9210$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 $503.906 .9200 \text { fax 503.906.9210 }$ |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 <br> 541.383.9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

## Project: BNSF-Skykomish <br> Project Number: BN050-16423-522 <br> Project Manager: Stephen Howard North Creek Analytical - Bothell

Reported:
01/10/06 17:50

Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) - Quality Control

|  | Reporting |  |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |

## Batch 5L22068: Prepared 12/22/05 Using EPA 3550B

| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 25.0 | " |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.64 |  | " | 8.33 | 91.7 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 8.59 |  | " | 8.33 | 103 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS (5L22068-BS1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 78.8 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 | 118 | 71-120 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.88 |  | " | 8.33 | 94.6 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS (5L22068-BS2) X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 78.8 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 87.8 | 89.7 | 71-120 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.88 |  | " | 8.33 | 94.6 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5L22068-BSD1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 78.0 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 | 117 | 71-120 | 1.02 | 40 |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.89 |  | " | 8.33 | 94.7 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5L22068-BSD2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 78.0 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 87.8 | 88.8 | 71-120 | 1.02 | 40 |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.89 |  | " | 8.33 | 94.7 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Duplicate (5L22068-DUP1) | Source: B5L0547-01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 4.56 | 11.3 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 3.43 |  |  | 28.3 | 40 |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 11.1 | 28.2 | " | 11.1 |  |  | 0.00 | 40 |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.75 |  | " | 9.41 | 93.0 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 9.95 |  | " | 9.41 | 106 | 50-150 |  |  |  |

## North Creek Analytical - Bothell

The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br>  |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522 Project Manager: Stephen Howard

Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) - Quality Control North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Analyte | Reporting |  |  | Spike Source |  |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Result | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |
| Batch 5L22069: Prepared 12/22/05 | Using EPA 3550B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blank (5L22069-BLK1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 25.0 | " |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.94 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 95.3 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 9.85 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 118 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS (5L22069-BS1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 84.0 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 |  | 126 | 71-120 |  |  | X |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.14 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 97.7 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS (5L22069-BS2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 84.0 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 87.8 |  | 95.7 | 71-120 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.14 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 97.7 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5L22069-BSD1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 87.0 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 |  | 130 | 71-120 | 3.51 | 40 | X |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.38 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 101 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5L22069-BSD2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 87.0 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 87.8 |  | 99.1 | 71-120 | 3.51 | 40 |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.38 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 101 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Duplicate (5L22069-DUP1) |  |  |  |  | ource: | 0547-23 |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 8.87 | 12.6 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry |  | 17.4 |  |  | 64.9 | 40 | Q-06 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 7.66 | 31.4 | " |  | 15.8 |  |  | 69.4 | 40 | Q-06 |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 10.1 |  | " | 10.5 |  | 96.2 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 12.5 |  | " | 10.5 |  | 119 | 50-150 |  |  |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br>  |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
$\begin{array}{rlc}\text { Project: } & \text { BNSF-Skykomish } & \text { Reported: } \\ \text { Project Number: } & \text { BN050-16423-522 } & 01 / 10 / 0617: 50\end{array}$
Seattle, WA 98134

## Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) - Quality Control North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Analyte | Reporting |  |  | Spike Source |  |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Result | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |
| Batch 5L23010: Prepared 12/23/05 | Using EPA 3550B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blank (5L23010-BLK1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 25.0 | " |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.20 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 86.4 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 9.02 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 108 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS (5L23010-BS1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 81.0 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 |  | 121 | 71-120 |  |  | X |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.53 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 90.4 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS (5L23010-BS2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 81.0 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 87.8 |  | 92.3 | 71-120 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.53 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 90.4 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5L23010-BSD1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 80.1 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 |  | 120 | 71-120 | 1.12 | 40 |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.42 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 89.1 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5L23010-BSD2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 80.1 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 87.8 |  | 91.2 | 71-120 | 1.12 | 40 |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.42 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 89.1 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Duplicate (5L23010-DUP1) |  |  |  |  | ource: | 0547-42 |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 5.19 | 10.5 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry |  | 3.04 |  |  | 52.2 | 40 | Q-05 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 7.62 | 26.3 | " |  | 7.50 |  |  | 1.59 | 40 |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 7.16 |  | " | 8.76 |  | 81.7 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 8.24 |  | " | 8.76 |  | 94.1 | 50-150 |  |  |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 425.420 .9200 fax 425.420.9210 |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924 .9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906 .9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 <br>  |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134

Project: BNSF-Skykomish
Project Number: BN050-16423-522 Project Manager: Stephen Howard

Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) - Quality Control North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Analyte | Reporting |  |  | Spike Source |  |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Result | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |
| Batch 5L27049: Prepared 12/27/05 | Using EPA 3550B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blank (5L27049-BLK1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | ND | 25.0 | " |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.80 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 106 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 9.31 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 112 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS (5L27049-BS1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 83.1 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 |  | 125 | 71-120 |  |  | X |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.10 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 97.2 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS (5L27049-BS2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 83.1 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 87.8 |  | 94.6 | 71-120 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.10 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 97.2 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5L27049-BSD1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 83.9 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 66.7 |  | 126 | 71-120 | 0.958 | 40 | X |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.10 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 97.2 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (5L27049-BSD2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 83.9 | 10.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 87.8 |  | 95.6 | 71-120 | 0.958 | 40 |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 8.10 |  | " | 8.33 |  | 97.2 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Duplicate (5L27049-DUP1) |  |  |  |  | ource: B | 0547-61 |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 45.4 | 11.3 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry |  | 40.3 |  |  | 11.9 | 40 |  |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 48.8 | 28.2 | " |  | 44.9 |  |  | 8.32 | 40 |  |
| Surrogate: 2-FBP | 10.3 |  | " | 9.41 |  | 109 | 50-150 |  |  |  |
| Surrogate: Octacosane | 11.3 |  | " | 9.41 |  | 120 | 50-150 |  |  |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Seat | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 $425.420 .9200 \text { fax } 425.420 .9210$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 <br> 509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 $503.906 .9200 \text { fax 503.906.9210 }$ |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 <br> 541.383.9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207

| Project: | BNSF-Skykomish | Reported: |
| ---: | :--- | :---: |
| Project Number: | BN050-16423-522 | $01 / 10 / 0617: 50$ |
| Project Manager: | Stephen Howard |  |

Semivolatile Petroleum Products by NWTPH-Dx (w/o Acid/Silica Gel Clean-up) - Quality Control North Creek Analytical - Bothell


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Sea | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 $425.420 .9200 \text { fax } 425.420 .9210$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 $503.906 .9200 \text { fax 503.906.9210 }$ |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 <br> 541.383.9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA 98134
$\begin{aligned} \text { Project: BNSF-Skykomish } & \text { Reported: }\end{aligned}$
Project Manager: Stephen Howard

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA Methods - Quality Control

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

| Analyte | Reporting |  |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Result | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |
| Batch 6A09026: Prepared 01/06/06 | Using TOC Preparation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blank (6A09026-BLK1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | ND | 500 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | ND | 500 | ${ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCS (6A09026-BS1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 33100 | 500 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 29900 |  | 111 | 70-130 |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 33600 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 112 | 70-130 |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 32300 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 108 | 70-130 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (6A09026-BSD1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 33500 | 500 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 29900 |  | 112 | 70-130 | 1.20 | 30 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 34800 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 116 | 70-130 | 3.51 | 30 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 32800 | 500 | ${ }^{\prime}$ | 29900 |  | 110 | 70-130 | 1.54 | 30 |  |
| Duplicate (6A09026-DUP1) |  |  |  |  | urce: | 0547-01 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 6290 | 564 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry |  | 5850 |  |  | 7.25 | 200 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 6590 | 564 | " |  | 6560 |  |  | 0.456 | 200 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 5520 | 564 | " |  | 5210 |  |  | 5.78 | 200 |  |
| Matrix Spike (6A09026-MS1) |  |  |  |  | urce: | 0547-01 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 9980 | 564 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 3700 | 5850 | 112 | 70-130 |  |  |  |
| Batch 6A10032: Prepared 01/09/06 | Using TOC | tion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blank (6A10032-BLK1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | ND | 500 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | ND | 500 | " |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | ND | 500 | " |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Sea | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 $425.420 .9200 \text { fax } 425.420 .9210$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 $503.906 .9200 \text { fax 503.906.9210 }$ |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 <br> 541.383.9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.
1011 SW Klickitat Way, Suite 207

| Project: | BNSF-Skykomish | Reported: |
| ---: | :--- | :---: |
| Project Number: | BN050-16423-522 | $01 / 10 / 0617: 50$ |
| Project Manager: | Stephen Howard |  |

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA Methods - Quality Control

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  |  | Reporting |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit |

Batch 6A10032: Prepared 12/29/05 Using TOC Preparation

| LCS (6A10032-BS1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 33500 | 500 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 29900 |  | 112 | 70-130 |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 34100 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 114 | 70-130 |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 32800 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 110 | 70-130 |  |  |  |
| LCS Dup (6A10032-BSD1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 34000 | 500 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 29900 |  | 114 | 70-130 | 1.48 | 30 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 34700 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 116 | 70-130 | 1.74 | 30 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 33300 | 500 | " | 29900 |  | 111 | 70-130 | 1.51 | 30 |  |
| Duplicate (6A10032-DUP1) | Source: B5L0547-62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 3680 | 725 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry |  | 3870 |  |  | 5.03 | 200 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - High | 3970 | 725 | " |  | 4250 |  |  | 6.81 | 200 |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Low | 3390 | 725 | " |  | 3370 |  |  | 0.592 | 200 |  |
| Matrix Spike (6A10032-MS1) | Source: B5L0547-62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Organic Carbon - Average | 5230 | 725 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dry | 1990 | 3870 | 68.3 | 70-130 |  |  | Q-01 |


| Seattle | 11720 North Creek Pkwy N, Suite 400, Bothell, WA 98011-8244 $425.420 .9200 \text { fax } 425.420 .9210$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
|  | 509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906.9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 |
|  | 907.563.9200 fax 907.563.9210 |


| Project: | BNSF-Skykomish |  |
| ---: | :--- | :---: |
| Project Number: | BN050-16423-522 | Reported: |
| Project Manager: | Stephen Howard | $01 / 10 / 0617: 50$ |

## Physical Parameters by APHA/ASTM/EPA Methods - Quality Control

North Creek Analytical - Bothell

|  | Reporting |  |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |

Batch 5L27043: Prepared 12/27/05 Using Dry Weight
Blank (5L27043-BLK1)

| Dry Weight | 99.8 | 1.00 \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

Batch 5L27044: Prepared 12/27/05 Using Dry Weight

| Blank (5L27044-BLK1) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dry Weight | 100 | 1.00 | \% |
| Batch 5L27045: Prepared 12/27/05 | Using Dry Weight |  |  |
| Blank (5L27045-BLK1) |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 100 | 1.00 | \% |
| Batch 5L27046: Prepared 12/27/05 | Using Dry Weight |  |  |
| Blank (5L27046-BLK1) |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 100 | 1.00 | \% |
| Batch 5L27047: Prepared 12/27/05 | Using Dry Weight |  |  |
| Blank (5L27047-BLK1) |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 100 | 1.00 | \% |
| Batch 5L30045: Prepared 12/30/05 | Using Dry Weight |  |  |
| Blank (5L30045-BLK1) |  |  |  |
| Dry Weight | 100 | 1.00 | \% |

North Creek Analytical - Bothell
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Spokane | 11922 E. 1st Avenue, Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5302 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 509.924.9200 fax 509.924.9290 |
| Portland | 9405 SW Nimbus Avenue, Beaverton, OR 97008-7132 |
|  | 503.906.9200 fax 503.906.9210 |
| Bend | 20332 Empire Avenue, Suite F-1, Bend, OR 97701-5711 |
|  | 541.383 .9310 fax 541.382.7588 |
| Anchorage | 2000 W International Airport Road, Suite A-10, Anchorage, AK 99502-1119 |
|  | 907.563.9200 fax 907.563.9210 |

The RETEC Group, Inc.

| Project: | BNSF-Skykomish |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Project Number: | BN050-16423-522 | Reported: |
| Project Manager: | Stephen Howard | $01 / 10 / 0617: 50$ |

## Notes and Definitions

Q-01 The spike recovery for this QC sample is outside of established control limits. Review of associated batch QC indicates the recovery for this analyte does not represent an out-of-control condition for the batch.

Q-05 Analyses are not controlled on RPD values from sample concentrations less than 10 times the reporting limit.
Q-06 Analyses are not controlled on RPD values from sample concentrations less than 5 times the reporting limit.
S-01 The surrogate recovery for this sample is not available due to sample dilution required from high analyte concentration and/or matrix interferences.

X See case narrative.

DET

Not Reported
dry Sample results reported on a dry weight basis
RPD
The sample chromatographic pattern does not resemble the fuel standard used for quantitation.
Results in the diesel organics range are primarily due to overlap from a heavy oil range product.
Hydrocarbon pattern most closely resembles a heavy fuel oil product.
Hydrocarbon pattern most closely resembles a heavy fuel oil. product.

Analyte DETECTED

Analyte NOT DETECTED at or above the reporting limit

Relative Percent Difference

The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


CHAIN OF CUSTODY REPORT


$\square$

CHAIN OF CUSTODY REPORT


CHAIN OF CUSTODY REPORT



Chain of Custody Record



> copies. Thank you. message in error, please notify the sender immediately and promptly delete this message and destroy all

 The RETEC Group, inc.
1011 S.W. Klickitat Way, Suite 207
Seattle, WA. $98134-1162$
(206) $624-9349$ Stephen Howard

In addition, we will be sending you approximately 20 additional samples (including dups) for NWTPH-
Dx analysis on Wednesday January 4. We will also like to have these analyzed on a 3-day rush basis.


Please analyze duplicates from the following seven samples:
As discussed, we would like duplicate samples run for NWTPH-Dx from a subset of the soil samples we
delivered to you on December 22. These samples can be run with standard turnaround time, rather than
the 3-day rush for the original samples.
Hi Kate,
Subject: BNSF Skykornish - Duplicate Samples
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { To: } & \text { Kate Haney } \\ \text { Cc: } & \text { Halah Voges }\end{array}$
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2005 10:03 AM
From: Steve Howard [showarderretec.com]

## Appendix C

## South Fork Skykomish River

 Mean Discharge Ranking in Summer
## Memorandum

TO: Halah Voges, Steve Howard, Mike Byers<br>FROM: Joe Scott<br>DATE: 10 January 2006<br>RE: $\quad$ South Fork Skykomish River Mean<br>Discharge Ranking in Summer

There is a need to know the summer stages of the South Fork of the Skykomish River to determine if construction of levee remediation can proceed safely in the summer of 2006 and how high the crest of the cofferdam needs to be to prevent overtopping during construction. River stages of the South Fork of the Skykomish River are measured by a sonic gage on the $5{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge. Mean monthly stage statistics are available for the years 2000 through 2004 (see Table 1), a total of only 5 years. Do these stages represent the typical range of river stages?

Mean monthly discharges of the South Fork of the Skykomish River at Gold Bar are available for the years 1929 through 2004, or 76 years. To address the above question, the 2000-2004 discharges of the South Fork of the Skykomish River at Gold Bar for June through September are compared to the 1929-2004 record to determine the summer normalcy of the last 5 years.

The mean monthly discharges for June through September for 1929-2004 are graphed and listed separately from the rest of the record (see Attachment A). For each of these months individually, the discharges are ordered in ascending order. The place in the order for the last five years is then noted on the listing.

The results indicate that the last five years are scattered in the record comparison over 76 years; but in general, three of the years are always near the low end of record and two years are always near the high end. For June, 2001, 2003 and 2004 flows ranked $17^{\text {th }}, 18^{\text {th }}$, and $23^{\text {rd }}$, respectively; whereas 2000 and 2002 flows ranked $62^{\text {nd }}$ and $74^{\text {th }}$, respectively. For July, 2003, 2004 and 2001 flows ranked $7^{\text {th }}, 10^{\text {th }}$, and $20^{\text {th }}$, respectively; whereas 2000 and 2002 ranked $49^{\text {th }}$ and $63^{\text {rd }}$, respectively. For August, 2003 flow ranked 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$; whereas 2001, 2000, 2002 and 2004 flows ranked $31^{\text {st }}, 49^{\text {th }}, 50^{\text {th }}$ and $59^{\text {th }}$, respectively. For September, 2001, 2003 and 2002 ranked $6^{\text {th }}$, $12^{\text {th }}$, and $18^{\text {th }}$, respectively; whereas 2000 and 2004 ranked $58^{\text {th }}$ and $75^{\text {th }}$, respectively.

This means that the years 2001 and 2003 represent relatively dry years. 2000 and 2002 represent fairly wet years for June and July; but 2000 and 2004 represent wet years for August and September.

I recommend that the maximum stage statistics for 2000 be used to guide the planning as to the safety of construction and for setting the crest of the cofferdam. The 2000 monthly stage statistics represent stages associated with slightly above average mean monthly river discharges.

10 January 2006
Page 2
3-Retec

This means that a water elevation of less than ( $914.2+8.2$ ) 922.4 feet (NAXD88) be set for the beginning of construction and that the crest of the cofferdam be no lower than elevation (914.2 + 7.6) 921.8 feet (NAVD88).

Table 1 Mean Monthly Stages (ft) of the South Fork of the Skykomish River at the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge

| Year and Month | Minimum | Mean | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 June | 5.8 | 6.6 | 8.2 |
| 2001 June | 4.7 | 5.2 | 6.0 |
| 2002 June | 5.9 | 7.2 | 8.7 |
| 2003 June | 4.4 | 5.4 | 6.8 |
| 2004 June | 4.4 | 5.4 | 6.4 |
| 2000 July | 4.2 | 4.9 | 6.0 |
| 2001 July | 3.6 | 4.1 | 4.9 |
| 2002 July | 4.2 | 5.5 | 6.7 |
| 2003 July | 3.2 | 4.0 | 4.8 |
| 2004 July | 3.4 | 4.0 | 4.7 |
| 2000 August | 3.2 | 3.8 | 4.4 |
| 2001 August | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.9 |
| 2002 August | 3.3 | 3.9 | 4.6 |
| 2003 August | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.6 |
| 2004 August | 3.2 | 3.8 | 5.9 |
| 2000 September | 2.9 | 3.7 | 7.6 |
| 2001 September | 2.7 | 3.2 | 3.5 |
| 2002 September | 2.9 | 3.4 | 3.9 |
| 2003 September | 2.7 | 3.2 | 3.8 |
| 2004 September | 3.5 | 4.6 | 7.0 |

## Attachment A

## Skykomish River Mean Monthly Discharges June through September, 1929-2004

Attachment A - Mean Montly Discharge (cfs) of the Skykomish River at Gold Bar September Ordered Data

| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1998 | 465 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1987 | 489 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1940 | 515 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1938 | 535 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1989 | 560 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 2001 | 579 | 6 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1929 | 594 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1993 | 597 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1942 | 612 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1957 | 635 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1952 | 646 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 2003 | 651 | 12 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1930 | 662 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1966 | 680 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1991 | 680 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1937 | 719 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1995 | 725 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 2002 | 733 | 18 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1990 | 739 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1967 | 769 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1943 | 773 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1946 | 806 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1939 | 830 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1979 | 855 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1986 | 886 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1935 | 917 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1936 | 926 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1994 | 927 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1934 | 976 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1951 | 1015 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1963 | 1056 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1960 | 1064 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1973 | 1073 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1953 | 1121 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1961 | 1121 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1999 | 1129 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1932 | 1137 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1996 | 1145 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1955 | 1150 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1931 | 1153 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1947 | 1176 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1975 | 1193 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1981 | 1200 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1988 | 1223 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1958 | 1226 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1965 | 1252 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1984 | 1253 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1950 | 1274 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1985 | 1311 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1962 | 1333 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1974 | 1350 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1982 | 1439 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1971 | 1486 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1992 | 1506 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1976 | 1525 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1956 | 1586 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1949 | 1691 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 2000 | 1703 | 58 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1948 | 1765 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1970 | 1774 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1945 | 1777 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1977 | 1779 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1983 | 1784 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1969 | 1998 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1980 | 2004 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1944 | 2147 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1954 | 2220 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1964 | 2450 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1997 | 2522 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1941 | 2542 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1972 | 2881 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1968 | 2985 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1978 | 2995 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1933 | 3366 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 2004 | 3537 | 75 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 9 | 1959 | 4942 |  |

Attachment A - Mean Montly Discharge (cfs) of the Skykomish River at Gold Bar August Ordered Data

| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 2003 | 535 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1992 | 589 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1941 | 612 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1987 | 627 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1958 | 654 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1940 | 659 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1994 | 662 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1938 | 690 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1944 | 696 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1986 | 707 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1931 | 712 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1998 | 717 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1930 | 722 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1934 | 754 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1985 | 827 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1951 | 843 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1945 | 849 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1970 | 855 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1988 | 858 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1981 | 862 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1979 | 879 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1973 | 886 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1936 | 888 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1961 | 891 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1942 | 918 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1969 | 947 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1929 | 983 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1963 | 986 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1952 | 991 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1957 | 1006 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 2001 | 1006 | 31 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1947 | 1039 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1989 | 1041 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1993 | 1086 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1996 | 1088 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1990 | 1132 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1937 | 1136 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1980 | 1142 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1967 | 1165 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1960 | 1215 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1935 | 1235 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1966 | 1236 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1984 | 1243 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1939 | 1260 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1983 | 1260 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1978 | 1282 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1991 | 1293 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1946 | 1310 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 2000 | 1316 | 49 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 2002 | 1318 | 50 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1977 | 1321 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1943 | 1346 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1995 | 1388 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1959 | 1422 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1968 | 1459 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1965 | 1470 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1982 | 1487 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1932 | 1518 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 2004 | 1553 | 59 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1953 | 1608 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1956 | 1620 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1997 | 1652 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1962 | 1810 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1948 | 1882 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1949 | 1971 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1975 | 2082 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1971 | 2615 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1972 | 2660 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1955 | 2741 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1950 | 2844 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1933 | 2989 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1976 | 3106 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1999 | 3126 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1954 | 3304 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1974 | 3389 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 8 | 1964 | 3605 |  |

Attachment A - Mean Montly Discharge (cfs) of the Skykomish River at Gold Bar July Ordered Data

| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1941 | 971 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1940 | 990 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1992 | 1027 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1987 | 1267 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1977 | 1279 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1958 | 1291 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 2003 | 1381 | 7 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1944 | 1388 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1934 | 1391 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 2004 | 1429 | 10 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1931 | 1645 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1986 | 1719 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1930 | 1736 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1994 | 1779 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1963 | 1811 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1938 | 1848 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1995 | 1867 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1945 | 1896 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1993 | 1903 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 2001 | 1937 | 20 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1973 | 1949 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1998 | 2033 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1996 | 2106 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1957 | 2127 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1951 | 2132 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1981 | 2136 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1980 | 2162 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1970 | 2316 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1936 | 2339 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1969 | 2345 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1989 | 2394 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1978 | 2397 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1961 | 2431 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1985 | 2444 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1942 | 2511 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1960 | 2547 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1947 | 2567 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1979 | 2674 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1929 | 2725 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1968 | 2759 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1988 | 2794 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1952 | 2849 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1965 | 3140 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1937 | 3242 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1990 | 3281 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1935 | 3385 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1962 | 3405 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1948 | 3594 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 2000 | 3703 | 49 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1966 | 3711 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1967 | 3869 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1939 | 3948 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1991 | 4003 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1984 | 4072 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1983 | 4115 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1932 | 4293 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1946 | 4403 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1982 | 4618 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1949 | 4666 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1959 | 5034 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1943 | 5090 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1953 | 5090 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 2002 | 5191 | 63 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1975 | 5934 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1997 | 6243 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1956 | 6326 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1976 | 6415 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1955 | 7304 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1950 | 7671 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1999 | 7764 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1954 | 7841 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1933 | 8080 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1971 | 8199 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1972 | 8209 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1964 | 8364 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 7 | 1974 | 8413 |  |

Attachment A - Mean Montly Discharge (cfs) of the Skykomish River at Gold Bar June Ordered Data

| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1992 | 1955 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1941 | 2169 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1940 | 2595 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1934 | 2600 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1987 | 3630 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1963 | 3689 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1994 | 3920 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1930 | 3941 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1944 | 4029 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1996 | 4029 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1995 | 4112 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1986 | 4115 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1977 | 4152 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1958 | 4237 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1993 | 4238 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1980 | 4300 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 2001 | 4377 | 17 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 2003 | 4580 | 18 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1973 | 4607 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1983 | 4630 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1931 | 4846 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1945 | 4903 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 2004 | 4942 | 23 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1938 | 5188 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1979 | 5351 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1952 | 5430 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1998 | 5433 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1951 | 5558 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1991 | 5578 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1988 | 5580 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1947 | 5617 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1957 | 5737 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1978 | 5760 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1981 | 5850 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1942 | 5931 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1953 | 6020 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1939 | 6089 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1965 | 6152 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1962 | 6252 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1989 | 6351 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1966 | 6452 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1960 | 6627 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1968 | 6721 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1935 | 6753 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1976 | 7141 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1990 | 7269 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1929 | 7329 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1943 | 7498 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1949 | 7549 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1970 | 7603 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1984 | 7683 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1961 | 7693 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1985 | 7759 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1936 | 7776 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1932 | 7984 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1954 | 8428 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1971 | 8491 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1969 | 8537 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1946 | 8551 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1975 | 8808 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1959 | 8835 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 2000 | 9062 | 62 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1982 | 9291 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1956 | 9534 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1937 | 9627 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1967 | 9655 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1997 | 9704 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1999 | 10240 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1955 | 10590 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1933 | 10960 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1972 | 11000 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1948 | 11060 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1964 | 11190 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 2002 | 11350 | 74 |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1950 | 11900 |  |
| USGS | 12134500 | 6 | 1974 | 13610 |  |

## Appendix D

## Scour Hydraulic Analysis

# CALCULATION SHEETS 

Project No.: BN050-16423-520
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Site: Skykomish

Page: 1 of 4

Subject: South Fork of the Skykomish River Scour
Date: 22 Dec 2005
By: Joe Scott
2-Retec

## Purpose

These calculations assess the potential scour in the South Fork of the Skykomish River during construction of the levee remediation. The summer construction window, due to fish closure on the river, is from 1 July to 15 September of any year.

## Given

Based on the topographic and hydrographic surveys of the river done by Bush, Roed \& Hitchings (BRH) in May 2005, the river bed in front of the levee has an average slope of $0.0028\left(0.16^{\circ}\right)$ between the bridge and the west end of the levee.

## Assumptions

Using data from the FEMA (2001) Flood Insurance Study and the survey data for the river, the flow characteristics of the river during construction and during flood events are assumed to be as given in Table 1.

Table 1. Skykomish River Flow Characteristics about 300 Feet Downstream of the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge.

| Flood <br> Frequency | Elevation, ft <br> NAVD88 | Discharge <br> cfs | Average <br> Flow Area <br> $\mathbf{f t}^{2}$ | Average <br> Velocity <br> ft/sec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summer Low | 917.2 | 6,000 | 325 | 18.5 |
|  |  |  | $249^{*}$ | $24.1^{*}$ |
| Summer High | 921.2 | 12,000 | 1,147 | 10.5 |
| $1-\mathrm{yr}$ | 924.2 | 20,500 | 1,804 | $16.2^{*}$ |
| $2-\mathrm{yr}$ | 925.0 | 24,000 | 1,984 | 12.4 |
| $5-\mathrm{yr}$ | 926.0 | 30,000 | 2,211 | 13.6 |
| $10-\mathrm{yr}$ | 926.8 | 32,200 | 2,396 | 13.4 |
| $50-\mathrm{yr}$ | 928.6 | 47,400 | 2,818 | 16.8 |
| $100-\mathrm{yr}$ | 929.4 | 54,300 | 3,009 | 18.0 |

* With cofferdam installed on river bar.
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The elevations and discharges as a function of recurrence intervals are from the calculations of river flow (RETEC, 1 February 2005). The cross-sectional areas are from a section cut across the river 300 feet downstream of the bridge and based on the BRH May 2005 survey data.

The river bed is composed of sand, gravel, and cobbles. Based on a visual inspection of the river bed, the estimated median grain size ( $\mathrm{D}_{50}$ ) is 2 inches ( $50 \mathrm{~mm}, 0.17$ feet).

Assume a grain size distribution as presented in Table 2. While boulders can be found in the river, it is assumed they are not present on the surface of the river bed or, if so, are too big to move.

Table 2. Skykomish River Sediment Distribution.

| Grain Size Description | Median Grain Size <br> $\mathbf{m m}$ | Size Distribution <br> \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sand | $0.074-2.0$ | 10 |
| Gravel | $2.0-76$ | 60 |
| Cobbles | $76-300$ | 30 |
| Boulders | $300+$ | 0 |

## Calculations

Localized scour may occur in the river bed due to flood flows or concentrated flows, like that between the cofferdam and north bank during construction.

The ASCE (2005) methods, which are derived from the work of Lagasse et (2001), are used to assess scour potential. First, the critical conditions (incipient motion) are calculated. Under critical conditions, the hydrodynamic forces on a grain are just balanced by the resisting forces. Sediment grains smaller than the critical sediment size will be transported downstream and grains equal to or larger will remain in place.

The critical conditions are assessed using a calculation spreadsheet (Attachment A) based on the ASCE methods. The calculation results need to be assessed with caution. The methods upon which the calculations are based are empirical approximations. The results are order of magnitude only, but they can be used in a qualitative sense.

The river cross-sectional areas reported in Table 1 are much less than those used in the flood study. For example, the cross-sectional area for section AT (about 300 feet downstream of the bridge) is $4,576 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ at the 100-year flood elevation as measured by photogrammetric means in 1993. At the same 100-year flood elevation, the CADD measured cross-sectional area is 3,006
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- Retec
$\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ as surveyed in 2005. This is a difference (decrease) of about $35 \%$. It is assumed that as the river bed elevation increased, the river water level increased accordingly for the various freshet recurrence intervals. In other words, the flood elevations may be higher than shown in Table 1 and the average velocities may be less than shown. This means that the scour velocity, shear stress, and critical sediment diameter are conservatively high. Calculation results, however, suggest that the river has been aggrading (depositing sediment) more than degrading (scouring), given the input parameters.

Blodgett (1986) provides a less sophisticated relationship of scour depth to median size of bed material in the channel. The relationship is expressed as:

$$
\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{s}}=1.42 \mathrm{D}_{50} 0^{-0.115},
$$

where $d_{s}$ is the mean depth of scour. Calculations $\left[1.42(2 / 12)^{-0.115}=1.7\right.$ feet $]$ indicate that the local scour during flood flows may be on the order of 2 feet.

## Discussion

The coarse, cohesionless nature of the river bed material suggests that the river bed may scour locally based on the river velocity and carrying capacity of the river. The river bed load is assumed to be subject to some transport during flood stages of the river and the distribution of the bed load is assumed to change seasonally in response to river flow. The calculations suggest that the river has been aggrading more than degrading.

Given the calculation results, during normal flow (less than flood flow) the river bed aggrades as material is transported downstream of the steep valleys in the Cascade Mountains. During flood flows, the river bed is scoured in places to a depth of about 2 feet. But as the flood flows recede, sediment is deposited and the elevation of the river bed returns to its pre-flood elevation or higher.
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## Stream Channel Equilibrium Slope Calculations Per Lagasse et (2001)*

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Units | Calculations |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | H w/o | H w | L w/o | L w | $100-\mathrm{Yr}$ |
| 2 | Specific weight of water | g | $\mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 62.4 | 62.4 | 62.4 | 62.4 | 62.4 |
| 3 | Specific weight of sediment | $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | $\mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 167 | 167 | 167 | 167 | 167 |
| 4 | Mannings roughness coefficient | n | - | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| 5 | Median sediment diameter | $\mathrm{D}_{50}$ | mm | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| 6 | Average channel discharge | Q | $\mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 12,000 | 12,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 54,300 |
| 7 | Wetted channel cross-sectional area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 1,147 | 743 | 325 | 249 | 3,009 |
| 8 | Wetted channel perimeter | P | ft | 215 | 122 | 200 | 118 | 248 |
| 9 | Average channel width at average channel discharge | W | ft | 213 | 120 | 197 | 115 | 240 |
| 10 | Existing channel slope | $\mathrm{S}_{\text {ex }}$ | - | 0.00280 | 0.00280 | 0.00280 | 0.00280 | 0.00280 |
| 11 | Distance upstream of base level control | L | ft | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 |
| 12 | Hydraulic radius of channel | R | ft | 5.3 | 6.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 12.1 |
| 13 | Average channel velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 10.5 | 16.2 | 18.5 | 24.1 | 18.0 |
| 14 | Shields parameter | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {s }}$ | - | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| 15 | Sediment roughness | $\mathrm{k}_{\text {s }}$ | ft | 0.851 | 0.851 | 0.851 | 0.851 | 0.851 |
| 16 | Boundary shear stress | $\mathrm{t}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 1.80 | 4.05 | 10.65 | 15.47 | 3.79 |
| 17 | Diameter of Sediment at incipient motion | $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | mm | 175.17 | 393.12 | 1034.09 | 1502.47 | 368.53 |
| 18 | Channel discharge per unit width | q | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 56.3 | 100.0 | 30.5 | 52.2 | 226.3 |
| 19 | Channel slope for stable $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{c}}$ with no upstream sediment supply | $\mathrm{S}_{\text {eq }}$ | - | 0.01098 | 0.02130 | 0.23498 | 0.25261 | 0.00965 |
| 20 | Sediment supply coefficient | a | - | 0.000003 | 0.000003 | 0.000003 | 0.000003 | 0.000003 |
| 21 | Sediment supply exponent | b | - | 3.67276 | 3.67276 | 3.67276 | 3.67276 | 3.67276 |
| 22 | Sediment supply exponent | C | - | 0.64433 | 0.64433 | 0.64433 | 0.64433 | 0.64433 |
| 23 | Sediment transport capacity per unit width | $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 0.04638 | 0.25004 | 0.17426 | 0.55229 | 0.59211 |
| 24 | Channel slope for stable $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{c}}$ with upstream sediment supply | $\mathrm{S}_{\text {eq }}$ | - | 0.00473 | 0.00935 | 0.07126 | 0.08448 | 0.00456 |
| 25 | Ultimate degradation at distance L with no sediment supply | $\mathrm{Y}_{\text {s }}$ | ft | -4.91 | -11.10 | -139.31 | -149.89 | -4.11 |
| 26 | Ultimate degradation at distance L with sediment supply | $\mathrm{Y}_{\text {s }}$ | ft | -1.16 | -3.93 | -41.08 | -49.01 | -1.05 |

* Lagasse, P.F., J.D Schall, and V.E. Richardson. Stream Stability at Highway Structures . Third Edition, Report FHWA NHI 01-002, Federal Highway Administration, Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 20, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C., 2001.

1-11 User input calculation identification, specific weight of water, specific weight of sediment, Mannings roughness coefficient, median sediment diameter, average discharge, average wetted channel cross-sectional area, wetted channel perimeter, average channel width, existing channel slope, and distance upstream of base level control.

```
12
    \(R=A / P\)
\(13 \mathrm{~V}=\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}\)
    \(K_{s}=0.047\) for \(D_{50}<2 \mathrm{~mm} ; \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{s}}=0.03\) for \(\mathrm{D}_{50}>2 \mathrm{~mm}\).
    \(\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{s}}=3.5 \mathrm{D}_{84}=3.5 \mathrm{D}_{50} \mathrm{e}^{[0.01157(84)-0.5785]}\)
    \(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{o}}=\left(\mathrm{gn}^{2} \mathrm{~V}^{2}\right) /\left(2.208 \mathrm{R}^{1 / 3}\right)\) for \(\mathrm{D}_{50}<2 \mathrm{~mm} ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{o}}=\left(\mathrm{g} \mathrm{V}^{2} / \mathrm{g}\right) /\left[5.75 \log \left(12.27 \mathrm{R} / \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{s}}\right)\right]^{2}\)
    \(D_{c}=\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{o}} /\left[\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{s}}\left(\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{s}}-\mathrm{g}\right)\right]\)
    \(q=Q / W\)
    \(S_{e q}=\left\{K_{s}\left(D_{c} e^{[0.01157(90)-0.5785]}\right)\left[\left(g_{s}-\mathrm{g}\right) / \mathrm{g}\right]\right\}^{(10 / 7)}[1.486 / \mathrm{qn}]^{(6 / 7)}\)
    \(\mathrm{a}=0.025 \mathrm{n}^{[2.39-0.8 \log (\mathrm{D} 50)]}\left(\mathrm{D}_{50}-0.07\right)^{-1.4}\)
    \(b=4.93-0.74 \log \left(D_{50}\right)\)
    \(c=-0.46+0.65 \log \left(D_{50}\right)\)
    \(q_{s}=a V^{b}(A / W)^{c}\)
    \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{eq}}=\left\{\mathrm{a} / \mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{s}}\right\}^{[10 / 3(\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{b})]} \mathrm{q}^{[2(2 \mathrm{~b}+3 \mathrm{c}) / 3(\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{b})]}(\mathrm{n} / 1.486)^{2}\)
25-26 \(\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{s}}=\mathrm{L}\left(\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{ex}}-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{eq}}\right)\)
```
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CLIENT: BNSF, BN050-19390
TASK: Interim Action for Levee Cleanup
RE: Dewatering Modeling

## Introduction

This memo is intended to document methods of fluid management within the excavation. It includes an additional estimate of the volume of water produced by dewatering to effect a negative hydraulic gradient into the excavation, methods to contain NAPL within the excavation and a brief summary of contingency actions to implement in the event that fluid from the excavation is migrating into the South Fork Skykomish River.

## Description of the Remedial Action

The proposed interim action will consist of excavating petroleum-contaminated soil from beneath the flood control levee west of the $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Bridge in Skykomish and from beneath adjacent portions of the South Fork Skykomish River to the north and the Town of Skykomish to the south. Excavation below the ordinary high water mark will be conducted within the regulatory fish window ${ }^{1}$.
The base of the excavation will be below the water table for much of the duration of the excavation. In addition, the river level is expected to be higher than the undisturbed riverbed in the excavation area for most of the construction period. Inner and outer coffer dams will be installed on the river bed around the excavation in the river to protect the excavation from rises in the river level and to help prevent water from flowing out of the excavation and into the river. The total length of the coffer dam along the river is roughly 700 feet. Further details of the coffer dam construction are provided in the EDR. In addition, one to two interior north-south trending coffer dams will be placed across the interior of the excavation as described in the EDR to further reduce the anticipated volume of water pumped to maintain hydraulic control of the excavations.
The physical properties of the site have been described in the EDR and previous documents ${ }^{2}$. In addition, a recent soil and sediment investigation was conducted in the Skykomish River and the levee; details of this investigation are included in the EDR (Appendix B).

[^4]
## Purpose of the Dewatering

Most of the excavation will probably be performed under wet conditions, however dewatering is proposed to create a hydraulic gradient towards the excavation pit and away from the river. An inward hydraulic gradient is required to keep water from the inside of the excavation from flowing through the subsurface under the coffer dams and into the river.

## Groundwater Modeling to Estimate Dewatering Volumes

Groundwater flow modeling was conducted using SEEP2D. The model was constructed using known site characteristics and construction design drawings contained in the EDR.

## Model Objective

The model objective was to estimate whether construction dewatering activities can maintain an inward gradient from the river without exceeding the maximum permitted surface water discharge rate ( $1,000 \mathrm{gpm}$ ). The model met the objective by calculating the volume of groundwater inflow into the planned excavation area for a given dewatering water elevation. The inflow volume was then directly compared to permit discharge limits.

## Model Methods

Groundwater inflow was estimated using a computer software program called SEEP2D. SEEP2D is a two-dimensional steady state finite element groundwater flow program. The software program was developed by the US Army Corps of Engineers and is commonly applied to two-dimensional, cross sectional groundwater flow problems involving engineered structures such as dams, dikes, and sheet piles. These features can be modeled more efficiently and accurately using a finite element solution method rather than a finite difference solution method such as the one used in the software program MODFLOW.

## Model Geometry

The model was constructed along the South-North cross-sectional line shown on Figure 1. This cross section line is located in the easternmost third of the excavation planned for the levee remediation. The cross section location was selected to represent a typical section of the excavation area. The basic model geometry is shown on Figure 2. The geometry is based on interpretation of engineering design drawings and ground surface/river bed topographic data.
The upland (south) boundary of the model is set at 200 feet south of the southern limit of the planned excavation area, approximately 30 feet north of with Railroad Avenue. The 200-foot distance represents the estimated distance where water table drawdown caused by excavation dewatering is zero. The northern model boundary is set in the middle portion of the Skykomish River where the riverbed has an elevation of approximately 914 feet above mean sea level (MSL).

The initial upper boundary of the model varies with location. Between the southern model boundary and the proposed southern limit of the excavation area the upper boundary drops uniformly between monitor well MW-37 (approximately 931 feet above mean sea level (ft-msl)) and the southern limit of the excavation area along the cross section line (approximately 926 ft msl . The upper boundary then follows the surface slope of the excavation area to an elevation of 918 feet. The upper boundary remains at the 918 foot elevation until it intersects the coffer dams where the boundary follows the shape of the coffer dams with surface water in between the two dams. North of the coffer dams the upper boundary is a constant elevation of 919.1 feet, representing the assumed water level elevation in the Skykomish River.
The simulated model bottom represents an elevation of 855 feet, approximately 50 feet deeper than the deepest planned portion of the excavation area. This depth is probably great enough such that the depth of the model bottom will not affect the model results.

## Model Mesh

The SEEP2D software program contains a finite element algorithm to solve groundwater flow equations. The algorithm uses a network of nodes and connecting lines known as a mesh to solve partial differential equations describing the flow of groundwater. The mesh can be modified to conform to the shape of geometric features. The density of nodes in the mesh can be varied to provide finer or coarser solutions to groundwater flow problems depending on the needs of the model. For example, the mesh at the excavation borders and near the excavation bottom is finer because finer meshes provide more accurate solutions to groundwater flow problems in areas of steep gradients or groundwater sinks and sources. Conversely, the mesh is coarser in areas further from and deeper beneath the excavation area because the accuracy of the solution is not affected by the mesh density in these areas. The initially constructed mesh is shown on Figure 3.
As previously discussed the mesh can be modified to conform to the shape of geometric features. This feature of the finite element method conforms to the shape of the mesh boundaries to the slope of the water table calculated by the model. The conforming of the mesh to the water table surface occurs when the water table is modeled as unconfined. The conformed mesh is automatically calculated by the model. The groundwater flow system in the excavation area is modeled as unconfined, consistent with the current site conceptual model. The water table modified mesh is shown on Figure 4.

## Material Properties and Boundary Conditions

Three material properties are specified in the model. These three properties represent native alluvium, sheet piles/coffer dam, and surface water. Native alluvium is assigned a uniform isotropic hydraulic conductivity value of 64 feet per day ${ }^{3}$. Although actual native alluvium stratigraphy and corresponding material properties are variable, the native alluvium was assigned

[^5]a uniform hydraulic conductivity value to simplify the modeling process and maintain flexibility for any future modeling. Sheet piles and the coffer dam are assigned hydraulic conductivity values of 0.1 feet per day. Sheet pile and coffer dam locations are shown on Figures 1 and 2.
Surface water areas are simulated by assigning a hydraulic conductivity value of 10,000 feet per day. This value creates negligible resistance to groundwater flow and facilitates the simulation of surface water using the finite element method. Three areas of surface water are simulated: the area between the northern model boundary to the northern-most coffer dam, the area between the two coffer dams, and the area between the southern-most coffer dam and the planned location of the temporary sheet pile wall.
The southern (upland) model boundary is simulated as a constant head boundary with a value of 922.15 feet. This value is the average water level elevation near July 1 between the years 2002 and 2005 at monitor well MW-37, located on Railroad Avenue. The boundary condition assumes no vertical component to the groundwater flow gradient at MW-37. The northern model boundary is simulated as a constant head boundary with a value of 919.1, the mean river stage elevation during July 2000. The 919.1 foot value is also assigned to all upper boundary nodes north of the coffer dams. Upper boundary nodes between the coffer dams and the sheet pile are assigned a constant head value of 918 feet. The 918 foot elevation represents a head potential difference of about 1 foot between the river and the excavation area.

Six sheet pile and south excavation wall boundary nodes at elevations between 918 and 922.15 feet are assigned as exit face nodes. The exit face nodes allow the model to calculate the configuration of the water table across the plane of the sheet pile.

## Model Results

The SEEP2D program software automatically calculates the net flow of groundwater through the model. In the model domain described in this memo, groundwater enters and exits the model through constant head nodes. Nodes where groundwater enters the model include the southern and northern boundary nodes as well as the upper boundary constant head nodes north of the coffer dams. Groundwater exits the model through all 918 foot constant head nodes, simulating pumping from the interior of the excavation necessary to maintain a 1 foot head difference across the coffer dams. Model calculated groundwater elevation contours and flow lines are shown on Figure 5. Most of the groundwater flowing into the excavation area comes from the river.
The net flow calculated by the model is about 0.9 gallons per minute per linear foot of excavation parallel to the river. The estimated flow rate is the combined flow of groundwater flowing into the excavation area from the south (upland) and the north (the river). The 0.9 gallons per minute flow rate represents the flow rate of water required to be removed from the excavation area to maintain a constant head elevation of 918 feet. This volume does not account for groundwater inflow across the western and eastern excavation boundaries. However, based on preliminary model results, this volume is less than 0.5 gallons per minute per foot of distance along the north/south sides. Therefore, to maintain hydraulic control over the entire excavation area ( 700 lineal feet east/west and the east and west ends), a pumping rate of around 930 gallons

February 21, 2006
Page 5
per minute (gpm) is predicted. To maintain control over a smaller excavation that would be the result of placing a single interior cofferdam, a pumping rate slightly over 600 gpm is predicted. For the scenario of utilization of two interior cofferdams, the excavation size is approximately 230 in the east-west direction and 300 feet in the north-south direction, and the predicted pumping rate to maintain the one foot head difference across the cofferdam is slightly greater than 500 gpm.

## Model Sensitivity

The model was constructed using engineering design documents, historic groundwater and surface water elevations, and existing knowledge of site characteristics. Parameters that could be varied to evaluate their affect on calculated discharge rates include constant head values, hydraulic conductivity values, and the geometry of the excavation area.

If constant head values are not changed, there will be a direct linear correlation between a change in hydraulic conductivity and a change in groundwater flow rate. This correlation is more important if the modeled hydraulic conductivity is increased rather than decreased. However, hydraulic conductivity would have to be increased approximately three times to create groundwater flow rates that may be greater than what ordinary dewatering measures can accommodate. This is unrealistic given the nature of the sediments present in the excavation area.

Sensitivity analysis for the modeling described in this memo consists of varying the geometry of the excavation area, and the associated constant head node values. The first sensitivity analysis scenario simulates dewatering to an elevation of 916 feet-msl within an open excavation (i.e an approximate drawdown of 3 feet). The model calculated flow based on this scenario is about 1.9 gpm per linear foot of excavation parallel to the river. The second sensitivity scenario simulates dewatering to an elevation of 910 feet-msl within an open excavation (i.e. an approximate drawdown of nine feet). The model calculated flow for the second sensitivity scenario is 3.4 gpm per linear foot of excavation parallel to the river.

A third sensitivity scenario simulates an upland constant head of 924.15, two feet greater than the original constant head boundary value of 922.15 . The 924.15 head value is 1 foot greater than the highest documented summer-time water level at well MW-37. The model predicted groundwater inflow rate for this scenario is 1.1 gpm , about 0.2 gpm greater than the initial model configuration.

Changing the constant head value of the river will not affect the simulated flow rates because in practice the dewatering heads in the excavation area will be adjusted to maintain a minimum head differential required to maintain flow from the river toward the excavation area.

## NAPL Control

Diesel and Bunker C will be excavated during the cleanup action. Since some of this will be present as NAPL in soil beneath the water table, it is probable that free-phase petroleum hydrocarbons (NAPL) will be released into the excavation during the remedial activities. The
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NAPL will potentially be present as a layer floating on the water surface as well as a lesser volume in small discrete bodies beneath the water table. Water will be present within the excavation; therefore, engineering measures will be taken to ensure that NAPL does not spread across the entire water surface in the excavation. These measures will include the following:

## Booms

Booms will be placed around the inside of the coffer dam, these boom will consist of booms with skirts of oil-absorbent material. This type of boom should be effective at controlling the spread of oil across the water surface as will as preventing oil from passing beneath the boom.

A line of booms will also be emplaced outside the coffer dams for added assurance that small releases of NAPL be captured before they flow down the Skykomish River.

## Skimmer pumps

Skimmer pumps will be employed inside the booms to remove oil from the water in the excavation, and to reduce the probability of oil escaping the booms. In addition, skimmer pumps will be used throughout the excavation as required to reduce the migration of NAPL across the excavation pit.

## Absorbent Pads

Oil absorbent pads will be used as necessary to remove floating oil from the excavation. These will be used to remove oil from heavy seeps and to contain the oil closer to the excavation face. They may also be used behind the booms, as required.

## Contingencies

Contingency measures will be available to prevent the migration of oil and reduce the possibility that contaminants are released into the Skykomish River. These measures may be used if the dewatering pumps are ineffective in containing fluids (especially NAPL) within the excavation or if the coffer dam is breached by flood waters.

The effectiveness of the dewatering system at maintaining flow into the excavation will be monitored by collecting frequent measurements of the water levels around the outer perimeter of the coffer dams (in the Skykomish River) and within the excavation pit, using automatic water level data loggers. These water level data will be supplemented by visual observations looking for the presence of sheen or some other indication of contamination outside the coffer dams. If the monitoring indicates that the dewatering system is ineffective, contingency measures will be undertaken. These will consist of additional containment of NAPL within the excavation pit by use of additional booms, adsorbent pads and skimmer pumps.

Two coffer dams will be constructed on the river bed around the excavation area. The second coffer dam will be constructed as a contingency measure to protect the river if the outer dam fails. These coffer dams will be lined with impermeable flexible sheeting to prevent excavation water from seeping into the river through the dams. As described in the EDR, should a breach in either coffer dam occur, work will immediately stop and measures will be taken to repair the
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dam. The on-call Spill Response contractor will be called in as needed to recover any substances that have accidentally been released.
In addition to the two coffer dams, an outer line of booms will be emplaced outside the coffer dams for added assurance that small releases of NAPL are captured before they flow down the Skykomish River.





| THE BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY <br> SKYKOMISH, WASHINGTON <br> BN050-16423- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MODIFIED MODEL MESH |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DATE: 02/20/06 | DRWN: A.S./SEA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Appendix F <br> EDR Amendment Form

# Engineering Design Report/ Sampling and Analysis Plan MINOR SITE MODIFICATION 

Site: Skykomish Levee
Modification Number:
Relevant EDR/SAP Section and Page Number:

## Date:

## Issue:

Describe problem resulting from current plan or document vs. field or other encountered conditions.

## Recommended Resolution:

## Resolution Approved by Ecology:

Requested by:

P.E. License No. and Seal

Approved by: $\qquad$
Louise Bardy
Site Manager
Department of Ecology
See other side for instructions regarding use of this form.

## Instructions for Use

1. Use this form to document and obtain approval for approval for significant changes to the EDR or SAP. Significant changes constitute changes in remedial goals, sampling protocol, schedule, deviations from the Order or any issues that arise that are not resolved by agreement between PLP representatives and Ecology.
2. In the case of significant changes, described above, the form on the other side should be completed. The issue section should include a specific reference to the section of the Order, EDR or document that is in dispute. If the issue requires rapid resolution, the requestor may call Louise Bardy at (425) 649-7209 or her designated representative before completing and FAXing the form.
3. After the form is filled out and signed by the requestor, FAX the completed form to Louise Bardy at 425-649-7098.
4. All completed forms should be copied in duplicate, with one copy remaining with the EDR/SAP and one copy sent to Louise Bardy.
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## 1 Introduction

This sampling and analysis plan (SAP) presents the project organization, objectives, and specific Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC) activities associated with the collection and evaluation of environmental soil and sediment samples during the levee cleanup zone interim action for cleanup at the BNSF Railway Company’s former maintenance and fueling facility in Skykomish, Washington. This SAP meets the requirements of the Model Toxics Control Act (WAC 173-340-820) and WAC 173-204, sediment management standards. All QA/QC procedures detailed in this SAP are in accordance with applicable professional technical standards, Washington Department of Ecology guidelines (Ecology, 1991, 1995), and project-specific goals. This SAP describes the procedures that will be implemented to ensure that the precision, accuracy, representativeness and completeness of the project data are sufficient to satisfy the project objectives.

This SAP pertains to soil and sediment samples that are collected as part of the performance monitoring (as defined in WAC 173-340410 (1) (a)) and stockpile characterization for the levee zone interim action for cleanup. Additional sampling for the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, compliance monitoring, and air monitoring will be detailed in other documents.

This SAP is an appendix to the Engineering Design Report Levee Zone Interim Action for Cleanup (EDR, RETEC, 2006). The EDR outlines remedial actions to which this SAP applies and presents a project schedule as required in WAC 173-340-820.

## 2 Project Organization

### 2.1 Project Structure

The organizational structure for the levee remediation phase of the project will consist of several RETEC staff. They include: a Client Service Manager, Project Manager, Regional Health and Safety Officer, Levee Remediation Chief Engineer, Site Safety Officer, Data Validator, and Support Staff. Additional members of the project team include, but are not limited to the laboratory coordinator, public relations officer, and Contractors.

### 2.2 Responsibilities of Project Personnel

The responsibilities of project personnel are described in the following paragraphs. In some cases one person may assume more than one role.

### 2.2.1 Client Service Manager

The Client Service Manager will be an alternate point of contact and will have responsibility for the overall success of the project. The Client Service Manager’s duties will include:

- Project oversight and strategy development with project team. Provision of resources to allow completion of project
- Assist Project team as needed in negotiations, strategy development, and project deliverables.


### 2.2.2 Project Manager

The Project Manager (PM) will be the primary point of contact and will have responsibility for technical, financial, and scheduling matters. The PM's responsibilities will include:

- Ecology contact
- Assignment of duties to the project staff and orientation of the staff to the needs and requirements of the project
- Supervision of the performance of project team members
- Monitoring all aspects of the project to verify that all work is being completed in accordance with this SAP
- Budget and schedule control
- Establishment of a project record-keeping system.


### 2.2.3 Regional Health and Safety Officer

The Regional Health and Safety Officer (HSO) has the following responsibilities:

- Interface with the Project Manager as required in matters of health and safety
- Approve the site-specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) for the project
- Amend the approved HASP as site conditions warrant
- Appoint or approve a Site Safety Officer (SSO) to assist in implementing the HASP
- Monitor compliance with the approved HASP
- Assist the Project Manager in ensuring that proper health and safety equipment is available for the project
- Approve personnel to work on the site with regard to medical examinations and health and safety training.


### 2.2.4 Levee Remediation Chief Engineer

The Levee Remediation Chief Engineer has the following responsibilities:

- Review all technical documents associated with the project for technical accuracy and feasibility
- Interface with the Project Manager as required in all technical matters
- Appoint or approve a Project Engineer to assist in approving invoices and working with the contractors
- Act as point contact for design work that has been subcontracted out, such as infrastructure and utilities and water management, and the general contractor (who will be a BNSF direct contract).


### 2.2.5 Project Engineer

The Project Engineer is responsible for assisting the Levee Remediation Chief Engineer.

- Reviewing subcontractors' work and approving all subcontractor invoices.
- Working with the subcontractors and analytical laboratories to ensure that all field activities are conducted appropriately and that field activities are properly documented.
- Coordinating the sampling operations to verify that the sampling team members adhere to this SAP.
- Providing daily schedules for field personnel including subcontractors.
- Maintaining a log for all work completed on site.
- Preparing the field investigation data and information for reports.
- Sending the analytical laboratory deliverables of performance sampling results to Ecology via electronic mail, or if the Ecology representative is on-site without electronic mail access, in hard copy. These deliverables will be sent immediately to Ecology if a timely response is to be requested of Ecology.

Note that it is not necessary for the Project Engineer to be present on-site during all sampling activities or field operations. Thorough coordination and communication with the sampling team members will ensure compliance with this SAP.

### 2.2.6 Public Relations Officer

The public relations officer will be an EnviroIssues employee. This officer will be the main contact for the public for the project. All comments, requests, questions and complaints should be directed to the Public Relations officer. If the Public Relations officer needs technical support, RETEC will be contacted and a member of the project team, likely the Project Manager, will provide technical input.

### 2.2.7 Quality Assurance Officer

The Quality Assurance (QA) Officer will be responsible for audits and monitoring adherence to the project QA objectives. The QA Officer reports directly to the Levee Remediation Chief Engineer. The QA Officer has the following responsibilities:

- Reviewing laboratory analytical data
- Coordinating QA/QC operation with the Laboratory Coordinator
- Providing the Data Validator with the laboratory analytical data and sampling field notes
- Informing the Levee Remediation Chief Engineer of whether soil excavation is complete in a given area per compliance monitoring data or whether additional excavation is required.


### 2.2.8 Site Safety Officer

The Site Safety Officer (SSO) will be responsible for verifying that project personnel adhere to the site safety requirements outlined in the HASP. These responsibilities will include:

- Conducting the health and safety training for project personnel as appropriate
- Modifying health and safety equipment or procedure requirements based on data gathered during the site work
- Determining the posting locations and routes to medical facilities, including poison-control centers, and arranging for emergency transportation to medical facilities
- Posting the telephone numbers of local public emergency services and facilities
- Performing site audits to verify adherence to the requirements of the HASP.

The SSO has authority to stop any operation that threatens the health or safety of the work team or surrounding populace. The daily health and safety activities may be conducted by the SSO or a designated replacement.

### 2.2.9 Laboratory Coordinator

The laboratory coordinator will be an employee at the analytical laboratory. Responsibilities of the Laboratory Coordinator will include:

- Collaborating with the Project Engineer in establishing sampling and analysis programs
- Serving as liaison between the laboratory and Project Engineer or QA Officer
- Serving as the "focal point" for laboratory activities
- Coordinating laboratory and data activities by the analytical services staff
- Notifying the laboratory and QA Officer of specific laboratory nonconformances and changes
- Maintaining a complete set of laboratory data
- Releasing testing data and results to the Project Engineer.


### 2.2.10 Data Validator

Responsibilities of the Data Validator will include:

- Identifying data to be classified as questionable or qualitative
- Comparing actual sampling and laboratory procedures to those outlined in this plan
- Reporting the validation results to the Project Engineer and QA Officer.


## 3 Excavation Performance Samples

### 3.1 Purpose

Excavation performance sampling will be performed at the limits of the excavation (with the exception of the southern side) to confirm that cleanup has been achieved in accordance with the compliance monitoring requirements in WAC 173-340-740, and WAC 173-204. The south side of the excavation will not be sampled since remediation will continue to the south at a future date. As discussed below (see 3.2: Sampling Locations), one discrete grab sample will be analyzed for excavation bottom and sidewall areas not to exceed 625 square feet.

Sediment is typically defined either as the upper 10 centimeters (the biologically active zone) or material below the ordinary high water mark, for the purposes of this SAP, sediments are defined as the solids which directly underlie the area beneath and waterward of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM). The OHWM was determined using a vegetation survey. The OHWM was staked and surveyed in the field. The OHWM elevation varies with distance along the river.

Excavations waterward of the OHWM will remove material exceeding the sediment cleanup level of $40.9 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx or extend at least 10 feet below the river bottom. If concentrations exceed $40.9 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx at the 10 foot depth below the river bottom, Ecology will be consulted regarding whether backfilling can be done or whether additional excavation is required. The uplands excavation less than 25 feet landward from the OHWM will remove material exceeding the soil cleanup level of $22 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx to a depth of at least 10 feet below the river bottom. NWPTH-Dx concentrations in material more than 25 feet landward of the OHWM must be less than or equal to the remediation level of $3,400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx and excavations will be backfilled with clean material

### 3.2 Sampling Locations

Both exterior sidewalls and excavation bottoms will be sampled during the Levee Interim Action for Cleanup. Sidewalls and excavation bottoms will be sampled separately. For either sidewall or excavation bottom sampling, one discrete grab sample will be collected per 625 square foot area ( $25^{\prime}$ x $25^{\prime}$ ) or fraction thereof. Areas larger than 625 square feet must be subdivided into areas less than or equal to 625 square feet and one discrete grab sample will be collected from each of the smaller areas.

Grab samples will be collected from approximately the center of each area. Additional grab samples will be collected from any visually-impacted areas and analyzed separately.

Samples will be named in a systematic fashion. For example, sample "SKY-SOIL-A1" would be collected from row A, column 1 and any subsequent samples from the same location due to re-excavation based on the results of the previous sampling would be named "SKY-SOIL-A1-2," etc. Sediment samples would be named with SED (such as "SKY-SED-A2") if the sample is intended to meet sediment cleanup levels. This includes material waterward of the OHWM.

The location of the discrete grab samples will be determined as accurately as possible given the conditions present in the field at the time of the sampling and the surveying technique used (i.e., accuracy within a few feet is desired). For example, if the bottom of the excavation at the approximate location of a proposed sample is relatively dry, the location can be located relatively accurately using a hand-help global positioning system device at the time of sampling. On the other hand, if soil removal at a sample location involves removing soil in 8 feet of water so that it is not physically possible to stand on the proposed sample location, the sample location will be determined by measuring as accurately as possible with the surveying techniques at hand from existing features or from known benchmarks. Stakes will be placed at the perimeter of the excavation to mark the 25 foot grids. It will not be possible to obtain the same accuracy of a sample location where the sample is taken in standing water as compared to a sample location where the sample is taken on dry ground. The GPS survey will be used to map all samples collected in locations where the sample point can be logged by the GPS unit.

### 3.3 Environmental Sampling Procedures

Environmental sampling procedures for soil and sediment will be identical. These samples will confirm that the extents of the excavation have been achieved. Soil and sediment samples at the limits of the excavation will be collected as discrete grab samples from the excavation using a clean stainless steel trowel or shovel or may be collected directly from the excavator bucket during excavation. Should sampling from the bucket be impractical, for example, if a clamshell bucket is to be used, material from the bucket will be placed on a clean plastic liner and the sample will be collected from the pile using a clean stainless steel spoon or trowel or by hand using disposable gloves. If the sample can be collected directly from the excavation, the sample will be collected from the floor of the excavation to be representative of the material left in place. Surface materials that are not to be included in the sample (such as rocks, twigs, and leaves) will be removed before the sample is collected.

Sampling containers will be filled to minimize head space, and will be appropriately labeled and stored prior to shipment or delivery to the laboratory. Reusable sampling equipment such as stainless steel trowels and shovels shall be decontaminated between sample locations as described below. Sampling procedures will comply with RETEC Standard Operating

Procedure (SOP) 210 (Attachment A). Decontamination processes will comply with SOP 120 (Attachment A).

The water in the excavation may be allowed to clear prior to sampling, depending on the length of time it takes for this to occur. Any visible sheen and/or petroleum product will be removed by a skimming system and water will be removed by pumping water from within the excavation area to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System-permitted treatment system.

### 3.4 Chemical Analysis and Turn-Around Times

Excavation performance monitoring samples will be analyzed by NWTPHDx. Although other indicator hazardous substances exist for the Site, NWTPH-Dx has been selected as the surrogate analysis in consultation with Ecology as outlined in the Feasibility Study (RETEC, 2005). The upland area consists of all material landward of the OHWM. Sediment, as defined above, includes all material waterward of the OHWM.

Performance samples within the sediment area must meet the sediment cleanup level of $40.9 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx. If excavation within the sediment area reaches a depth of 10 feet below the river bottom and the $40.9 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx cleanup level is not met, Ecology will be consulted and the area may be backfilled as it may be protective of sediment.

Material less than 25 feet landward from the OHWM must meet upland soil cleanup standards to a depth of 10 feet below the river bottom. Beyond 25 feet landward, upland areas where soil remediation levels are applicable that are represented by samples with concentrations less than or equal to $3,400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx will be backfilled following Ecology approval. If the concentration exceeds $3,400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx, the 2,500 square foot area may be re-excavated an additional 2 feet and re-sampled. If the depth of the excavation prevents the 625 square foot area from being re-excavated, Ecology will be consulted and contingencies such as soil mixing may be used.

Rush turn-around times, such as 24-hours, may be requested for some of the samples collected depending on the staging of work within the Project Area. Once Ecology receives analytical data, they will have 24 hours (on a weekday basis) to respond with approval for backfill or selection of BNSF's proposed contingency actions. It may be necessary to perform work on weekends to meet the project schedule. If Ecology review of performance sample data and backfill approval will be needed on a weekend day, RETEC will make every effort to give Ecology 48 hours notice. RETEC will submit performance sampling data to Ecology upon receipt from the laboratory for portions of the excavation for which we are requesting approval to backfill.

## 4 Stockpile Sampling

### 4.1 Purpose

Excavated material will be field-screened and segregated based on final disposal or placement location. Clean overburden material will be classified as appropriate for backfill or designated for waste disposal off-site. Stockpiles will be separated to prevent cross-contamination. Stockpiles will be sampled before the material is used for backfill and as required by the waste management facility for disposal. The final sampling procedure for the backfill material will be established when the contractor provides a plan for filling and maintaining stockpiles and through coordination with the waste disposal facility. The sampling frequency and testing requirements of the stockpiles of impacted materials designated for disposal are set by the disposal company. Those details will be worked out with the disposal company at a later date.

### 4.2 Locations

Overburden stockpiles will be divided into volumes of 200 cubic yards as the material is stockpiled and the sections will be named sequentially (for example, the first 200 cubic yards would be referred to and labeled as Stockpile A, the second 200 cubic yards would be referred to and labeled as Stockpile B). A plan for filling and maintaining stockpiles will be developed with the contractor. Samples will be named based on the name of the stockpile (for example, "SKY-STOCK-A" will represent the first 200 cubic yards, "SKY-STOCK-B" the second 200 cubic yards).

### 4.3 Stockpile Environmental Sampling Procedures

Based on existing analytical data for the site, overburden material will consist of material removed from the levee above the road elevation and the upper four feet of the uplands. Four grab samples will be collected from each 200 cubic yard division of the stockpile and composited into one sample for laboratory analysis. An excavator will be used to cut a trench 3 feet normal to the pile surface at four locations equally spaced around the pile and the grab sample will be collected from the vertical mid-point within the trench.

Samples will be collected using equipment appropriate to the depth from which collection is to occur. The grab samples will be of equal volume and will be collected using a clean, stainless steel trowel of spoon. Samples may be collected directly from piles or from a shovel or excavator bucket. The grab samples will be homogenized in a decontaminated stainless steel bowl or in a disposable zip-lock type bag. Sampling containers will be filled to minimize headspace, and will be appropriately labeled and stored prior to delivery to the laboratory.

### 4.4 Overburden Stockpile Chemical Analysis and Turn-Around Times

Overburden stockpile samples will be analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons by NWTPH-Dx. Standard turn-around times will be requested since material will likely be suitable for backfill.

### 4.5 Disposal or Reuse as Backfill

In order to be considered clean, the concentration must be less than or equal to cleanup level, i.e., $22 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx in soil or $40.9 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx in sediment, or the laboratory's Practical Quantitation Limit (PQL) estimated to be approximately $35 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ for NWTPH-Dx. If a sample concentration is clean, the volume represented by that sample can be used anywhere within the Project Area as backfill except as sediment in reconstruction of the river bed. If a sample concentration is clean, the volume represented by that sample may be stockpiled in a long-term stockpile area for use as backfill on the railyard during subsequent phases of remediation. Alternatively, excavated soils and sediments whose NWTPH-Dx concentrations are not clean may be screened and materials that are less than 1 inch in diameter will be designated under WAC 173-303 and disposed of at an appropriate facility. The screening operation is expected to remove most of the finer grained soil that may cling to oversized material, leaving the oversized fraction relatively free of impacts. The 1.0 inch and greater size material must pass visual inspection as having no visible contamination and be approved by Ecology for use as backfill in areas of the excavation greater than 25 feet landward of the OHWM.

Over-sized boulders \& rip-rap will be reused in reconstruction of the levee if they pass visual inspection as having no visible contamination and are approved for reuse by Ecology. Rip-rap and boulders with visual contamination may be reused after steam cleaning. Photo-documentation of materials passing visual inspections will be maintained in the project records.

## 5 Sample Handling

### 5.1 Sample Handling

Analytical methods and requirements for soil and sediment are summarized in Table 6-1. Soil and sediment samples will be analyzed for the following constituents:

- Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (NWTPH-diesel extended).


## Table 5-1 Sample Handling and Preservation Requirements for Soil and Sediment

| Parameter | Method | Container | Preservation | Holding <br> Time Soil |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TPH | NWTPH-Dx | 8 oz. WMG | Cool to 4 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 14 days |

Notes:
Container
WMG = wide mouth glass

### 5.2 Sample Packing and Labeling Procedures

Samples must be packed to prevent damage to the sample container and labeled to allow sample identification. All samples must be packaged so that they do not leak, break, vaporize or cause cross-contamination of other samples. Waste samples and environmental samples (e.g., soil, etc.) should not be placed in the same container. Each individual sample must be properly labeled and identified. A chain-of-custody record must accompany each shipping container. When refrigeration is required for sample preservation, samples must be kept cool during the time between collection and final packaging.

All samples must be clearly identified immediately upon collection. Each sample bottle label will include the following information:

- Client and project name
- A unique sample description (such as SKY-SOIL-A1 or SKY-STOCK-A)
- Sample collection date and time.

Additionally, the sample bottle label may include:

- Sampler's name or initials
- Indication of addition of preservative, if applicable
- Analyses to be performed.

After collection, the samples will be maintained under chain-of-custody procedures as described below.

### 5.3 Chain of Custody

Chain-of-custody procedures are intended to document sample possession from the time of collection to disposal. Chain-of-custody forms must document transfers of sample custody. A sample is considered to be under custody if it is in one's possession, view, or in a designated secure area. The chain-of-custody record will include, at a minimum, the following information:

- Client and project name
- Sample collector's name
- Company's (RETEC) mailing address and telephone number
- Designated recipient of data (name and telephone number)
- Analytical laboratory's name and city
- Description of each sample (i.e., unique identifier and matrix)
- Date and time of collection
- Quantity of each sample or number of containers
- Type of analysis required
- Addition of preservative, if applicable
- Requested turn-around times
- Date and method of shipment.

Additional information may include type of sample containers, shipping identification air bill numbers, etc.

When transferring custody, both the individual(s) relinquishing custody of samples and the individual(s) receiving custody of samples will sign, date, and note the time on the form. If samples are to leave the collector's possession for shipment to the laboratory, the subsequent packaging procedures will be followed. If an on-site lab is being used, a chain-of-custody must be completed but the following packing procedures do not apply. All samples will be stored appropriately by the lab.

### 5.3.1 Packing for Shipment

Packing of samples for shipment will comply with RETEC Standard Operating Procedure 110 (Attachment A). To prepare a cooler for shipment, the sample bottles will be inventoried and logged on the chain-of-custody form. At least one layer of protective material will be placed in the bottom of the container. As each sample bottle is logged on the chain-of-custody form, it should be wrapped with protective material (e.g., bubble wrap, matting, plastic gridding, or similar material) to prevent breakage. Each sample bottle should be placed upright in the shipping container. Each sample bottle cap should be checked during wrapping and tightened if needed. Avoid over tightening, which may cause bottle cap to crack and allow leakage. Additional packaging material such as bubble wrap or Styrofoam pellets should be spread throughout the voids between the sample bottles.

Most samples require refrigeration as a minimum preservative. If needed, reusable cold packs or ice placed in heavy-duty zip-lock type bags should be distributed over the top of the samples. Two or more cold packs or bags should be used to cool the samples to 4 to 6 degrees Celsius. Additional packing material should then be placed to fill the balance of the cooler or container.

Place the original completed chain-of-custody record in a zip-lock type plastic bag and place the bag on the top of the contents within the cooler or shipping container. Alternatively, the bag may be taped to the underside of the container lid. Retain a copy of the chain-of-custody record with the field records.

Close the top or lid of the cooler or shipping container and rotate/shake the container to verify that the contents are packed so that they do not move. Add additional packaging if needed and reseal. Place signed and dated chain-ofcustody seal at two different locations (front and back) on the cooler or container lid and overlap with transparent packaging tape. The chain-ofcustody tape should be placed on the container in such a way that opening the container will destroy the tape. Packaging tape should encircle each end of the cooler at the hinges.

Sample shipment should be sent via courier or an overnight express service that can guarantee 24-hour delivery. Retain copies of all shipment records as provided by the shipper.

Chain-of-custody records will be maintained in an appropriate file with the Project Manager. Copies of these records will be submitted in an appendix to the final report. Chain-of-custody information will also be recorded in field notebooks.

### 5.4 Sample Log-In

Upon receipt of samples (which will be accompanied by a completed chain-of-custody record detailing requested analyses), the Laboratory Coordinator(s) or his/her delegate will:

- Verify all paperwork, chain-of-custody records, and similar documentation
- Log-in samples, assign unique laboratory sample numbers, and attach the numbers to the sample container(s)
- Store samples in a refrigerated sample bank
- Record temperature upon receipt.


## 6 Analytical Procedures

The laboratories utilized for analysis of samples collected under the SAP shall perform all analysis according to EPA/Ecology-accepted methods. Accepted EPA methods consist of those methods that are documented in the "Contract Lab Program Statement of Work for Organic Analysis" or any alternative method that has been approved by EPA/Ecology for use during this project. The analytical method procedures are detailed in the laboratory QA manual.

### 6.1 Analytical Laboratories

A laboratory accredited by Ecology will perform analysis on all soil and sediment samples collected as described in this SAP.

### 6.2 General Requirements

In general, the laboratory will adhere to those recommendations as promulgated in 21 CFR Part 58, "Good Laboratory Practices" and procedures described in SW-846 Test Methods for Evaluating Solid WastePhysical/Chemical Methods, Third Edition, 1994; and those criteria presented in 40 CFR 136.

### 6.3 Analytical Data Review

The QA Officer will perform a review of the data received from the analytical laboratory to ensure that all of the project QC criteria have been met. Every component of the data package will be inspected. A series of QC forms will be supplied by the laboratory with the analytical data package and will be used as part of the data review process.

The results of all environmental sampling will be sent to the Data Validator for validation. A report containing the results of the validation will be submitted to the QA Officer.

## 7 Quality Control and Quality <br> Assurance

### 7.1 Quality Control of Soil and Sediment Sample Collection

At least one soil/sediment sample in every 20 will be field split for pseudoreplicated chemical analysis. Split samples will be collected by filling two sets of sample containers with the soils collected. Field splits will not be identified as splits on the sample labels or chain-of-custody forms but will be identified as such in the field notebook and the sample logs. A summary of the QA samples to be collected is summarized in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1 Summary of Quality-Assurance Soil and Sediment Samples

| Matrix | Parameter | Equipment <br> Rinseate <br> Samples | Field <br> Duplicates | Matrix <br> Spikes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Soil | A | 1 per 20 <br> samples | 1 per 20 <br> samples | 1 per 20 <br> samples |
| Sediment | A | 1 per 20 <br> samples | 1 per 20 <br> samples | 1 per 20 <br> samples |
| Stockpiles for <br> ere-use as <br> backfill | A | As required by <br> waste <br> management <br> facility | 1 per 20 <br> samples | 1 per 20 <br> samples |

Notes:
A -Field duplicate and equipment rinseate samples will be analyzed for the same parameters as the investigative samples.

### 7.1.1 Documentation

Various documents will be completed and maintained as a part of soil and sediment sample collection. These documents will provide a summary of the sample collection procedures and conditions, shipment method, analyses requested, and the custody history. These documents may include:

- Field books
- Soil sampling forms
- Sample labels
- Chain-of-custody forms
- Shipping receipts.

All documentation will be stored in the project files.

### 7.1.2 Decontamination

Decontamination is performed as a quality control measure and as a safety precaution. It prevents cross-contamination between samples and also helps maintain a clean working environment. All equipment which could potentially contact samples requires decontamination. This includes hand tools, monitoring and testing equipment, personal protective equipment, or heavy equipment (e.g., loaders, backhoes, drill rigs, etc.). All decontamination will comply with RETEC Standard Operating Procedure 120 (Attachment A).

Decontamination will be achieved by rinsing with liquids that may include: soap and/or detergent solutions, tap water, distilled water and methanol. Equipment may be allowed to air dry after being cleaned or may be wiped dry with paper towels or chemical-free cloths.

All sampling equipment will be decontaminated prior to use and between each sample collection point as outlined in SOP 120 (Attachment A). Waste products produced by the decontamination procedures such as rinse liquids, solids, rags, gloves, etc. will be collected and disposed of properly at an offsite licensed facility and shipment will comply with RETEC SOP 430 (Attachment A). Any materials and equipment that will be reused must be decontaminated or placed in plastic bags before being taken off-site.

All soil sample collection apparatus will be fully decontaminated before sampling and between sampling points. At least one equipment rinseate sample will be collected after decontamination for every 20 soil grab samples collected. Duplicate and equipment rinsate samples will be analyzed for the same constituents as the environmental samples. Excavator buckets will be rinsed out to the extent possible. Soil grab samples will be collected away from the walls of the excavator buckets to reduce possible crosscontamination.

The following are decontamination procedures for sampling equipment:

1) Remove gross visible solids from the equipment by brushing and then rinse with tap water.
2) Wash with detergent or soap solution (e.g., Alconox ${ }^{\circledR}$ and tap water).
3) Rinse with tap or distilled water.
4) Repeat entire procedure or any parts of the procedure if solids appear to still be present on the sampling equipment.
5) Rinse with distilled water.
6) After decontamination procedure is completed, avoid placing equipment directly on ground surface where recontamination is
possible. Spoons and trowel will be placed in clean plastic bags or wrapped in foil.

No additional decontamination procedures will be required if the equipment appears to be visually clean. If impacts are visible after hot water/steam cleaning, then a detergent wash solution with brushes (if necessary) will be used.

### 7.2 Quality Assurance Objectives

Quality assurance objectives help to achieve the data quality requirements required by the project. Soil and sediment samples will be collected for NWTPH-Dx analysis as described above in order to meet the objectives of the interim action for cleanup. To help achieve the data quality requirements, the following quality-control parameters will be evaluated throughout the course of this project:

- Detection limits
- Practical Quantitation Limits
- Data precision
- Data accuracy
- Representativeness
- Comparability and completeness.

These quality-assessment parameters are described in greater detail in the following paragraphs.

### 7.2.1 Detection Limits

The method detection limit for a given parameter is determined by procedures specified in the analytical method. Detection limits will be observed for all laboratory analyses performed during this project, except where matrix interferences and high concentrations of target and non-target compounds increase the reporting detection limits. Method detection limits for NWTPHDx at Test America Laboratories, the laboratory selected for this work, are listed in Table 7-2. Samples that are highly impacted visually in the field will be flagged for the laboratory to minimize dilution of the entire set of samples.

Table 7-2 NWTPH-Dx Method Detection and Practical Quantitation Limits

|  | Method Detection Limit <br> (mg/kg) | Estimated Practical <br> Quantitation Limit / <br> Reporting Limit (mg/kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diesel Range Hydrocarbons | 1.60 | 10.0 |
| Lube Oil Range Hydrocarbons | 3.19 | 25.0 |

### 7.2.2 Practical Quantitation Limits

Practical quantitation limits are the lowest concentrations that can be reliably measured within specified limits of precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness, and comparability during routine laboratory operation conditions (WAC 173-340-200). At Test America, practical quantitation limits are equivalent to reporting limits. The NWTPH-Dx method detection limits are below the cleanup and remediation levels for this site, but the reporting limits do vary during routine analyses. When the lab cannot meet the cleanup levels or remediation levels with the reporting limits, appropriate analytical QA/QC will be provided to Ecology to justify use of that reporting limit. The reporting limit may typically be $10.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ for diesel range hydrocarbons and $25.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ for lube oil range hydrocarbons, i.e., $35 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ NWTPH-Dx, but needs to be approved by Ecology upon review of the QA/QC information.

### 7.2.3 Precision

Precision will be determined for field split samples by examining sample results for degree of variance.

Precision is a measure of agreement among individual measurements of the same parameter, usually under prescribed similar conditions. Precision is best expressed in terms of the relative percent difference. The relative percent difference (RPD) parameter will be calculated to define the precision between duplicate analyses.

The RPD for each component is calculated using the following equation:

$$
\% \mathrm{RPD}=\frac{\left(\mathrm{X}_{2}-\mathrm{X}_{1}\right)}{\left[\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}+\mathrm{X}_{2}\right) / 2\right]} \times 100
$$

where:
$\mathrm{X}_{1}=$ parent sample value
$\mathrm{X}_{2}=$ duplicate sample value
The laboratory objective for precision is to generate RPD values that fall within the established control limits for the method employed. The field objective for precision is to generate RPD values that are between 0 and 50 percent for soil and sediment samples (USEPA, 1996). If the criteria are not met, the data reviewer will examine other quality-control criteria to determine the need for some qualification of the data.

### 7.2.4 Accuracy

Accuracy is defined as the degree of agreement between a measurement and an accepted reference of true concentration and is an indication of any bias that exists during sampling, handling, matrix interference, and analysis. Accuracy is determined by spiking samples with a known concentration of standard compounds and comparing the analytical results with the known value. Data accuracy will be assessed by determining the percent recovery of a spiked compound. Percent recovery (\%R) is determined by the equation:

$$
\% \mathrm{R}=\frac{\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{0}\right)}{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}} \times 100
$$

where:
$\mathrm{C}_{1}=$ measured concentration in the spiked sample
$\mathrm{C}_{0}=$ measured concentration in the unspiked sample
$\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}} \quad=\quad$ concentration at which the sample was spiked
The concentration at which the sample was spiked $\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}\right)$ is calculated, using the following equation:

$$
\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}=\frac{\left(\mathrm{C}_{\text {spike }} \times \mathrm{V}_{\text {spike }}\right)}{\mathrm{V}_{\text {sample }}+\mathrm{V}_{\text {spike }}}
$$

where:
$\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}} \quad=\quad$ concentration at which the sample was spiked
$\mathrm{C}_{\text {spike }}=$ spike concentration
$\mathrm{V}_{\text {spike }}=\quad$ volume of spike
$\mathrm{V}_{\text {sample }}=\quad$ volume of sample
The laboratory objective for accuracy is to generate $\% \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{s}}$ that fall within established control limits for the method employed. These control limits are the more conservative of laboratory control charts that consider 9-12 months of laboratory quality control data and method specifications.

Surrogate and matrix spiking compounds and sample selection for spiking are determined by current SW-846 methodologies. Percent recoveries indicate the actual performance of the analytical method on real world samples. Surrogate spikes, matrix spikes, matrix spike duplicates, and QC spikes will be conducted using standard laboratory methods.

### 7.2.5 Representativeness

Representativeness is the degree to which data accurately and precisely represent a characteristic population, a process control or an environmental condition. Taking the following steps will ensure representativeness of the data:

- Performing sampling procedures as described in this SAP and recording any deviations from these methods in the project field book
- Using only standard USEPA analytical procedures with well established quality assurance/quality control criteria
- Using a contract lab with a well established performance record
- Subjecting all data to validation process.

Appropriate sampling procedures will be implemented so that the samples are representative of the environmental matrices from which they were obtained as specified above.

### 7.2.6 Comparability and Completeness

Comparability is achieved through the use of the same analytical methods that were used previously, through use of trained personnel and through following procedures in this SAP. Extraction or analytical procedures performed by the laboratory for the project will be in compliance with USEPA standard methods and references for these methods will be included with the analytical report. Completeness is a measure of the amount of valid data obtained from a measurement system compared to the amount that was expected to be obtained under normal conditions. The completeness goal will be at least 90 percent.

### 7.3 Data Management and Assessment

The data collected and validated as part of the project scope of work will be combined with the data already compiled for the facility. This section discusses the management of data generated as part of the field effort.

### 7.3.1 Data Management

## Reporting

After receipt of the analytical results, the QA Officer will review all raw data, including QA/QC data from the sample analyses.

Periodic reports will include a summary of data reduction results and a discussion of any inconsistencies that exist from a data-use standpoint. All field data sheets will be included as an appendix in the reports. All raw data
will be appropriately identified in reports and included in a separate appendix of the report. Raw data will be submitted to Ecology following the schedule and format specified in the Agreed Order for this project.

## Representativeness

The determination of the representativeness of the data will be performed by:

- Comparing actual sampling procedures to those delineated in this plan.
- Examining the results of QC samples for evidence of crosscontamination; such evidence may be cause for invalidations or qualification of the affected samples.
- Invalidating non-representative data or identifying data to be classified as questionable or qualitative. Only representative data will be used in subsequent data reduction, validation activities and facility characterization.

The analytical results of the equipment rinseate samples (cross-contamination) will be compared to the results of the field samples to determine if the level of impact is significant. The rule of $5 x$ will be used when chemicals are measured in a QC sample. This rule states that if a sample concentration is less than five times (5x) the QC sample, the sample should be qualified as non-detectable (EPA, 1988).

## Data Review

The objective of the data review is to identify any qualitative, unreliable or invalid laboratory measurements. Data review entails a review of the laboratory-provided QC data to verify that the laboratory is properly performing the QC program and is operating within the required control limits. As a result, it will be possible to determine which samples, if any, are related to out-of-control laboratory QC samples. Laboratory data will be screened for inclusion of and frequency of the necessary QC supporting information, such as detection limit verification, duplicates, spikes and method blanks. QC supporting information will be screened to determine whether any data are outside established control limits. Any out-of-control data without appropriate corrective action will be cause to qualify the affected measurement data. Missing or infrequent QC information will be cause to contact the laboratory concerning affected measurement data and to request additional QC supporting information for re-analysis.

### 7.3.2 Data Assessment

Data assessment will be conducted in accordance with RETEC Standard Operating Procedure 410 (Attachment A).

## Laboratory Procedures

Following the assessment of laboratory data for the inclusion of required QC data, the QC data will be analyzed for accuracy and precision. If quality control audits result in the detection of unacceptable data, the QA Officer will be responsible for initiating corrective action, which may include:

- Reanalyzing samples if holding-time criteria permit
- Resampling and analyzing
- Evaluating and amending sampling and analytical procedures
- Accepting data and acknowledging the level of uncertainty.


## Accuracy

The accuracy of the data will be determined as follows:

- Computing percent recoveries for spiked samples
- Calculating the standard deviation in the overall average recovery value
- Determining the range of uncertainty at a given level of confidence.

The accuracy of the data will be used to determine any bias in the analytical methods. The field sample results will not be adjusted for bias, but the bias will be considered in the interpretation of the data.

## Precision

The determination of the precision of the data will be performed by examining duplicate samples for degree of variance and by determining if sampling error has occurred by the variance of duplicates. The precision values calculated from the field duplicates will be used in the data interpretations to determine how sensitive the site characterizations are to the variances in the data.

Specific precision targets cannot be formulated without baseline precision data. However, the precision data will be summarized into the following categories. For each compound or element, the number of field duplicates with variance in the following ranges will be evaluated:

- Less than 10 percent
- 10 to 25 percent
- 25 to 50 percent
- Greater than 50 percent.

This will provide qualitative information to the individuals interpreting the data as to the range of variances and will also allow the proper planning for QC samples in future sampling episodes.

### 7.3.3 Data Validation

After reviewing the laboratory analytical data, the QA officer will provide the Data Validator with the data and field notes from the applicable sampling activities. The Data Validator will compare the actual sampling and laboratory procedures to those explained in this plan, identify any questionable or qualitative data, and report the validation results to the QA Officer.

## 8 Review and Reporting of Laboratory Data

Data quality and utility depends on many factors, including sampling methods, sample preparation, analytical methods, quality control and documentation. Physical and chemical data have been divided into five categories (EPA Region V Model Quality Assurance Project Plan, 1991), as follows:

- Level V B Nonstandard Methods. Analyses by nonstandard protocols, such as ultra-low detection limits or analysis of an unusual chemical compound. These analyses often require method modification and/or development. CLP (Contract Laboratory Program) Special Analytical Services (SAS) projects are considered Level V.
- Level IV B CLP Routine Analytical Services (RAS). This level is characterized by rigorous QA/QC protocols and documentation, and it provides qualitative and quantitative analytical data. Some EPA regions have obtained similar support via their own regional laboratories, university laboratories or other commercial laboratories.
- Level III B Laboratory Analysis (using methods other than the CLP RAS). This level is used primarily in support of engineering studies, using standard EPA-approved procedures. Some procedures may be equivalent to CLP RAS, without the CLP document requirements.
- Level II B Field Analysis. This level is characterized by the use of portable analytical instruments that can be used on-site or in mobile laboratories stationed near a site (close-support labs). Depending upon the types of impacts, sample matrix and personnel skills, qualitative and quantitative data can be obtained.
- Level I B Field Screening. This level is characterized by the use of portable instruments that can provide real-time data to assist in the optimization of sampling point locations and for health and safety support. The types of data included are those generated on site through the use of PID, pH , conductivity, or other real-time monitoring equipment. Data can be generated regarding the presence or absence of certain materials (especially volatiles) at sampling locations.

The data generated in this project will be prepared and reviewed for Level III validation. The laboratory will use EPA methods to identify analytical values that do not meet the required ranges for surrogate recoveries and matrix spike
recoveries. If such values are identified, then the analysis must be repeated. If the re-analyzed values are within required limits and holding times, they will be reported as true values. If, in the repeated analysis, the values are still outside required limits, the data are considered to be invalid, and matrix effects are considered to have caused the values to be outside of the acceptable recovery limits.

### 8.1 Analytical Data

The laboratory will submit results that are supported by sufficient backup data and QA/QC results to enable the quality of the data to be determined conclusively. Prior to release of data, the laboratory coordinator(s) will: review the data package for reasonableness; review QC data results; verify that calculation checks were properly performed; review chain-of-custody record(s), sample preservation, and holding-time requirements; and write a project narrative. Data that are not acceptable will be held until the problems are resolved. Section 3 of this SAP describes the procedures that are employed to evaluate the precision, accuracy, representativeness, and completeness of the analytical test data generated during this project. It is the responsibility of the QA Officer to review these parameters. Validity of all data will be determined based on the criteria described in Section 3.

### 8.2 Final Reporting and Archiving of Laboratory Documents

Upon successful completion of the data validation process, all data generated at the site will be tabulated and stored on computer disk in a format suitable for import to a relational database. Data summaries and results will be submitted in final report form as a completion report. This report will consist of all pertinent sample and project information. It will also identify analytical procedures.

Copies of all analytical data and/or final reports will be retained in the laboratory files, and at the discretion of the Laboratory Coordinator(s), the data will be stored on computer disks for a minimum of 1 year.

After one year, or whenever the data become inactive, the files will be transferred to archives in accordance with standard laboratory procedure. Data may be retrieved from archives upon request.

## 9 References

Ecology, 1991. Guidance and Specifications for Preparing Quality Assurance Project Plans. Washington State Department of Ecology.

Ecology, 1995a, Guidance for Remediation of Petroleum Contaminated Soils. Washington State Department of Ecology Toxics Cleanup Program. Document 91-30.

Ecology, 1995. Guidance on Sampling and Data Analysis Methods. Washington State Department of Ecology Toxics Cleanup Program.

Ecology, 1997. Analytical Methods for Petroleum Hydrocarbons. June. Publication 97-602.

EPA, 1988. Laboratory Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Organic Analyses. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I.

EPA, 1991. EPA Region $V$ Model Quality Assurance Project Plan. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V, Office of Superfund.

EPA, 1994. Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste - Physical/Chemical Methods. Third Edition. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. SW-846.

RETEC, 2005. Final Feasibility Study- Skykomish, Washington. Prepared for BNSF Railway Company. Seattle, March.

USEPA Region I, 1996. Laboratory Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Organics Analyses, December.

## Attachment A

RETEC Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)

# RETEC Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) 120 Decontamination 

### 1.0 Purpose and Applicability

The RETEC Group, Inc. (RETEC) SOP 120 describes the methods to be used for the decontamination of items that may become contaminated during field operations. Decontamination is performed as a quality assurance measure, and as a safety and health precaution. It prevents cross-contamination between samples and also helps maintain a clean working environment. Equipment requiring decontamination may include hand tools, monitoring and testing equipment, personal protective equipment (PPE), or heavy equipment (e.g., loaders, backhoes, drill rigs, etc.).

Decontamination is achieved mainly by rinsing with liquids, which may include soap and/or detergent solutions, tap water, distilled water, and methanol or isopropyl alcohol. Equipment may be allowed to air dry after being cleaned or may be wiped dry with paper towels or chemical-free cloths.

All sampling equipment will be decontaminated prior to use and between each sample collection point. Waste products produced by the decontamination procedures, such as rinse liquids, solids, rags, gloves, etc., will be collected and disposed of properly, based on the nature of contamination and site protocols. Any materials and equipment that will be reused must be decontaminated or properly protected before being taken off site.

Specific project requirements as described in an approved Work Plan, Sampling Plan, Quality Assurance Project Plan, the RETEC Corporate Environment, Health, and Safety (EHS) Manual, Job Hazard Analysis (JHA), Safety Task Analysis Review (STAR), or Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) will take precedence over the procedures described in this document.

### 2.0 Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the field sampling coordinator to ensure that proper decontamination procedures are followed and that all waste materials produced by decontamination are properly managed. It is the responsibility of any subcontractors (e.g., drilling or sampling contractors) to follow the designated decontamination procedures that are stated in their contracts and outlined in the project HASP. It is the responsibility of all personnel involved with sample collection or decontamination to maintain a clean working environment and to ensure that no contaminants are inadvertently introduced into the environment, tracked out of the contamination reduction zone (CRZ), or passed from one sample point to another.

### 3.0 Health and Safety

This section presents the generic hazards associated with decontamination and is intended to provide general guidance in preparing site-specific health and safety documents. The Site-Specific HASP, JHAs, and STARs will address additional requirements and will take precedence over this document. Note that decontamination usually requires Level D personal protection unless there is a potential for airborne exposures to site contaminants. Under circumstances where potential airborne exposure is possible respiratory protective equipment may be required based on personal air monitoring results. Upgrades to Level C will be coordinated with your Site Safety and Health Officer (SSHO) or EHS Coordinator.

Health and safety hazards potentially involved decontamination include the following:

- Skin contact with decontamination solvents. Wear solvent impervious gloves when decontaminating equipment. Methanol and isopropanol are approved but use the solvents sparingly and dispense only from pre-labeled polypropylene solvent wash bottles. Whenever possible use an aqueous based non-toxic cleaning agents in lieu of solvents. Hexane is prohibited from use for decontamination.
- Avoid contact with site contaminants. Exposure to contaminated media is possible when either removing contaminated personal protective equipment (PPE) or decontaminating heavy equipment. Take care to prevent slips and falls when scrubbing over boots in the CRZ and remove PPE using proper "inside-out" techniques to minimize airborne exposure to potentially contaminated particulate. In addition to Level D PPE, wear a face shield when brushing off heavy equipment or using a pressure washer. Consult the Corporate EHS Manual for additional precautions.
- Decontamination pad liquids. If large volumes of rinsates are generated, wash water must be properly characterized prior to disposal. Avoid contact and wear PPE during liquids transfer.


### 4.0 Supporting Materials

The following materials should be on hand in sufficient quantity to ensure that proper decontamination methods and procedures are followed:

- Cleaning liquids and dispensers (phosphate-free soap and/or detergent solutions, tap water, distilled water, deionized water, reagent grade methanol or isopropyl, etc.)
- PPE, as defined in the project HASP
- Paper towels or chemical-free cloths
- Disposable chemically impervious gloves
- Waste-storage containers (e.g., drums, boxes, plastic bags)
- Drum labels, if necessary
- Cleaning containers (e.g., plastic and/or galvanized steel pans or buckets)
- Cleaning brushes
- Plastic sheeting
- Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDSs) for any chemicals or site-specific contaminants and decontamination solvents
- A copy of the Site-Specific HASP (consult for heavy equipment decontamination)


### 5.0 Methods and Procedures

The extent of known contamination will determine the degree of decontamination required. When the extent of contamination cannot be readily determined, cleaning should be done according to the assumption that the equipment is highly contaminated.

Standard operating procedures listed below describe the method for full field decontamination. If different technical procedures are required for a specific project, they will be spelled out in the project plans.

Such variations in decontamination may include all or an expanded scope of these decontamination procedures:

- Remove gross contamination from the equipment by brushing and then rinse with tap water.
- Wash with detergent or soap solution (e.g., Alconox and tap water).
- Rinse with tap water or distilled water.
- Rinse with reagent grade methanol or isopropyl alcohol.
- Rinse with deionized water (distilled water is an acceptable substitute if deionized water is unavailable).
- Repeat entire procedure or any parts of the procedure as necessary.
- After decontamination procedure is completed, avoid placing equipment directly on ground surface to avoid re-contamination.

Downhole drilling equipment, such as augers, split spoons, Shelby tubes, and sand lines, will be decontaminated with pressurized hot water or steam wash, followed by a fresh water rinse. No additional decontamination procedures will be required if the equipment appears to be visually clean. If contamination is visible after hot water/steam cleaning, then a detergent wash solution with brushes (if necessary) will be used. Items heavily contaminated with product may require more aggressive decontamination techniques. If the items cannot be discarded, consult your EHS coordinator to obtain guidance in this regard.

### 6.0 Quality Assurance/Quality Control

To assess the adequacy of decontamination procedures, rinsate blanks should be collected and analyzed for the same parameters as the field samples. Specific number of blanks will be defined in the project-specific sampling plan. In general, one rinsate blank will be collected per 20 samples.

### 7.0 Documentation

Field notes describing procedures used to decontaminate equipment/personnel and for collection of the rinsate blanks will be documented by on-site personnel. Field notes will be retained in the project files.

# RETEC Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) 210 Soil Sample Collection 

### 1.0 Purpose and Applicability

The RETEC Group, Inc. (RETEC) SOP 210 describes methods used to obtain soil samples for physical testing, stratigraphic correlations, and chemical analysis. Soil samples are obtained in conjunction with surface sampling, test pit excavation, soil boring, and monitoring well installation programs. These procedures provide specific information for determining the physical makeup of the surface and subsurface environment, as well as how to estimate the extent and magnitude of soil contamination, if present. RETEC SOP 210 will discuss sampling of the surface material with hand tools and sampling of the subsurface material by augers and split spoons, and within test pits by backhoes and hand tools.

Specific project requirements as described in an approved Work Plan, Sampling Plan, Quality Assurance Project Plan, Job Hazard Analysis, Safety Task Analysis Review, or SiteSpecific Health \& Safety Plan will take precedence over the procedures described in this document.

### 2.0 Responsibilities

The project geologist/engineer will be responsible for the proper use and maintenance of all types of equipment used for obtaining soil samples. The geologist/engineer will determine the location, total depth, and overall size of each surface sample collection point and test pit, and the location and depth of all subsurface borings based on the project specific sampling plan. The project geologist/engineer will be responsible for locating any subsurface utilities or structures, and disseminating this information to the contractor prior to commencing the sampling program. The location of overhead utilities and obstructions relative to the sampling locations will also be noted. In addition, a Safety Task Analysis Review will be conducted to assess any other potential health and safety hazards associated with soil sample collection.

It shall be the responsibility of the project geologist/engineer to observe all activities pertaining to soil sampling and subsurface investigations to ensure that all the standard procedures are followed properly, and to record all pertinent data on a field log or field book. The collection, handling, and storage of all samples will be the responsibility of the geologist/engineer.

It is the responsibility of the contractor to provide safe and well-maintained equipment for obtaining subsurface samples in borings and for decontamination of the equipment. Test pit construction, split-spoon sampling, and subsurface augering will be conducted by the
contractor. In addition, the contractor will be responsible for containment of cuttings, if required.

### 3.0 Health and Safety

This section presents the generic hazards associated with soil sampling techniques and is intended to provide general guidance in preparing site-specific health and safety documents. The Site-Specific Health \& Safety Plan, Job Hazard Analyses, and Safety Task Analysis Reviews will address additional requirements and will take precedence over this document. Note that sample collection usually requires Level D personal protection unless there is a potential for airborne exposures to site contaminants.

Health and safety hazards include but are not limited to the following:

## Test Pit Excavation

- Heavy equipment operation
- Cave-in (trench/excavation work)
- Hazardous materials (exposure and/or release)
- Utilities (underground)
- High noise levels
- Air quality (i.e., chemical, dust, explosive conditions)
- Uneven walking/working surfaces


## Hollow Stem Auger Drilling

- Heavy equipment operation
- Pinch points
- Rotating parts
- Loose clothing
- Heavy lifting
- Air quality (i.e., chemical, dust, explosive conditions)
- Hazardous materials (exposure and release)
- Pressurized lines
- High noise levels
- Utilities (underground or overhead)
- Hoisting
- Overhead hazards
- Hand hazards


## Rotary Drilling (Mud/Air)

- Same as above
- Increased noise hazard
- Increased dust hazard (air rotary)
- Cyclones/Diverters (pressurized lines should be anchored with whip-stops)
- Investigation derived waste containment
- Blow protect inspection/replacement
- Sample collection (i.e., there are increased hazards when taking samples from air rotary rigs resulting from overhead hazards (cyclones), pressurized lines, increased noise, and air quality at sample collection outlets. Field personnel must be aware of these hazards and initiate engineered controls to limit these hazards.)

If site/project conditions warrant the use of other drilling techniques, hazards associated with these techniques will be evaluated by amendment in the site-specific Health \& Safety Plan, Job Hazard Analyses, or Safety Task Analysis Reviews. Drill rig inspections, if applicable, will be completed prior to initiating soil sampling.

### 4.0 Supporting Materials

In addition to materials provided by the contractor, the geologist/engineer will provide:

- Sample bottles/containers and labels
- Boring or test pit logs
- Field notebook
- Chain-of-custody forms
- Depth-measurement device
- Stakes and fluorescent flagging tape
- Decontamination solution
- Camera for photographing sections
- Sampling equipment (e.g., knives, trowels, shovels, hand augers, aluminum foil, etc.)
- Plastic garbage bags
- Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDSs) for any chemicals or site specific contaminants
- A copy of the site-specific Health and Safety Plan


### 5.0 Methods and Procedures

Specific sampling equipment and methodology will be dictated by characteristics of the soil to be sampled, type of soil samples required, and by the analytical procedures to be employed. Soil samples obtained at the surface may be collected using a shovel, trowel, or hand auger. A hand auger can be used to extract shallow soil samples up to 10 feet below the surface. Sampling to obtain uniform coverage within a specified area will often require the use of an area grid. These considerations will be followed based upon project specific requirements.

There are two types of samples that may be required by the project sampling plan, grab or composite. A grab sample is collected from a specific location or depth and placing it in the appropriate sample container. A composite sample consists of several discrete locations (or depths) mixed to provide a homogeneous, representative sample. To ensure that the sample is representative, the soil volume and collection method from each discrete location should be as identical as possible. It should be noted that samples analyzed for volatile organic compounds cannot be composited since it is necessary to expose the soil to the atmosphere prior to transfer into the sample container.

The sampling depth interval in borings is typically one sample for every five feet with additional samples taken at the discretion of the project geologist/engineer when significant color, textural, or odor changes are encountered. Deviations in the standard operating procedure will be covered in the project specific sampling plans.

Most subsurface explorations by RETEC will be on privately owned land, often an industrial facility. Prior to commencing subsurface exploration, RETEC will work with the facility manager to locate any subsurface utilities or structures and discuss any pertinent health and safety issues. Utility companies, (electric, gas, water, phone, sewer, etc.) who may have equipment or transmission lines buried in the vicinity, will also be notified. Many regions have organizations, which represent all utilities for these notification purposes. Allow enough time after notification (typically three working days) for the utilities to respond and provide locations of any equipment, which may be buried on site. Overhead lines must also be kept in consideration when a drilling rig is used. As a rule of thumb, the rig and derrick should be at least 25 feet away from overhead lines unless special shielding and grounding are provided. In addition, consult the site-specific health and safety documentation.

### 5.1 General Applications

General locations shall be mapped by the field geologist/engineer using a stationary structure as the reference point. Specific locations for test pits and sampling locations will be documented by survey or by using topographic maps and/or plans. A preliminary log of the test pit, or boring shall be prepared in the field by the field geologist/engineer. A sketch of the test pit may be necessary to depict the strata encountered. Before measuring the depth to groundwater, if encountered, the field geologist/engineer will allow sufficient time for stabilization of the water table in the excavation or boring. All information shall be recorded on the field $\log$ or the field book.

### 5.2 Surface Sampling

Prior to surface sampling, remove all surface materials that are not to be included in the sample such as rocks, twigs, and leaves. For sample collection taken within the upper two to three feet, use a shovel or trowel. A hand auger may be used for depths of up to 10 feet. When using the hand auger, auger the hole to the required depth, then slowly remove the auger and collect the soil sample from the auger flight or auger bucket at the point corresponding to the required depth. A tube sampler can be attached to the auger rods after augering to the desired depth, inserted into the open borehole, and then advanced into the soil at the base of the boring. If sampling is in sandy or non-cohesive soil, a shovel may be necessary to collect samples. Sample logging is described in Section 5.5.

Photographs of specific geologic features or sample location may be required for documentation purposes. A scale or item providing a size perspective should be placed in each photograph. The frame number and picture location shall also be documented in the field book. All equipment shall be decontaminated following RETEC SOP 120 between sample locations unless otherwise specified in the project specific sampling plan.

### 5.3 Test Pit Excavation and Sampling

Test pits shall be excavated in compliance with applicable safety regulations. Walls should be cut as near vertical as possible to facilitate stratigraphic logging. Field personnel will not enter an open test pit deeper than four feet without shoring or benching present. Samples shall be collected from the backhoe bucket with a trowel or from the side of the test pit wall (depending upon the depth of the test pit and the safety precautions in place). The size, depth, and orientation of the test pit shall be recorded on the test pit log (Figure 1). Sample logging is described in Section 5.5.

Photographs of specific geologic features or sample location may be required for documentation purposes. A scale or item providing a size perspective should be placed in each photograph. Frame numbers and picture locations shall also be documented in the field book.

The test pit shall be inspected and the test pit log reviewed to ensure that all the appropriate and/or required data and samples have been collected. All test pits will be backfilled to original grade and compacted. All equipment shall be decontaminated following RETEC SOP 120 and guidance provided in the Health and Safety Plan between sample locations unless otherwise specified in the project specific sampling plan. Avoid using flammable liquids for decontamination purposes.

### 5.4 Subsurface Sampling

Note: RETEC employees conducting these operations must have completed a drilling safety course.

Borings are typically advanced by two methods: rotary drilling and augering. The casing shall be of the flush-joint or flush-couple type and of sufficient size to allow for soil
sampling, coring, and/or well installation. All casing sections shall be straight and free of any obstructions. Hollow-stem augers or solid-flight augers with casing may be used according to specific project requirements. Rotary drilling with water, mud, or air may be used in dense or indurated formations to advance to the required sample depth where a split spoon sampler or a coring device will be used to obtain the sample. Re-circulated water shall not be used when casing is being driven unless specified in project specific sampling plans and/or directed and properly documented by the field geologist/engineer. If recirculated water is used, all loose material within the casing shall be removed by washing to the required sampling depth using a minimum amount of water. Care should be taken to limit re-circulation of the wash water to those times when the water supply is extremely limited or unavailable. The amount of water used should be documented in the project field book or on the field form.

Generally subsurface soil samples shall be obtained using a split-tube type sampler (split spoon), however, other devices (Shelby tubes, continuous samples, core, etc.) may be used as specified in the project specific sampling plan. Split-spoons come in a variety of sizes with the most standard having a 2 -inch OD, a $13 / 8$-inch ID and a 24 -inch long barrel with an 18inch sample capacity. Split spoons shall be equipped with a check valve at the top and a flap valve or basket-type retainer at the bottom. Samples shall be obtained using the standard penetration test (SPT), which allows for qualitative determination of mechanical properties and aids in identification of material type. The number of hammer blows shall be recorded on the boring log (Figure 2) for each six-inch drive distance.

The soil sampler shall be opened immediately upon removal from the casing. If the recovery is inadequate (i.e., most of the penetrated material was not retained inside the soil sampler), a note will be made on the boring log stating that "no recovery" was possible at that depth. In the event that gravels or other material prevent penetration by the split spoon, samples may be collected from the auger flights. Slowly remove the auger and collect the sample at the point corresponding to the required depth. Samples collected in this manner must be documented on the boring log. Sample logging is described in Section 5.5.

Photographs of specific geologic features or sample location may be required for documentation purposes. A scale or item providing a size perspective should be placed in each photograph. The frame number and picture location shall also be documented in the field book. All equipment will be decontaminated following RETEC SOP 120 between sample locations and sample depths unless otherwise specified in the project specific sampling plan.

Upon completion of the boring, backfill may be required. The backfill may consist of native material, hydrated bentonite chips/pellets, Portland cement/bentonite grout, or other low permeability material as specified in the project specific sampling plan. All applicable state/federal regulations concerning plugging of boreholes should be reviewed prior to the commencement of field activities.

### 5.5 Sample Logging

To ensure consistent descriptions of soil or rock material, the following criteria should be included on the sampling logs:

- Soil or rock type
- Depth ranges, recorded in feet
- Grain size
- Roundness
- Sorting
- Moisture
- Color
- Degree of oil contamination
- Remarks

Examples of soil types would be gravel, sand, silt, or clay. Soil types should be based on the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS). Figure 3 shows the USCS table. Examples of rock types include limestone, shale, claystone, siltstone, and sandstone. Soil/rock classifications determined in the field may be subject to change based upon laboratory tests. Factors to consider before changing a field determination include the expertise of the field geologist/engineer and laboratory personnel, representative character of the tested sampling, labeling errors, etc. Any changes made after this consideration shall be discussed and incorporated in the project report.

Grain size, roundness, and degree of sorting should also be included on the log if they are discernable. In addition to composition, blow counts and the length of the sample recovered should also be recorded on the sampling log. The degree of sample moisture should be described as dry, moist, and wet.

The color(s) or range of color(s) of the soil or rock type should be defined. If a Munsell color chart is used, the number designation of the color will also be recorded in the description. A notation of the degree of oil contamination should be included on the sample log. The contamination should be noted as high ( $30 \%$ ), medium (10-30 \%), low (1-10 \%), or none. Other classifiers may include odor (low to high) and mottling (low to high).

Remarks should include anything pertinent to the sample description or sample collection that is not described above. Other information to be placed on the logs as appropriate is:

- PID readings (with associated calibration information)
- Appearance of contamination (consistency)
- Degree of fracturing or cementation in the rock
- Drilling equipment used (rod size, bit type, pump type, rig manufacturer and model, etc.)
- Special problems and their resolution (hole caving, recurring problems at a particular depth, sudden tool drops, excessive grout takes, drilling fluid losses, lost casing, etc.)

Dates for start and completion of borings

- Depth of first encountered free water
- Definitions of special abbreviations used on log


### 5.6 Sample Handling

Specific procedures pertaining to the handling and shipment of samples shall be in accordance with RETEC SOP 110. A clean pair of gloves and decontaminated sampling tools will be used when handling the samples during collection to prevent cross contamination. A representative sample will be placed in the sampling container. Sample containers (jars or bags) shall be labeled with the following information:

- Client or project name, or unique identifier, if confidential
- Unique sample description (i.e., test pit, boring, or sampling point number and horizontal/vertical location)
- Sample collection date and time
- Sampler's name or initials
- Analyses to be performed

These data shall be recorded on the field logs and/or field book. Larger bulk samples shall be placed in cloth bags with plastic liners or plastic five-gallon buckets. Sample bags shall be marked with the information listed above.

### 6.0 Quality Assurance/Quality Control

Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) requirements include, but are not limited to, blind field duplicates, blind rinsate blanks, and blind field blanks. These samples will be collected on a frequency of one QA/QC sample per 20 field samples or a minimum of one QA/QC sample per day unless otherwise specified in the project specific sampling plan.

### 7.0 Documentation

Documentation may consist of all or part of the following:

- Test pit or boring log
- Sample log sheets
- Field log book
- Chain-of-custody forms
- Shipping receipts
- Health \& Safety forms (Job Hazard Analysis, Safety Task Analysis Review, and/or Site Specific Health \& Safety Plan amendments)
- PID calibration records

All documentation shall be placed in the project files and retained following completion of the project.

### 8.0 References

Handbook of Suggested Practices for the Design and Installation of Ground-Water Monitoring Wells, EPA/600/4-89/034, published by National Water Well Association, 1991.

RCRA Ground Water Monitoring Technical Enforcement Guidance Document, published by National Water Well Association, 1986.

A Compendium of Superfund Field Operations, EPA 540/P-87/001, published by the Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Office of Waste Programs Enforcement, US EPA, 1987.

Preparation of Soil Sampling Protocols: Sampling Techniques and Strategies, EPA/600/R92/128, published by the Environmental Research Center, 1992.
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| The RETEC Group |  | BORING LOG |  | BORING <br> SHEET |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT |  | CONTRACTOR | OF |  |

FIELD GUIDE AND USCS CLASSIFICATION TABLE

SAND

| SOIL TYPE | SPT, N Blows/ft. | Relative Density, \% | FIELD TEST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { VERY LOOSE } \\ \text { SAND } \end{gathered}$ | 4 | 0-15 | Easily penetrated with $1 / 2$ " reinforcing rod pushed by hand. |
| LOOSE SAND | 4-10 | 15-35 | Easily penetrated with $1 / 2$ " reinforcing rod pushed by hand. |
| MEDIUM DENSE SAND | 10-30 | 35-65 | Penetrated a foot with $1 / 2$ " reinforcing rod driven with $5-\mathrm{lb}$ hammer. |
| DENSE SAND | 30-50 | 65-85 | Penetrated a foot with $1 / 2$ " reinforcing rod driven with $5-\mathrm{lb}$ hammer. |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { VERY DENSE } \\ \text { SAND } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 50 | 85-100 | Penetrated only a few inches with $1 / 2$ " reinforcing rod driven with 5 -lb hammer. |

CLAY

| $\begin{gathered} \text { CLAY } \\ \text { CONSISTENCY } \end{gathered}$ | THUMB PENETRATION | SPT, N BLOWSI FT. | Undrained Shear Strength c (PSF) | Unconfined Compressive Strength (PSF) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | TORVANE | Pocket Penetrometer |
| VERY SOFT | Easily penetratatd several inches by thumb. Exudes betwen thumband fingers when squeezed in hand. | <2 | 250 | 500 |
| SOFT | Easily penetrated one inch by thumb. Molded by light finger pressure. | 2-4 | 250-500 | 500-1000 |
| MEDIUM STIFF | Can be penetrated over 1/4 " by thumb with moderate effort. Molded by strong finger pressure. | 4-8 | 500-1000 | 1000-2000 |
| STIFF | Indented about $1 / 4$ " by thumb but penetrated only with great effort. | 8-15 | $\begin{gathered} 1000- \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2000-4000 |
| VERY STIFF | Readily indented by thumbnail. | 15-30 | $\begin{gathered} 2000- \\ 4000 \end{gathered}$ | 4000-8000 |
| HARD | Indented with difficulty by thumbnail. | >30 | >4000 | >8000 |

Unified Soil Classification System (USCS)

|  |  | MILLIMETERS | INCHES | SIEVE SIZES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BOULDERS |  | $>300$ | $>11.8$ | - |
| COBBLES |  | $75-300$ | $2.9-11.8$ | - |
| GRAVEL | COARSE | $75-19$ | $2.9-.75$ | - |
|  | FINE | $19-4.8$ | $.75-.19$ | $3 / 4$ " - No. 4 |
| SAND | COARSE | $4.8-2.0$ | $.19-.08$ | No. $4-$ No. 10 |
|  | MEDIUM | $2.0-.43$ | $.08-.02$ | No. $10-$ No. 40 |
|  | FINE | $.43-.08$ | $.08-.003$ | No. $40-$ No. 200 |
| FINES | SILTS | $<.08$ | $<.003$ | $<$ No. 200 |
|  | CLAYS | $<.08$ | $<.003$ | $<$ No. 200 |

Table Title

| MAJOR DIVISIONS |  |  | LETTER SYMBOL | TYPICAL DESCRIPTIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COARSE GRAINED SOILS <br> MORE THAN 50\% OF MATERIAL IS LARGER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE | GRAVEL AND GRAVELLY SOILS <br> MORE THAN 50\% OF COARSE FRACTION PASSING NO. 4 SIEVE | CLEAN GRAVELS (LITTLE OR NO FINES) | GW | WELL - GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL <br> - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES. |
|  |  |  | GP | POORLY - GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NOT FINES. |
|  |  | GRAVELS <br> WITH FINES <br> (APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES) | GM | SILTY GRAVELS, GRAVEL-SAND SILT MIXTURES. |
|  |  |  | GC | CLAYEY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - CLAY MIXTURES. |
|  | SAND AND SANDY SOILS <br> MORE THAN 50\% OF COARSE FRACTION PASSING NO. 4 SIEVE | CLEAN SAND (LITtLE OR NO FINES) | SW | WELL-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SANDS, LITTLE OR NO FINES. |
|  |  |  | SP | POORLY - GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SANDS, LITTLE OR NO FINES. |
|  |  | SANDS WITH FINES APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES) | SM | SILTY - SANDS, SAND - SILT MIXTURES |
|  |  |  | SC | CLAYEY SANDS, SAND - CLAY MIXTURES. |
| FINE <br> GRAINED <br> SOILS <br> MORE THAN 50\% OF MATERIAL IS SMALLER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE | SILTS AND CLAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LIQUID LIMIT LESS } \\ & \text { THAN } 50 \end{aligned}$ | ML | INORGANIC SILTS AND VERY FINE SANDS, ROCK FLOUR, SILTY OR CLAYEY FINE SANDS OR CLAYEY SILTS WITH SLIGHT PLASTICITY. |
|  |  |  | CL | INORGANIC CLAYS OF LOW TO MEDIUM PLASTICITY, GRAVELLY CLAYS, SANDY CLAYS, SILTY, CLAYS, LEAN CLAYS. |
|  |  |  | OL | ORGANIC SILTS AND ORGANIC SILTY CLAYS OF LOW PLASTIIITY. |
|  | SILTS AND CLAYS | LIQUID LIMIT GREATER THAN 50 | MH | INORGANIC SITLS, MICACEOUS OR DIATOMACEOUS FINE SAND OR SILTY SOILS. |
|  |  |  | CH | INORGANIC CLAYS OF HIGH PLASTICITY, FAT CLAYS. |
|  |  |  | OH | ORGANIC CLAYS OF MEDIUM TO HIGH PLASTICITY, ORGANIC SILTS. |
| HIGHLY ORGANIC SOILS |  |  | PT | PEAT, HUMUS, SWAMP SOILS WITH HIGH ORGANIC CONTENTS. |

# RETEC Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) 430 Hazardous Waste Management \& Shipping 

### 1.0 Purpose and Applicability

The RETEC Group, Inc. (RETEC) SOP 430 details the proper management and shipping of hazardous wastes. Specific project requirements as described in an approved Work Plan, Sampling Plan, Quality Assurance Project Plan, Job Hazard Analysis (JHA), Safety Task Analysis (STAR), or Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) will take precedence over the procedures described in this document.

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulates hazardous waste from the point of its generation through its point of final disposal. EPA has developed generator standards that address on-site accumulation of hazardous waste in 40 CFR 262. Additional waste accumulation and handling procedures may be required by your local state agency.

### 2.0 Responsibilities

Hazardous waste management is an essential component of many RETEC projects. Everyone who handles hazardous waste is responsible for ensuring that the waste is properly managed. Improperly managing waste can result in violations and fines, and criminal penalties.

### 3.0 Health and Safety

Although there are no specific health and safety hazards associated with this task, always remember to work safe.

### 4.0 Supporting Materials

Supporting materials for the management of hazardous waste are as follows:

- Copy of RCRA regulations (40 CFR 261 and 262)
- Copy of applicable state regulations
- Waste management labels


### 5.0 Methods and Procedures

The RCRA regulations establish a comprehensive hazardous waste management system under the authority of RCRA Subtitle C. RCRA regulates hazardous waste from the point of its generation through its point of final disposal. Hazardous waste generators are subject to varying degrees of regulation depending on the amount of hazardous waste produced. These methods and procedures define the three classifications of generators, details the varying
degree of regulation that applies to each, and explains hazardous waste manifesting and shipping requirements.

### 5.1 Generator Status

A generator can be thought of as any entity whose process produces hazardous waste or whose action causes a hazardous waste to be subject to regulation (40 CFR 260.10). On RETEC jobsites, our clients are almost always considered the generator. If a hazardous waste was generated in one of our offices, however, we would likely be considered the generator.

Generators fall into one of three types of generator status categories according to the amount of waste generated in a calendar month. These three classes of generators are described in Table 1: conditionally exempt small quantity generators (CESQGs), small quantity generators (SQGs), and large quantity generators (LQGs). Regulatory requirements for each become increasingly stringent as the volume of waste generated grows. Section 4.2 details the regulatory requirements for each type of generator.

Generators sometimes periodically exceed or fall below their normal generation limits in a generator month. If the amount of waste generated in that calendar month exceeds the limits of their generator status, the generator is responsible for complying with additional regulatory requirements of the new status. For example, if a generator produces 300 kilograms (kg) of hazardous waste in March, the waste must be managed in accordance with the SQG regulations; if the same generator produces $1,500 \mathrm{~kg}$ of hazardous waste in April, the waste must be managed in accordance with the LQG regulations (50 Federal Register (FR) 10153; March 24, 1986).

Table 1 Generator Status and Applicable Regulations

| Generator Status | Quantity of Waste Generated | Accumulation <br> Limit | Applicable Regulations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conditionally Exempt <br> Small Quantity (CESQG) | $\leq 100 \mathrm{~kg} /$ month <br> $\leq 1 \mathrm{~kg}$ acute <br> $\leq 100 \mathrm{~kg}$ acute residue or <br> contaminated soil | $1,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ | $\S 261.5$ |
| Small Quantity (SQG) | Between $100-1,000 \mathrm{~kg} /$ month <br> (approx. $220-2200 \mathrm{lbs})$ | $6,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ | Part 262, Subparts A, B, C <br> ( S262.34(d) is specific to SQGs); and <br> Subparts E, F, G, H if applicable; and <br> portions of Subpart D as specified in <br> §262.44 |
| Large Quantity (LQG) | $\geq 1,000 \mathrm{~kg} /$ month (approx. 2,200 <br> lbs) <br> $>1 \mathrm{~kg} /$ month acute (approx. 2.2 <br> lbs) <br> $>100 \mathrm{~kg}$ acute residue or <br> contaminated soil | NA | All Part 262 Requirements |

### 5.2 Hazardous Waste Management Requirements by Generator Status

### 5.2.1 Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator Requirements

Hazardous waste generated by CESQG is not subject to specific management standards under the federal hazardous waste regulations. Care must be taken that a client who maintains a CESQG does not generate more than 100 kg of hazardous waste (or more than 1 kg of acute hazardous waste, or more than 100 kg of spill residue from an acute hazardous waste) on site in one month or greater than $1,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ total at any time. If the client exceeds the $1,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ limit for hazardous waste, their site is subject to the SQG requirements in §262.34(d) and discussed in Section 5.2.2 of this SOP (§261.5(g)). If a client exceeds any of the limits set for acute hazardous waste, then they are subject to Large Quantity Generator requirements discussed in Section 5.2.3 of this SOP (§261.5(f)).

If your client is a CESQG, then you must ensure that the following waste management requirements are met:

- Maintain the client's generator status by accumulating only a maximum $1,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ of hazardous waste, or 1 kg of acute hazardous waste, or 100 kg of acute spill residue onsite at any time (§261.5).
- Place the waste in a container that is compatible with its properties, and is in good condition (Best Management Practice (BMP))
- Label all waste with content and hazard information (OSHA HazCom)
- Inspect the waste container frequent enough to determine that the container is not leaking and is in good condition (BMP)
- Minimize potential spills by inspecting the container at regular intervals, by placing containers away from stormwater drains, and by placing waste in secondary containment, if possible (BMP).
- Ensure that personnel shipping the waste is trained in DOT hazardous materials transport, and ship the waste in accordance with DOT regulatory requirements (See Section 4.4)
- Dispose of hazardous waste at a permitted or authorized disposal facility (§261.5(f)(3) and §261.5(g)(3)).


### 5.2.1 Small Quantity Generator Requirements

Generally, SQGs must comply with only some of the regulations that apply to LQGs. Care must be taken that a client who maintains an SQG does not accumulate more than $6,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ of hazardous waste on site at any time, and that waste is shipped offsite within 180 days of generation (or 270 days if shipped 200 miles or more). If the client exceeds the $6,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ limit for hazardous waste or the accumulation time limit, then their site is subject to LQG or requirements detailed in Section 4.2.3 of this SOP (§261.5(f)).

If your client is an SQG, then you must ensure that the following waste management requirements are met:

- Maintain the client's generator status by generating between 100 and $1,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ per month and accumulating only $6,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ of hazardous waste onsite at any one time (§262.34).
- Read and understand your role in relation to the facility's preparedness and prevention procedures, which are required by RCRA (§262.34(d)(4)).
- Ensure that RETEC staff handling hazardous waste are trained in accordance with the facility's RCRA personnel training program (§262.34(d)(5)(iii)).
- Accumulate waste in tanks or containers only (§262.34).
- Place the waste in a container that is compatible with its properties ( $\$ 260.10$ ), is in good condition ( $\S \S 264$ / 265.171), and is closed, except when waste is being added or removed (§264 / 265.173).
- Ensure that hazardous waste is not mixed with any other type of waste or any materials that the waste may react with (BMP, §260.10).
- Place containers holding ignitable or reactive wastes at least 50 feet from the property line (§264 / 265.173).
- Label all waste with content and hazard information (OSHA HazCom)
- Inspect the containers for leaking and deterioration at least once a week ( $\$ \S 264 / 265.174$ ), and retain records of inspection in a log as detailed in §§264/265.15(d).
- Minimize potential spills by inspecting the container at regular intervals, by placing containers away from stormwater drains, and by placing waste in secondary containment, if possible (BMP).
- Prepare a manifest in accordance with the instructions found in the Appendix of §262, and sign the manifest only if a legal agreement has been reached with the client (see Section 4.3).
- Ensure that personnel shipping the waste and preparing the manifest are trained in DOT hazardous materials transport, and ship the waste in accordance with DOT regulatory requirements (See Section 4.4).
- Ensure that the waste is shipped offsite at 180 days or less, or before 270 days if the waste will be shipped 200 miles or more to the disposal facility (§262.34(e)).
- Dispose of hazardous waste at a permitted or authorized disposal facility (§261.5(f)(3) and §261.5(g)(3)).


### 5.2.2 Large Quantity Generator Requirements

LQG are the most heavily regulated of all generators. If your client is an LQG, then you must ensure that the following waste management requirements are met:

- Read and understand your role in relation to the facility's preparedness and prevention procedures, which are required by RCRA (§262.34(d)(4)).
- Review the facility’s RCRA contingency plan (§262.34(a)(4)), and understand your role should an emergency occur.
- Ensure that RETEC staff handling hazardous waste are trained in accordance with the facility's RCRA personnel training program (§262.34(d)(5)(iii)).
- Accumulate hazardous waste only in containers, tanks, containment buildings, or on drip pads (§262.34), and meet the air emission control requirements for accumulation tanks and containers (§§262.34(a)(l)(i) and (ii)).
- Place the waste in a container that is compatible with its properties (\$260.10), is in good condition (§§264/265.171), and is closed, except when waste is being added or removed (§264/265.173).
- Ensure that hazardous waste is not mixed with any other type of waste (BMP) or any materials that the waste may react with (§260.10).
- Place containers holding ignitable or reactive wastes at least 50 feet from the property line (§264/265.173).
- Label all waste with content and hazard information (OSHA HazCom).
- Inspect the containers for leaking and deterioration at least once a week ( $\S \S 264 / 265.174$ ), and retain records of inspection in a $\log$ as detailed in §§264/265.15(d).
- Minimize potential spills by inspecting the container at regular intervals, by placing containers away from stormwater drains, and by placing waste in secondary containment, if possible (BMP).
- Prepare a manifest in accordance with the instructions found in the Appendix of §262, and sign the manifest only if a legal agreement has been reached with the client (see Section 4.3).
- Ensure that personnel shipping the waste and preparing the manifest are trained in DOT hazardous materials transport, and ship the waste in accordance with DOT regulatory requirements (Section 4.4)
- Ensure that the waste is shipped offsite at 90 days (§264.34).
- Dispose of hazardous waste at a permitted or authorized disposal facility (§261.5(f)(3) and §261.5(g)(3)).


### 5.3 Department of Transportation Requirements

The Hazardous Material Regulations (HMR) state that all hazardous wastes are hazardous materials because they are capable of posing an unreasonable risk to health, safety, and property when transported in commerce (49 CFR Parts 172-179). Preparation of hazardous materials for transportation is the responsibility of RETEC when we offer the material for transportation. A DOT-trained individual may offer a hazardous material for transportation if
it is in an approved packing or container and is:

- Properly classed
- Properly described
- In a properly manufactured and tested packaging or container
- In a packing marked in accordance with the HMR
- The package is in full compliance with Part 178 (173.22)(a)(1)-(4))

Attachment B provides shipping information for wastes that are commonly shipped from client sites. Always review the HMR to ensure that the shipping information associated with the waste is complete and accurate. Remember that only DOT trained individuals may ship hazardous waste or prepare hazardous waste for shipment.

### 5.4 Manifests

A generator who transports, or offers for transportation, hazardous waste for off-site treatment, storage, or disposal must prepare a Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest. The manifest is a multiple-copy tracking document that tracks the chain of custody for the waste from the point it leaves the generator to final disposition at a hazardous waste disposal or recycling facility (Part 262, Subpart B). Once the chain is complete, the receiving facility returns a signed copy of the manifest to the generator. CESQG are not required to use a manifest when shipping their waste offsite, but may use a bill of lading for internal tracking purposes. A copy of the manifest form and instructions for completion are found in the Appendix to Part 262.

In general, client manifests should not be prepared or signed by RETEC employees. In some cases, a client may want a RETEC employee to act as their agent and sign a manifest. RETEC employees may only sign client manifests upon completion of a letter agreement with the client authorizing RETEC and RETEC employees to act as the client's agent in arranging for waste disposal or transportation. The client must agree to, sign, and return the letter before RETEC employees act as the client's agent or signing any documents on behalf of the client. Attachment A provides a template that may be used to meet the requirements of the authorization letter; you may call RETEC's Shared Services Risk Management for more assistance in preparation of the letter.

RETEC employees who prepare or sign a manifest as an agent for the client must have received Department of Transportation (DOT) hazardous materials shipping training in the last three years (49 CFR 172 -179). In no case may a RETEC employee prepare or sign a manifest without having received DOT training.

### 5.5 Land Disposal Restriction Forms

In addition to a manifest, you must complete a Land Disposal Restriction (LDR) Form to accompany a hazardous waste manifest. LDR forms communicate to the waste vendor that the hazardous waste doesn't meet the treatment standard required by the LDR regulations. It is the waste vendor's responsibility to ensure that after treatment the waste meets the standard before land disposal. A list of the LDR treatment standards is found in 40 CFR
268.40.

### 6.0 Quality Assurance/Quality Control

Every manifest signed as an agent for the client must be reviewed for accuracy by an experienced co-worker or supervisor. If additional questions arise, contact a RETEC EH\&S coordinator for assistance with finding an internal RETEC expert.

### 7.0 Documentation

Copies of manifests that are signed as an agent for the client must be returned to the client for their records; copies should be retained in the project file for at least 5 years.

## Attachment A Conditions for Acting as Agent to Sign Manifests

## Conditions for RETEC Acting as Agent to Sign Waste Manifests

The following information and indemnity provisions must be covered in a letter agreement with the Client authorizing RETEC and RETEC employees to act as the Client's agent in arranging for waste disposal or transportation. It is not sufficient merely to send the letter to the Client. The Client must agree to, sign, and return the letter before RETEC will commence to act as the Client's agent or sign any documents on behalf of the Client. The order that the information is presented is not as important, but the content of the letter is critical to limit RETEC's liability and protect the Client. Please feel free to have Corporate Risk Management (Charlotte Lawson (904) 726-8379) proofread any authorization letter you are preparing. Attached is a sample authorization letter.

Prior to undertaking to act as agent for a Client to arrange for and sign waste manifests and other documents relating to the transport and disposal of wastes, the following conditions and procedures must be followed:

1. Document the phone telephone conversation, meeting, proposal, letter or situation upon which you will base the client authorization.
2. Detail the scope of work including the 1 ) origination site, 2) disposal site and 3) period of authorization, if any.

## EXAMPLE:

Per our conversation on Tuesday this letter is to confirm ABC Industries, Inc.'s (ABC) authorization to have RETEC Consulting Corporation (RETEC) act as agent for ABC Industries, Inc. for the purpose of arranging for the transport and disposal of hazardous wastes and other materials from the Green Acres MGP site to the Landsend Landfill for the period of March 3 through August 1, 2001, and signing on behalf of $\underline{\text { ABC }}$ waste manifests and other documents required for the transport and disposal of such materials.

## 3. Expressly state the indemnification (Very Important!)

It is recognized that $\underline{\text { ABC may assert that certain third persons or parties may rightfully bear the }}$ ultimate legal responsibility for any and all hazardous or nonhazardous substances, wastes, pollutants or contaminants which may currently be present on or have originated from the Green Acres MGP site. For the transport and disposal activities to be undertaken by RETEC as described above, it is agreed that RETEC shall under no circumstances be considered the generator of any hazardous or nonhazardous substances, wastes, pollutants or contaminants which may currently be present on or have originated from the Green Acres MGP site for the purposes of any environmental or other law or regulation. It is agreed that any hazardous materials, pollutants or contaminants generated or encountered in the performance of such activities by RETEC shall remain the property of $\underline{A B C}$, shall remain the responsibility of $\underline{A B C}$ and shall be disposed of under a RCRA hazardous waste Generator Number obtained by and carried in name of ABC .

ABC agrees to defend, hold harmless and indemnify RETEC and its affiliates, and their officers, directors, employees, agents and subcontractors from and against any and all claims, actions, causes of action, liability, judgments, fines, penalties and costs (including attorney's fees) incurred by or to which any of them are subjected and which arise out of or related to the materials, wastes, pollutants or contaminants generated, originating from or transported from ABC's properties.

## 4. Ask for formal authorization (We cannot sign manifests or bills of lading at risk.)

If these conditions are acceptable, please sign and fax this authorization letter to my attention at [RETEC's office fax number].
Add signature, title \& date lines at the bottom of letter.
5. Add deadline or schedule information, if applicable.

In order to schedule the waste disposal by March 3, 2001, we request a fax authorization by February 25.

## 6. Request an immediate call if there has been a misunderstanding.

If you have any questions or require more information about the planned waste disposal, please call me immediately at [RETEC's office phone number]. RETEC appreciates this opportunity to be of continued service to ABC Industries, Inc.
7. Remember that when signing any waste manifests or related documents to do so as agent for the Client.
For example, [your name], agent for ABC Industries, Inc.

## HARD DATE

Mr. John Brown
ABC Industries, Inc.
1234 West Industrial Drive
Anytown, MO 17345
Dear Mr. Brown:
Per our conversation on Tuesday, this letter is to confirm ABC Industries, Inc.'s (ABC) authorization to have RETEC Consulting Corporation (RETEC) act as agent for ABC Industries, Inc. for the purpose of arranging for the transport and disposal of hazardous wastes and other materials from the Green Acres MGP site to the Landsend Landfill for the period of March 3 through August 1, 2001, and signing on behalf of ABC waste manifests and other documents required for the transport and disposal of such materials.

It is recognized that ABC may assert that certain third persons or parties may rightfully bear the ultimate legal responsibility for any and all hazardous or nonhazardous substances, wastes, pollutants or contaminants which may currently be present on or have originated from the Green Acres MGP site. For the transport and disposal activities to be undertaken by RETEC as described above, it is agreed that RETEC shall under no circumstances be considered the generator of any hazardous or nonhazardous substances, wastes, pollutants or contaminants which may currently be present on or have originated from the Green Acres MGP site for the purposes of any environmental or other law or regulation. It is agreed that any hazardous materials, pollutants or contaminants generated or encountered in the performance of such activities by RETEC shall remain the property of ABC, shall remain the responsibility of ABC and shall be disposed of under a RCRA hazardous waste Generator Number obtained by and carried in name of ABC.

ABC agrees to defend, hold harmless, and indemnify RETEC and its affiliates, and their officers, directors, employees, agents, and subcontractors from and against any and all claims, actions, causes of action, liability, judgments, fines, penalties and costs (including attorney's fees) incurred by or to which any of them are subjected and which arise out of or related to the materials, wastes, pollutants or contaminants generated, originating from or transported from ABC's properties.

If these conditions are acceptable, please sign and fax this authorization letter to my attention at (978) 3692979. In order to schedule the waste disposal by March 3, 2001, we request a fax authorization by February 25. If you have any questions or require more information about the planned waste disposal, please call me immediately at (978) 371-1422. RETEC appreciates this opportunity to be of continued service to ABC Industries, Inc.

Sincerely,
The RETEC Group, Inc.

Richard Manager
Project Manager
Authorizing Signature for ABC Industries, Inc
Name, Title (print)

## Date

## Attachment B <br> Waste Shipping Information for Common Wastes

## Air Stripper Packing

## Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA <br> Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | LDR Form (40 CFR 268.7) | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262.34) | DOT Marking (49 CFR 172 Subpart D) | DOT Label (49 CFR 172 <br> Subpart E) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Placard } \\ \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ \text { Subpart F) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Air Stripper Packing TCLP Benzene > $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, Lead $>5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste Manifest | Hazardous Waste <br> Solid, N.O.S., 9, <br> NA3077, PGIII <br> (Lead, Benzene) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| Air Stripper Packing TCLP Lead < 5 mg/L <br> Benzene < 0.5 mg/L | No | No | Straight Bill of Lading | Non-Regulated <br> Material | No | No | No | No | No |

## Fuel Oil

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | LDR Form (40 CFR 268.7) | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262.34) | DOT Marking ( 49 CFR 172 Subpart D) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { DOT Label } \\ \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ \text { Subpart E) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Placard } \\ (49 \text { CFR } 172 \\ \text { Subpart F) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fuel Oil for <br> Disposal <br> Flashpoint < 140F, <br> TCLP <br> Benzene < 0.5 <br> mg/L | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste <br> Manifest | Waste Fuel Oil Mixture, 3, NA1993 PGIII | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| Fuel Oil for <br> Recycling <br> Flashpoint > 200F, TCLP <br> Benzene, <0.5 mg/L | No | Yes | Haz Materials of Lading | Fuel Oil Mixture, 3, NA1993, PGIII (Benzene) | No | No | Yes | No* | Yes* |
| Fuel Oil <br> Flashpoint > 200F, TCLP <br> Benzene < 0.5 mg/L | No | No | Straight Bill of Lading | Non-Regulated <br> Material | No | No | No | No | No |

## Fuel Oil and Water Mixtures

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | LDR Form $(40$ CFR 268.7) | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262,34) | DOT Marking (49 CFR 172 Subpart D) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DOT Label } \\ & \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ & \text { Subpart E) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Placard } \\ & (49 \text { CFR } 172 \\ & \text { Subpart F) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mostly Fuel Oil <br> Flashpoint < 140F, <br> TCLP <br> Benzene > 0.5 <br> mg/L | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste <br> Manifest | Waste Fuel Oil <br> Mixture, 3, NA1993, <br> PGII (Benzene) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| Mostly Water, (Fuel <br> Oil portion recycled) <br> Flashpoint 141- <br> 200F, TCLP <br> Benzene > 0.5 <br> mg/L | No | Yes | Haz Materials Bill of Lading | Combustible Liquid, N.O.S., NA1993 PGIII (Fuel Oil) | No | No | Yes | No | Yes* |
| Mostly Water <br> Flashpoint > 200F, <br> TCLP <br> Benzene < 0.5 <br> mg/L | No | No | Straight Bill of Lading | Non-Regulated <br> Material | No | No | No | No | No |

* With Exceptions


## Gasoline

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | $\begin{gathered} \text { LDR Form } \\ (40 \text { CFR 268.7) } \end{gathered}$ | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262,34) | DOT Marking (49 CFR 172 Subpart D) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DOT Label } \\ & \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ & \text { Subpart E) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Placard } \\ \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ \text { Subpart F) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gasoline for <br> Disposal <br> Flashpoint < 140F TCLP <br> Benzene > $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste Manifest | Waste Gasoline <br> Mixture, 3, UN1203, <br> PGII (Benzene) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| Gasoline for <br> Recycling <br> Flashpoint < 140F, TCLP <br> Benzene > $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No | Yes | Haz Materials Bill of Lading | Gasoline Mixture, <br> 3, UN1203, PGII | No | No | Yes | Yes* | Yes* |

* With Exceptions


## Gasoline and Water Mixtures

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { LDR Form } \\ (40 \text { CFR 268.7) } \end{array}$ | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262,34) | DOT Marking (49 CFR 172 <br> Subpart D) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { DOT Label } \\ \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ \text { Subpart E) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Placard } \\ & \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ & \text { Subpart F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mostly Gasoline <br> Flashpoint >140F, TCLP <br> Benzene $>0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste Manifest | Waste Gasoline Mixture, 3, UN1203, PGII (Benzene) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| Mostly Water with Gasoline Flashpoint < 140F, TCLP Benzene $<0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, TCLP Lead > $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No | Yes | Haz Waste Manifest | Waste Flammable Liquid, N.O.S., 3, UN1993, PGIII (Lead, Benzene) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| Mostly Water <br> Flashpoint 141-200F, TCLP <br> Benzene < 0.5 gm/l | No | Yes | Haz Materials Bill of Lading | Combustible Liquid, N.O.S., NA1993 PGIII (Gasoline) | No | No | Yes | No* | Yes* |
| Mostly Water <br> Flashpoint > 200F, <br> TCLP Lead > $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, <br> TCLP Benzene > $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No | No | Straight Bill of Lading | Non-Regulated Material | No | No | No | No | No |

* With Exceptions


## Oil/Water Separator Sludge

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | LDR Form (40 CFR 268.7) | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262,34) | DOT Marking <br> (49 CFR 172 <br> Subpart D) | DOT Label (49 CFR 172 Subpart E) | Placard <br> (49 CFR 172 <br> Subpart F) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O/W separator sludge TCLP Benzene < $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ TCLP Cresol >200 mg/L, TCLP Lead > $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, Flashpoint >200F | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste <br> Manifest | Hazardous Waste Liquid, N.O.S., 9, <br> NA3082, PGIII (Lead, Cresol) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| O/W separator sludge Flashpoint 141-200F, TCLP Benzene < $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ TCLP Lead < $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No | Yes | Haz Materials Bill of Lading | Combustible Liquid N.O.S., NA1993 PGIII (Oil) | No | No | Yes | No* | Yes* |
| O/W separator sludge <br> Flashpoint > 200F TCLP <br> Lead < $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, TCLP <br> Benzene $<0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No | No | Straight Bill of Lading | Non-Regulated Material | No | No | No | No | No |

* With Exceptions


## PPE, Sorbents, Trash

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { LDR Form } \\ \text { (40 CFR 268.7) } \end{array}$ | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262.34) | DOT Marking (49 CFR 172 Subpart D) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { DOT Label } \\ \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ \text { Subpart E) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Placard } \\ (49 \text { CFR } 172 \\ \text { Subpart F) } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PPE and Trash <br> TCLP Benzene <br> $>0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, TCLP Lead <br> $<5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste Manifest | Hazardous Waste <br> Solid, N.O.S., 9, NA3077, PGIII (Benzene) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| PPE and Trash TCLP Lead < 5.0 mg/L, TCLP Benzene $<0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No | No | Straight Bill of Lading | Non-Regulated Material | No | No | No | No | No |

* With Exceptions


## Soil and Debris

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper <br> (49 CFR <br> Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | LDR Form (40 CFR 268.7) | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262.34) | DOT Marking <br> (49 CFR 172 <br> Subpart D) | DOT Label (49 CFR 172 Subpart E) | Placard (49 CFR 172 Subpart F) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AST gasoline spill/release clean-up (soil and debris) Benzene $>0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste Manifest | Hazardous Waste <br> Solid, N.O.S., 9, <br> NA3077, PGIII <br> (Benzene) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| UST gasoline spill/release clean up (soil and debris) Benzene > 10 mg/L | No | Yes | Haz Materials Bill of Lading | Environmentally Hazardous Substances, Solid, N.O.S., 9, UN3077, PGIII (Benzene) | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| UST gasoline spill/ <br> TCLP Benzene <br> $<5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, <br> TCLP Lead $=2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No | No | Straight Bill of Lading | Non-Regulated Material | No | No | No | No | No |

* With Exceptions


## Spent Acid

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | LDR Form (40 CFR 268.7) | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262,34) | DOT Marking <br> (49 CFR 172 <br> Subpart D) | DOT Label (49 CFR 172 Subpart E) | Placard (49 CFR 172 Subpart F) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spent Acid (HCL) <br> pH=1, TCLP <br> Benzene < $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ <br> TCLP Lead < $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste Manifest | Waste Hydrochloric Acid Solution, 8, UN1789, PGII | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| Spent Acid (HCL) $\mathrm{pH}=3$, TCLP <br> Benzene $<0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ <br> TCLP Lead $<5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No | No | Haz Materials Bill of Lading | Hydrochloric Acid Solution, 8, UN1789 PGIII | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes* |

* With Exceptions


## Spent Carbon

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | LDR Form (40 CFR 268.7) | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262,34) | DOT Marking (49 CFR 172 Subpart D) | DOT Label <br> (49 CFR 172 <br> Subpart E) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Placard } \\ & \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ & \text { Subpart F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spent Carbon <br> TCLP Benzene <br> $>0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste Manifest | Hazardous Waste Solid, N.O.S., 9, NA3077, PGIII (Benzene) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| Spent Carbon <br> TCLP Benzene <br> $<0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ <br> Flashpoint >141- <br> < 200F | No | Yes | Haz Materials Bill of Lading | Combustible liquid, N.O.S., NA1993, PGIII (Gasoline) <br> Domestic Transport | No | No | Yes | No* | Yes* |
| Spent Carbon TCLP Benzene ND, Flashpoint > 200F | No | No | Straight Bill of Lading | Non-Regulated Material | No | No | No | No | No |

* With Exceptions


## Waste Oil

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT <br> Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | LDR Form (40 CFR 268.7) | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262,34) | DOT Marking (49 CFR 172 Subpart D) | DOT Label (49 CFR 172 Subpart E) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Placard } \\ & \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ & \text { Subpart F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste Oil <br> TCLP <br> Benzene > $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, <br> Flashpoint > 200F | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste <br> Manifest | Hazardous Waste Liquid, N.O.S., 9, NA3082, PGIII (Oil, Benzene) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| Waste Oil for <br> Disposal or <br> Recycling Flashpoint 141-200F | No | Yes | Haz Materials Bill of Lading | Combustible Liquid, N.O.S., NA1993, <br> PGIII (Oil) | No | No | Yes | No* | Yes* |
| Waste Oil for <br> Recycling <br> Flashpoint >200F, TCLP <br> Lead > 5.0 mg/L | No | No | Straight Bill of Lading | Non-Regulated Material | No | No | No | No | No |

* With Exceptions


## WASTE OIL AND WATER MIXTURES

## Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste | RCRA Regulated | DOT Regulated | Shipping Paper (49 CFR Subpart C) | Shipping Name (49 CFR 172.101) | $\begin{gathered} \text { LDR Form } \\ (40 \text { CFR 268.7) } \end{gathered}$ | RCRA Label (40 CFR 262,34) | DOT Marking (49 CFR 172 Subpart D) | $\begin{gathered} \text { DOT Label } \\ \text { (49 CFR } 172 \\ \text { Subpart E) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Placard } \\ (49 \text { CFR } 172 \\ \text { Subpart F) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waste oil/water TCLP Benzene $>5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, Flashpoint > 200F | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste Manifest | Hazardous Waste Liquid, N.O.S., 9, NA3082, PGIII (Oil, Benzene) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes* |
| Waste oil/water for disposal or recycling FP 141-200F | No | Yes | Haz Materials Bill of Lading | Combustible Liquid, N.O.S., NA1993 PGIII (Oil) | No | No | Yes | No* | Yes* |
| Waste Oil-recycled Flashpoint > 200F TCLP Lead $>5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | No | No | Straight Bill of Lading | Non-Regulated Material | No | No | No | No | No |

* With Exceptions


## Well Purge /Development Water

Packaging, Marking, Labeling and Shipping

| Example Waste <br> RCRA <br> Regulated | Degulated | Shipping <br> Paper <br> (49 CFR <br> Subpart C) | Shipping Name <br> (49 CFR 172.101) | LDR Form <br> (40 CFR 268.7) | RCRA Label <br> (40 CFR 262,34) | DOT Marking <br> (49 CFR 172 <br> Subpart D) | DOT Label <br> (49 CFR 172 <br> Subpart E) | Placard <br> (49 CFR 172 <br> Subpart F) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| UST Groundwater <br> TCLP Lead $>5 \mathrm{ppm}$ | Yes | Yes | Haz Waste <br> Manifest | Hazardous Waste <br> Liquid, N.O.S., 9, <br> NA3082, PGII <br> (Lead) | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |

* With Exceptions


## Appendix H

## Stormwater System Design

# CALCULATION SHEET 

Project No.: BN050-16423-520
Page: 1 of 12
Client: BNSF
Date: 12 Jan 2006
Site: Skykomish
Subject: Drainage System Analysis
By: Joe Scott

- Retec


## Purpose

The purpose of this calculation is to provide a preliminary analysis of piping size and headloss for the new (proposed) drainage system to be installed as part of the Skykomish Levee Remediation. These calculations address a drainage system for an area that is encompassed by the railroad line to the south, the levee crest on the north, $5^{\text {th }}$ Street to the east, and McCowen's house on West River Road on the west. The area west of McCowen's house is drained by a drainage ditch and the Town does not plan to include this area in the proposed drainage system (Personal communication, Gary West, 15 December 2005).

The layout of a preliminary system is given in plan and profile in Figure 1. The analysis concentrates on verifying the pipe sizes and headlosses in the outfall and trunk line to be installed under West River Road.

## Given

Per the Town's Resolution, the analysis and the preliminary design is in general conformance with the King County, Washington, Surface Water Design Manual (SWDM, King County, Department of Natural Resources and Parks, 2005) and the King County Road Standards 1993 (KCRS, King County, Department of Transportation, 1993).

Per the calculation of runoff (Calculation by RETEC of Stormwater Runoff to Drainge System, 21 December 2005), the peak runoff for the 25-year return frequency storm event, and the design flow for the conveyance system, is 7.0 cfs ( $3,140 \mathrm{gpm}$ ).

The components of the drainage conveyance system are discussed below. Where applicable, the appropriate SWDM or KCRS design criteria are referenced.

## Catch Basins

Per KCRS (7.04A), a catch basin shall be spaced no more than 150 feet apart. Catch Basins Type 1 (per King County Standard Drawing No. 2-003) are to be installed adjacent to the curb at the toe of the retaining wall. While KCRS (7.04B) prefers that catch basins be used for road surfaces, it does not rule out the use of curb inlets.

## Catch Basin Drain (Lateral) Pipe

Each catch basin is to be connected by an 8-inch lateral to a nearby manhole or an adjacent catch basin. If two adjacent catch basins are interconnected by an 8-inch lateral pipe, the downstream catch basin will be connected by a 12 -inch lateral pipe to a nearby manhole.
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SWDM (4.2.1.1, Pg. 4-11) requires a minimum of 2 feet of cover over drain pipe. The lateral drain pipes will be subjected to snowplow loads (assumed H20) periodically. Therefore, the IE of the exiting drain pipe from the catch basin will be at least 32 inches below the structure rim elevation.

## Manholes

The manholes are to be 48 -inch diameter King County Standard Manholes Type 1 (Drawing No. 2-007).

## Manhole-to-Manhole (Trunk) Drain Pipe

The trunk drain line is to run between, and interconnect, manholes. It is to run parallel to the levee for 630 feet and needs to carry increasing flows from 0.83 cfs at $5^{\text {th }}$ Street to 7.00 cfs at the outfall.

## Oil/Water Separator

To help maintain surface water quality in the river, an oil/water separator is to be located between the first manhole and the outfall. The simplest structure is the 72-inch diameter baffle type (FROP-B) flow restrictor/oil pollution control device in a manhole per King County Standard Drawing No. 2-027.

## Check Valve

To prevent backflow in the conveyance system, a check valve is to be located between the oil/water separator and the outfall. The check valve is to be a Red Valve duck-billed Series 39 valve, or equivalent. For easy maintenance and replacement, the valve will be installed in an assessable underground concrete vault.

## Outfall

The outfall is to be a tightline pipe from the oil/water separator, through the check valve, and under the levee, to an energy dissipating rock pad near the toe of the levee into the South Fork of the Skykomish River. To prevent large debris and children from entering the outfall pipe, a metal grating will be installed over the end of the outfall pipe. To prevent floating debris from damaging the end of the outfall, large guardian rocks will be placed around the end of the outfall.
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## Assumptions

A number of options are available to the design of the drainage system. These include two configurations (a four-manhole and a six-manhole configuration), six pipe sizes (from 12 to 30 inches), and two trunk line slopes ( $0.2 \%$ to $0.5 \%$ ). The plan is to optimize the drainage system design in the analysis.

Using KCRS criteria, seven catch basins are needed to intercept surface drainage along the levee. One catch basin (CB) each is assumed to be located at the north end of $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Arterial CB6), one at the bend midway between the north ends of $5^{\text {th }}$ and $6^{\text {th }}$ Streets (CB5), one at the north end of $6^{\text {th }}$ Street (CB4), three evenly spaced between the north end of $6^{\text {th }}$ Street and the west end of the levee retaining wall (CBs 3, 2, and 1), and one at the end of the temporary road traversing Lyderson's property (CB0).

The flow into each catch basin is assumed to be proportional to the areas of the subsections of the total drainage area. The sub-areas and resulting flows to the individual catch basins is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The Apportioned Catch Basin Flows Based on Percentage of Drainage Area.

| Catch Basin <br> Number | Portion of Total Area <br> (\%) | Apportioned Flow to CB <br> (cfs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CB0 | 15 | 1.05 |
| CB1 | 12 | 0.84 |
| CB2 | 13 | 0.91 |
| CB3 | 13 | 0.91 |
| CB4 | 19 | 1.33 |
| CB5 | 16 | 1.12 |
| CB6 | 12 | 0.84 |

The Town has expressed a preference (Personal Communication, Gary West, 15 December 2005) that all pipe material be HDPE pipe, corrugated on the outside and smooth on the inside (King County’s designation of LCPE pipe per SWDM, Section 4.2.1.1). The calculations assume this material in subsequent calculations.

The main drainage trunk pipe will be analyzed for minimum slope down to the west of $0.2 \%$ and a maximum of $0.5 \%$. The $0.2 \%$ slope is the SWDM (4.2.1, Pg. 4-11) and KCRS minimum allowable slope. The maximum slope of $0.5 \%$ conforms to the topography. West River Road
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drops 3 feet ( 927.2 feet to 924.2 feet) in the 640 feet along the length of the levee. This is a slope of $0.5 \%$ ( 0.0047 to be more precise).

The levee remediation will require removal of the existing conveyance system up to about 100 feet south of the levee and installation of a new drainage system with reconstruction of the levee. The existing drainage system, within the confines of the levee remediation zone and intercepted by the barrier wall, is assumed to consist of the following:

- A 12-inch concrete pipe with an invert elevation (IE per NAVD88) of 924.76 feet from a catch basin in $5^{\text {th }}$ Street Arterial extending north about 140 feet through the existing levee to an 18-inch CMP outfall with an IE of 919.68 feet;
- A 6-inch concrete pipe with an IE of 923.20 feet from a catch basin in $6^{\text {th }}$ Street extending north through the existing levee, but with no visible outfall;
- An 8 -inch concrete pipe with an IE of 923.60 feet from the same $6^{\text {th }}$ Street catch basin as above extending northwest about 100 feet through the existing levee to an 8-inch CMP outfall with an IE of 918.26 feet;
- An 8-inch concrete pipe with an IE of 924.76 feet from a different catch basin in $6^{\text {th }}$ Street extending north about 60 feet to a catch basin at the end of $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street and West River Road and an IE of 923.44 feet;
- An 8-inch concrete pipe coming into the above catch basin (at the end of $6^{\text {th }}$ Street and West River Road) from the southeast with an IE of 923.49 feet;
- A 12-inch CMP with an IE of 923.54 feet from the same $6^{\text {th }}$ Street and West River Road catch basin as above extending north about 50 feet through the existing levee to an 18inch CMP outfall with an IE of 921.39 feet.

Construction of the new surface water drainage system is anticipated to include the following steps:

- Intercepting existing pipe and conveying them to manholes;
- Installing seven catch basins along West River Road at the Town-side toe of the levee;
- Installing additional catch basins south of the levee as the limits of the excavation require;
- Installing 8 -inch to 12 -inch lateral pipe from each inlet/catch basin to a manhole;
- Installing four or six 48-inch manholes along West River Road;
- Installing 12 -inch to 24 -inch trunk pipe connecting the manholes;
- Installing a 72-inch manhole-type oil/water separator upstream between the last manhole and the outfall;
- Installing a check valve between the oil/water separator and the outfall;
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- Installing an 18-inch to 30-inch outfall pipe through the levee and into the South Fork of the Skykomish River.

The four-manhole configuration is assumed to consist of the following consecutive elements:

- 42-foot long outfall with an in-line check valve,
- 6-foot diameter oil/water separator,
- 10-foot long trunk pipeline,
- 4-foot diameter manhole (MH1),
- 364-foot long trunk pipeline,
- 4-foot diameter manhole (MH2),
- 164-foot long trunk pipeline,
- 4-foot diameter manhole (MH3),
- 100-foot long trunk pipeline,
- 4-foot diameter manhole (MH4).

The six-manhole configuration is assumed to consist of the following consecutive elements:

- 42-foot long outfall with an in-line check valve,
- 6-foot diameter oil/water separator,
- 10-foot long trunk pipeline,
- 4-foot diameter manhole (MH1),
- 160-foot long trunk pipeline,
- 4-foot diameter manhole (MH2),
- 118-foot long trunk pipeline,
- 4-foot diameter manhole (MH3),
- 78-foot long trunk pipeline,
- 4-foot diameter manhole (MH4),
- 164-foot long trunk pipeline,
- 4-foot diameter manhole (MH5),
- 100-foot long trunk pipeline,
- 4-foot diameter manhole (MH6).

The proposed rim elevations of the structures for each configuration are presented in Table 2. The four-manhole configuration is presented schematically in Figure 2 and the six-manhole configuration in Figure 3.

For calculation purposes, the water elevation in the river is assumed to have an annual high water level of 922.8 feet (NAVD88) and may drop below elevation 919.0 feet.

# CALCULATION SHEET 

Project No.: BN050-16423-520
Page: 6 of 12
Client: BNSF
Date: 12 Jan 2006
Site: Skykomish
Subject: Drainage System Analysis
By: Joe Scott

Table 2. Proposed Rim Elevations (in Feet, NAVD) of Oil/Water Separator and Manholes Along West River Road.

| Structure | 4-Manhole Option | 6-Manhole Option |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oil/Water Separator | $925.00^{*}$ | $925.00^{*}$ |
| Manhole 1 | 924.20 | 924.20 |
| Manhole 2 | 925.20 | 924.40 |
| Manhole 3 | 926.50 | 925.00 |
| Manhole 4 | 927.20 | 925.40 |
| Manhole 5 | - | 926.40 |
| Manhole 6 | - | 927.20 |

* Baffle elevation is 923.50 feet.


## Calculations

Per SWDM (4.2.1.1, Pg 4-11), the minimum full pipe flow velocity shall be 3 feet per second (fps), the minimum pipe slope shall be $0.2 \%$ for 12 -inch pipe and larger ( $0.5 \%$ for 8 -inch pipe), and the maximum length between structures shall be 300 feet, and 150 feet for grades less than 1\% (KCRS, 7.04.A).

Using the above restrictions and the uniform flow analysis method, a preliminary analysis (pipe sizes, invert elevations, and backwater levels) of the trunk pipes between manholes and the outfall are calculated. Analyses are performed for pipes flowing full, associated with a river level higher than 921.0 feet, and for pipes flowing partially full, associated with river level lower than 919.0 feet.

The initial screening of pipe sizes, invert elevations, and backwater levels is analyzed using the Darcy-Weisbach methods for backwater calculations. The calculations for pipes flowing full, along with their sources and the equations upon which they are based, are presented on spreadsheets in Attachment A for the outfall to MH1, in Attachment B for the four-manhole configuration, and in Attachment C for the six-manhole configuration.

The differential headwater elevations and slope elevations for each run of pipe are summarized in Tables 3 and 4 for the four-manhole and six-manhole configurations, respectively. The differential headwater elevations are obtained by adding the minor headlosses, and pipe friction for each run of pipe between structures.

The elevation of the hydraulic grade line (headwater level) at each structure is obtained by adding the respective differential headwater elevations and slope elevations to the tailwater
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elevation of the river. An optimum trunk pipeline configuration is obtained by selecting the pipe sizes and slopes whose sequential addition of differential headwater elevations and slope elevations do not exceed the sequential manhole rim elevations.

Table 3. Differential Headwater Elevations (in Feet) and Slope Elevations (in Feet) for Each Run of Pipe for the Four-Manhole Configuration.

| Pipe Run | $\mathbf{1 2 "}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 "}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 "}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 "}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 "}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 "}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 \%}$ <br> Slope | $\mathbf{0 . 5 \%}$ <br> Slope |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Outfall to Oil/Water Separator |  |  | 1.67 | 0.89 | 0.53 | 0.30 | 0.09 | 0.22 |
| Oil/Water Separator Baffle Orifice | 1.23 | 0.51 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.03 | - | - |
| Oil/Water Separator to Manhole 1 |  |  | 0.37 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.08 |
| Manhole 1 to Manhole 2 | 3.06 | 1.08 | 0.44 |  |  |  | 0.74 | 1.84 |
| Manhole 2 to Manhole 3 | 0.40 | 0.14 |  |  |  |  | 0.34 | 0.84 |
| Manhole 3 to Manhole 4 | 0.06 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.21 | 0.52 |

To keep from overflowing at the manhole lids (see Table 2 for rim elevations) during an annual high river flow (elevation 922.7 feet NAVD), an optimum four-manhole configuration has the following trunk pipeline sizes:

- 24 -inch diameter outfall with an IE of 919.0 feet at a slope of $0.2 \%$ from the river to manhole 1 (MH1). This includes a 24 -inch diameter in-line check valve and the oil/water separator.
- 18 -inch diameter trunk pipe at a slope of $0.2 \%$ from MH1 to MH2,
- 12-inch diameter trunk pipe at a slope of $0.5 \%$ from MH2 to MH3,
- 12-inch diameter trunk pipe at a slope of $0.5 \%$ from MH3 to MH4.

Table 4. Differential Headwater Elevations (In Feet) and Slope Elevations (in Feet) for Each Run of Pipe for the Six-Manhole Configuration.

| Pipe Run | $\mathbf{1 2 "}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 "}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 "}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 "}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 "}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 "}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 \%}$ <br> Slope | $\mathbf{0 . 5 \%}$ <br> Slope |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Outfall to Oil/Water Separator |  |  | 1.67 | 0.89 | 0.53 | 0.30 | 0.09 | 0.22 |
| Oil/Water Separator Baffle Orifice | 1.23 | 0.51 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.03 | - | - |
| Oil/Water Separator to Manhole 1 |  |  | 0.37 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.08 |
| Manhole 1 to Manhole 2 | 2.41 | 0.89 | 0.40 | 0.19 | 0.10 |  | 0.33 | 0.82 |
| Manhole 2 to Manhole 3 | 1.42 | 0.51 | 0.23 | 0.12 |  |  | 0.24 | 0.61 |
| Manhole 3 to Manhole 4 | 0.70 | 0.26 | 0.12 |  |  |  | 0.16 | 0.41 |
| Manhole 4 to Manhole 5 | 0.41 | 0.14 | 0.07 |  |  |  | 0.34 | 0.84 |
| Manhole 5 to Manhole 6 | 0.07 | 0.02 |  |  |  |  | 0.21 | 0.52 |

DRAFT - For Internal Use Only - Subject to Revision after Review or if New Data Becomes Available.
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To keep from overflowing at the manhole lids (see Table 2 for rim elevations) during an annual high river flow (elevation 922.7 feet NAVD), an optimum six-manhole configuration has the following trunk pipeline sizes:

- 24-inch diameter outfall with an IE of 919.0 feet at a slope of $0.2 \%$ from the river to manhole 1 (MH1). This includes a 24 -inch diameter in-line check valve and the oil/water separator.
- 18-inch diameter trunk pipe at a slope of $0.2 \%$ from MH1 to MH2,
- 18 -inch diameter trunk pipe at a slope of $0.2 \%$ from MH2 to MH3,
- 18 -inch diameter trunk pipe at a slope of $0.2 \%$ from MH3 to MH4,
- 12-inch diameter trunk pipe at a slope of $0.5 \%$ from MH4 to MH5,
- 12-inch diameter trunk pipe at a slope of $0.5 \%$ from MH5 to MH6.

For comparison, the SWDM backwater analysis method was applied to both configurations. The analyses are presented on spreadsheets in Attachments D and E for the four-manhole and sixmanhole configurations, respectively. The resulting headwater elevations are about $15 \%$ higher ( $\sim 0.30$ feet) than those calculated by the Darcy-Weisbach methods above. This indicates that the SWDM backwater analysis method is the more conservative method of calculation. It also indicates that the water level in the river can rise to an elevation of 923.5 feet for either configuration before it starts to overflow the rims of the manholes on West River Road.

For river levels below 919.0 feet (NAVD), the outfall and portions of the trunk pipelines flow only partially full. This means that the analysis needs to use culvert flow methods to evaluate. Partial flow culvert analysis is not exact and requires the use of SWDM nomographs and empirical curves in a series of trial-and-error calculations. For each pipe segment, the tailwater elevation is calculated using the critical depth from Figure 4.3.1.F (Pg. 4-49). The tailwater elevation results are presented in Table 5. Again, the SWDM backwater analysis method was applied to both configurations. The calculations are presented in Attachments F and G. In all cases, the hydraulic grade line is below the crown of the pipe at the outlet, or exit end, and just above the crown at the inlet, or entrance, end. This means that all the pipe segments flow partially full and the outlet end of the pipe and flow full at the inlet end.
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Table 5. Tailwater Elevation Calculations for both Configurations.

| Segment |  | Pipe Diameter [D] <br> (in) | Pipe Discharge [Q] (cfs) | Critical <br> Depth- <br> Diameter <br> Ratio | Critical <br> Depth <br> [d ${ }_{c}$ ] <br> (ft) | Outlet <br> Invert Elevation (ft) | Tailwater Elevation* <br> (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Outfall - O/W Separator | 24 | 7.00 | 0.47 | 0.94 | 919.00 | 920.47 |
|  | O/W Separator - MH1 | 24 | 7.00 | 0.47 | 0.94 | 919.09 | 920.56 |
|  | MH1 - MH2 | 18 | 4.20 | 0.39 | 0.58 | 919.12 | 920.16 |
|  | MH2 - MH3 | 12 | 1.96 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 919.86 | 920.65 |
|  | MH3 - MH4 | 12 | 0.84 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 920.70 | 921.38 |
|  | Outfall - O/W Separator | 24 | 7.00 | 0.47 | 0.94 | 919.00 | 920.47 |
|  | O/W Separator - MH1 | 24 | 7.00 | 0.47 | 0.94 | 919.09 | 920.56 |
|  | MH1 - MH2 | 18 | 5.11 | 0.59 | 0.88 | 919.12 | 920.31 |
|  | MH2 - MH3 | 18 | 4.20 | 0.51 | 0.76 | 919.45 | 920.58 |
|  | MH3 - MH4 | 18 | 3.29 | 0.46 | 0.69 | 919.69 | 920.78 |
|  | MH4 - MH5 | 12 | 1.96 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 919.85 | 920.64 |
|  | MH5 - MH6 | 12 | 0.84 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 920.69 | 921.38 |

* Tailwater elevation = Invert elevation $+\left(\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{c}}\right) / 2$.


## Discussion

The preliminary details of the structures and pipelines are given in Tables 6 and 7, respectively. These details will cause some revision to Figure 1 before it is incorporated into the final drawing set.

There is a potential to eliminate two manholes along the levee by interconnecting two sets of catch basins. CB4 could be interconnected to CB3 with an 8-inch lateral pile and CB5 could be interconnected to CB6 with an 8 -inch lateral. Then CBs 3 and 6 could be connected to here adjacent manholes by 12 -inch lateral pipes.
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Ecology may determine that the manhole-type oil/water separator is insufficient, in which case a larger vault-type baffle oil/water separator or coalescing plate separator will be required.

Table 6. Preliminary Structure Details for the Skykomish Drainage System.

| Structure |  | Rim Elevation <br> (ft) | Invert Elevation In <br> (ft) | Invert <br> Elevation Out <br> (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | O/W Separator | 925.00 | 919.10 | 919.09 |
|  | CB0 | 923.50 |  | 920.50 |
|  | MH 1 | 924.20 | 919.13 | 919.12 |
|  | CB 1 | 924.40 |  | 921.40 |
|  | CB2 | 924.44 |  | 921.44 |
|  | MH 2 | 925.20 | 919.87 | 919.86 |
|  | CB3 | 924.96 |  | 921.96 |
|  | CB4 | 925.51 |  | 922.51 |
|  | MH 3 | 926.50 | 920.71 | 920.70 |
|  | CB5 | 926.38 |  | 923.38 |
|  | MH 4 | 927.20 | 912.23 | 921.22 |
|  | CB6 | 927.10 |  | 924.10 |
|  | O/W Separator | 925.00 | 919.10 | 919.09 |
|  | CB0 | 923.50 |  | 920.50 |
|  | MH 1 | 924.20 | 919.13 | 919.12 |
|  | CB 1 | 924.40 |  | 921.40 |
|  | MH 2 | 924.40 | 923.02 | 922.98 |
|  | CB 2 | 924.44 |  | 921.44 |
|  | MH 3 | 925.00 | 921.32 | 921.28 |
|  | CB 3 | 924.96 |  | 921.96 |
|  | MH 4 | 925.40 | 920.91 | 920.89 |
|  | CB 4 | 925.51 |  | 922.51 |
|  | MH 5 | 926.40 | 920.31 | 920.29 |
|  | CB 5 | 926.38 |  | 923.38 |
|  | MH 6 | 927.20 | 919.51 | 919.49 |
|  | CB 6 | 927.10 |  | 924.10 |
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Table 7. Preliminary Pipe Details for the Skykomish Drainage system.

|  | Pipe Segment | Invert <br> Elevation In <br> (ft) | Invert <br> Elevation Out <br> (ft) | Inside Diameter <br> (in) | Length <br> (ft) | Slope <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | O/W Separator - Outfall | 919.09 | 919.00 | 24 | 42 | 0.2 |
|  | MH1 - O/W Separator | 919.12 | 919.10 | 24 | 10 | 0.2 |
|  | CB0 - MH1 | 920.50 | 919.20 | 8 | 130 | 1 |
|  | CB1-MH1 | 919.90 | 919.75 | 8 | 15 | 1 |
|  | CB2-CB1 | 921.44 | 919.94 | 12 | 150 | 1 |
|  | MH2 - MH1 | 919.86 | 919.13 | 18 | 364 | 0.2 |
|  | CB3 - CB4 | 921.96 | 920.80 | 8 | 116 | 1 |
|  | CB4-MH2 | 920.75 | 920.40 | 12 | 35 | 1 |
|  | MH3 - MH2 | 920.70 | 919.87 | 12 | 164 | 0.5 |
|  | CB5 - MH3 | 923.38 | 923.32 | 8 | 6 | 1 |
|  | MH4 - MH3 | 921.22 | 920.71 | 12 | 100 | 0.5 |
|  | CB6-MH4 | 924.10 | 924.02 | 8 | 8 | 1 |
|  | O/W Separator - Outfall | 919.09 | 919.00 | 24 | 42 | 0.2 |
|  | MH1 - O/W Separator | 919.12 | 919.10 | 24 | 10 | 0.2 |
|  | CB0 - MH1 | 920.50 | 919.20 | 8 | 130 | 1 |
|  | CB1 - MH1 | 919.90 | 919.75 | 8 | 15 | 1 |
|  | MH2 - MH1 | 919.45 | 919.13 | 18 | 160 | 0.2 |
|  | CB2 - MH2 | 921.44 | 921.38 | 8 | 6 | 1 |
|  | MH3 - MH2 | 919.69 | 919.46 | 18 | 118 | 0.2 |
|  | CB3 - MH3 | 921.96 | 921.90 | 8 | 6 | 1 |
|  | MH4 - MH3 | 919.85 | 919.70 | 18 | 78 | 0.2 |
|  | CB4 - MH4 | 920.75 | 920.40 | 8 | 35 | 1 |
|  | MH5 - MH4 | 920.69 | 919.86 | 12 | 164 | 0.5 |
|  | CB5 - MH5 | 923.38 | 923.32 | 8 | 6 | 1 |
|  | MH6 - MH5 | 921.21 | 920.70 | 12 | 100 | 0.5 |
|  | CB6 - MH6 | 924.10 | 924.02 | 8 | 8 | 1 |
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## Skykomish Levee Drainage System

Pipe Headloss from Outfall from Discharge to O/W Separator:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | Outfall-O/W | Outfall-O/W | Outfall-O/W | Outfall-O/W |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 18 | 21 | 24 | 30 |
| 4 | Pipe length | L | ft | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 |
| 5 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 1.767 | 2.405 | 3.142 | 4.909 |
| 6 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 3.96 | 2.91 | 2.23 | 1.43 |
| 7 | Kinematic viscosity | n | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 |
| 8 | Reynold's number | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{Re}}$ | - | 312726 | 268050 | 234544 | 187635 |
| 9 | Friction factor | f | - | 0.016 | 0.017 | 0.017 | 0.018 |
| 10 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.01 |


| 1-4 | User input of calculation identification, flow rate, pipe diameter, and pile length. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{pd}^{2} / 4$; note that if diameter is in inches, then $\mathrm{d}=$ diameter/12. |
| 6 | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 7 | For kinematic viscosity, see Tuma Table A.60, or equivalent. |
| 8 | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{Re}}=\mathrm{dv} / \mathrm{n}$ |
| 9 | For friction factor, see Tuma Table A.65, or equivalent. |
| 10 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}=\mathrm{fLv}{ }^{2} / 2 \mathrm{gd}$ |

Tuma, Jan J. Handbook of Physical Calculations. Second Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1983.
Minor Headloss from Outfall from Discharge to O/W Separator:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | Outfall Out | CV | $\mathrm{O} / \mathrm{W}$ Out | Outfall Out | CV | O/W Out |  |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 |  |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 18 | 18 | 18 | 21 | 21 | 21 |  |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 1.767 | 1.767 | 1.767 | 2.405 | 2.405 | 2.405 |  |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 3.96 | 3.96 | 3.96 | 2.91 | 2.91 | 2.91 |  |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 1.00 | 5.00 | 0.42 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 0.38 |  |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.24 | 1.22 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.66 | 0.05 |  |

1-3 User input of calculation identification, flow rate, pipe diameter, and pile length.

|  | $A=\mathrm{pd}^{2} / 4$; note that if diameter is in inches, then $\mathrm{d}=$ diameter/12. .2 |
| :---: | :---: |


\section*{| 4 | $\mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{pd}^{2} / 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ | <br> 6 For minor loss coefficient, see Tuma Pages 188-189, or equivalent <br> $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}=\mathrm{Kv}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$}

Minor Headloss from Outfall from Discharge to O/W Separator (Cont.):

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | Outfall Out | CV | $\mathrm{O} / \mathrm{W}$ Out | Outfall Out | CV | $\mathrm{O} / \mathrm{W}$ Out |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 24 | 24 | 24 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 3.142 | 3.142 | 3.142 | 4.909 | 4.909 | 4.909 |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 2.23 | 2.23 | 2.23 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.43 |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 1.00 | 5.00 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 0.34 |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.08 | 0.39 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.01 |

Minor Headloss at Oil/Water Separator:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | Orifice | Orifice | Orifice | Orifice | Orifice | Orifice |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 12 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 30 |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.767 | 2.405 | 3.142 | 4.909 |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 8.91 | 5.70 | 3.96 | 2.91 | 2.23 | 1.43 |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 1.23 | 0.51 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.03 |

Pipe Headloss from O/W Separator to MH1:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | $\mathrm{O} / \mathrm{W}-\mathrm{MH} 1$ | $\mathrm{O} / \mathrm{W}-\mathrm{MH} 2$ | $\mathrm{O} / \mathrm{W}-\mathrm{MH} 3$ | $\mathrm{O} / \mathrm{W}-\mathrm{MH} 4$ |
| 2 | llow rate | Q | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 18 | 21 | 24 | 30 |
| 4 | Pipe length | L | ft | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 5 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 1.767 | 2.405 | 3.142 | 4.909 |
| 6 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}^{2}$ | 3.96 | 2.91 | 2.23 | 1.43 |
| 7 | Kinematic viscosity | n | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 |
| 8 | Reynold's number | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{Re}}$ | - | 312726 | 268050 | 234544 | 187635 |
| 9 | Friction factor | f | - | 0.016 | 0.017 | 0.017 | 0.018 |
| 10 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |

## Minor Headloss from O/W Separator to MH1:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | O/W In | MH1 Out | O/W In | MH1 Out | O/W In | MH1 Out | O/W In | MH1 Out |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 18 | 18 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 24 | 30 | 30 |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 1.767 | 1.767 | 2.405 | 2.405 | 3.142 | 3.142 | 4.909 | 4.909 |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 3.96 | 3.96 | 2.91 | 2.91 | 2.23 | 2.23 | 1.43 | 1.43 |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 1.00 | 0.42 | 1.00 | 0.38 | 1.00 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 0.34 |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.24 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.01 |

## Skykomish Levee Drainage System

Pipe Headloss from MH1 to MH4:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{MH} 2$ | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{MH} 2$ | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{MH} 2$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{MH} 3$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{MH} 3$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{MH} 4$ |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 0.84 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 12 | 15 | 18 | 12 | 15 | 12 |
| 4 | Pipe length | L | ft | 369 | 369 | 369 | 165 | 165 | 100 |
| 5 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.767 | 0.785 | 1.227 | 0.785 |
| 6 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 5.35 | 3.42 | 2.38 | 2.50 | 1.60 | 1.07 |
| 7 | Kinematic viscosity | n | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 |
| 8 | Reynold's number | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{Re}}$ | - | 281453 | 225162 | 187635 | 131345 | 105076 | 56291 |
| 9 | Friction factor | f | - | 0.015 | 0.016 | 0.016 | 0.017 | 0.018 | 0.019 |
| 10 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 2.46 | 0.86 | 0.35 | 0.27 | 0.09 | 0.03 |


| 1-4 | User input of calculation identification, flow rate, pipe diameter, and pile length |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{pd}^{2} / 4$; note that if diameter is in inches, then $\mathrm{d}=$ diameter/12. |
| 6 | $v=Q / A$ |
| 7 | For kinematic viscosity, see Tuma Table A.60, or equivalent. |
| 8 | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{Re}}=\mathrm{dv} / \mathrm{n}$ |
| 9 | r friction factor, see Tuma Table A.65, or equivalent. |
| 10 | $h_{L}=f L v^{2} / 2 \mathrm{gd}$ |

Tuma, Jan J. Handbook of Physical Calculations . Second Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1983.

## Minor Headloss from MH1 to MH2:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{In}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{Out}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{In}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{Out}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{In}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{Out}$ |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 18 |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0.785 | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.227 | 1.767 | 1.767 |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 5.35 | 5.35 | 3.42 | 3.42 | 2.38 | 2.38 |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 0.92 | 0.42 | 0.81 | 0.38 | 0.70 | 0.36 |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.41 | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.03 |


| $1-3$ | User input of calculation identification, flow rate, pipe diameter, and pile length. |
| :---: | :--- |
| 4 | $\mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{pd}^{2} / 4$; note that if diameter is in inches, then $\mathrm{d}=$ diameter/12. |
|  | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 6 | For minor loss coefficient, see Tuma Pages 188-189, or equivalent. |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{L}}=\mathrm{Kv}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |

Minor Headloss from MH2 to MH4:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{In}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{Out}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{In}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{Out}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{In}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 4-\mathrm{Out}$ |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 1.96 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 12 |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0.785 | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.227 | 0.785 | 0.785 |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 2.50 | 2.50 | 1.60 | 1.60 | 1.07 | 1.07 |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 0.92 | 0.42 | 0.81 | 0.38 | 0.92 | 0.42 |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 |

## Skykomish Levee Drainage System

Pipe Headloss from MH1 to MH2:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{MH} 2$ | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{MH} 2$ | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{MH} 2$ | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{MH} 2$ | $\mathrm{MH} 1-\mathrm{MH} 2$ |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 5.11 | 5.11 | 5.11 | 5.11 | 5.11 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 12 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 24 |
| 4 | Pipe length | L | ft | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 |
| 5 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.767 | 2.405 | 3.142 |
| 6 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} \mathrm{sec}$ | 6.51 | 4.16 | 2.89 | 2.12 | 1.63 |
| 7 | Kinematic viscosity | n | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 |
| 8 | Reynold's number | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{Re}}$ | - | 342434 | 273948 | 228290 | 195677 | 171217 |
| 9 | Friction factor | f | - | 0.014 | 0.015 | 0.016 | 0.016 | 0.016 |
| 10 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 1.47 | 0.52 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 0.05 |


| 1-4 | User input of calculation identification, flow rate, pipe diameter, and pile length. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{pd}^{2} / 4$; note that if diameter is in inches, then $\mathrm{d}=$ diameter/12. |
| 6 | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 7 | For kinematic viscosity, see Tuma Table A.60, or equivalent. |
| 8 | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{Re}}=\mathrm{dv} / \mathrm{n}$ |
| 9 | For friction factor, see Tuma Table A.65, or equivalent. |
| 10 | $h_{L}=f L v^{2} / 2 \mathrm{gd}$ |

Tuma, Jan J. Handbook of Physical Calculations. Second Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1983.

## Minor Headloss from MH1 to MH2:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | MH1-In | MH2-Out | MH1-In | MH2-Out | MH1-In | MH2-Out | MH1-In | MH2-Out |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 5.11 | 5.11 | 5.11 | 5.11 | 5.11 | 5.11 | 5.11 | 5.11 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0.785 | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.227 | 1.767 | 1.767 | 2.405 | 2.405 |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | v | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 6.51 | 6.51 | 4.16 | 4.16 | 2.89 | 2.89 | 2.12 | 2.12 |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 1.00 | 0.42 | 1.00 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 0.35 | 1.00 | 0.34 |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.66 | 0.28 | 0.27 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.02 |


| 1-3 | User input of calculation identification, flow rate, pipe diameter, and pile length. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4 | $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{pd}^{2} / 4$; note that if diameter is in inches, then $\mathrm{d}=$ diameter/12. |
| 5 | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 6 | For minor loss coefficient, see Tuma Pages 188-189, or equivalent. |
| 7 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}=\mathrm{Kv}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |

## Minor Headloss from MH1 to MH2 (Cont.):

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | $\mathrm{MH1}-\mathrm{ln}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{Out}$ |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 5.11 | 5.11 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 24 | 24 |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 3.142 | 3.142 |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 1.63 | 1.63 |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 1.00 | 0.33 |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.04 | 0.01 |

Pipe Headloss from MH2 to MH4:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{MH} 3$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{MH} 2$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{MH} 3$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{MH} 3$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{MH} 4$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{MH} 4$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{MH} 4$ |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 3.29 | 3.29 | 3.29 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 12 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 12 | 15 | 18 |
| 4 | Pipe length | L | ft | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| 5 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.767 | 2.405 | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.767 |
| 6 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 5.35 | 3.42 | 2.38 | 1.75 | 4.19 | 2.68 | 1.86 |
| 7 | Kinematic viscosity | n | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 |
| 8 | Reynold's number | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{Re}}$ | - | 281453 | 225162 | 187635 | 160830 | 220471 | 176377 | 146981 |
| 9 | Friction factor | f | - | 0.015 | 0.015 | 0.016 | 0.016 | 0.015 | 0.016 | 0.017 |
| 10 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.79 | 0.26 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.32 | 0.11 | 0.05 |

Pipe Headloss from MH4 to MH6:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | $\mathrm{MH} 4-\mathrm{MH} 5$ | $\mathrm{MH} 4-\mathrm{MH} 5$ | $\mathrm{MH} 4-\mathrm{MH} 5$ | $\mathrm{MH} 5-\mathrm{MH} 6$ | $\mathrm{MH} 5-\mathrm{MH} 6$ |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 1.96 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 12 | 15 | 18 | 12 | 15 |
| 4 | Pipe length | L | ft | 164 | 164 | 164 | 100 | 100 |
| 5 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.767 | 0.785 | 1.227 |
| 6 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} \mathrm{sec}$ | 2.50 | 1.60 | 1.11 | 1.07 | 0.68 |
| 7 | Kinematic viscosity | n | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 | 0.0000190 |
| 8 | Reynold's number | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{Re}}$ | - | 131345 | 105076 | 87563 | 56291 | 45032 |
| 9 | Friction factor | f | - | 0.017 | 0.018 | 0.018 | 0.020 | 0.020 |
| 10 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.27 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.01 |

Attachment C

Minor Headloss from MH2 to MH3:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{In}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{Out}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{In}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{Out}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{In}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{Out}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 2-\mathrm{In}$ | $\mathrm{MH} 3-\mathrm{Out}$ |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.20 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0.785 | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.227 | 1.767 | 1.767 | 2.405 | 2.405 |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft}^{2} \mathrm{sec}$ | 5.35 | 5.35 | 3.42 | 3.42 | 2.38 | 2.38 | 1.75 | 1.75 |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 1.00 | 0.42 | 1.00 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 0.35 | 1.00 | 0.34 |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.44 | 0.19 | 0.18 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.02 |

## Minor Headloss from MH3 to MH5:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | MH3-In | MH4-Out | MH3-In | MH4-Out | MH3-In | MH4-Out | MH4-In | MH5-Out |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 3.29 | 3.29 | 3.29 | 3.29 | 3.29 | 3.29 | 1.96 | 1.96 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 12 |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0.785 | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.227 | 1.767 | 1.767 | 0.785 | 0.785 |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 4.19 | 4.19 | 2.68 | 2.68 | 1.86 | 1.86 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 1.00 | 0.42 | 1.00 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 0.35 | 1.00 | 0.42 |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.27 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.04 |

Minor Headloss from MH4 to MH6:

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Calculation Identification | - | - | MH4-In | MH5-Out | MH4-In | MH5-Out | MH5-In | MH6-Out | MH5-In | MH6-Out |
| 2 | Flow rate | Q | cfs | 1.96 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| 3 | Pipe diameter | d | in | 15 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| 4 | Pipe area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 1.227 | 1.227 | 1.767 | 1.767 | 0.785 | 0.785 | 1.227 | 1.227 |
| 5 | Average flow velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 1.60 | 1.60 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 0.68 | 0.68 |
| 6 | Minor loss coefficient | K | - | 1.00 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 0.35 | 1.00 | 0.42 | 1.00 | 0.36 |
| 7 | Pipe headloss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{L}}$ | ft | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |

King County Surface Water Design Manual (2005)* Backwater Calculation

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pipe Segment - Outlet Structure | - | - | Outfall | O/W Sep | MH1 | MH2 | MH3 |
| 2 | Pipe Segment - Inlet Structure | - | - | O/W Sep | MH1 | MH2 | MH3 | MH4 |
| 3 | Discharge | Q | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 4.20 | 1.96 | 0.84 |
| 4 | Pipe Length | L | ft | 42.00 | 10.00 | 364.00 | 164.00 | 100.00 |
| 5 | Pipe Diameter | D | in | 24 | 24 | 18 | 12 | 12 |
| 6 | Manning "n" Value | n | - | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 |
| 7 | Outlet Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {out }}$ | ft | 919.00 | 919.09 | 919.12 | 919.86 | 920.70 |
| 8 | Inlet Elevation | $E l_{\text {in }}$ | ft | 919.09 | 919.12 | 919.86 | 920.70 | 921.22 |
| 9 | Barrel Area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 3.14 | 3.14 | 1.77 | 0.79 | 0.79 |
| 10 | Barrel Velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 2.23 | 2.23 | 2.38 | 2.50 | 1.07 |
| 11 | Barrel Velocity Head | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{V}}$ | ft | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.02 |
| 12 | Tailwater Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {TW }}$ | ft | 922.70 | 923.24 | 923.36 | 923.98 | 924.55 |
| 13 | Friction Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{f}}$ | ft | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.49 | 0.42 | 0.05 |
| 14 | Entrance Hydraulic Grade Elevation | El $\mathrm{l}_{\text {entHGL }}$ | ft | 922.73 | 923.25 | 923.85 | 924.40 | 924.60 |
| 15 | Entrance Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ent }}$ | - | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| 16 | Entrance Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {ent }}$ | ft | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.01 |
| 17 | Exit Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ex }}$ | - | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 18 | Exit Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{ex}}$ | ft | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.02 |
| 19 | Other Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{0}$ | - | 5.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 20 | Other Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{0}$ | ft | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 21 | Outlet Control Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {outcont }}$ | ft | 923.24 | 923.36 | 923.98 | 924.55 | 924.62 |
| 22 | Inlet Control Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {incont }}$ | ft | 921.09 | 921.12 | 921.36 | 921.70 | 922.22 |
| 23 | Approach Velocity Head | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {AV }}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 24 | Bend Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 25 | Bend Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 26 | Upstream Trunkline Discharge | $\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 4.20 | 1.96 | 0.84 |
| 27 | Upstream Lateral Discharge | $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ | cfs | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.80 | 2.24 | 0.00 |
| 28 | Junction Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{j}}$ | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.42 | 0.60 | 0.00 |
| 29 | Junction Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 30 | Headwater Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\mathrm{HW}}$ | ft | 923.24 | 923.36 | 923.98 | 924.55 | 924.62 |

* King County, Washington, Surface Water Design Manual. King County Department of Natural Resources, January 24, 2005.

| 1-8 | User input of pipe segment, discharge (Q), pipe length (L), pipe diameter (D), roughness coefficient (n), outlet elevation (El ${ }_{\text {out }}$ ), inlet elevation (El ${ }_{\text {in }}$ ). |
| :---: | :---: |
| 9 | $A=p(D / 12)^{2} / 4$ |
| 10 | $V=Q / A$ |
| 11 | $h_{V}=V^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 12 | User input of tailwater elevation $\left(E l_{T W}\right)$; or $\left(D+d_{c}\right) / 2$, whichever is greater. |
| 13 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{F}}=\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{nV})^{2}(\mathrm{D} / 48)^{-4 / 3} / 2.22$ |
| 14 | $E l_{\text {entHGL }}=E l_{\text {TW }}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{F}}$ |
| 15 | User input of entrance headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ent }}$ ). |
| 16 | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {ent }}=\mathrm{K}_{\text {ent }} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 17 | User input of exit headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{ex}}$ ). |
| 18 | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {exit }}=\mathrm{K}_{\text {ex }} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 19 | User input of other headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{0}$ ). |
| 20 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{o}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 21 | $E l_{\text {outcont }}=E l_{\text {entHGL }}+h_{\text {ent }}+h_{\text {exit }}$ |
| 22 | User input of inlet control elevation ( $\mathrm{El}_{\text {incon }}$ ). |
| 23 | User input of approach velocity head, $h_{A V}=h_{V}$ in upstream segment. |
| 24 | User input of bend headloss coefficient. |
| 25 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ |
| 26 | User input of upstream trunkline discharge ( $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ ). |
| 27 | User input of upstream lateral discharge ( $\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ ). |
| 28 | $\mathrm{Kj}=\left(\mathrm{Q}_{3} / \mathrm{Q}_{1}\right) /\left[1.18+0.63\left(\mathrm{Q}_{3} / \mathrm{Q}_{1}\right)\right]$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ |
| 30 | $E l_{\text {HW }}=$ greater of $E l_{\text {outcont }}$ or $E l_{\text {incont }}-\mathrm{h}_{\text {AV }}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}$ |

King County Surface Water Design Manual (2005)* Backwater Calculation

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pipe Segment - Outlet Structure | - | - | Outfall | O/W Sep | MH1 | MH2 | MH3 | MH4 | MH5 |
| 2 | Pipe Segment - Inlet Structure | - | - | O/W Sep | MH1 | MH2 | MH3 | MH4 | MH5 | MH6 |
| 3 | Discharge | Q | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 5.11 | 4.20 | 3.29 | 1.96 | 0.84 |
| 4 | Pipe Length | L | ft | 42.00 | 10.00 | 160.00 | 118.00 | 78.00 | 164.00 | 100.00 |
| 5 | Pipe Diameter | D | in | 24 | 24 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 12 |
| 6 | Manning "n" Value | n | - | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 |
| 7 | Outlet Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {out }}$ | ft | 919.00 | 919.09 | 919.12 | 919.45 | 919.69 | 919.85 | 920.69 |
| 8 | Inlet Elevation | $E l_{\text {in }}$ | ft | 919.09 | 919.12 | 919.45 | 919.69 | 919.85 | 920.69 | 921.21 |
| 9 | Barrel Area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 3.14 | 3.14 | 1.77 | 1.77 | 1.77 | 0.79 | 0.79 |
| 10 | Barrel Velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 2.23 | 2.23 | 2.89 | 2.38 | 1.86 | 2.50 | 1.07 |
| 11 | Barrel Velocity Head | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{V}}$ | ft | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.02 |
| 12 | Tailwater Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {TW }}$ | ft | 922.70 | 923.24 | 923.36 | 923.88 | 924.17 | 924.32 | 925.08 |
| 13 | Friction Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{f}}$ | ft | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.32 | 0.16 | 0.06 | 0.42 | 0.05 |
| 14 | Entrance Hydraulic Grade Elevation | $E l_{\text {entHGL }}$ | ft | 922.73 | 923.25 | 923.68 | 924.04 | 924.23 | 924.74 | 925.13 |
| 15 | Entrance Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ent }}$ | - | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1.50 | 2.50 |
| 16 | Entrance Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {ent }}$ | ft | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.15 | 0.04 |
| 17 | Exit Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{ex}}$ | - | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| 18 | Exit Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {ex }}$ | ft | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.05 |
| 19 | Other Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{o}}$ | - | 5.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 20 | Other Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{0}$ | ft | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 21 | Outlet Control Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {outcont }}$ | ft | 923.24 | 923.36 | 923.88 | 924.17 | 924.32 | 925.08 | 925.22 |
| 22 | Inlet Control Elevation | $E l_{\text {incont }}$ | ft | 921.09 | 921.12 | 920.95 | 921.19 | 922.35 | 921.69 | 922.21 |
| 23 | Approach Velocity Head | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 24 | Bend Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 25 | Bend Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 26 | Upstream Trunkline Discharge | $\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ | cfs | 7.00 | 5.11 | 4.20 | 3.29 | 1.96 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| 27 | Upstream Lateral Discharge | $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ | cfs | 0.00 | 1.89 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.33 | 1.12 | 0.00 |
| 28 | Junction Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{j}}$ | - | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.42 | 0.66 | 0.00 |
| 29 | Junction Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 30 | Headwater Elevation | $E l_{\text {HW }}$ | ft | 923.24 | 923.36 | 923.88 | 924.17 | 924.32 | 925.08 | 925.22 |

* King County, Washington, Surface Water Design Manual. King County Department of Natural Resources, January 24, 2005.

| 1-8 | User input of pipe segment, discharge (Q), pipe length (L), pipe diameter (D), roughness coefficient (n), outlet elevation (El ${ }_{\text {out }}$ ), inlet elevation (El ${ }_{\text {in }}$ ). |
| :---: | :---: |
| 9 | $A=p(D / 12)^{2} / 4$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{V}=\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 11 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{v}}=\mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 12 | User input of tailwater elevation ( $\mathrm{El}_{\mathrm{TW}}$ ); or $\left(\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{c}}\right) / 2$, whichever is greater. |
| 13 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{F}}=\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{nV})^{2}(\mathrm{D} / 48)^{-4 / 3} / 2.22$ |
| 14 | $E l_{\text {enthGL }}=\mathrm{El}_{\text {TW }}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{F}}$ |
| 15 | User input of entrance headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ent }}$ ). |
| 16 | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {ent }}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{ent}} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 17 | User input of exit headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{ex}}$ ). |
| 18 | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {exit }}=\mathrm{K}_{\text {ex }} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 19 | User input of other headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{0}$ ). |
| 20 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{o}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 21 | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {outcont }}=\mathrm{El}_{\text {entHGL }}+\mathrm{h}_{\text {ent }}+\mathrm{h}_{\text {exit }}$ |
| 22 | User input of inlet control elevation ( $E l_{\text {incon }}$ ). |
| 23 | User input of approach velocity head, $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}=\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{V}}$ in upstream segment. |
| 24 | User input of bend headloss coefficient. |
| 25 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ |
| 26 | User input of upstream trunkline discharge ( $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ ). |
| 27 | User input of upstream lateral discharge $\left(\mathrm{Q}_{1}\right)$. |
| 28 | $\mathrm{Kj}=\left(\mathrm{Q}_{3} / \mathrm{Q}_{1}\right) /\left[1.18+0.63\left(\mathrm{Q}_{3} / \mathrm{Q}_{1}\right)\right]$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ |
| 30 | $E l_{\text {HW }}=$ greater of $\mathrm{El}_{\text {outcont }}$ or $\mathrm{El}_{\text {incont }}-\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}$ |

King County Surface Water Design Manual (2005)* Backwater Calculation

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pipe Segment - Outlet Structure | - | - | Outfall | O/W Sep | MH1 | MH2 | MH3 |
| 2 | Pipe Segment - Inlet Structure | - | - | O/W Sep | MH1 | MH2 | MH3 | MH4 |
| 3 | Discharge | Q | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 4.20 | 1.96 | 0.84 |
| 4 | Pipe Length | L | ft | 42.00 | 10.00 | 364.00 | 164.00 | 100.00 |
| 5 | Pipe Diameter | D | in | 24 | 24 | 18 | 12 | 12 |
| 6 | Manning "n" Value | n | - | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 |
| 7 | Outlet Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {out }}$ | ft | 919.00 | 919.09 | 919.12 | 919.86 | 920.70 |
| 8 | Inlet Elevation | $E l_{\text {in }}$ | ft | 919.09 | 919.12 | 919.86 | 920.70 | 921.22 |
| 9 | Barrel Area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 3.14 | 3.14 | 1.77 | 0.79 | 0.79 |
| 10 | Barrel Velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 2.23 | 2.23 | 2.38 | 2.50 | 1.07 |
| 11 | Barrel Velocity Head | $h_{V}$ | ft | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.02 |
| 12 | Tailwater Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {TW }}$ | ft | 920.47 | 920.56 | 920.16 | 920.65 | 921.38 |
| 13 | Friction Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{f}}$ | ft | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.49 | 0.42 | 0.05 |
| 14 | Entrance Hydraulic Grade Elevation | $E l_{\text {entHGL }}$ | ft | 921.09 | 921.12 | 921.36 | 921.70 | 922.22 |
| 15 | Entrance Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ent }}$ | - | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| 16 | Entrance Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {ent }}$ | ft | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.01 |
| 17 | Exit Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ex }}$ | - | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 18 | Exit Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{ex}}$ | ft | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.02 |
| 19 | Other Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{0}$ | - | 5.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 20 | Other Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{0}$ | ft | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 21 | Outlet Control Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {outcont }}$ | ft | 921.59 | 921.24 | 921.49 | 921.85 | 922.25 |
| 22 | Inlet Control Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {incont }}$ | ft | 920.44 | 920.07 | 921.00 | 921.35 | 921.77 |
| 23 | Approach Velocity Head | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 24 | Bend Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 25 | Bend Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 26 | Upstream Trunkline Discharge | $\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 4.20 | 1.96 | 0.84 |
| 27 | Upstream Lateral Discharge | $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ | cfs | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.80 | 2.24 | 0.00 |
| 28 | Junction Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{j}}$ | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.42 | 0.60 | 0.00 |
| 29 | Junction Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 30 | Headwater Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\mathrm{Hw}}$ | ft | 921.59 | 921.24 | 921.49 | 921.85 | 922.25 |

* King County, Washington, Surface Water Design Manual. King County Department of Natural Resources, January 24, 2005.

| 1-8 | User input of pipe segment, discharge (Q), pipe length (L), pipe diameter (D), roughness coefficient (n), outlet elevation (El ${ }_{\text {out }}$ ), inlet elevation (El ${ }_{\text {in }}$ ). |
| :---: | :---: |
| 9 | $A=p(D / 12)^{2} / 4$ |
| 10 | $V=Q / A$ |
| 11 | $h_{V}=V^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 12 | User input of tailwater elevation $\left(E l_{T W}\right)$; or $\left(D+d_{c}\right) / 2$, whichever is greater. |
| 13 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{F}}=\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{nV})^{2}(\mathrm{D} / 48)^{-4 / 3} / 2.22$ |
| 14 | $E l_{\text {entHGL }}=E l_{\text {TW }}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{F}}$ |
| 15 | User input of entrance headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ent }}$ ). |
| 16 | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {ent }}=\mathrm{K}_{\text {ent }} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 17 | User input of exit headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{ex}}$ ). |
| 18 | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {exit }}=\mathrm{K}_{\text {ex }} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 19 | User input of other headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{0}$ ). |
| 20 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{o}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 21 | $E l_{\text {outcont }}=E l_{\text {entHGL }}+h_{\text {ent }}+h_{\text {exit }}$ |
| 22 | User input of inlet control elevation ( $\mathrm{El}_{\text {incon }}$ ). |
| 23 | User input of approach velocity head, $h_{A V}=h_{V}$ in upstream segment. |
| 24 | User input of bend headloss coefficient. |
| 25 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ |
| 26 | User input of upstream trunkline discharge ( $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ ). |
| 27 | User input of upstream lateral discharge ( $\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ ). |
| 28 | $\mathrm{Kj}=\left(\mathrm{Q}_{3} / \mathrm{Q}_{1}\right) /\left[1.18+0.63\left(\mathrm{Q}_{3} / \mathrm{Q}_{1}\right)\right]$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ |
| 30 | $E l_{\text {HW }}=$ greater of $E l_{\text {outcont }}$ or $E l_{\text {incont }}-\mathrm{h}_{\text {AV }}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}$ |

King County Surface Water Design Manual (2005)* Backwater Calculation

| Step | Item/Description | Symbol | Unit | Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pipe Segment - Outlet Structure | - | - | Outfall | O/W Sep | MH1 | MH2 | MH3 | MH4 | MH5 |
| 2 | Pipe Segment - Inlet Structure | - | - | O/W Sep | MH1 | MH2 | MH3 | MH4 | MH5 | MH6 |
| 3 | Discharge | Q | cfs | 7.00 | 7.00 | 5.11 | 4.20 | 3.29 | 1.96 | 0.84 |
| 4 | Pipe Length | L | ft | 42.00 | 10.00 | 160.00 | 118.00 | 78.00 | 164.00 | 100.00 |
| 5 | Pipe Diameter | D | in | 24 | 24 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 12 |
| 6 | Manning "n" Value | n | - | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 | 0.012 |
| 7 | Outlet Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {out }}$ | ft | 919.00 | 919.09 | 919.12 | 919.45 | 919.69 | 919.85 | 920.69 |
| 8 | Inlet Elevation | $E l_{\text {in }}$ | ft | 919.09 | 919.12 | 919.45 | 919.69 | 919.85 | 920.69 | 921.21 |
| 9 | Barrel Area | A | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 3.14 | 3.14 | 1.77 | 1.77 | 1.77 | 0.79 | 0.79 |
| 10 | Barrel Velocity | V | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 2.23 | 2.23 | 2.89 | 2.38 | 1.86 | 2.50 | 1.07 |
| 11 | Barrel Velocity Head | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{V}}$ | ft | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.02 |
| 12 | Tailwater Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {TW }}$ | ft | 920.47 | 920.56 | 920.31 | 920.58 | 920.78 | 920.64 | 921.38 |
| 13 | Friction Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{f}}$ | ft | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.32 | 0.16 | 0.06 | 0.42 | 0.05 |
| 14 | Entrance Hydraulic Grade Elevation | $E l_{\text {entHGL }}$ | ft | 921.09 | 921.12 | 920.95 | 921.19 | 921.35 | 921.69 | 922.21 |
| 15 | Entrance Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ent }}$ | - | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1.50 | 2.50 |
| 16 | Entrance Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {ent }}$ | ft | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.15 | 0.04 |
| 17 | Exit Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{ex}}$ | - | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| 18 | Exit Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {ex }}$ | ft | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.05 |
| 19 | Other Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{0}$ | - | 5.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 20 | Other Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{0}$ | ft | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 21 | Outlet Control Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {outcont }}$ | ft | 921.59 | 921.24 | 921.14 | 921.32 | 921.43 | 922.03 | 922.31 |
| 22 | Inlet Control Elevation | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {incont }}$ | ft | 921.09 | 921.12 | 920.95 | 921.19 | 922.35 | 921.69 | 922.21 |
| 23 | Approach Velocity Head | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {AV }}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 24 | Bend Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 25 | Bend Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 26 | Upstream Trunkline Discharge | $\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ | cfs | 7.00 | 5.11 | 4.20 | 3.29 | 1.96 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| 27 | Upstream Lateral Discharge | $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ | cfs | 0.00 | 1.89 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.33 | 1.12 | 0.00 |
| 28 | Junction Loss Coefficient | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{j}}$ | - | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.42 | 0.66 | 0.00 |
| 29 | Junction Head Loss | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}$ | ft | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 30 | Headwater Elevation | $E l_{\text {HW }}$ | ft | 921.59 | 921.24 | 921.14 | 921.32 | 922.35 | 922.03 | 922.31 |

* King County, Washington, Surface Water Design Manual. King County Department of Natural Resources, January 24, 2005.

| 1-8 | User input of pipe segment, discharge (Q), pipe length (L), pipe diameter (D), roughness coefficient (n), outlet elevation (El ${ }_{\text {out }}$ ), inlet elevation (El ${ }_{\text {in }}$ ). |
| :---: | :---: |
| 9 | $A=p(D / 12)^{2} / 4$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{V}=\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 11 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{v}}=\mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 12 | User input of tailwater elevation ( $\mathrm{El}_{\mathrm{TW}}$ ); or $\left(\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{c}}\right) / 2$, whichever is greater. |
| 13 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{F}}=\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{nV})^{2}(\mathrm{D} / 48)^{-4 / 3} / 2.22$ |
| 14 | $E l_{\text {enthGL }}=\mathrm{El}_{\text {TW }}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{F}}$ |
| 15 | User input of entrance headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ent }}$ ). |
| 16 | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {ent }}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{ent}} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 17 | User input of exit headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{ex}}$ ). |
| 18 | $\mathrm{h}_{\text {exit }}=\mathrm{K}_{\text {ex }} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 19 | User input of other headloss coefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{0}$ ). |
| 20 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{o}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{V}^{2} / 2 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| 21 | $\mathrm{El}_{\text {outcont }}=\mathrm{El}_{\text {entHGL }}+\mathrm{h}_{\text {ent }}+\mathrm{h}_{\text {exit }}$ |
| 22 | User input of inlet control elevation ( $E l_{\text {incon }}$ ). |
| 23 | User input of approach velocity head, $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}=\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{V}}$ in upstream segment. |
| 24 | User input of bend headloss coefficient. |
| 25 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ |
| 26 | User input of upstream trunkline discharge ( $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ ). |
| 27 | User input of upstream lateral discharge $\left(\mathrm{Q}_{1}\right)$. |
| 28 | $\mathrm{Kj}=\left(\mathrm{Q}_{3} / \mathrm{Q}_{1}\right) /\left[1.18+0.63\left(\mathrm{Q}_{3} / \mathrm{Q}_{1}\right)\right]$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ |
| 30 | $E l_{\text {HW }}=$ greater of $\mathrm{El}_{\text {outcont }}$ or $\mathrm{El}_{\text {incont }}-\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{AV}}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}$ |




Figure 2. Schematic Plan and Profile of the Four-Manhole Configuration.


Figure 3. Schematic Plan and Profile of the Six-Manhole Configuration.

## SKYKOMISH LEVEE REMEDIATION
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DRAFT BID SET

GENERAL NOTES:
 2. vertical datum is north american vertical datum 1988
(Nevobs
3. All oistances ARE u.s. surver fet.


6. Soll wit imphox concentations less Than 22 ma/ra

EROSION AND SEDIMENI
CONTROL NOTES:
 SACLITES, UALITES, ETC






 EUENS AND TO ENLURE THAT SEDMENT AND SEOMENT-ADEEN WATER OO N




 WHEN ANY SOLL IS DROPOPED ON THE ROAONAY, 11. To confrol oust maces stall be covere when transortine

DEMOLITION NOTES:







SITE RESTORATION NOTES:



LEGEND:

| SURFACE FEATURES: | UTILITY FEATURES: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | data subsurface |
| CNUN/L buILDIng Footprint | ELECTRIC OVERHEAD |
| 0 COncrete (Existing) | telephone overhead |
| Streambed/water channel | WATER |
| FENCE (EXISTING) | Storm Sewer (EXISTING) |
| Rallroad track | Storm sewer (proposed |
| CURB/PAVEMENT/SIDEWALK (EXISTING) | SEptic line |
| CURB/PAVEMENT/SIDEwALK (PROPOSED) | ® CATCH BASIN (EXISTING) |
| -925- CONTOUR (EXISTING) | 目 CATCH BASIN (PROPOSED) |
| -925- CONTOUR (PROPOSED) | (11) manhole (Proposed) |
| unu vegetation | (6W) grey water tank |
| - bnsf property line | (BW) black water tank |
| HIGH VISIBILITY METAL FENCE (PROPOSED TEMPORARY) SILT FENCE | (6BW) GREY/bLACK WATER TANK |
| DIRECTION OF SURFACE WATER FLOW |  |
| Boㅍ,", TREES |  |












A



ENLARGED SUMP DETALL

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { notes: }
\end{aligned}
$$

> NER.
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2. WATER TREATMENT PLANT AREA IS TO BE GRADED TO PosItvELY DRAIN } \\ & \text { TOWARES THE WATER COLLECTON SUMP. }\end{aligned}$
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3. ContanMent berms shall be constructed of imported clean soll. no } \\ & \text { ON site borrow wil be avilabe. PLAce continment berm sols }\end{aligned}$

> ENGINER
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4. DALY INSPECCTON AND MANTENANCE OF THE CONTAIMENT BERMS IS REQUIRED } \\ & \text { FOR THE OURETON OF THE PROUCCT. }\end{aligned}$
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5. SOLIDS Accumulated in the sump shall be excavated periodically and } \\ & \text { pLaced on The waste materil stockple. }\end{aligned}$
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6. ANY DAMAGE TO Water treatment area must be reported to the site } \\ & \text { inginer MMmelatel. }\end{aligned}$
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7. LINER SHALL BE } 40 \text { MLI HDPE ONE SOLD SHEET OR SEAMS SHALL BE WELDED } \\ & \text { PER SPECIFICATONS ANO MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATEMS. NO OVERLAP IS }\end{aligned}$
> ER SNED.
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8. SUMP SHALL BE A S5-GALLON HDPE DRUM. A HOLE SHALL BE CUT IN THE } \\ & \text { LINER CENTERED OVER THE DRUM TO ALIOW WATER TO DRAIN NTO THE DRUM }\end{aligned}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 0. SIZE OF THE WATER TREATMENT AREA SHALL BE DETTRRMINED BY TH }
\end{aligned}
$$

THE BNSF RAIL WAY COMPANY
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In accordance with the River and Levee Investigation Work Plan; RETEC, September 28, 2005.
    ${ }^{2}$ In accordance with the Draft Work Plan for Additional Investigation Activities; RETEC, December 14, 2005.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ The River and Levee Investigation Work Plan (RETEC, September 28, 2005) specified a grid of primary borehole locations and contingency borehole locations. While the plan was adhered to as closely as possible, the river level did not allow boreholes to be advanced at all specified locations.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ NWTPH-Dx quantifies petroleum hydrocarbons with carbon ranges between C12 and C36.

[^3]:    Kate Haney
    Project Manager
    North Creek Analytical

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ July 1 to September 15, 2006.
    ${ }^{2}$ The most comprehensive descriptions are included in the Supplemental Remedial Investigation Report (RETEC, 2001) and the Feasibility Study (RETEC, 2004).

[^5]:    ${ }^{3}$ This hydraulic conductivity is the average hydraulic conductivity determined from slug tests performed in the upland sand and gravel. Further details are included in the Supplemental Remedial Investigation Report (RETEC, 2001).

