Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

# Remediation Division Correspondence Identification Form

## SITE & PROGRAM AREA IDENTIFICATION

### SITE LOCATION

Site Name: Union Pacific Railroad Houston Wood Preserving Works

Address 1: 4910 Liberty Road

Address 2:

Houston State: **Texas**

Zip Code: 77026 County: Harris

TCEQ Region: Houston - 12

### REMEDIATION DIVISION PROGRAM AND FACILITY IDENTIFICATION

Is This Site Being Managed Under A State Lead Contract? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Program Area: IHW Corrective Action

Mail Code: MC-127 (IHW)

Is This A New Site To This Program Area? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Additional Information: SWR No. 31547

Additional Information: Permit/ Compliance Plan No. 50343

## DOCUMENT(S) IDENTIFICATION

| | PHASE OF REMEDIATION | DOCUMENT NAME |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Miscellanous | 2025 1st Semi-Annual Monitoring Report - SWMU 1 |
| 2. | Please select a phase of remediatic | |
| 3. | Please select a phase of remediatic | |
| 4. | Please select a phase of remediatic | |
| 5. | Please select a phase of remediatic | |

## CONTACT INFORMATION

☑ I attest that all work has been done in accordance with TCEQ rules ☑ I certify that I am aware misrepresentation of any claim is a violation.

### RESPONSIBLE PARTY/APPLICANT/CUSTOMER INFORMATION (IF APPLICABLE)

Union Pacific Railroad

### ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT/REPORT PREPARER/AGENT

WSP USA Inc.

### SIGNATURES

## DATABASE CODES

| Document No. | TCEQ Database Term | Document No. | TCEQ Database Term |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | | 4. | |
| 2. | | 5. | |
| 3. | | | |

**REPORT**

Correction Action Monitoring Report

# 2025 First Semi-Annual Event

*Former Houston Wood Preserving Works*

*4910 Liberty Road*

*Houston, Texas*




07/02/25

Submitted to:

Submitted by:

**WSP USA Inc**
1601 S MoPac Expressway, Suite 325D
Austin, Texas, USA 78746

Texas Geoscience Firm No. 50561
Texas Engineering Firm No. 2263

July 2, 2025

# Table of Contents

**TABLES**



**FIGURES**



**APPENDICES**

# Signature Page

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision according to a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

Signature

6/27/2025
Date

Rodney N. Doerr
Name

VP Safety + Chief Safety Officer
Title

# 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This semi-annual report presents a summary and evaluation of the Corrective Action Groundwater Monitoring for January through June 2025 for the Closed Surface Impoundment (Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 1) at the former Wood Preserving Works facility (the Site) located in Houston, Texas. The groundwater monitoring activities for this period were performed by WSP USA Inc. (WSP), on behalf of Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), in January 2025.

The two uppermost groundwater bearing units, the A-Transmissive Zone (A-TZ) and the B-Transmissive Zone (B-TZ), were monitored during this period. Groundwater elevation data collected in mid-December 2024 show A-TZ groundwater generally flows southwest across SWMU 1 at a relatively flat hydraulic gradient of approximately 0.0004 ft/ft. Groundwater flow during the previous event (2024 second semi-annual monitoring event) in the A-TZ was observed to have a hydraulic gradient of approximately 0.0016 ft/ft with a general flow direction outward from SWMU 1 to the southwest.

Groundwater elevation data collected in the B-TZ in mid-December 2024 indicate groundwater flows east to west across SWMU 1 with a hydraulic gradient of approximately 0.006 ft/ft. Groundwater flow during the previous event (2024 second semi-annual monitoring event) was observed to have a hydraulic gradient of approximately 0.0017 ft/ft with a general flow direction to the northwest across SWMU 1.

Analytical results from the semi-annual sampling event were compared to Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Texas Risk Reduction Program (TRRP) Protective Concentration Limits (PCLs) or Groundwater Protection Standards (GWPs), as designated in Section IV.D of the Compliance Plan, dated June 10, 2005. Constituent concentrations were below their respective PCLs during the 2025 first semi-annual monitoring period. All POC monitoring wells in the A-TZ and B-TZ are considered to be compliant for this monitoring period.

# 2.0 INTRODUCTION

This semi-annual report presents a summary and evaluation of groundwater monitoring data collected during the 2025 first semi-annual monitoring period (January through June) at the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) former Houston Wood Preserving Works facility (the Site) located at 4910 Liberty Road in Houston, Texas (Figure 1). Semi-annual groundwater monitoring is required for the Site as a condition of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Hazardous Waste Permit No. 50343 and associated Compliance Plan (CP) No. 50343, both renewed and issued on June 10, 2005. Groundwater monitoring at the Site is performed to monitor groundwater quality beneath the Closed Surface Impoundment Unit No. 001 (Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 1).

On behalf of UPRR, WSP USA Inc. (WSP) conducted groundwater monitoring activities at SWMU 1 on January 7, 10, and 15, 2025 (water level measurements and groundwater sampling). Groundwater monitoring activities included sampling and gauging the background and point of compliance (POC) wells and piezometers associated with SWMU 1. The sampling event, analytical data, and data evaluation provided in this report fulfill the semi-annual corrective action reporting requirements for the first half of 2025 as described in the CP, Section VII.C.2. This section requires the following reporting elements:

| Semi-Annual Corrective Action Report Requirements | Report Section, Table(s) and/or Figure(s) |
|---|---|
| A narrative summary of the evaluations made in accordance with CP Sections V, VI, and VII for the preceding six-month period. These periods shall be January 1 through June 30 and July 1 through December 31 (VII.C.2.a.) | 3.0 |
| Summary of Methods utilized for management of recovered/purged water (VII.C.2.b.) | 3.2 |
| An updated table and map of the monitoring and corrective action system wells (VII.C.2.c.) | Section 3.1.1 and Figure 2 |
| The results of the chemical analyses, submitted in a tabulated format in a form acceptable to the Executive Director, which clearly indicates each parameter that exceeds the Groundwater Protection Standard (GWPS). Copies of the original laboratory report for chemical analyses showing detection limits and quality control and quality assurance data shall be provided if requested by the Executive Director (VII.C.2.d.) | Tables 1 & 2<br>Appendix C |
| Tabulation of the water level elevations (relative to mean sea level), depth to water measurements, and total depth of well measurements collected since the data that was submitted in the previous semiannual report (VII.C.2.e.) | Table 4 |
| Potentiometric surface maps showing the elevation of the water table at the time of sampling and direction of groundwater flow gradients (VII.C.2.f.) | Figures 3 & 4 |

| Semi-Annual Corrective Action Report Requirements (cont'd) | Report Section, Table(s) and/or Figure(s) |
|---|---|
| Quarterly tabulations of quantities of recovered groundwater and NAPLs, and graphs of monthly recorded flow rates versus time for the recovery wells during each period. A narrative summary describing and evaluating the NAPL recovery program shall also be included (VII.C.2.h.) | Not Applicable |
| Tabulation of the total contaminant mass recovered from each recovery system for each reporting period, if such a system is installed (VII.C.2.i.) | Not Applicable |
| Tabulation of the data evaluation results pursuant to Section VI.D and status of each well listed on CP Table V with regard to compliance with the corrective action objectives and compliance with the GWPSs (VII.C.2.j.) | Table 5 |
| Maps of the contaminated area depicting concentrations of constituents listed in Table IV and any newly detected Table III constituents as isopleths contours or discrete concentrations if isopleths contours cannot be inferred (VII.C.2.k.) | Not Applicable |
| Maps indicating the extent and thickness of the LNAPLs and DNAPLs, if detected (VII.C.2.l.) | Not Detected |
| An updated schedule summary as required by Section X (VII.C.2.m.) | Appendix D |
| Summary of any changes made to the monitoring/corrective action program and a summary of recovery well inspections, repairs, and any operational difficulties (VII.C.2.n.) | None |
| A table of the modifications and amendments made to this Compliance Plan with their corresponding approval dates by the executive director or the Commission and a brief description of each action (VII.C.2.o.) | None |
| Corrective Measures Implementation (CMI) Report to be submitted in accordance with Section VIII.F, if necessary (VII.C.2.p.) | Not Applicable |
| Tabulation of well casing elevations in accordance with Attachment B No. 16 (VII.C.2.q.) | Table 4 |
| Recommendation for any changes (VII.C.2.r.) | None |
| Certification and well installation diagram for any new well installation or replacement and certification for any well plugging and abandonment (VII.C.2.s.) | Not Applicable |
| A summary of any activity within an area subject to institutional control (VII.C.2.t.) | None |
| Any other items requested by the Executive Director (VII.C.2.u.) | None |

As of January 2025, a recovery system had not been installed and is not necessary for the regulated unit. Therefore, Provisions 8, 9, and 10 that relate to recovery wells or recovery system, are not applicable for this reporting period.

Responses to each of the semi-annual report provisions required by CP Section VII.C.2 are provided in Section 3.0.

# 3.0 2025 FIRST SEMI-ANNUAL GROUNDWATER MONITORING EVENT

A discussion of each of the semi-annual report provisions required by CP Section VII.C.2 is presented below by reference number to the list of provisions in Section 2.0.

## 3.1 Narrative Summary of First Semi-Annual Monitoring Activities

The CP requires an evaluation of the Corrective Action Program (Section V) and Groundwater Monitoring Program summarizing the overall effectiveness of the Corrective Action Program (Section VI). This narrative summary includes provisions for response and reporting requirements as detailed in the CP Section VII, as discussed below.

### 3.1.1 Corrective Action Program

Groundwater samples were collected from the Background and POC wells (as detailed in CP Table V, which is provided in Appendix A) to assess potentially affected groundwater quality in the A-Transmissive Zone (A-TZ) and the B-Transmissive Zone (B-TZ). These water-bearing zones are defined as:

- A-TZ refers to the first sand unit encountered at approximately 13 feet below ground surface (bgs) and averages 7 feet in thickness; and
- B-TZ refers to the second sand unit encountered at approximately 30 feet bgs and averages 9 feet in thickness.

The definitions of the A-TZ and B-TZ are consistent with the Uppermost Transmissive Zone (UTZ) and Second Transmissive Zone (STZ), respectively, as defined in CP Provision I.A.

The following monitoring wells were sampled during this event (Figure 2):

- A-TZ POC wells: MW-01A, MW-02, MW-07, MW-10A, and MW-11A;
- A-TZ Background well: MW-08;
- B-TZ POC wells: MW-10B, MW-11B, and P-10; and
- B-TZ Background well: P-12.

### 3.1.2 Groundwater Monitoring

WSP performed quarterly inspections of SWMU 1 in January and April 2025 and conducted the first semi-annual groundwater sampling activities on January 7, 10, and 15, 2025. Groundwater sampling was performed using procedures outlined in a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) document titled Low-Flow (Minimal Drawdown) Ground-Water Sampling Procedures (EPA/540/S-95/504) published in April 1996 and approved in the CP application. Groundwater samples were analyzed for the Detected Hazardous and Solid Waste Constituents listed in the CP, Table III (Appendix A).

Monitoring wells are equipped with dedicated polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) tubing for groundwater sampling. A peristaltic pump was used to purge and collect groundwater samples. An approximate one-foot section of disposable silicon tubing was placed around the pump head and attached to the PTFE tubing for proper operation of the pump. Groundwater was pumped from the screened interval of each well at a flow rate of less than 0.5 L/min using a flow-through cell. Field parameters including temperature, pH, specific conductivity, dissolved oxygen, and turbidity were measured during purging and sampling activities. When field parameters had

stabilized to the EPA-specified criteria, a sample was then collected for analysis. The samples were also collected at a flow rate of less than 0.5 L/min. Recorded field parameters are summarized in Appendix B.

For each well, sample bottles were filled directly from the pumping apparatus described above, and were sealed and packed in coolers with sufficient ice to maintain a sample temperature of approximately 4°C. The sample coolers were delivered to ALS Environmental in Houston, Texas for laboratory analysis. Chain-of-Custody forms were completed and kept with their respective samples. Copies of the analytical data and COCs are included in Appendix C. Groundwater samples were then analyzed for the Detected Hazardous and Solid Waste Constituents listed in the CP, Table III (Appendix A).

## 3.2 Purge Water Management

Approximately ten gallons of purge water were generated during the 2025 low-flow groundwater sampling event. The purge water was containerized in a Department of Transportation (DOT) certified, 55-gallon steel drum, combined with purge water from site-wide sampling activities, and temporarily stored on site in a fenced and locked container storage area (NOR 007). Wastes generated during the first SWMU 1 sampling event in 2025 were transported from the Site by OMI to the US Ecology Robstown facility, located in Robstown, Texas in April 2025. The waste manifest is provided in Appendix D.

## 3.3 Monitoring and Corrective Action System Wells

A summary of the current monitoring and corrective action groundwater wells is discussed in Section 3.1.1. Configuration of the current monitoring and corrective action well network is presented on Figure 2.

## 3.4 Analytical Results

The 2025 first semi-annual groundwater analytical results from the A-TZ and B-TZ are summarized in Tables 1 and 2, respectively and the laboratory analytical report is provided in Appendix C. The analytical results were compared to the Detected Hazardous and Solid Waste Constituent limits, which are taken from the current TCEQ Texas Risk Reduction Program (TRRP) Tier 1 Protective Concentration Levels (PCLs). TRRP PCLs serve as the Groundwater Protection Standard (GWPS), as detailed in Section IV.D and Table III of the CP. If concentrations exceeded the concentration limits of this report, the concentration is bolded within the table.

Quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) samples (matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate results) are summarized in Table 3.

## 3.5 Well Measurements

During the sampling event, the following information was recorded at each monitoring well:

***Before Sampling:***

- The presence of light NAPLs was evaluated; and
- Depth to groundwater below the top of casing was measured to the nearest 0.01 foot.

***After Sampling:***

- The presence of dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) was evaluated using visual observations and an oil-water interface probe; and
- Total well depths of the wells were measured.

Table 4 provides a summary of these measurements. None of the compliance wells had measurable amounts or any indication of LNAPL or DNAPL.

## 3.6 Potentiometric Surface Maps

Groundwater elevation data used to prepare the potentiometric surface maps for the 2025 first semi-annual monitoring event were collected in mid-December 2024 as part of a site-wide evaluation and update to the groundwater flow model for the Site. Additional groundwater levels were collected when the SWMU POC and background wells were sampled; however, groundwater levels, which were measured over a few days, were impacted by rainfall events that occurred during the sampling event. The potentiometric surface maps of the A-TZ and B-TZ are presented in Figures 3 and 4, respectively.

Based on groundwater elevation data collected in the A-TZ during the December 2024 gauging event, groundwater generally flows southwest across SWMU 1 at a relatively flat hydraulic gradient of approximately 0.0004 ft/ft. Groundwater flow during the previous event (2024 second semi-annual monitoring event) in the A-TZ was observed to have a hydraulic gradient of approximately 0.0016 ft/ft with a general flow direction outward from SWMU 1 to the southwest.

Groundwater elevation data collected in the B-TZ during the December 2024 gauging event indicate groundwater flows east to west across SWMU 1 with a hydraulic gradient of approximately 0.0018 ft/ft. Groundwater flow during the previous event (2024 second semi-annual monitoring event) was observed to have a hydraulic gradient of approximately 0.0017 ft/ft with a general flow direction to the northwest across SWMU 1.

## 3.7 Non-Aqueous Phase Liquids

Measurable amounts of LNAPL and/or DNAPL were not observed in any of the compliance wells.

## 3.8 Recovered Groundwater and NAPL

To date, a recovery system has not been installed nor is necessary at the SWMU 1; therefore, this provision is not applicable.

## 3.9 Contaminant Mass Recovered

With no groundwater recovery system installed, or necessary, this provision is not applicable for the Site.

## 3.10 Analytical Data Evaluation

Section VI.D of the CP describes two methods which may be used to determine the compliance status of a given well:

- Analytical results may be either directly compared with PCLs (CP Table III; included in Appendix A), or
- Analytical results can be statistically compared with PCLs using the Confidence Interval Procedure for the mean concentration based on normal, log-normal, or non-parametric distribution, which the 95% confidence coefficient of the t-distribution will be used in construction of the confidence interval.

Direct comparison to PCLs was used to evaluate the analytical data. Tables 1 (A-TZ) and 2 (B-TZ) show the results of a direct comparison of data for this sampling event to the respective PCLs. Wells and piezometers are in compliance if each of the constituents listed in the CP Table III was reported at a concentration less than or equal to the PCL.

Based on the analytical results from the monitoring event, the compliance wells completed in both transmissive zones are compliant with GWPSs. Compliance status for each of the monitoring wells is provided in Table 5.

Concentration versus time graphs for COCs in the A-TZ (2-methylnaphthalene (Figure E-1), dibenzofuran (Figure E-2), and naphthalene (Figure E-3)) and the B-TZ (dibenzofuran (Figure E-4) and naphthalene (Figure E-5)) are provided in Appendix E. The graphs demonstrate that COC concentrations in the A-TZ and B-TZ POC wells have shown a steady decrease over time with sporadic detections.

A QA/QC review and Data Usability Summary (DUS) were prepared for the January 2025 analytical data by GHD Services Inc. (Appendix C). The laboratory qualified analytes with concentrations above the sample detection limits (SDLs) but below the method quantitation limits (MQLs) as estimated on analytical tables (Tables 1 and 2).

## 3.11 Reported Concentration Maps

Reported concentrations of each constituent analyzed for the 2025 first semi-annual monitoring event are presented on Figures 5 and 6 for the A-TZ and B-TZ compliance wells, respectively. Constituent concentrations in the POC and background wells were below PCLs. POC wells have been in compliance with the concentration limits during the last 11 semi-annual sampling events (5.5 years).

## 3.12 Extent of NAPL

No measurable amounts of LNAPL or DNAPL were detected in any of the compliance wells.

## 3.13 Updated Compliance Schedule

Section X of the CP requires that the Permittee submit a schedule summarizing the activities required by the Compliance Plan issued on June 10, 2005, which was originally submitted to the TCEQ on August 4, 2004. An updated compliance schedule is included as Appendix F in this report.

## 3.14 Summary of Changes Made to Corrective Action Program

No changes have been made to the corrective action program.

## 3.15 Modifications and Amendments to Compliance Plan

A compliance plan renewal application was submitted to TCEQ on December 23, 2003 consistent with the renewal requirements for the RCRA permit at the site. The RCRA permit and CP were issued June 10, 2005. There have been no modifications or amendments to the Compliance Plan since the last permit issued. However, a RCRA Part A and Part B Permit Renewal Application with a Major Modification to the Compliance Plan was submitted on December 10, 2014, with revisions dated December 7, 2015, July 29, 2016, June 24, 2017, July 9, 2019, August 31, 2020, October 26, 2020, and January 15, 2021. The TCEQ completed the technical review of the Permit Renewal Application and prepared a preliminary decision and final draft permit. The application is currently in the public comment review period. A Class 1 Permit Modification to update the facility contact information was submitted on February 28, 2018 and approved by the TCEQ in a letter dated March 20, 2018.

## 3.16 Corrective Measures Implementation (CMI) Report

A Response Action Plan (RAP) was submitted with the Compliance Plan to the TCEQ on December 10, 2014 with revisions dated December 7, 2015, July 29, 2016, June 24, 2017, July 9, 2019, August 31, 2020, October 26, 2020 and January 15, 2021.

## 3.17 Well Casing Elevations

In accordance with the facility Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Plan (GWSAP) dated May 13, 2004 (Revision 1), which requires SWMU 1 monitoring well elevations to be resurveyed every five years, the six A-TZ and four B-TZ monitoring well elevations were surveyed in December 2020. The top of casing elevations in Table 4 are based on the December 2020 survey.

## 3.18 Recommendation for Changes

As detailed in a response letter to TCEQ dated August 5, 2020, SWMU 1 will remain in the Corrective Action Program and continue to be evaluated in accordance with Section IV.F.3 of the CP. Once the compliance monitoring objectives are met, UPRR will propose to switch to the compliance monitoring program following issuance of the renewed permit.

## 3.19 Well Installation and/or Abandonment

No monitoring wells were installed or abandoned as part of the monitoring program or the Corrective Action Program during the reporting period.

## 3.20 Activity Within Area Subject to Institutional Control

No areas are under institutional control; therefore, this provision does not apply.

## 3.21 Other Requested Items

No other items have been requested by the executive director.

# Tables

**Table 1**
**Summary of Analytical Results for the A-Transmissive Zone (A-TZ)**
**Semiannual Monitoring Report: 2025 First Semi-Annual Event**

**Houston Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**

| Analyte | PCL (mg/L) | Monitoring Well IDs (Concentrations mg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | MW-01A | | | FD-01 (MW-01A) | | | MW-02 | | | MW-07 | | | MW-08 | | | MW-10A | | | MW-11A | | |
| | | 1/7/2025 | LQ | VQ | 1/7/2025 | LQ | VQ | 1/7/2025 | LQ | VQ | 1/7/2025 | LQ | VQ | 1/15/2025 | LQ | VQ | 1/10/2025 | LQ | VQ | 1/10/2025 | LQ | VQ |
| Acenaphthene | 1.5 | 0.051 | | J | 0.033 | | J | 0.000027 | U | U | 0.000076 | J | J | 0.000027 | U | U | 0.013 | | | 0.0044 | | |
| Acenaphthylene | 1.5 | 0.00058 | | J | 0.00034 | | J | 0.000015 | U | U | 0.000015 | U | U | 0.000015 | U | U | 0.00016 | | | 0.000015 | U | U |
| Anthracene | 7.3 | 0.0016 | | J | 0.0011 | | J | 0.00024 | | | 0.000061 | J | J | 0.000014 | U | U | 0.00017 | | | 0.00058 | | |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 0.006 | 0.000059 | J | J | 0.000037 | U | U | 0.000037 | U | U | 0.000037 | U | U | 0.000065 | J | J | 0.000037 | U | U | 0.000037 | U | U |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.098 | 0.016 | | J | 0.0092 | | J | 0.00015 | | | 0.000020 | U | U | 0.00002 | U | U | 0.0027 | | | 0.0011 | | |
| Fluoranthene | 0.98 | 0.0025 | | J | 0.0017 | | J | 0.0014 | | | 0.000010 | U | U | 0.000010 | U | U | 0.000072 | J | J | 0.0011 | | |
| Fluorene | 0.98 | 0.027 | | J | 0.017 | | J | 0.0048 | | | 0.000030 | U | U | 0.00003 | U | U | 0.004 | | | 0.001 | | |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 0.098 | 0.0035 | | | 0.0026 | | | 0.0022 | | | 0.000019 | U | U | 0.000019 | U | U | 0.0033 | | | 0.000666 | | |
| Naphthalene | 0.49 | 0.00046 | | | 0.00036 | | | 0.00002 | U | U | 0.00002 | U | U | 0.00016 | | | 0.052 | | | 0.00330 | | |
| Phenanthrene | 0.73 | 0.0033 | | | 0.0025 | | | 0.00042 | | | 0.000086 | J | J | 0.000021 | U | U | 0.00095 | | | 0.0016 | | |
| Pyrene | 0.73 | 0.0011 | | J | 0.00076 | | J | 0.00085 | | | 0.000019 | U | U | 0.000019 | U | U | 0.00004 | J | J | 0.00059 | | |

Notes:
PCL = Protective Concentration Level
The Compliance Plan Section IV.D defines the Groundwater Protection Standard (GWPS) as the PCL
FD-01 = Duplicate sample collected at MW-01A

LQ - Lab Qualifier
J = Estimated value between the SDL and the MQL
U = Value not detected greater than the MQL

VQ - Validation Qualifier
J = Estimated concentration
U = Non-detect due to low concentrations detected in the associated field blank

**Table 2**
**Summary of Analytical Results for the B-Transmissive Zone (B-TZ)**
**Semiannual Monitoring Report: 2024 Second Semi-Annual Event**

**Houston Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**

| Analyte | PCL (mg/L) | Monitoring Well IDs (Concentrations mg/L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | MW-10B | | | MW-11B | | | P-10 | | | FD-02 (P-10) | | | P-12 | | |
| | | 1/10/2025 | LQ | VQ | 1/10/2025 | LQ | VQ | 1/7/2025 | LQ | VQ | 1/7/2025 | LQ | VQ | 1/10/2025 | LQ | VQ |
| Acenaphthene | 1.5 | 0.013 | | | 0.14 | | | 0.047 | | | 0.046 | | | 0.000027 | U | U |
| Acenaphthylene | 1.5 | 0.00018 | | | 0.0023 | | | 0.000015 | U | U | 0.000015 | U | U | 0.000015 | U | U |
| Anthracene | 7.3 | 0.00041 | | | 0.0056 | | | 0.003 | | | 0.0033 | | | 0.000014 | U | U |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 0.006 | 0.000059 | J | J | 0.000067 | J | J | 0.000037 | U | U | 0.000037 | U | U | 0.000037 | U | U |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.098 | 0.0028 | | | 0.031 | | | 0.0035 | | | 0.003 | | | 0.00002 | U | U |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | 2.4 | 0.00002 | U | U | 0.000020 | U | U | 0.000020 | U | U | 0.000020 | U | U | 0.00002 | U | U |
| Fluoranthene | 0.98 | 0.00066 | | | 0.014 | | | 0.0027 | | | 0.0031 | | | 0.000010 | U | U |
| Fluorene | 0.98 | 0.0044 | | | 0.057 | | | 0.01800 | | | 0.018 | | | 0.00003 | U | U |
| Naphthalene | 0.49 | 0.0089 | | | 0.0077 | | | 0.014 | | | 0.016 | | | 0.00002 | U | U |
| Phenol | 7.3 | 0.000035 | U | U | 0.000035 | U | U | 0.000035 | U | U | 0.000035 | U | U | 0.000035 | U | U |
| Pyrene | 0.73 | 0.00034 | | | 0.0056 | | | 0.00110 | | | 0.0013 | | | 0.00064 | | |

Notes:
PCL = Protective Concentration Level
The Compliance Plan Section IV.D defines the Groundwater Protection Standard (GWPS) as the PCL
FD-02 = Duplicate sample collected at P-10

LQ - Lab Qualifier
J = Estimated value between the SDL and the MDQ
U = Value not detected greater than the MQL

VQ - Validation Qualifier
J = Estimated concentration
U = Non-detect due to low concentrations detected in the associated field blank

**Table 3**
**Summary of Analytical Results for Quality Assurance/Quality Control Samples**
**Semiannual Monitoring Report: 2025 First Semi-Annual Event**

**Houston Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**

| Analyte | P-12(MS)[1] | | P-12(MSD)[1] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Matrix Spike | | Matrix Spike Duplicate | |
| | 1/10/2025 | | 1/10/2025 | |
| Acenaphthene | 4.683 | | 4.728 | |
| Acenaphthylene | 4.826 | | 4.9 | |
| Anthracene | 5.053 | | 5.034 | |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 5.658 | | 5.796 | |
| Dibenzofuran | 4.621 | | 4.859 | |
| Fluoranthene | 5.242 | | 5.208 | |
| Fluorene | 4.846 | | 5.002 | |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 3.819 | | 4.009 | |
| Naphthalene | 4.196 | | 4.404 | |
| Phenanthrene | 4.906 | | 4.977 | |
| Pyrene | 5.447 | | 5.498 | |

Notes:
PCL = Protective Concentration Level
(1) = P-12(MS) and P-12(MSD) are matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate samples collected at P-12, respectively.

**Table 5**
**Compliance Status of Wells and Piezometers**
**Semiannual Monitoring Report: 2025 First Semi-Annual Event**

**Houston Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**

| Zone | Monitoring Well Location | Well Designation | Compliance Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| A-TZ Monitoring Location | MW-01A | Point of Compliance | Compliant |
| | MW-02 | Point of Compliance | Compliant |
| | MW-07 | Point of Compliance | Compliant |
| | MW-08 | Background Well | Compliant |
| | MW-10A | Point of Compliance | Compliant |
| | MW-11A | Point of Compliance | Compliant |
| B-TZ Monitoring Location | MW-10B | Point of Compliance | Compliant |
| | MW-11B | Point of Compliance | Compliant |
| | P-10 | Point of Compliance | Compliant |
| | P-12 | Background Well | Compliant |

**Table 4**
**Water Level Measurements**
**Semiannual Monitoring Report: 2025 First Semi-Annual Event**

**Houston Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**

| Well ID | Top of Casing Elevation (TOC) (ft MSL)* | Date Measured | Water Depth (ft. BTOC) | Depth to NAPL (ft. BTOC) | Total Well Depth as Completed (ft. BTOC) | Total Well Depth (ft. BTOC) | Potentiometric Elevation (ft. MSL) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A-TZ Monitoring Locations** | | | | | | | |
| MW-01A | 47.85 | 12/16/2024 | 8.30 | ND | 20.2 | 19.90 | 39.55 |
| MW-02 | 47.93 | 12/16/2024 | 8.22 | ND | 20.3 | 20.07 | 39.71 |
| MW-07 | 48.87 | 12/16/2024 | 9.50 | ND | 25.9 | 24.86 | 39.37 |
| MW-08 | 49.30 | 12/16/2024 | 9.74 | ND | 26.8 | 25.17 | 39.56 |
| MW-10A | 49.91 | 12/16/2024 | 10.41 | ND | 25.9 | 25.63 | 39.50 |
| MW-11A | 50.21 | 12/16/2024 | 10.61 | ND | 24.4 | 24.07 | 39.60 |
| **B-TZ Monitoring Locations** | | | | | | | |
| MW-10B | 49.85 | 12/16/2024 | 10.43 | ND | 48.8 | 46.33 | 39.42 |
| MW-11B | 50.09 | 12/16/2024 | 10.72 | ND | 46.8 | 46.70 | 39.37 |
| P-10 | 47.91 | 12/16/2024 | 8.29 | ND | 40.0 | 42.90 | 39.62 |
| P-12 | 48.65 | 12/16/2024 | 8.80 | ND | 40.0 | 41.27 | 39.85 |

Notes
BTOC = feet below the top of the well casing
ft. MSL = feet above Mean Sea Level
ND = Not Detected
*TOC elevations based on December 2020 survey (see Section 3.17)
Groundwater levels collected during the 2025 first semi-annual groundwater monitoring event were impacted by rainfall events that occurred during the sampling event. Instead, groundwater elevation data collected in mid-December 2024 as part of site-wide evaluation and update to the groundwater flow model of the site were used to prepare the potentiometric surface maps and are reported in this table.

# Figures




**REFERENCE(S)**

BASE MAP TAKEN FROM U.S.G.S. 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE, SETTEGAST, TEXAS, 1982


QUADRANGLE LOCATION

CLIENT

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

PROJECT

HOUSTON WOOD PRESERVING WORKS

TITLE

**SITE LOCATION MAP**

CONSULTANT

wsp

| | |
|---|---|
| YYYY-MM-DD | 2024-06-28 |
| DESIGNED | AJD |
| PREPARED | AJD |
| REVIEWED | AKS |
| APPROVED | MKW |

PROJECT NO. US0039040.4227

REV. 0

FIGURE 1

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI A

0 1 in

Last Edited By: adiamond Date: 2024-06-28 Time:12:35:19 PM | Printed By: adiamond Date: 2024-06-28 Time:12:38:09 PM
Path: \\golder.gds\complexdata\office\Texarkana\Projects - Round Rock_2019\19119232 - HWPWD-Semi-Annual Monitoring Event\SWMU Figures\2024 - 1st Semi-Annual\ | File Name: 001 - Site Location Map.dwg

Last Edited By: adiamond Date: 2024-06-28 Time:12:38:59 PM | Printed By: adiamond Date: 2024-06-28 Time:12:40:49 PM |
Path: \\golder.gds\complexdata\office\Texarkana\Projects - Round Rock_2019\19119232 - HWPW\0-Semi-Annual Monitoring Event\SWMU Figures\2024 - 1st Semi-Annual\ | File Name: 002 - Corrective Action MW Network.dwg




**LEGEND**

- ROAD, PARKING LOT, SIDEWALK
- FENCE
- RAILROAD
- A-TZ MONITORING WELL LOCATION
- B-TZ MONITORING WELL LOCATION

**NOTE(S)**

1. * BACKGROUND WELL.

**REFERENCE(S)**

BASE MAP TAKEN FROM ERM-SOUTHWEST, INC 0014419A310.DWG, 6/19/2006.

CLIENT
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

PROJECT
HOUSTON WOOD PRESERVING WORKS

TITLE
**CORRECTIVE ACTION MONITORING WELL NETWORK**
**TCEQ PERMIT UNIT NO. 1**

CONSULTANT

| | |
|---|---|
| YYYY-MM-DD | 2024-06-28 |
| DESIGNED | AJD |
| PREPARED | AJD |
| REVIEWED | AKS |
| APPROVED | MKW |

PROJECT NO. US0039040.4227 | REV. 0 | FIGURE 2

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI A
1 in
0

Last Edited By: adiamond Date: 2024-01-04 Time:12:37:18 PM | Printed By: adiamond Date: 2024-01-10 Time:3:44:57 PM |
Path: \\golder.gds\complexdata\office\Texarkana\Projects - Round Rock_2019\19119232 - HWPW\0-Semi-Annual Monitoring Event\SWMU Figures\2023 - 2nd Semi-Annual\ | File Name: 003 - A-TZ Pot Surface Map (SWMU 1) - July 2023.dwg




**LEGEND**

- UPRR PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- ROAD, PARKING LOT, SIDEWALK
- FENCE
- RAILROAD
- A-TZ MONITORING WELL LOCATION (*-COMPLIANCE WELL)
- (39.55) GROUNDWATER ELEVATION (FT, HVD) (NM = NOT MEASURED)
- 40 GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOUR (FT, HVD) C.I. = 1.0 FT (DASHED WHERE INFERRED)
- INFERRED GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTION

ESTIMATED GRADIENT

$A_i \rightarrow A_i = \frac{0.05\ ft}{114\ ft} = 0.0004\ ft/ft$

**REFERENCE(S)**

BASE MAP TAKEN FROM ERM-SOUTHWEST, INC 0014419a310.DWG, 6/19/2006

STATE OF TEXAS
MATTHEW K. WICKHAM
GEOLOGY
LIC. # 5330
LICENSED
PROFESSIONAL GEOSCIENTIST

07/02/25

CLIENT
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

PROJECT
HOUSTON WOOD PRESERVING WORKS

TITLE
**A-TZ POTENTIOMETRIC SURFACE CONTOUR MAP DECEMBER 2024**

CONSULTANT
wsp
TEXAS GEOSCIENCE FIRM NO. 50561
TEXAS ENGINEERING FIRM NO. 2263

| | |
|---|---|
| YYYY-MM-DD | 2025-02-17 |
| DESIGNED | AJD |
| PREPARED | CET |
| REVIEWED | AKS |
| APPROVED | MKW |

PROJECT NO. US0039040.4227 | REV. 0 | FIGURE 3

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI A
1 in
0

Last Edited By: adiamond Date: 2024-01-04 Time:12:51:24 PM | Printed By: adiamond Date: 2024-01-10 Time:3:43:28 PM |
Path: \\golder.gds\complexdata\office\Texarkana\Projects - Round Rock_2019\19119232 - HWPW\0-Semi-Annual Monitoring Event\SWMU Figures\2023 - 2nd Semi-Annual\ | File Name: 004 - B-TZ Pot Surface Map (SWMU 1) - July 2023.dwg




**LEGEND**

- UPRR PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- ROAD, PARKING LOT, SIDEWALK
- FENCE
- RAILROAD
- B-TZ MONITORING WELL LOCATION (*-COMPLIANCE WELL)
- (40.17) GROUNDWATER ELEVATION (FT, HVD) (NM = NOT MEASURED)
- 40 GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOUR (FT, HVD) C.I. = 1.0 FT (DASHED WHERE INFERRED)
- INFERRED GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTION

ESTIMATED GRADIENT

$$B_i \rightarrow B_i \quad \frac{0.48\ ft}{265\ ft} = 0.0018\ ft/ft$$

**REFERENCE(S)**

BASE MAP TAKEN FROM ERM-SOUTHWEST, INC 0014419a310.DWG, 6/19/2006

STATE OF TEXAS
MATTHEW K. WICKHAM
GEOLOGY
LIC. # 5330
LICENSED
PROFESSIONAL GEOSCIENTIST

07/02/25

CLIENT
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

PROJECT
HOUSTON WOOD PRESERVING WORKS

TITLE
**B-TZ POTENTIOMETRIC SURFACE CONTOUR MAP DECEMBER 2024**

CONSULTANT
wsp
TEXAS GEOSCIENCE FIRM NO. 50561
TEXAS ENGINEERING FIRM NO. 2263

| | |
|---|---|
| YYYY-MM-DD | 2025-02-17 |
| DESIGNED | AJD |
| PREPARED | CET |
| REVIEWED | AKS |
| APPROVED | MKW |

PROJECT NO. US0039040.4227 | REV. 0 | FIGURE 4

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI A
0 1 in




| Constituent | Conc. (mg/L) |
|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | <0.000027 |
| Acenaphthylene | <0.000015 |
| Anthracene | 0.00024 |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | <0.000037 |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.00015 |
| Fluoranthene | 0.0014 |
| Fluorene | 0.0048 |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 0.0022 |
| Naphthalene | <0.00002 |
| Phenathrene | 0.00042 |
| Pyrene | 0.00085 |

| Constituent | Conc. (mg/L) | Conc. (mg/L) * |
|---|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | 0.051 J | 0.033 J |
| Acenaphthylene | 0.00058 J | 0.00034 J |
| Anthracene | 0.0016 J | 0.0011 J |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 0.000059 J | <0.000037 |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.016 J | 0.0092 J |
| Fluoranthene | 0.0025 J | 0.0017 J |
| Fluorene | 0.027 J | 0.017 J |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 0.0035 | 0.0026 |
| Naphthalene | 0.00046 | 0.00036 |
| Phenathrene | 0.0033 | 0.0025 |
| Pyrene | 0.0011 J | 0.00076 J |

| Constituent | Conc. (mg/L) |
|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | 0.013 |
| Acenaphthylene | 0.00016 |
| Anthracene | 0.00017 |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | <0.000037 |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.0027 |
| Fluoranthene | 0.000072 J |
| Fluorene | 0.004 |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 0.0033 |
| Naphthalene | 0.052 |
| Phenathrene | 0.00095 |
| Pyrene | 0.00004 J |

| Constituent | Conc. (mg/L) |
|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | 0.0044 |
| Acenaphthylene | <0.000015 |
| Anthracene | 0.00058 |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | <0.000037 |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.0011 |
| Fluoranthene | 0.0011 |
| Fluorene | 0.001 |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 0.000666 |
| Naphthalene | 0.00330 |
| Phenathrene | 0.0016 |
| Pyrene | 0.00059 |

| Constituent | Conc. (mg/L) |
|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | <0.000027 |
| Acenaphthylene | <0.000015 |
| Anthracene | <0.000014 |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 0.000065 J |
| Dibenzofuran | <0.00002 |
| Fluoranthene | <0.000010 |
| Fluorene | <0.00003 |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | <0.000019 |
| Naphthalene | 0.00016 |
| Phenathrene | <0.000021 |
| Pyrene | <0.000019 |

| Constituent | Conc. (mg/L) |
|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | 0.000076 J |
| Acenaphthylene | <0.000015 |
| Anthracene | 0.000061 J |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | <0.000037 |
| Dibenzofuran | <0.000020 |
| Fluoranthene | <0.000010 |
| Fluorene | <0.000030 |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | <0.000019 |
| Naphthalene | <0.00002 |
| Phenathrene | 0.000086 J |
| Pyrene | <0.000019 |

Indicator Parameters

| Constituent | PCL (mg/L) |
|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | 1.5 |
| Acenaphthylene | 1.5 |
| Anthracene | 7.3 |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 0.006 |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.098 |
| Fluoranthene | 0.98 |
| Fluorene | 0.98 |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 0.098 |
| Naphthalene | 0.49 |
| Phenathrene | 0.73 |
| Pyrene | 0.73 |

**LEGEND**

FENCE

RAILROAD

A-TZ MONITORING WELL LOCATION

**NOTE(S)**

1. SAMPLES COLLECTED IN JANUARY 2025.
2. J = ESTIMATED VALUE BETWEEN SQL AND MDL.
3. < = VALUE NOT DETECTED GREATER THAN MDL.
4. * = FIELD DUPLICATE.

**REFERENCE(S)**

BASE MAP TAKEN FROM ERM-SOUTHWEST, INC 0014419a310.DWG, 6/19/2006.

CLIENT
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

PROJECT
HOUSTON WOOD PRESERVING WORKS

TITLE
**A-TZ REPORTED CONCENTRATIONS**
**2025 1ST SEMI-ANNUAL MONITORING EVENT**

CONSULTANT

TEXAS GEOSCIENCE FIRM NO. 50561
TEXAS ENGINEERING FIRM NO. 2263

| | |
|---|---|
| YYYY-MM-DD | 2024-12-09 |
| DESIGNED | AJD |
| PREPARED | RO |
| REVIEWED | GCG |
| APPROVED | MKW |

PROJECT NO. US0039040.4227 | REV. 0 | FIGURE 5

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI A




| Constituent | Conc. (mg/L) |
|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | 0.013 |
| Acenaphthylene | 0.00018 |
| Anthracene | 0.00041 |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 0.000059 J |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.0028 |
| Di-n-butyl Phthalate | <0.00002 |
| Fluoranthene | 0.00066 |
| Fluorene | 0.0044 |
| Naphthalene | 0.0089 |
| Phenol | <0.000035 |
| Pyrene | 0.00034 |

| Constituent | Conc. (mg/L) |
|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | 0.14 |
| Acenaphthylene | 0.0023 |
| Anthracene | 0.0056 |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 0.000067 J |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.031 |
| Di-n-butyl Phthalate | <0.000020 |
| Fluoranthene | 0.014 |
| Fluorene | 0.057 |
| Naphthalene | 0.0077 |
| Phenol | <0.000035 |
| Pyrene | 0.0056 |

| Constituent | Conc. (mg/L) | Conc. (mg/L) * |
|---|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | 0.047 | 0.046 |
| Acenaphthylene | <0.000015 | <0.000015 |
| Anthracene | 0.003 | 0.0033 |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | <0.000037 | <0.000037 |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.0035 | 0.003 |
| Di-n-butyl Phthalate | <0.000020 | <0.000020 |
| Fluoranthene | 0.0027 | 0.0031 |
| Fluorene | 0.01800 | 0.018 |
| Naphthalene | 0.014 | 0.016 |
| Phenol | <0.000035 | <0.000035 |
| Pyrene | 0.00110 | 0.0013 |

| Constituent | Conc. (mg/L) |
|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | <0.000027 |
| Acenaphthylene | <0.000015 |
| Anthracene | <0.000014 |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | <0.000037 |
| Dibenzofuran | <0.00002 |
| Di-n-butyl Phthalate | <0.00002 |
| Fluoranthene | <0.000010 |
| Fluorene | <0.00003 |
| Naphthalene | <0.00002 |
| Phenol | <0.000035 |
| Pyrene | 0.00064 |

Indicator Parameters

| Constituent | PCL (mg/L) |
|---|---|
| Acenaphthene | 1.5 |
| Acenaphthylene | 1.5 |
| Anthracene | 7.3 |
| bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 0.006 |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.098 |
| Di-n-butyl Phthalate | 2.4 |
| Fluoranthene | 0.98 |
| Fluorene | 0.98 |
| Naphthalene | 0.49 |
| Phenol | 7.3 |
| Pyrene | 0.73 |

**LEGEND**

- FENCE
- RAILROAD
- B-TZ MONITORING WELL LOCATION
- PIEZOMETER LOCATION

**NOTE(S)**

1. SAMPLES COLLECTED IN JANUARY 2025.
2. J = ESTIMATED VALUE BETWEEN SQL AND MDL.
3. JL = ESTIMATED VALUE BETWEEN SQL AND MDL; BIASED LOW.
4. R = VALUE NOT DETECTED GRATER THAN MDL; REJECTED.
5. < = VALUE NOT DETECTED GREATER THAN MDL.
6. * = FIELD DUPLICATE.
7. THE SAMPLE AND DUPLICATE SAMPLE COLLECTED AT P-10 WERE EXTRACTED OUTSIDE OF THE ESTABLISHED HOLDING TIME FOR SEMI-VOLITILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS ANALYSIS. ASSOCIATED DETECTED SAMPLE RESULTS WERE QUALIFIED AS ESTIMATED; BIASED LOW (JL). ASSOCIATED NON-DETECT SAMPLE RESULTS WERE REJECTED (R).

**REFERENCE(S)**

BASE MAP TAKEN FROM ERM-SOUTHWEST, INC 0014419a310.DWG, 6/19/2006.

CLIENT
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

PROJECT
HOUSTON WOOD PRESERVING WORKS

TITLE
**B-TZ REPORTED CONCENTRATIONS**
**2025 1ST SEMI-ANNUAL MONITORING EVENT**

CONSULTANT
wsp
TEXAS GEOSCIENCE FIRM NO. 50561
TEXAS ENGINEERING FIRM NO. 2263

| | |
|---|---|
| YYYY-MM-DD | 2025-03-28 |
| DESIGNED | AJD |
| PREPARED | RO |
| REVIEWED | GCG |
| APPROVED | MKW |

PROJECT NO. US0039040.4227
REV. 0
FIGURE 6

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI A

Last Edited By: adiamond Date: 2023-12-04 Time:1:50:59 PM | Printed By: adiamond Date: 2024-01-03 Time:9:22:28 AM
Path: \\golder.gds\complexdata\office\Texarkana\Projects - Round Rock_2019\19119232 - HWPWD-Semi-Annual Monitoring Event\SWMU Figures\2023 - 2nd Semi-Annual\ | File Name: 006 - B-TZ Reported Concentrations 2023 2nd SAME.dwg

APPENDIX A

# Compliance Plan Tables

TABLE III - CORRECTIVE ACTION PROGRAM
Table of Detected Hazardous and Solid Waste Constituents and
Concentration Limits for the Ground-Water Protection Standard

**Closed Surface Impoundment (NOR Unit No. 001, SWMU No. 01)**

| A-Transmissive Zone | | B-Transmissive Zone | |
|---|---|---|---|
| COLUMN A Hazardous Constituents | COLUMN B Concentration Limits (mg/l) | COLUMN A Hazardous Constituents | COLUMN B Concentration Limits (mg/l) |
| Acenaphthene | 1.5[PCL] | Acenaphthene | 1.5[PCL] |
| Acenaphthylene | 1.5[PCL] | Acenaphthylene | 1.5[PCL] |
| Anthracene | 7.3[PCL] | Anthracene | 7.3[PCL] |
| Dibenzofuran | 0.098[PCL] | Dibenzofuran | 0.098[PCL] |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 0.006[PCL] | Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 0.006[PCL] |
| Fluoranthene | 0.98[PCL] | Fluoranthene | 0.98[PCL] |
| Fluorene | 0.98[PCL] | Fluorene | 0.98[PCL] |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 0.098[PCL] | Di-n-butyl phthalate | 2.4[PCL] |
| Naphthalene | 0.49[PCL] | Naphthalene | 0.49[PCL] |
| Phenanthrene | 0.73[PCL] | Phenol | 7.3[PCL] |
| Pyrene | 0.73[PCL] | Pyrene | 0.73[PCL] |

PCL Alternate Concentration Limit pursuant to 30 TAC §335.160(b) based upon the Protective Concentration Level determined under 30 TAC Chapter 350 for Residential Land Use. The PCL value, Column B, will change as updates to the rule are promulgated. Changes to the rule automatically change the concentration value established in Column B in this table.

TABLE V
Designation of Wells by Function

POINT OF COMPLIANCE WELLS

1. Closed Surface Impoundment (NOR Unit No. 001, SWMU No. 01)
A-Transmissive Zone: MW-01A, MW-02, MW-07, MW-10A, and MW-11A
B-Transmissive Zone: MW-10B, MW-11B, and P-10

POINT OF EXPOSURE WELLS

1. Closed Surface Impoundment (NOR Unit No. 001, SWMU No. 01)
None

BACKGROUND WELLS

1. Closed Surface Impoundment (NOR Unit No. 001, SWMU No. 01)
A-Transmissive Zone: MW-8
B-Transmissive Zone: P-12

Note: Wells and piezometers identified on Attachment A maps that are not listed in this table are subject to change, upon approval by the executive director, without modification to the Compliance Plan. The wells and piezometers for the Closed Surface Impoundment are depicted on Attachment A, Sheets 3 and 4.

APPENDIX B

# Field Parameters

**Table B-1**
**Groundwater Sampling Field Parameters**
**Semiannual Monitoring Report: 2025 First Semi-Annual Event**

**Houston Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**

| Field Parameter | Monitoring Well IDs | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A-Transmissive Zone | | | | | | B-Transmissive Zone | | | |
| | MW-01A | MW-02 | MW-07 | MW-08 | MW-10A | MW-11A | MW-10B | MW-11B | P-10 | P-12 |
| | 1/7/2025 | 1/7/2025 | 1/7/2025 | 1/15/2025 | 1/10/2025 | 1/10/2025 | 1/10/2025 | 1/10/2025 | 1/7/2025 | 1/10/2025 |
| Time Sampled (hrs CST) | 15:43 | 14:58 | 13:29 | 11:10 | 13:25 | 9:55 | 10:49 | 9:13 | 12:25 | 14:35 |
| Temperature (ºC) | 20.25 | 18.35 | 18.13 | 19.93 | 17.5 | 15.47 | 17.91 | 18.7 | 17.86 | 18.85 |
| pH (Standard Units) | 6.71 | 6.52 | 6.63 | 7.05 | 6.85 | 6.51 | 6.61 | 6.74 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| Specific Conductivity (mmhos/cm) | 1.060 | 0.937 | 0.993 | 0.593 | 0.952 | 0.789 | 1.070 | 0.985 | 1.050 | 1.140 |
| Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | 0.2 | 0.39 | 0.49 | 0.56 | 1 | 2.08 | 1.18 | 1.43 | 0.97 | 0.70 |
| Turbidity (NTU) | 5.7 | 1 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

APPENDIX C

# Laboratory Analytical Reports and Data Usability Summaries

10450 Stancliff Rd. Suite 210
Houston, TX 77099
T: +1 281 530 5656
F: +1 281 530 5887

January 27, 2025

Manny Higa
WSP Austin
1601 S. MoPac Expressway
Suite 325D
Austin, TX 78746

Work Order: **HS25010364**

Laboratory Results for: **Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works**

Dear Manny Higa ,

ALS Environmental received 7 sample(s) on Jan 09, 2025 for the analysis presented in the following report.

The analytical data provided relates directly to the samples received by ALS Environmental and for only the analyses requested. Results are expressed as "as received" unless otherwise noted.

QC sample results for this data met EPA or laboratory specifications except as noted in the Case Narrative or as noted with qualifiers in the QC batch information. Should this laboratory report need to be reproduced, it should be reproduced in full unless written approval has been obtained by ALS Environmental. Samples will be disposed in 30 days unless storage arrangements are made.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

**Generated By: DAYNA.FISHER**
Luis Aguilar

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Client:** | WSP Austin | **TRRP Laboratory Data Package Cover Page** |
| **Project:** | Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | |
| **WorkOrder:** | **HS25010364** | |

This data package consists of all or some of the following as applicable:

This signature page, the laboratory review checklist, and the following reportable data:

R1 Field chain-of-custody documentation;

R2 Sample identification cross-reference;

R3 Test reports (analytical data sheets) for each environmental sample that includes:

a) Items consistent with NELAC Chapter 5,
b) dilution factors,
c) preparation methods,
d) cleanup methods, and
e) if required for the project, tentatively identified compounds (TICs).

R4 Surrogate recovery data including:

a) Calculated recovery (%R), and
b) The laboratory's surrogate QC limits.

R5 Test reports/summary forms for blank samples;

R6 Test reports/summary forms for laboratory control samples (LCSs) including:

a) LCS spiking amounts,
b) Calculated %R for each analyte, and
c)The laboratory's LCS QC limits.

R7 Test reports for project matrix spike/matrix spike duplicates (MS/MSDs) including:

a) Samples associated with the MS/MSD clearly identified,
b) MS/MSD spiking amounts,
c) Concentration of each MS/MSD analyte measured in the parent and spiked samples,
d) Calculated %Rs and relative percent differences (RPDs), and
e) The laboratory's MS/MSD QC limits.

R8 Laboratory analytical duplicate (if applicable) recovery and precision:

a) the amount of analyte measured in the duplicate,
b) the calculated RPD, and
c) the laboratory's QC limits for analytical duplicates.

R9 List of method quantitation limits (MQLs) and detectability check sample results for each analyte for each method and matrix.

R10 Other problems or anomalies.
The Exception Report for each "No" or "Not Reviewed (NR)" item in Laboratory Review Checklist and for each analyte, matrix, and method for which the laboratory does not hold NELAC accreditation under the Texas Laboratory Accreditation Program.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Client:** | WSP Austin |
| **Project:** | Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works |
| **WorkOrder:** | **HS25010364** |

**TRRP Laboratory Data Package Cover Page**

Release Statement: I am responsible for the release of this laboratory data package. This laboratory is NELAC accredited under the Texas Laboratory Accreditation Program for all the methods, analytes and matrices reported in this data package except as noted in the Exception Reports. The data have been reviewed and are technically compliant with the requirements of the methods used, except where noted by the laboratory in the attached exception reports. By my signature below, I affirm to the best of my knowledge, all problems/anomalies, observed by the laboratory have been identified by the laboratory in the Laboratory Review Checklist, and no information affecting the quality of the data has been knowingly withheld.

Check, if applicable: [NA] This laboratory meets an exception under 30 TAC §25.6 and was last inspected by [ ] TCEQ or [ ] _____ on (enter date of last inspection). Any findings affecting the data in this laboratory data package are noted in the Exception Reports herein. The official signing the cover page of the report in which these data are used is responsible for releasing this data package and is by signature affirming the above release statement is true.

Luis Aguilar

| Laboratory Review Checklist: Reportable Data | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Laboratory Name: ALS Laboratory Group | | | LRC Date: 01/27/2025 | | | | |
| Project Name: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | | | Laboratory Job Number: HS25010364 | | | | |
| Reviewer Name: Luis Aguilar | | | Prep Batch Number(s): 222764, 222853 | | | | |
| #[1] | A[2] | Description | Yes | No | NA[3] | NR[4] | ER#[5] |
| **R1** | OI | **Chain-of-custody (C-O-C)** | | | | | |
| | | Did samples meet the laboratory's standard conditions of sample acceptability upon receipt? | X | | | | |
| | | Were all departures from standard conditions described in an exception report? | X | | | | |
| **R2** | OI | **Sample and quality control (QC) identification** | | | | | |
| | | Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the laboratory ID numbers? | X | | | | |
| | | Are all laboratory ID numbers cross-referenced to the corresponding QC data? | X | | | | |
| **R3** | OI | **Test reports** | | | | | |
| | | Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? | X | | | | |
| | | Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards? | X | | | | |
| | | Were calculations checked by a peer or supervisor? | X | | | | |
| | | Were all analyte identifications checked by a peer or supervisor? | X | | | | |
| | | Were sample detection limits reported for all analytes not detected? | X | | | | |
| | | Were all results for soil and sediment samples reported on a dry weight basis? | | | X | | |
| | | Were % moisture (or solids) reported for all soil and sediment samples? | | | X | | |
| | | Were bulk soils/solids samples for volatile analysis extracted with methanol per SW-846 Method 5035? | | | X | | |
| | | If required for the project, TICs reported? | | | X | | |
| **R4** | O | **Surrogate recovery data** | | | | | |
| | | Were surrogates added prior to extraction? | X | | | | |
| | | Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? | X | | | | |
| **R5** | OI | **Test reports/summary forms for blank samples** | | | | | |
| | | Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? | X | | | | |
| | | Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? | X | | | | |
| | | Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if applicable, cleanup procedures? | X | | | | |
| | | Were blank concentrations < MQL? | X | | | | |
| **R6** | OI | **Laboratory control samples (LCS):** | | | | | |
| | | Were all COCs included in the LCS? | X | | | | |
| | | Was each LCS taken through the entire analytical procedure, including prep and cleanup steps? | X | | | | |
| | | Were LCSs analyzed at the required frequency? | X | | | | |
| | | Were LCS (and LCSD, if applicable) %Rs within the laboratory QC limits? | X | | | | |
| | | Does the detectability data document the laboratory's capability to detect the COCs at the MDL used to calculate the SDLs? | X | | | | |
| | | Was the LCSD RPD within QC limits? | X | | | | |
| **R7** | OI | **Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) data** | | | | | |
| | | Were the project/method specified analytes included in the MS and MSD? | | | X | | |
| | | Were MS/MSD analyzed at the appropriate frequency? | | X | | | 1 |
| | | Were MS (and MSD, if applicable) %Rs within the laboratory QC limits? | | | X | | |
| | | Were MS/MSD RPDs within laboratory QC limits? | | | X | | |
| **R8** | OI | **Analytical duplicate data** | | | | | |
| | | Were appropriate analytical duplicates analyzed for each matrix? | | | X | | |
| | | Were analytical duplicates analyzed at the appropriate frequency? | | | X | | |
| | | Were RPDs or relative standard deviations within the laboratory QC limits? | | | X | | |
| **R9** | OI | **Method quantitation limits (MQLs):** | | | | | |
| | | Are the MQLs for each method analyte included in the laboratory data package? | X | | | | |
| | | Do the MQLs correspond to the concentration of the lowest non-zero calibration standard? | X | | | | |
| | | Are unadjusted MQLs and DCSs included in the laboratory data package? | X | | | | |
| **R10** | OI | **Other problems/anomalies** | | | | | |
| | | Are all known problems/anomalies/special conditions noted in this LRC and ER? | X | | | | |
| | | Were all necessary corrective actions performed for the reported data? | X | | | | |
| | | Was applicable and available technology used to lower the SDL and minimize the matrix interference affects on the sample results? | X | | | | |
| | | Is the laboratory NELAC-accredited under the Texas Laboratory Program for the analytes, matrices and methods associated with this laboratory data package? | X | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Laboratory Review Checklist: Supporting Data | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Laboratory Name: ALS Laboratory Group | | | LRC Date: 01/27/2025 | | | | |
| Project Name: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | | | Laboratory Job Number: HS25010364 | | | | |
| Reviewer Name: Luis Aguilar | | | Prep Batch Number(s): 222764, 222853 | | | | |
| #[1] | A[2] | Description | Yes | No | NA[3] | NR[4] | ER#[5] |
| S1 | OI | **Initial calibration (ICAL)** | | | | | |
| | | Were response factors and/or relative response factors for each analyte within QC limits? | X | | | | |
| | | Were percent RSDs or correlation coefficient criteria met? | X | | | | |
| | | Was the number of standards recommended in the method used for all analytes? | X | | | | |
| | | Were all points generated between the lowest and highest standard used to calculate the curve? | X | | | | |
| | | Are ICAL data available for all instruments used? | X | | | | |
| | | Has the initial calibration curve been verified using an appropriate second source standard? | X | | | | |
| S2 | OI | **Initial and continuing calibration verification (ICCV and CCV) and continuing calibration blank (CCB)** | | | | | |
| | | Was the CCV analyzed at the method-required frequency? | X | | | | |
| | | Were percent differences for each analyte within the method-required QC limits? | X | | | | |
| | | Was the ICAL curve verified for each analyte? | X | | | | |
| | | Was the absolute value of the analyte concentration in the inorganic CCB < MDL? | | | X | | |
| S3 | O | **Mass spectral tuning:** | | | | | |
| | | Was the appropriate compound for the method used for tuning? | X | | | | |
| | | Were ion abundance data within the method-required QC limits? | X | | | | |
| S4 | O | **Internal standards (IS):** | | | | | |
| | | Were IS area counts and retention times within the method-required QC limits? | | X | | | 2 |
| S5 | OI | **Raw data** (NELAC section 1 appendix A glossary, and section 5.12 or ISO/IEC 17025 section | | | | | |
| | | Were the raw data (for example, chromatograms, spectral data) reviewed by an analyst? | X | | | | |
| | | Were data associated with manual integrations flagged on the raw data? | X | | | | |
| S6 | O | **Dual column confirmation** | | | | | |
| | | Did dual column confirmation results meet the method-required QC? | | | X | | |
| S7 | O | **Tentatively identified compounds (TICs):** | | | | | |
| | | If TICs were requested, were the mass spectra and TIC data subject to appropriate checks? | | | X | | |
| S8 | I | **Interference Check Sample (ICS) results:** | | | | | |
| | | Were percent recoveries within method QC limits? | | | X | | |
| S9 | I | **Serial dilutions, post digestion spikes, and method of standard additions** | | | | | |
| | | Were percent differences, recoveries, and the linearity within the QC limits specified in the method? | | | X | | |
| S10 | OI | **Method detection limit (MDL) studies** | | | | | |
| | | Was a MDL study performed for each reported analyte? | X | | | | |
| | | Is the MDL either adjusted or supported by the analysis of DCSs? | X | | | | |
| S11 | OI | **Proficiency test reports:** | | | | | |
| | | Was the laboratory's performance acceptable on the applicable proficiency tests or evaluation studies? | X | | | | |
| S12 | OI | **Standards documentation** | | | | | |
| | | Are all standards used in the analyses NIST-traceable or obtained from other appropriate sources? | X | | | | |
| S13 | OI | **Compound/analyte identification procedures** | | | | | |
| | | Are the procedures for compound/analyte identification documented? | X | | | | |
| S14 | OI | **Demonstration of analyst competency (DOC)** | | | | | |
| | | Was DOC conducted consistent with NELAC Chapter 5C or ISO/IEC 4? | X | | | | |
| | | Is documentation of the analyst's competency up-to-date and on file? | X | | | | |
| S15 | OI | **Verification/validation documentation for methods** (NELAC Chap 5 or ISO/IEC 17025 Section 5) | | | | | |
| | | Are all the methods used to generate the data documented, verified, and validated, where applicable? | X | | | | |
| S16 | OI | **Laboratory standard operating procedures (SOPs):** | | | | | |
| | | Are laboratory SOPs current and on file for each method performed? | X | | | | |

Items identified by the letter "R" must be included in the laboratory data package submitted in the TRRP-required report(s). Items identified by the letter "S" should be retained and made available upon request for the appropriate retention period.
O = Organic Analyses; I = Inorganic Analyses (and general chemistry, when applicable);
NA = Not Applicable;
NR = Not Reviewed;
R# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked).

| Laboratory Review Checklist: Exception Reports | | |
|---|---|---|
| Laboratory Name: ALS Laboratory Group | | LRC Date: 01/27/2025 |
| Project Name: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | | Laboratory Job Number: HS25010364 |
| Reviewer Name: Luis Aguilar | | Prep Batch Number(s): 222764, 222853 |
| **ER#[5]** | **Description** | |
| 1 | Batch 222764 and Batch 222853, Semivolatiles by method SW8270, LCS/LCSD were analyzed and reported in lieu of an MS/MSD for this batch. The batch quality control criteria were met. | |
| 2 | Batch 222764, Semivolatiles by method SW8270, Internal standard recoveries for 1,4-Dichlorobenzene, Chrysene-d12, and Perylene-d12 were outside the control limit. Internal standard failures did not affect target analyte, no qualification necessary. | |

Items identified by the letter "R" must be included in the laboratory data package submitted in the TRRP-required report(s). Items identified by the letter "S" should be retained and made available upon request for the appropriate retention period.
O = Organic Analyses; I = Inorganic Analyses (and general chemistry, when applicable);
NA = Not Applicable;
NR = Not Reviewed;
R# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked).

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**Work Order:** HS25010364

## SAMPLE SUMMARY

| Lab Samp ID | Client Sample ID | Matrix | TagNo | Collection Date | Date Received | Hold |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HS25010364-01 | WG-1620-P10-20250107 | Water | | 07-Jan-2025 12:25 | 09-Jan-2025 09:55 | ☐ |
| HS25010364-02 | WG-1620-MW07-20250107 | Water | | 07-Jan-2025 13:29 | 09-Jan-2025 09:55 | ☐ |
| HS25010364-03 | WG-1620-FDD1-20250107 | Water | | 07-Jan-2025 00:00 | 09-Jan-2025 09:55 | ☐ |
| HS25010364-04 | WG-1620-MW02-20250107 | Water | | 07-Jan-2025 14:58 | 09-Jan-2025 09:55 | ☐ |
| HS25010364-05 | WG-1620-FB-01-20250107 | Water | | 07-Jan-2025 15:30 | 09-Jan-2025 09:55 | ☐ |
| HS25010364-06 | WG-1620-FD-02-20250107 | Water | | 07-Jan-2025 00:00 | 09-Jan-2025 09:55 | ☐ |
| HS25010364-07 | WG-1620-MW01A-20250107 | Water | | 07-Jan-2025 15:43 | 09-Jan-2025 09:55 | ☐ |

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-P10-20250107
Collection Date: 07-Jan-2025 12:25

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010364
Lab ID:HS25010364-01
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 10-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: ML |
| **Acenaphthene** | **0.047** | | **0.00027** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 23-Jan-2025 17:47 |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.000015 | | 0.000015 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:05 |
| **Anthracene** | **0.0030** | | **0.000014** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:05 |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.000037 | | 0.000037 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:05 |
| **Dibenzofuran** | **0.0035** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:05 |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:05 |
| **Fluoranthene** | **0.0027** | | **0.000010** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:05 |
| **Fluorene** | **0.018** | | **0.00030** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 23-Jan-2025 17:47 |
| **Naphthalene** | **0.014** | | **0.00020** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 23-Jan-2025 17:47 |
| Phenol | < 0.000035 | | 0.000035 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:05 |
| **Pyrene** | **0.0011** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:05 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *82.8* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:47* |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *91.4* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:05* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *94.7* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:05* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *73.2* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:47* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *71.4* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:47* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *52.1* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:05* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *81.3* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:47* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *109* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:05* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *68.5* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:47* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *70.6* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:05* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *56.5* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:05* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *77.1* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:47* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-MW07-20250107
Collection Date: 07-Jan-2025 13:29

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010364
Lab ID:HS25010364-02
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 10-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: GEY |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | < 0.000019 | | 0.000019 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| **Acenaphthene** | **0.000076** | J | **0.000027** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.000015 | | 0.000015 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| **Anthracene** | **0.000061** | J | **0.000014** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.000037 | | 0.000037 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| Dibenzofuran | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| Fluoranthene | < 0.000010 | | 0.000010 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| Fluorene | < 0.000030 | | 0.000030 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| Naphthalene | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| **Phenanthrene** | **0.000086** | J | **0.000021** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| Pyrene | < 0.000019 | | 0.000019 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:29 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *67.3* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:29* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *87.9* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:29* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *49.8* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:29* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *101* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:29* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *59.8* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:29* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *39.1* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:29* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-FDD1-20250107
Collection Date: 07-Jan-2025 00:00

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010364
Lab ID:HS25010364-03
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 10-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: ML |
| **Acenaphthene** | **0.046** | | **0.00027** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 23-Jan-2025 17:25 |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.000015 | | 0.000015 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:52 |
| **Anthracene** | **0.0033** | | **0.000014** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:52 |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.000037 | | 0.000037 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:52 |
| **Dibenzofuran** | **0.0030** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:52 |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:52 |
| **Fluoranthene** | **0.0031** | | **0.000010** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:52 |
| **Fluorene** | **0.018** | | **0.00030** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 23-Jan-2025 17:25 |
| **Naphthalene** | **0.016** | | **0.00020** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 23-Jan-2025 17:25 |
| Phenol | < 0.000035 | | 0.000035 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:52 |
| **Pyrene** | **0.0013** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 13-Jan-2025 22:52 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *99.5* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:52* |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *96.7* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:25* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *75.0* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:25* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *90.8* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:52* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *55.5* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:52* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *71.2* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:25* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *83.3* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:25* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *105* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:52* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *72.4* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:52* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *69.0* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:25* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *76.1* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 17:25* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *51.3* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *13-Jan-2025 22:52* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-MW02-20250107
Collection Date: 07-Jan-2025 14:58

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010364
Lab ID:HS25010364-04
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 14-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: ML |
| **2-Methylnaphthalene** | **0.0022** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| Acenaphthene | < 0.000027 | | 0.000027 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.000015 | | 0.000015 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| **Anthracene** | **0.00024** | | **0.000014** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.000037 | | 0.000037 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| **Dibenzofuran** | **0.00015** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| **Fluoranthene** | **0.0014** | | **0.000010** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| **Fluorene** | **0.0048** | | **0.000030** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| Naphthalene | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| **Phenanthrene** | **0.00042** | | **0.000021** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| **Pyrene** | **0.00085** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 20:59 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *55.2* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 20:59* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *79.9* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 20:59* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *78.1* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 20:59* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *99.6* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 20:59* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *70.9* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 20:59* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *83.0* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 20:59* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-FB-01-20250107
Collection Date: 07-Jan-2025 15:30

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010364
Lab ID:HS25010364-05
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | Prep:SW3510 / 14-Jan-2025 | | | Analyst: ML |
| Acenaphthene | < 0.000027 | | 0.000027 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:21 |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.000015 | | 0.000015 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:21 |
| Anthracene | < 0.000014 | | 0.000014 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:21 |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.000037 | | 0.000037 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:21 |
| Dibenzofuran | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:21 |
| Fluoranthene | < 0.000010 | | 0.000010 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:21 |
| Fluorene | < 0.000030 | | 0.000030 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:21 |
| Naphthalene | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:21 |
| Pyrene | < 0.000019 | | 0.000019 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:21 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *35.1* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:21* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *77.8* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:21* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *77.0* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:21* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *82.5* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:21* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *69.5* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:21* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *83.2* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:21* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-FD-02-20250107
Collection Date: 07-Jan-2025 00:00

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010364
Lab ID:HS25010364-06
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 14-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: ML |
| **2-Methylnaphthalene** | **0.0026** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:43 |
| **Acenaphthene** | **0.033** | | **0.00027** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 17-Jan-2025 17:07 |
| **Acenaphthylene** | **0.00034** | | **0.000015** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:43 |
| **Anthracene** | **0.0011** | | **0.000014** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:43 |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.000037 | | 0.000037 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:43 |
| **Dibenzofuran** | **0.0092** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:43 |
| **Fluoranthene** | **0.0017** | | **0.000010** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:43 |
| **Fluorene** | **0.017** | | **0.00030** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 17-Jan-2025 17:07 |
| **Naphthalene** | **0.00036** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:43 |
| **Phenanthrene** | **0.0025** | | **0.000021** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:43 |
| **Pyrene** | **0.00076** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 21:43 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *88.3* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:43* |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *36.7* | *J* | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:07* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *86.2* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:07* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *78.0* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:43* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *74.9* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:43* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *80.5* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:07* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *97.0* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:07* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *81.6* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:43* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *66.9* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:43* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *75.5* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:07* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *86.6* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:07* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *81.0* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 21:43* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-MW01A-20250107
Collection Date: 07-Jan-2025 15:43

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010364
Lab ID:HS25010364-07
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 14-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: ML |
| **2-Methylnaphthalene** | **0.0035** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 22:27 |
| **Acenaphthene** | **0.051** | | **0.00027** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 17-Jan-2025 17:30 |
| **Acenaphthylene** | **0.00058** | | **0.000015** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 22:27 |
| **Anthracene** | **0.0016** | | **0.000014** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 22:27 |
| **Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate** | **0.000059** | J | **0.000037** | **0.00020** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 22:27 |
| **Dibenzofuran** | **0.016** | | **0.00020** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 17-Jan-2025 17:30 |
| **Fluoranthene** | **0.0025** | | **0.000010** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 22:27 |
| **Fluorene** | **0.027** | | **0.00030** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 17-Jan-2025 17:30 |
| **Naphthalene** | **0.00046** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 22:27 |
| **Phenanthrene** | **0.0033** | | **0.000021** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 22:27 |
| **Pyrene** | **0.0011** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 16-Jan-2025 22:27 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *102* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 22:27* |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *51.4* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:30* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *87.8* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:30* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *79.8* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 22:27* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *79.5* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 22:27* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *83.6* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:30* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *99.7* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:30* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *81.6* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 22:27* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *68.9* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 22:27* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *80.5* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:30* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *86.3* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *17-Jan-2025 17:30* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *85.0* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *16-Jan-2025 22:27* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

**Weight / Prep Log**

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010364

**Batch ID:** 222764 **Start Date:** 10 Jan 2025 13:17 **End Date:** 10 Jan 2025 13:17
**Method:** SV AQ SEP FUN EXTRACT-LOWLEV - 3510C **Prep Code:** 3510_B_LOW

| Sample ID | Container | Sample Wt/Vol | Final Volume | Prep Factor | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HS25010364-01 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |
| HS25010364-02 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |
| HS25010364-03 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |

**Batch ID:** 222853 **Start Date:** 14 Jan 2025 10:02 **End Date:** 14 Jan 2025 10:02
**Method:** SV AQ SEP FUN EXTRACT-LOWLEV - 3510C **Prep Code:** 3510_B_LOW

| Sample ID | Container | Sample Wt/Vol | Final Volume | Prep Factor | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HS25010364-04 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |
| HS25010364-05 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |
| HS25010364-06 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |
| HS25010364-07 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010364

## DATES REPORT

| Sample ID | Client Samp ID | Collection Date | Leachate Date | Prep Date | Analysis Date | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Batch ID:** 222764 ( 1 ) | **Test Name :** LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D | | | | **Matrix:** Water | |
| HS25010364-01 | WG-1620-P10-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 12:25 | | 10 Jan 2025 13:17 | 23 Jan 2025 17:47 | 10 |
| HS25010364-01 | WG-1620-P10-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 12:25 | | 10 Jan 2025 13:17 | 13 Jan 2025 22:05 | 1 |
| HS25010364-02 | WG-1620-MW07-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 13:29 | | 10 Jan 2025 13:17 | 13 Jan 2025 22:29 | 1 |
| HS25010364-03 | WG-1620-FDD1-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 00:00 | | 10 Jan 2025 13:17 | 23 Jan 2025 17:25 | 10 |
| HS25010364-03 | WG-1620-FDD1-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 00:00 | | 10 Jan 2025 13:17 | 13 Jan 2025 22:52 | 1 |
| **Batch ID:** 222853 ( 1 ) | **Test Name :** LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D | | | | **Matrix:** Water | |
| HS25010364-04 | WG-1620-MW02-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 14:58 | | 14 Jan 2025 10:02 | 16 Jan 2025 20:59 | 1 |
| HS25010364-05 | WG-1620-FB-01-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 15:30 | | 14 Jan 2025 10:02 | 16 Jan 2025 21:21 | 1 |
| HS25010364-06 | WG-1620-FD-02-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 00:00 | | 14 Jan 2025 10:02 | 17 Jan 2025 17:07 | 10 |
| HS25010364-06 | WG-1620-FD-02-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 00:00 | | 14 Jan 2025 10:02 | 16 Jan 2025 21:43 | 1 |
| HS25010364-07 | WG-1620-MW01A-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 15:43 | | 14 Jan 2025 10:02 | 17 Jan 2025 17:30 | 10 |
| HS25010364-07 | WG-1620-MW01A-20250107 | 07 Jan 2025 15:43 | | 14 Jan 2025 10:02 | 16 Jan 2025 22:27 | 1 |

WorkOrder: HS25010364
InstrumentID: SV-10
Test Code: 8270_LOW_W
Test Number: SW8270
Test Name: Low-Level Semivolatiles by 8270D

**METHOD DETECTION / REPORTING LIMITS**

**Matrix:** Aqueous **Units:** mg/L

| Type | Analyte | CAS | DCS Spike | DCS | MDL | PQL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | Acenaphthene | 83-32-9 | 0.000050 | 0.000034 | 0.000027 | 0.00010 |
| A | Fluorene | 86-73-7 | 0.000050 | 0.000033 | 0.000030 | 0.00010 |
| A | Naphthalene | 91-20-3 | 0.000050 | 0.000037 | 0.000020 | 0.00010 |
| A | 2-Methylnaphthalene | 91-57-6 | 0.00010 | 0.000083 | 0.000019 | 0.00010 |
| A | Acenaphthylene | 208-96-8 | 0.000050 | 0.000030 | 0.000015 | 0.00010 |
| A | Anthracene | 120-12-7 | 0.000050 | 0.000036 | 0.000014 | 0.00010 |
| A | Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 117-81-7 | 0.00010 | 0.000084 | 0.000037 | 0.00020 |
| A | Dibenzofuran | 132-64-9 | 0.00010 | 0.000088 | 0.000020 | 0.00010 |
| A | Fluoranthene | 206-44-0 | 0.000050 | 0.000038 | 0.000010 | 0.00010 |
| A | Phenanthrene | 85-01-8 | 0.000050 | 0.000039 | 0.000021 | 0.00010 |
| A | Pyrene | 129-00-0 | 0.000050 | 0.000040 | 0.000019 | 0.00010 |
| S | 2,4,6-Tribromophenol | 118-79-6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | 2-Fluorobiphenyl | 321-60-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | 2-Fluorophenol | 367-12-4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | 4-Terphenyl-d14 | 1718-51-0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | Nitrobenzene-d5 | 4165-60-0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | Phenol-d6 | 13127-88-3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |

WorkOrder: HS25010364
InstrumentID: SV-7
Test Code: 8270_LOW_W
Test Number: SW8270
Test Name: Low-Level Semivolatiles by 8270D

**METHOD DETECTION / REPORTING LIMITS**

**Matrix:** Aqueous **Units:** mg/L

| Type | Analyte | CAS | DCS Spike | DCS | MDL | PQL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | Acenaphthylene | 208-96-8 | 0.000050 | 0.000041 | 0.000015 | 0.00010 |
| A | Anthracene | 120-12-7 | 0.000050 | 0.000042 | 0.000014 | 0.00010 |
| A | Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 117-81-7 | 0.00010 | 0.000067 | 0.000037 | 0.00020 |
| A | Dibenzofuran | 132-64-9 | 0.000050 | 0.000050 | 0.000020 | 0.00010 |
| A | Di-n-butyl phthalate | 84-74-2 | 0.00010 | 0.000087 | 0.000020 | 0.00020 |
| A | Fluoranthene | 206-44-0 | 0.000050 | 0.000045 | 0.000010 | 0.00010 |
| A | Phenol | 108-95-2 | 0.00010 | 0.000099 | 0.000035 | 0.00020 |
| A | Pyrene | 129-00-0 | 0.000050 | 0.000045 | 0.000019 | 0.00010 |
| A | 2-Methylnaphthalene | 91-57-6 | 0.000050 | 0.000039 | 0.000019 | 0.00010 |
| A | Acenaphthene | 83-32-9 | 0.000050 | 0.000040 | 0.000027 | 0.00010 |
| A | Fluorene | 86-73-7 | 0.000050 | 0.000040 | 0.000030 | 0.00010 |
| A | Naphthalene | 91-20-3 | 0.000050 | 0.000034 | 0.000020 | 0.00010 |
| A | Phenanthrene | 85-01-8 | 0.000050 | 0.000044 | 0.000021 | 0.00010 |
| S | 2,4,6-Tribromophenol | 118-79-6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | 2-Fluorobiphenyl | 321-60-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | 2-Fluorophenol | 367-12-4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | 4-Terphenyl-d14 | 1718-51-0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | Nitrobenzene-d5 | 4165-60-0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | Phenol-d6 | 13127-88-3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010364

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 222764 ( 1 )** **Instrument: SV-7** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**MBLK** Sample ID: **MBLK-222764** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **13-Jan-2025 18:57**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-7_504303** SeqNo: **8633246** PrepDate: **10-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | < 0.019 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Acenaphthene | < 0.027 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.015 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Anthracene | < 0.014 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.037 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | |
| Dibenzofuran | < 0.020 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | < 0.020 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | |
| Fluoranthene | < 0.010 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Fluorene | < 0.030 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Naphthalene | < 0.020 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Phenanthrene | < 0.021 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Phenol | < 0.035 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | |
| Pyrene | < 0.019 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *1.745* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *34.9* | *34 - 129* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *3.611* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *72.2* | *40 - 125* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *2.37* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *47.4* | *20 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *4.568* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *91.4* | *40 - 135* | | | | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *3.433* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *68.7* | *41 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *2.807* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *56.1* | *20 - 120* | | | | |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010364

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 222764 ( 1 )** **Instrument: SV-7** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**LCS** Sample ID: **LCS-222764** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **13-Jan-2025 19:20**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-7_504303** SeqNo: **8633247** PrepDate: **10-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 3.665 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 73.3 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthene | 4.09 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 81.8 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthylene | 4.151 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 83.0 | 47 - 120 | | | | |
| Anthracene | 4.537 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 90.7 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 3.286 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 65.7 | 40 - 139 | | | | |
| Dibenzofuran | 4.293 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 85.9 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | 4.149 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 83.0 | 45 - 123 | | | | |
| Fluoranthene | 4.428 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 88.6 | 45 - 125 | | | | |
| Fluorene | 4.3 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 86.0 | 49 - 120 | | | | |
| Naphthalene | 3.69 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 73.8 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Phenanthrene | 4.309 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 86.2 | 45 - 121 | | | | |
| Phenol | 4.015 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 80.3 | 20 - 124 | | | | |
| Pyrene | 4.035 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 80.7 | 40 - 130 | | | | |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *4.255* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *85.1* | *34 - 129* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *4.761* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *95.2* | *40 - 125* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *3.254* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *65.1* | *20 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *5.007* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *100* | *40 - 135* | | | | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *3.737* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *74.7* | *41 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *2.953* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *59.1* | *20 - 120* | | | | |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010364

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 222764 ( 1 )** **Instrument: SV-7** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**LCSD** Sample ID: **LCSD-222764** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **13-Jan-2025 19:44**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-7_504303** SeqNo: **8633248** PrepDate: **10-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | RPD %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 3.905 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 78.1 | 50 - 120 | 3.665 | 6.35 | 20 | |
| Acenaphthene | 4.156 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 83.1 | 45 - 120 | 4.09 | 1.6 | 20 | |
| Acenaphthylene | 4.36 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 87.2 | 47 - 120 | 4.151 | 4.91 | 20 | |
| Anthracene | 4.517 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 90.3 | 45 - 120 | 4.537 | 0.438 | 20 | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 3.484 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 69.7 | 40 - 139 | 3.286 | 5.84 | 20 | |
| Dibenzofuran | 4.442 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 88.8 | 50 - 120 | 4.293 | 3.41 | 20 | |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | 4.033 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 80.7 | 45 - 123 | 4.149 | 2.82 | 20 | |
| Fluoranthene | 4.426 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 88.5 | 45 - 125 | 4.428 | 0.0572 | 20 | |
| Fluorene | 4.516 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 90.3 | 49 - 120 | 4.3 | 4.89 | 20 | |
| Naphthalene | 3.981 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 79.6 | 45 - 120 | 3.69 | 7.58 | 20 | |
| Phenanthrene | 4.234 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 84.7 | 45 - 121 | 4.309 | 1.77 | 20 | |
| Phenol | 3.703 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 74.1 | 20 - 124 | 4.015 | 8.09 | 20 | |
| Pyrene | 4.085 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 81.7 | 40 - 130 | 4.035 | 1.23 | 20 | |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *3.723* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *74.5* | *34 - 129* | *4.255* | *13.3* | *20* | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *4.724* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *94.5* | *40 - 125* | *4.761* | *0.777* | *20* | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *2.702* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *54.0* | *20 - 120* | *3.254* | *18.5* | *20* | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *5.125* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *102* | *40 - 135* | *5.007* | *2.33* | *20* | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *3.578* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *71.6* | *41 - 120* | *3.737* | *4.36* | *20* | |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *3.577* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *71.5* | *20 - 120* | *2.953* | *19.1* | *20* | |

**The following samples were analyzed in this batch:** HS25010364-01 HS25010364-02 HS25010364-03

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010364

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 222853 ( 1 )** **Instrument: SV-10** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**MBLK** Sample ID: **MBLK-222853** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **16-Jan-2025 13:37**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-10_504486** SeqNo: **8636272** PrepDate: **14-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | < 0.019 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Acenaphthene | < 0.027 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.015 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Anthracene | < 0.014 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.037 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | |
| Dibenzofuran | < 0.020 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Fluoranthene | < 0.010 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Fluorene | < 0.030 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Naphthalene | < 0.020 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Phenanthrene | < 0.021 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Pyrene | < 0.019 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *4.511* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *90.2* | *34 - 129* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *3.826* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *76.5* | *40 - 125* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *3.655* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *73.1* | *20 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *4.081* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *81.6* | *40 - 135* | | | | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *3.254* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *65.1* | *41 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *3.908* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *78.2* | *20 - 120* | | | | |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010364

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 222853 ( 1 )** **Instrument: SV-10** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**LCS** Sample ID: **LCS-222853** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **16-Jan-2025 13:59**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-10_504486** SeqNo: **8636273** PrepDate: **14-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 3.094 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 61.9 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthene | 3.533 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 70.7 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthylene | 3.695 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 73.9 | 47 - 120 | | | | |
| Anthracene | 3.611 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 72.2 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 4.043 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 80.9 | 40 - 139 | | | | |
| Dibenzofuran | 3.588 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 71.8 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Fluoranthene | 3.826 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 76.5 | 45 - 125 | | | | |
| Fluorene | 3.644 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 72.9 | 49 - 120 | | | | |
| Naphthalene | 3.434 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 68.7 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Phenanthrene | 3.661 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 73.2 | 45 - 121 | | | | |
| Pyrene | 3.615 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 72.3 | 40 - 130 | | | | |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *4.366* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *87.3* | *34 - 129* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *3.61* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *72.2* | *40 - 125* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *3.564* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *71.3* | *20 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *3.549* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *71.0* | *40 - 135* | | | | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *3.164* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *63.3* | *41 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *3.788* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *75.8* | *20 - 120* | | | | |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010364

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 222853 ( 1 )** **Instrument: SV-10** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**LCSD** Sample ID: **LCSD-222853** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **16-Jan-2025 14:21**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-10_504486** SeqNo: **8636340** PrepDate: **14-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | RPD %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 3.069 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 61.4 | 50 - 120 | 3.094 | 0.808 | 20 | |
| Acenaphthene | 3.564 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 71.3 | 45 - 120 | 3.533 | 0.892 | 20 | |
| Acenaphthylene | 3.669 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 73.4 | 47 - 120 | 3.695 | 0.706 | 20 | |
| Anthracene | 3.593 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 71.9 | 45 - 120 | 3.611 | 0.491 | 20 | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 4.079 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 81.6 | 40 - 139 | 4.043 | 0.893 | 20 | |
| Dibenzofuran | 3.512 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 70.2 | 50 - 120 | 3.588 | 2.15 | 20 | |
| Fluoranthene | 3.831 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 76.6 | 45 - 125 | 3.826 | 0.113 | 20 | |
| Fluorene | 3.624 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 72.5 | 49 - 120 | 3.644 | 0.562 | 20 | |
| Naphthalene | 3.394 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 67.9 | 45 - 120 | 3.434 | 1.17 | 20 | |
| Phenanthrene | 3.627 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 72.5 | 45 - 121 | 3.661 | 0.926 | 20 | |
| Pyrene | 3.578 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 71.6 | 40 - 130 | 3.615 | 1.02 | 20 | |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *4.048* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *81.0* | *34 - 129* | *4.366* | *7.55* | *20* | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *3.508* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *70.2* | *40 - 125* | *3.61* | *2.89* | *20* | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *3.608* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *72.2* | *20 - 120* | *3.564* | *1.22* | *20* | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *3.546* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *70.9* | *40 - 135* | *3.549* | *0.0983* | *20* | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *3.113* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *62.3* | *41 - 120* | *3.164* | *1.6* | *20* | |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *3.779* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *75.6* | *20 - 120* | *3.788* | *0.242* | *20* | |

**The following samples were analyzed in this batch:** HS25010364-04 HS25010364-05 HS25010364-06 HS25010364-07

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** **HS25010364**

**QUALIFIERS, ACRONYMS, UNITS**

| Qualifier | Description |
|---|---|
| * | Value exceeds Regulatory Limit |
| a | Not accredited |
| B | Analyte detected in the associated Method Blank above the Reporting Limit |
| E | Value above quantitation range |
| H | Analyzed outside of Holding Time |
| J | Analyte detected below quantitation limit |
| M | Manually integrated, see raw data for justification |
| n | Not offered for accreditation |
| ND | Not Detected at the Reporting Limit |
| O | Sample amount is > 4 times amount spiked |
| P | Dual Column results percent difference > 40% |
| R | RPD above laboratory control limit |
| S | Spike Recovery outside laboratory control limits |
| U | Analyzed but not detected above the MDL/SDL |

| Acronym | Description |
|---|---|
| DCS | Detectability Check Study |
| DUP | Method Duplicate |
| LCS | Laboratory Control Sample |
| LCSD | Laboratory Control Sample Duplicate |
| MBLK | Method Blank |
| MDL | Method Detection Limit |
| MQL | Method Quantitation Limit |
| MS | Matrix Spike |
| MSD | Matrix Spike Duplicate |
| PDS | Post Digestion Spike |
| PQL | Practical Quantitaion Limit |
| SD | Serial Dilution |
| SDL | Sample Detection Limit |
| TRRP | Texas Risk Reduction Program |

| Unit Reported | Description |
|---|---|
| mg/L | Milligrams per Liter |

## CERTIFICATIONS,ACCREDITATIONS & LICENSES

| Agency | Number | Expire Date |
|---|---|---|
| Arizona | AZ0793 | 27-May-2025 |
| Arkansas | 88-00356_2024 | 27-Mar-2025 |
| California | 2919; 2025 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Dept of Defense | L24-240 | 30-Apr-2026 |
| Dept of Defense | L24-239 | 30-Apr-2026 |
| Florida | E87611-38 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Illinois | 2000322023-11 | 31-Jul-2025 |
| Kansas | E-10352 2023-2024 | 31-Jul-2025 |
| Kentucky | 123043 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Louisiana | 03087 2023-2024 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Maine | 2024017 | 23-Jun-2026 |
| Michigan | 9971 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Nebraska | NE-OS-25-13 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| New Jersey | TX008 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Pennsylvania | 018 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Tennessee | 04016 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Texas | T104704231 TX-C24-00130 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Utah | TX026932023-14 | 31-Jul-2025 |

## Sample Receipt Checklist

**Work Order ID:** HS25010364 **Date/Time Received:** 09-Jan-2025 09:55

**Client Name:** PBW **Received by:** Paresh M. Giga

**Completed By:** /S/ Michael Lucio (eSignature) 09-Jan-2025 20:31 (Date/Time) **Reviewed by:** (eSignature) (Date/Time)

Matrices: w Carrier name: FedEx

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Shipping container/cooler in good condition? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | Not Present ☐ |
| Custody seals intact on shipping container/cooler? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| Custody seals intact on sample bottles? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| VOA/TX1005/TX1006 Solids in hermetically sealed vials? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| Chain of custody present? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | 1 Page(s) |
| Chain of custody signed when relinquished and received? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | COC IDs:320995 |
| Samplers name present on COC? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Chain of custody agrees with sample labels? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Samples in proper container/bottle? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Sample containers intact? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Sufficient sample volume for indicated test? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| All samples received within holding time? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Container/Temp Blank temperature in compliance? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Temperature(s)/Thermometer(s): | 0.8uc/0.8c | IR36 |
| Cooler(s)/Kit(s): | 49467 | |
| Date/Time sample(s) sent to storage: | 01/9/2025 1633 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Water - VOA vials have zero headspace? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | No VOA vials submitted ☑ |
| Water - pH acceptable upon receipt? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | N/A ☑ |
| pH adjusted? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | N/A ☑ |

pH adjusted by:

Login Notes:

Client Contacted: Date Contacted: Person Contacted:

Contacted By: Regarding:

Comments:

Corrective Action:

Cincinnati, OH +1 513 733 5336
Fort Collins, CO +1 970 490 1511
Everett, WA +1 425 356 2600
Holland, MI +1 616 399 6070

# Chain of Custody Form

Page 1 of 1

COC ID: 320995

WSP Austin
Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works

ALS Project Manager:

| Customer Information | | Project Information | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Purchase Order | UPRR/Kevin Peterburs | Project Name | Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | A | 8270_LOW_W (SemiVolatiles Select List ~~13A~~ (ATZ)) |
| Work Order | | Project Number | 1620-21-Rev0 SR 92688 | B | 8270_Low_W(Semi Volatiles SelectList BTZ)) |
| Company Name | WSP Austin | Bill To Company | Union Pacific Railroad- A/P | C | 8270_Low_W(ATZ & BTZ Semi Volatiles)) |
| Send Report To | ~~Eric Matz~~ MANNY HIGA | Invoice Attn | Accounts Payable | D | |
| Address | 1601 S. MoPac Expressway Suite 325D | Address | 1400 Douglas Street Stop 0750 | E | |
| | | | | F | |
| City/State/Zip | Austin, TX 78746 | City/State/Zip | Omaha NE 681790750 | G | |
| Phone | (512) ~~671-3434~~ 275-0593 | Phone | | H | |
| Fax | ~~(512) 671-3447~~ (832) 792-6659 | Fax | | I | |
| e-Mail Address | ~~ehatz@enSolutions.com~~ emmanuel.higa@wsp.com | e-Mail Address | arthur.gibson@alsglobal.com | J | |

| No. | Sample Description | Date | Time | Matrix | Pres. | # Bottles | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | Hold |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | WG-1620-P10-20250107 | 1-7-2025 | 1225 | W | N,8 | 2 | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | WG-1620-MW07-20250107 | 1-7-2025 | 1329 | W | N,8 | 2 | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | WG-1620-FD01-20250107 | 1-7-2025 | — | W | N,8 | 2 | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | WG-1620-MW02-20250107 | 1-7-2025 | 1458 | W | N,8 | 2 | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | WG-1620-FB-01-20250107 | 1-7-2025 | 1530 | W | N,8 | 2 | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | WG-1620-FD-02-20250107 | 1-7-2025 | — | W | N,8 | 2 | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | WG-1620-MW01A-20250107 | 1-7-2025 | 1543 | W | N,8 | 2 | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Sampler(s) Please Print & Sign: Charles Young

Shipment Method: HAND Carry

Required Turnaround Time: (Check Box) ☒ STD 10 Wk Days ☐ 5 Wk Days ☐ 2 Wk Days ☐ 24 Hour

Results Due Date:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Relinquished by: | Date: 1-9-2025 | Time: 0836 | Received by: | 0836 |
| Relinquished by: | Date: 1/9/25 | Time: 955 | Received by (Laboratory): | 1/9/25 09:55 |
| Logged by (Laboratory): | Date: | Time: | Checked by (Laboratory): | |

Notes: UPRR HW/PW 1620-21

| Cooler ID | Cooler Temp. |
|---|---|
| 49467 | 0.8° |
| | 4.6 |

QC Package: (Check One Box Below)
☐ Level II Std QC
☐ Level III Std QC/Raw Data
☐ Level IV Std QC/ LP
☐ Other
☒ TRRP Checklist
☐ TRRP Level IV

Preservative Key: 1-HCl 2-$HNO_3$ 3-$H_2SO_4$ 4-NaOH 5-$Na_2S_2O_3$ 6-$NaHSO_4$ 7-Other 8-4°C 9-5035

Note: 1. Any changes must be made in writing once samples and COC Form have been submitted to ALS Environmental.
2. Unless otherwise agreed in a formal contract, services provided by ALS Environmental are expressly limited to the terms and conditions stated on the reverse.
3. The Chain of Custody is a legal document. All information must be completed accurately.

10450 Stancliff Rd. Suite 210
Houston, TX 77099
T: +1 281 530 5656
F: +1 281 530 5887

January 27, 2025

Manny Higa
WSP Austin
1601 S. MoPac Expressway
Suite 325D
Austin, TX 78746

Work Order: **HS25010430**

Laboratory Results for: **Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works**

Dear Manny Higa ,

ALS Environmental received 5 sample(s) on Jan 10, 2025 for the analysis presented in the following report.

The analytical data provided relates directly to the samples received by ALS Environmental and for only the analyses requested. Results are expressed as "as received" unless otherwise noted.

QC sample results for this data met EPA or laboratory specifications except as noted in the Case Narrative or as noted with qualifiers in the QC batch information. Should this laboratory report need to be reproduced, it should be reproduced in full unless written approval has been obtained by ALS Environmental. Samples will be disposed in 30 days unless storage arrangements are made.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

**Generated By: DAYNA.FISHER**
Luis Aguilar

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Client:** | WSP Austin | **TRRP Laboratory Data Package Cover Page** |
| **Project:** | Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | |
| **WorkOrder:** | **HS25010430** | |

This data package consists of all or some of the following as applicable:

This signature page, the laboratory review checklist, and the following reportable data:

R1 Field chain-of-custody documentation;

R2 Sample identification cross-reference;

R3 Test reports (analytical data sheets) for each environmental sample that includes:

a) Items consistent with NELAC Chapter 5,
b) dilution factors,
c) preparation methods,
d) cleanup methods, and
e) if required for the project, tentatively identified compounds (TICs).

R4 Surrogate recovery data including:

a) Calculated recovery (%R), and
b) The laboratory's surrogate QC limits.

R5 Test reports/summary forms for blank samples;

R6 Test reports/summary forms for laboratory control samples (LCSs) including:

a) LCS spiking amounts,
b) Calculated %R for each analyte, and
c)The laboratory's LCS QC limits.

R7 Test reports for project matrix spike/matrix spike duplicates (MS/MSDs) including:

a) Samples associated with the MS/MSD clearly identified,
b) MS/MSD spiking amounts,
c) Concentration of each MS/MSD analyte measured in the parent and spiked samples,
d) Calculated %Rs and relative percent differences (RPDs), and
e) The laboratory's MS/MSD QC limits.

R8 Laboratory analytical duplicate (if applicable) recovery and precision:

a) the amount of analyte measured in the duplicate,
b) the calculated RPD, and
c) the laboratory's QC limits for analytical duplicates.

R9 List of method quantitation limits (MQLs) and detectability check sample results for each analyte for each method and matrix.

R10 Other problems or anomalies.
The Exception Report for each "No" or "Not Reviewed (NR)" item in Laboratory Review Checklist and for each analyte, matrix, and method for which the laboratory does not hold NELAC accreditation under the Texas Laboratory Accreditation Program.

**ALS Houston, US** Date: 27-Jan-25

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Client:** | WSP Austin | **TRRP Laboratory Data Package Cover Page** |
| **Project:** | Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | |
| **WorkOrder:** | **HS25010430** | |

Release Statement: I am responsible for the release of this laboratory data package. This laboratory is NELAC accredited under the Texas Laboratory Accreditation Program for all the methods, analytes and matrices reported in this data package except as noted in the Exception Reports. The data have been reviewed and are technically compliant with the requirements of the methods used, except where noted by the laboratory in the attached exception reports. By my signature below, I affirm to the best of my knowledge, all problems/anomalies, observed by the laboratory have been identified by the laboratory in the Laboratory Review Checklist, and no information affecting the quality of the data has been knowingly withheld.

Check, if applicable: [NA] This laboratory meets an exception under 30 TAC §25.6 and was last inspected by [ ] TCEQ or [ ] _____ on (enter date of last inspection). Any findings affecting the data in this laboratory data package are noted in the Exception Reports herein. The official signing the cover page of the report in which these data are used is responsible for releasing this data package and is by signature affirming the above release statement is true.

Luis Aguilar

| Laboratory Review Checklist: Reportable Data | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Laboratory Name: ALS Laboratory Group | | | LRC Date: 01/27/2025 | | | | | |
| Project Name: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | | | Laboratory Job Number: HS25010430 | | | | | |
| Reviewer Name: Luis Aguilar | | | Prep Batch Number(s): 222920 | | | | | |
| #[1] | A[2] | Description | Yes | No | NA[3] | NR[4] | ER#[5] | |
| **R1** | OI | **Chain-of-custody (C-O-C)** | | | | | | |
| | | Did samples meet the laboratory's standard conditions of sample acceptability upon receipt? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were all departures from standard conditions described in an exception report? | X | | | | | |
| **R2** | OI | **Sample and quality control (QC) identification** | | | | | | |
| | | Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the laboratory ID numbers? | X | | | | | |
| | | Are all laboratory ID numbers cross-referenced to the corresponding QC data? | X | | | | | |
| **R3** | OI | **Test reports** | | | | | | |
| | | Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? | X | | | | | |
| | | Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were calculations checked by a peer or supervisor? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were all analyte identifications checked by a peer or supervisor? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were sample detection limits reported for all analytes not detected? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were all results for soil and sediment samples reported on a dry weight basis? | | | X | | | |
| | | Were % moisture (or solids) reported for all soil and sediment samples? | | | X | | | |
| | | Were bulk soils/solids samples for volatile analysis extracted with methanol per SW-846 Method 5035? | | | X | | | |
| | | If required for the project, TICs reported? | | | X | | | |
| **R4** | O | **Surrogate recovery data** | | | | | | |
| | | Were surrogates added prior to extraction? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? | | X | | | 1 | |
| **R5** | OI | **Test reports/summary forms for blank samples** | | | | | | |
| | | Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if applicable, cleanup procedures? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were blank concentrations < MQL? | X | | | | | |
| **R6** | OI | **Laboratory control samples (LCS):** | | | | | | |
| | | Were all COCs included in the LCS? | X | | | | | |
| | | Was each LCS taken through the entire analytical procedure, including prep and cleanup steps? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were LCSs analyzed at the required frequency? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were LCS (and LCSD, if applicable) %Rs within the laboratory QC limits? | X | | | | | |
| | | Does the detectability data document the laboratory's capability to detect the COCs at the MDL used to calculate the SDLs? | X | | | | | |
| | | Was the LCSD RPD within QC limits? | X | | | | | |
| **R7** | OI | **Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) data** | | | | | | |
| | | Were the project/method specified analytes included in the MS and MSD? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were MS/MSD analyzed at the appropriate frequency? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were MS (and MSD, if applicable) %Rs within the laboratory QC limits? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were MS/MSD RPDs within laboratory QC limits? | X | | | | | |
| **R8** | OI | **Analytical duplicate data** | | | | | | |
| | | Were appropriate analytical duplicates analyzed for each matrix? | | | X | | | |
| | | Were analytical duplicates analyzed at the appropriate frequency? | | | X | | | |
| | | Were RPDs or relative standard deviations within the laboratory QC limits? | | | X | | | |
| **R9** | OI | **Method quantitation limits (MQLs):** | | | | | | |
| | | Are the MQLs for each method analyte included in the laboratory data package? | X | | | | | |
| | | Do the MQLs correspond to the concentration of the lowest non-zero calibration standard? | X | | | | | |
| | | Are unadjusted MQLs and DCSs included in the laboratory data package? | X | | | | | |
| **R10** | OI | **Other problems/anomalies** | | | | | | |
| | | Are all known problems/anomalies/special conditions noted in this LRC and ER? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were all necessary corrective actions performed for the reported data? | X | | | | | |
| | | Was applicable and available technology used to lower the SDL and minimize the matrix interference affects on the sample results? | X | | | | | |
| | | Is the laboratory NELAC-accredited under the Texas Laboratory Program for the analytes, matrices and methods associated with this laboratory data package? | X | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| Laboratory Review Checklist: Supporting Data | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Laboratory Name: ALS Laboratory Group | | | LRC Date: 01/27/2025 | | | | |
| Project Name: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | | | Laboratory Job Number: HS25010430 | | | | |
| Reviewer Name: Luis Aguilar | | | Prep Batch Number(s): 222920 | | | | |
| #[1] | A[2] | Description | Yes | No | NA[3] | NR[4] | ER#[5] |
| **S1** | OI | **Initial calibration (ICAL)** | | | | | |
| | | Were response factors and/or relative response factors for each analyte within QC limits? | X | | | | |
| | | Were percent RSDs or correlation coefficient criteria met? | X | | | | |
| | | Was the number of standards recommended in the method used for all analytes? | X | | | | |
| | | Were all points generated between the lowest and highest standard used to calculate the curve? | X | | | | |
| | | Are ICAL data available for all instruments used? | X | | | | |
| | | Has the initial calibration curve been verified using an appropriate second source standard? | X | | | | |
| **S2** | OI | **Initial and continuing calibration verification (ICCV and CCV) and continuing calibration blank (CCB)** | | | | | |
| | | Was the CCV analyzed at the method-required frequency? | X | | | | |
| | | Were percent differences for each analyte within the method-required QC limits? | X | | | | |
| | | Was the ICAL curve verified for each analyte? | X | | | | |
| | | Was the absolute value of the analyte concentration in the inorganic CCB < MDL? | | | X | | |
| **S3** | O | **Mass spectral tuning:** | | | | | |
| | | Was the appropriate compound for the method used for tuning? | X | | | | |
| | | Were ion abundance data within the method-required QC limits? | X | | | | |
| **S4** | O | **Internal standards (IS):** | | | | | |
| | | Were IS area counts and retention times within the method-required QC limits? | X | | | | |
| **S5** | OI | **Raw data** (NELAC section 1 appendix A glossary, and section 5.12 or ISO/IEC 17025 section | | | | | |
| | | Were the raw data (for example, chromatograms, spectral data) reviewed by an analyst? | X | | | | |
| | | Were data associated with manual integrations flagged on the raw data? | X | | | | |
| **S6** | O | **Dual column confirmation** | | | | | |
| | | Did dual column confirmation results meet the method-required QC? | | | X | | |
| **S7** | O | **Tentatively identified compounds (TICs):** | | | | | |
| | | If TICs were requested, were the mass spectra and TIC data subject to appropriate checks? | | | X | | |
| **S8** | I | **Interference Check Sample (ICS) results:** | | | | | |
| | | Were percent recoveries within method QC limits? | | | X | | |
| **S9** | I | **Serial dilutions, post digestion spikes, and method of standard additions** | | | | | |
| | | Were percent differences, recoveries, and the linearity within the QC limits specified in the method? | | | X | | |
| **S10** | OI | **Method detection limit (MDL) studies** | | | | | |
| | | Was a MDL study performed for each reported analyte? | X | | | | |
| | | Is the MDL either adjusted or supported by the analysis of DCSs? | X | | | | |
| **S11** | OI | **Proficiency test reports:** | | | | | |
| | | Was the laboratory's performance acceptable on the applicable proficiency tests or evaluation studies? | X | | | | |
| **S12** | OI | **Standards documentation** | | | | | |
| | | Are all standards used in the analyses NIST-traceable or obtained from other appropriate sources? | X | | | | |
| **S13** | OI | **Compound/analyte identification procedures** | | | | | |
| | | Are the procedures for compound/analyte identification documented? | X | | | | |
| **S14** | OI | **Demonstration of analyst competency (DOC)** | | | | | |
| | | Was DOC conducted consistent with NELAC Chapter 5C or ISO/IEC 4? | X | | | | |
| | | Is documentation of the analyst's competency up-to-date and on file? | X | | | | |
| **S15** | OI | **Verification/validation documentation for methods** (NELAC Chap 5 or ISO/IEC 17025 Section 5) | | | | | |
| | | Are all the methods used to generate the data documented, verified, and validated, where applicable? | X | | | | |
| **S16** | OI | **Laboratory standard operating procedures (SOPs):** | | | | | |
| | | Are laboratory SOPs current and on file for each method performed? | X | | | | |

Items identified by the letter "R" must be included in the laboratory data package submitted in the TRRP-required report(s). Items identified by the letter "S" should be retained and made available upon request for the appropriate retention period.
O = Organic Analyses; I = Inorganic Analyses (and general chemistry, when applicable);
NA = Not Applicable;
NR = Not Reviewed;
R# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked).

| Laboratory Review Checklist: Exception Reports | | |
|---|---|---|
| Laboratory Name: ALS Laboratory Group | | LRC Date: 01/27/2025 |
| Project Name: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | | Laboratory Job Number: HS25010430 |
| Reviewer Name: Luis Aguilar | | Prep Batch Number(s): 222920 |
| **ER#[5]** | **Description** | |
| 1 | Batch 222920, Semivolatiles by method SW8270, Sample WG-1620-MW11B-20250110: The surrogate recoveries could not be determined due to dilution below the calibration range.<br><br>Batch 222920, Semivolatiles by method SW8270, Samples WG-1620-MW11A-20250110, WG-1620-MW10B-20250110, WG-1620-MW10A-20250110: Surrogate recoveries were outside of the control limits due to matrix interference. 2,4,6-Tribromophenol.<br><br>Batch 222920, Semivolatiles by method SW8270, Sample WG-1620-MW10B-20250110, Surrogate recoveries were outside of the control limits due to matrix interference. | |

Items identified by the letter "R" must be included in the laboratory data package submitted in the TRRP-required report(s). Items identified by the letter "S" should be retained and made available upon request for the appropriate retention period.
O = Organic Analyses; I = Inorganic Analyses (and general chemistry, when applicable);
NA = Not Applicable;
NR = Not Reviewed;
R# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked).

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**Work Order:** HS25010430

## SAMPLE SUMMARY

| Lab Samp ID | Client Sample ID | Matrix | TagNo | Collection Date | Date Received | Hold |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HS25010430-01 | WG-1620-MW11B-20250110 | Water | | 10-Jan-2025 09:13 | 10-Jan-2025 17:25 | ☐ |
| HS25010430-02 | WG-1620-MW11A-20250110 | Water | | 10-Jan-2025 09:55 | 10-Jan-2025 17:25 | ☐ |
| HS25010430-03 | WG-1620-MW10B-20250110 | Water | | 10-Jan-2025 10:49 | 10-Jan-2025 17:25 | ☐ |
| HS25010430-04 | WG-1620-MW10A-20250110 | Water | | 10-Jan-2025 13:25 | 10-Jan-2025 17:25 | ☐ |
| HS25010430-05 | WG-1620-P12-20250110 | Water | | 10-Jan-2025 14:35 | 10-Jan-2025 17:25 | ☐ |

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-MW11B-20250110
Collection Date: 10-Jan-2025 09:13

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010430
Lab ID:HS25010430-01
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 15-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: ML |
| **Acenaphthene** | **0.14** | | **0.0027** | **0.010** | **mg/L** | 100 | 24-Jan-2025 15:05 |
| **Acenaphthylene** | **0.0023** | | **0.000015** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 23-Jan-2025 18:09 |
| **Anthracene** | **0.0056** | | **0.000014** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 23-Jan-2025 18:09 |
| **Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate** | **0.000067** | J | **0.000037** | **0.00020** | **mg/L** | 1 | 23-Jan-2025 18:09 |
| **Dibenzofuran** | **0.031** | | **0.00020** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 24-Jan-2025 12:53 |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 23-Jan-2025 18:09 |
| **Fluoranthene** | **0.014** | | **0.00010** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 24-Jan-2025 12:53 |
| **Fluorene** | **0.057** | | **0.00030** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 24-Jan-2025 12:53 |
| **Naphthalene** | **0.0077** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 23-Jan-2025 18:09 |
| Phenol | < 0.000035 | | 0.000035 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 23-Jan-2025 18:09 |
| **Pyrene** | **0.0056** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 23-Jan-2025 18:09 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *0* | *JS* | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *100* | *24-Jan-2025 15:05* |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *115* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 12:53* |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *101* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *23-Jan-2025 18:09* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *89.0* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 12:53* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *0* | *JS* | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *100* | *24-Jan-2025 15:05* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *79.0* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *23-Jan-2025 18:09* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *74.2* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *23-Jan-2025 18:09* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *0* | *JS* | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *100* | *24-Jan-2025 15:05* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *80.8* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 12:53* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *77.3* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *23-Jan-2025 18:09* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *0* | *JS* | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *100* | *24-Jan-2025 15:05* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *89.7* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 12:53* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *78.3* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 12:53* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *72.2* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *23-Jan-2025 18:09* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *0* | *JS* | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *100* | *24-Jan-2025 15:05* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *0* | *JS* | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *100* | *24-Jan-2025 15:05* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *81.0* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *23-Jan-2025 18:09* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *89.5* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 12:53* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-MW11A-20250110
Collection Date: 10-Jan-2025 09:55

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010430
Lab ID:HS25010430-02
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 15-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: ML |
| **2-Methylnaphthalene** | **0.00066** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| **Acenaphthene** | **0.0044** | | **0.000027** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.000015 | | 0.000015 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| **Anthracene** | **0.00058** | | **0.000014** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.000037 | | 0.000037 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| **Dibenzofuran** | **0.0011** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| **Fluoranthene** | **0.0011** | | **0.000010** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| **Fluorene** | **0.0010** | | **0.000030** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| **Naphthalene** | **0.0033** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| **Phenanthrene** | **0.0016** | | **0.000021** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| **Pyrene** | **0.00059** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:01 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *4.26* | *S* | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:01* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *103* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:01* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *61.0* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:01* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *108* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:01* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *86.8* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:01* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *78.8* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:01* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-MW10B-20250110
Collection Date: 10-Jan-2025 10:49

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010430
Lab ID:HS25010430-03
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 15-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: ML |
| **Acenaphthene** | **0.013** | | **0.00027** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 24-Jan-2025 13:37 |
| **Acenaphthylene** | **0.00018** | | **0.000015** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:23 |
| **Anthracene** | **0.00041** | | **0.000014** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:23 |
| **Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate** | **0.000059** | J | **0.000037** | **0.00020** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:23 |
| **Dibenzofuran** | **0.0028** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:23 |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:23 |
| **Fluoranthene** | **0.00066** | | **0.000010** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:23 |
| **Fluorene** | **0.0044** | | **0.000030** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:23 |
| **Naphthalene** | **0.0089** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:23 |
| Phenol | < 0.000035 | | 0.000035 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:23 |
| **Pyrene** | **0.00034** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:23 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *27.9* | *S* | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:23* |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *129* | *S* | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 13:37* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *103* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 13:37* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *93.6* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:23* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *85.9* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:23* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *93.7* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 13:37* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *100* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 13:37* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *91.6* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:23* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *81.0* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:23* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *91.2* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 13:37* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *89.8* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:23* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *102* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *24-Jan-2025 13:37* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-MW10A-20250110
Collection Date: 10-Jan-2025 13:25

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010430
Lab ID:HS25010430-04
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 15-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: ML |
| **2-Methylnaphthalene** | **0.0033** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:45 |
| **Acenaphthene** | **0.013** | | **0.00027** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 23-Jan-2025 18:31 |
| **Acenaphthylene** | **0.00016** | | **0.000015** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:45 |
| **Anthracene** | **0.00017** | | **0.000014** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:45 |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.000037 | | 0.000037 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:45 |
| **Dibenzofuran** | **0.0027** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:45 |
| **Fluoranthene** | **0.000072** | J | **0.000010** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:45 |
| **Fluorene** | **0.0040** | | **0.000030** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:45 |
| **Naphthalene** | **0.052** | | **0.00020** | **0.0010** | **mg/L** | 10 | 23-Jan-2025 18:31 |
| **Phenanthrene** | **0.00095** | | **0.000021** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:45 |
| **Pyrene** | **0.000040** | J | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 17-Jan-2025 16:45 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *130* | *S* | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 18:31* |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *47.9* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:45* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *94.6* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:45* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *114* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 18:31* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *106* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 18:31* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *86.1* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:45* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *119* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 18:31* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *104* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:45* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *81.6* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:45* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *101* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 18:31* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *112* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *10* | *23-Jan-2025 18:31* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *91.8* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *17-Jan-2025 16:45* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-P12-20250110
Collection Date: 10-Jan-2025 14:35

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010430
Lab ID:HS25010430-05
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | Prep:SW3510 / 15-Jan-2025 | | | Analyst: ML |
| Acenaphthene | < 0.000027 | | 0.000027 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.000015 | | 0.000015 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| Anthracene | < 0.000014 | | 0.000014 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.000037 | | 0.000037 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| Dibenzofuran | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| Fluoranthene | < 0.000010 | | 0.000010 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| Fluorene | < 0.000030 | | 0.000030 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| Naphthalene | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| Phenol | < 0.000035 | | 0.000035 | 0.00020 | mg/L | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| **Pyrene** | **0.00064** | | **0.000019** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 15-Jan-2025 21:20 |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *82.0* | | | *34-129* | *%REC* | *1* | *15-Jan-2025 21:20* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *80.8* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *15-Jan-2025 21:20* |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *78.6* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *15-Jan-2025 21:20* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *88.1* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *15-Jan-2025 21:20* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *70.4* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *15-Jan-2025 21:20* |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *84.4* | | | *20-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *15-Jan-2025 21:20* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

**Weight / Prep Log**

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010430

**Batch ID:** 222920 **Start Date:** 15 Jan 2025 11:37 **End Date:** 15 Jan 2025 11:37
**Method:** SV AQ SEP FUN EXTRACT-LOWLEV - 3510C **Prep Code:** 3510_B_LOW

| Sample ID | Container | Sample Wt/Vol | Final Volume | Prep Factor | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HS25010430-01 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |
| HS25010430-02 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |
| HS25010430-03 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |
| HS25010430-04 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |
| HS25010430-05 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010430

## DATES REPORT

| Sample ID | Client Samp ID | Collection Date | Leachate Date | Prep Date | Analysis Date | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Batch ID:** 222920 ( 0 ) | **Test Name :** LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D | | | | **Matrix:** Water | |
| HS25010430-01 | WG-1620-MW11B-20250110 | 10 Jan 2025 09:13 | | 15 Jan 2025 11:37 | 24 Jan 2025 15:05 | 100 |
| HS25010430-01 | WG-1620-MW11B-20250110 | 10 Jan 2025 09:13 | | 15 Jan 2025 11:37 | 24 Jan 2025 12:53 | 10 |
| HS25010430-01 | WG-1620-MW11B-20250110 | 10 Jan 2025 09:13 | | 15 Jan 2025 11:37 | 23 Jan 2025 18:09 | 1 |
| HS25010430-02 | WG-1620-MW11A-20250110 | 10 Jan 2025 09:55 | | 15 Jan 2025 11:37 | 17 Jan 2025 16:01 | 1 |
| HS25010430-03 | WG-1620-MW10B-20250110 | 10 Jan 2025 10:49 | | 15 Jan 2025 11:37 | 24 Jan 2025 13:37 | 10 |
| HS25010430-03 | WG-1620-MW10B-20250110 | 10 Jan 2025 10:49 | | 15 Jan 2025 11:37 | 17 Jan 2025 16:23 | 1 |
| HS25010430-04 | WG-1620-MW10A-20250110 | 10 Jan 2025 13:25 | | 15 Jan 2025 11:37 | 23 Jan 2025 18:31 | 10 |
| HS25010430-04 | WG-1620-MW10A-20250110 | 10 Jan 2025 13:25 | | 15 Jan 2025 11:37 | 17 Jan 2025 16:45 | 1 |
| HS25010430-05 | WG-1620-P12-20250110 | 10 Jan 2025 14:35 | | 15 Jan 2025 11:37 | 15 Jan 2025 21:20 | 1 |

WorkOrder: HS25010430
InstrumentID: SV-10
Test Code: 8270_LOW_W
Test Number: SW8270
Test Name: Low-Level Semivolatiles by 8270D

**METHOD DETECTION / REPORTING LIMITS**

**Matrix:** Aqueous **Units:** mg/L

| Type | Analyte | CAS | DCS Spike | DCS | MDL | PQL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | Acenaphthene | 83-32-9 | 0.000050 | 0.000034 | 0.000027 | 0.00010 |
| A | Acenaphthylene | 208-96-8 | 0.000050 | 0.000030 | 0.000015 | 0.00010 |
| A | Anthracene | 120-12-7 | 0.000050 | 0.000036 | 0.000014 | 0.00010 |
| A | Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 117-81-7 | 0.00010 | 0.000084 | 0.000037 | 0.00020 |
| A | Dibenzofuran | 132-64-9 | 0.00010 | 0.000088 | 0.000020 | 0.00010 |
| A | Di-n-butyl phthalate | 84-74-2 | 0.00010 | 0.000088 | 0.000020 | 0.00020 |
| A | Fluoranthene | 206-44-0 | 0.000050 | 0.000038 | 0.000010 | 0.00010 |
| A | Fluorene | 86-73-7 | 0.000050 | 0.000033 | 0.000030 | 0.00010 |
| A | Naphthalene | 91-20-3 | 0.000050 | 0.000037 | 0.000020 | 0.00010 |
| A | Phenol | 108-95-2 | 0.00010 | 0.000096 | 0.000035 | 0.00020 |
| A | Pyrene | 129-00-0 | 0.000050 | 0.000040 | 0.000019 | 0.00010 |
| A | 2-Methylnaphthalene | 91-57-6 | 0.00010 | 0.000083 | 0.000019 | 0.00010 |
| A | Phenanthrene | 85-01-8 | 0.000050 | 0.000039 | 0.000021 | 0.00010 |
| S | 2,4,6-Tribromophenol | 118-79-6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | 2-Fluorobiphenyl | 321-60-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | 2-Fluorophenol | 367-12-4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | 4-Terphenyl-d14 | 1718-51-0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | Nitrobenzene-d5 | 4165-60-0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | Phenol-d6 | 13127-88-3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010430

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 222920 ( 0 )** **Instrument: SV-10** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**MBLK** Sample ID: **MBLK-222920** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **15-Jan-2025 18:46**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-10_504468** SeqNo: **8634485** PrepDate: **15-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | < 0.019 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Acenaphthene | < 0.027 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.015 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Anthracene | < 0.014 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.037 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | |
| Dibenzofuran | < 0.020 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | < 0.020 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | |
| Fluoranthene | < 0.010 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Fluorene | < 0.030 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Naphthalene | < 0.020 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Phenanthrene | < 0.021 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Phenol | < 0.035 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | |
| Pyrene | < 0.019 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *3.962* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *79.2* | *34 - 129* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *3.94* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *78.8* | *40 - 125* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *4.108* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *82.2* | *20 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *4.038* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *80.8* | *40 - 135* | | | | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *3.537* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *70.7* | *41 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *4.361* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *87.2* | *20 - 120* | | | | |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010430

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 222920 ( 0 )** **Instrument: SV-10** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**LCS** Sample ID: **LCS-222920** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **15-Jan-2025 19:52**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-10_504468** SeqNo: **8634486** PrepDate: **15-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 3.337 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 66.7 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthene | 3.877 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 77.5 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthylene | 4.005 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 80.1 | 47 - 120 | | | | |
| Anthracene | 4.075 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 81.5 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 4.635 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 92.7 | 40 - 139 | | | | |
| Dibenzofuran | 4.027 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 80.5 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | 4.419 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 88.4 | 45 - 123 | | | | |
| Fluoranthene | 4.08 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 81.6 | 45 - 125 | | | | |
| Fluorene | 3.955 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 79.1 | 49 - 120 | | | | |
| Naphthalene | 3.657 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 73.1 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Phenanthrene | 3.952 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 79.0 | 45 - 121 | | | | |
| Phenol | 4.436 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 88.7 | 20 - 124 | | | | |
| Pyrene | 4.075 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 81.5 | 40 - 130 | | | | |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *4.361* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *87.2* | *34 - 129* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *3.84* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *76.8* | *40 - 125* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *3.949* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *79.0* | *20 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *3.934* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *78.7* | *40 - 135* | | | | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *3.711* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *74.2* | *41 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *4.141* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *82.8* | *20 - 120* | | | | |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010430

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 222920 ( 0 )** **Instrument: SV-10** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**MS** Sample ID: **HS25010430-05MS** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **16-Jan-2025 12:53**
Client ID: **WG-1620-P12-20250110** Run ID: **SV-10_504486** SeqNo: **8634945** PrepDate: **15-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 3.819 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 76.4 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthene | 4.683 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 93.7 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthylene | 4.826 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 96.5 | 47 - 120 | | | | |
| Anthracene | 5.053 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 101 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 5.658 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 113 | 40 - 139 | | | | |
| Dibenzofuran | 4.621 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 92.4 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | 5.457 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 109 | 45 - 123 | | | | |
| Fluoranthene | 5.242 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 105 | 45 - 125 | | | | |
| Fluorene | 4.846 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 96.9 | 49 - 120 | | | | |
| Naphthalene | 4.196 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 83.9 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Phenanthrene | 4.906 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 98.1 | 45 - 121 | | | | |
| Phenol | 5.114 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 102 | 20 - 124 | | | | |
| Pyrene | 5.447 | 0.10 | 5 | 0.6449 | 96.0 | 40 - 130 | | | | |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *5.764* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *115* | *34 - 129* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *4.755* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *95.1* | *40 - 125* | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *4.551* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *91.0* | *20 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *5.017* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *100* | *40 - 135* | | | | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *4.157* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *83.1* | *41 - 120* | | | | |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *4.797* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *95.9* | *20 - 120* | | | | |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010430

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 222920 ( 0 )** **Instrument: SV-10** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**MSD** Sample ID: **HS25010430-05MSD** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **15-Jan-2025 22:04**
Client ID: **WG-1620-P12-20250110** Run ID: **SV-10_504468** SeqNo: **8634521** PrepDate: **15-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | RPD %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 4.009 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 80.2 | 50 - 120 | 3.819 | 4.86 | 20 | |
| Acenaphthene | 4.728 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 94.6 | 45 - 120 | 4.683 | 0.949 | 20 | |
| Acenaphthylene | 4.9 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 98.0 | 47 - 120 | 4.826 | 1.53 | 20 | |
| Anthracene | 5.034 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 101 | 45 - 120 | 5.053 | 0.376 | 20 | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 5.796 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 116 | 40 - 139 | 5.658 | 2.42 | 20 | |
| Dibenzofuran | 4.859 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 97.2 | 50 - 120 | 4.621 | 5.02 | 20 | |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | 5.728 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 115 | 45 - 123 | 5.457 | 4.86 | 20 | |
| Fluoranthene | 5.208 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 104 | 45 - 125 | 5.242 | 0.651 | 20 | |
| Fluorene | 5.002 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 100 | 49 - 120 | 4.846 | 3.18 | 20 | |
| Naphthalene | 4.404 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 88.1 | 45 - 120 | 4.196 | 4.84 | 20 | |
| Phenanthrene | 4.977 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 99.5 | 45 - 121 | 4.906 | 1.44 | 20 | |
| Phenol | 5.457 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 109 | 20 - 124 | 5.114 | 6.49 | 20 | |
| Pyrene | 5.498 | 0.10 | 5 | 0.6449 | 97.1 | 40 - 130 | 5.447 | 0.928 | 20 | |
| *Surr: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol* | *5.447* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *109* | *34 - 129* | *5.764* | *5.65* | *20* | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *4.663* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *93.3* | *40 - 125* | *4.755* | *1.97* | *20* | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorophenol* | *4.839* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *96.8* | *20 - 120* | *4.551* | *6.14* | *20* | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *4.834* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *96.7* | *40 - 135* | *5.017* | *3.73* | *20* | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *4.322* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *86.4* | *41 - 120* | *4.157* | *3.89* | *20* | |
| *Surr: Phenol-d6* | *4.962* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *99.2* | *20 - 120* | *4.797* | *3.39* | *20* | |

**The following samples were analyzed in this batch:** HS25010430-01 HS25010430-02 HS25010430-03 HS25010430-04 HS25010430-05

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** **HS25010430**

**QUALIFIERS, ACRONYMS, UNITS**

| Qualifier | Description |
|---|---|
| * | Value exceeds Regulatory Limit |
| a | Not accredited |
| B | Analyte detected in the associated Method Blank above the Reporting Limit |
| E | Value above quantitation range |
| H | Analyzed outside of Holding Time |
| J | Analyte detected below quantitation limit |
| M | Manually integrated, see raw data for justification |
| n | Not offered for accreditation |
| ND | Not Detected at the Reporting Limit |
| O | Sample amount is > 4 times amount spiked |
| P | Dual Column results percent difference > 40% |
| R | RPD above laboratory control limit |
| S | Spike Recovery outside laboratory control limits |
| U | Analyzed but not detected above the MDL/SDL |

| Acronym | Description |
|---|---|
| DCS | Detectability Check Study |
| DUP | Method Duplicate |
| LCS | Laboratory Control Sample |
| LCSD | Laboratory Control Sample Duplicate |
| MBLK | Method Blank |
| MDL | Method Detection Limit |
| MQL | Method Quantitation Limit |
| MS | Matrix Spike |
| MSD | Matrix Spike Duplicate |
| PDS | Post Digestion Spike |
| PQL | Practical Quantitaion Limit |
| SD | Serial Dilution |
| SDL | Sample Detection Limit |
| TRRP | Texas Risk Reduction Program |

| Unit Reported | Description |
|---|---|
| mg/L | Milligrams per Liter |

## CERTIFICATIONS,ACCREDITATIONS & LICENSES

| Agency | Number | Expire Date |
|---|---|---|
| Arizona | AZ0793 | 27-May-2025 |
| Arkansas | 88-00356_2024 | 27-Mar-2025 |
| California | 2919; 2025 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Dept of Defense | L24-240 | 30-Apr-2026 |
| Dept of Defense | L24-239 | 30-Apr-2026 |
| Florida | E87611-38 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Illinois | 2000322023-11 | 31-Jul-2025 |
| Kansas | E-10352 2023-2024 | 31-Jul-2025 |
| Kentucky | 123043 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Louisiana | 03087 2023-2024 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Maine | 2024017 | 23-Jun-2026 |
| Michigan | 9971 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Nebraska | NE-OS-25-13 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| New Jersey | TX008 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Pennsylvania | 018 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Tennessee | 04016 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Texas | T104704231 TX-C24-00130 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Utah | TX026932023-14 | 31-Jul-2025 |

**ALS Houston, US** Date: 27-Jan-25

## Sample Receipt Checklist

**Work Order ID:** HS25010430 **Date/Time Received:** **10-Jan-2025 17:25**

**Client Name:** PBW **Received by:** **Paresh M. Giga**

| **Completed By:** | /S/ Michael Lucio | 09-Jan-2025 20:31 | **Reviewed by:** | /S/ salina zaid | 13-Jan-2025 14:00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | eSignature | Date/Time | | eSignature | Date/Time |

Matrices: **w** Carrier name: **FedEx**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Shipping container/cooler in good condition? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | Not Present ☐ |
| Custody seals intact on shipping container/cooler? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| Custody seals intact on sample bottles? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| VOA/TX1005/TX1006 Solids in hermetically sealed vials? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| Chain of custody present? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | 1 Page(s) |
| Chain of custody signed when relinquished and received? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | COC IDs:320995 |
| Samplers name present on COC? | Yes ☐ | No ☑ | |
| Chain of custody agrees with sample labels? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Samples in proper container/bottle? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Sample containers intact? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Sufficient sample volume for indicated test? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| All samples received within holding time? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Container/Temp Blank temperature in compliance? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Temperature(s)/Thermometer(s): | 0.8uc/0.8c | IR36 | |
| Cooler(s)/Kit(s): | 49467 | | |
| Date/Time sample(s) sent to storage: | 01/9/2025 1633 | | |
| Water - VOA vials have zero headspace? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | No VOA vials submitted ☑ |
| Water - pH acceptable upon receipt? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | N/A ☑ |
| pH adjusted? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | N/A ☑ |
| pH adjusted by: | | | |

Login Notes:

Client Contacted: Date Contacted: Person Contacted:

Contacted By: Regarding:

Comments:

Corrective Action:

**ALS Houston, US** Date: 27-Jan-25

## Sample Receipt Checklist

**Work Order ID:** HS25010430 **Date/Time Received:** **10-Jan-2025 17:25**

**Client Name:** PBW **Received by:** **Paresh M. Giga**

| **Completed By:** | /S/ Michael Lucio | 11-Jan-2025 12:35 | **Reviewed by:** | /S/ salina zaid | 13-Jan-2025 14:00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | eSignature | Date/Time | | eSignature | Date/Time |

Matrices: **w** Carrier name: **Client**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Shipping container/cooler in good condition? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | Not Present ☐ |
| Custody seals intact on shipping container/cooler? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| Custody seals intact on sample bottles? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| VOA/TX1005/TX1006 Solids in hermetically sealed vials? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| Chain of custody present? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | 1 Page(s) |
| Chain of custody signed when relinquished and received? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | COC IDs:320999 |
| Samplers name present on COC? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Chain of custody agrees with sample labels? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Samples in proper container/bottle? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Sample containers intact? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Sufficient sample volume for indicated test? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| All samples received within holding time? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Container/Temp Blank temperature in compliance? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Temperature(s)/Thermometer(s): | 3.8uc/3.8c | IR36 | |
| Cooler(s)/Kit(s): | 49218 | | |
| Date/Time sample(s) sent to storage: | 01/11/2025 1236 | | |
| Water - VOA vials have zero headspace? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | No VOA vials submitted ☑ |
| Water - pH acceptable upon receipt? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | N/A ☑ |
| pH adjusted? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | N/A ☑ |
| pH adjusted by: | | | |

Login Notes:

Client Contacted: Date Contacted: Person Contacted:

Contacted By: Regarding:

Comments:

Corrective Action:

Cincinnati, OH +1 513 733 5336
Fort Collins, CO +1 970 490 1511
Everett, WA +1 425 356 2600
Holland, MI +1 616 399 6070

# Chain of Custody Form

Page 1 of 1

COC ID: 320999

WSP Austin
Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works

ALS Project Manager:

| Customer Information | | Project Information | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Purchase Order | UPRR/Kevin Peterburs | Project Name | Houston TX-Wood Pres. | A | 8270-Low_W(SemiVolatile selectList ATZ |
| Work Order | PO# 4300241947 | Project Number | 1620-21-Rev05R92688 | B | 8270-Low_W(SemiVolatile selectList BTZ |
| Company Name | WSP Austin | Bill To Company | Union Pacific RailRoad | C | 8270_Low_W(ATZ&BTZ SemiVolatiles) |
| Send Report To | Manny Higa | Invoice Attn | Accounts Payable | D | |
| Address | 1601 S. MoPac Exp. Suite 325D | Address | 1400 Douglas Street Stop 0750 | E | |
| | | | | F | |
| City/State/Zip | Austin, TX, 78746 | City/State/Zip | Omaha NE 68179-0750 | G | |
| Phone | (512) 275-0593 | Phone | | H | |
| Fax | (832) 792-6659 | Fax | | I | |
| e-Mail Address | emmanuel.higa@wsp.com | e-Mail Address | arthur.gibson@ALSGlobal.com | | |

| No. | Sample Description | Date | Time | Matrix | Pres. | # Bottles | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | Hold |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | WG-1620-MW11B-20250110 | 1-10-25 | 0913 | W | 8 | 2 | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | WG-1620-MW11A-20250110 | 1-10-25 | 0955 | W | 8 | 2 | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | WG-1620-MW-10B-20250110 | 1-10-25 | 1049 | W | 8 | 2 | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | WG-1620-MW-10A-20250110 | 1-10-25 | 1325 | W | 8 | 2 | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | WG-1620-P12-20250110 | 1-10-25 | 1435 | W | 8 | 2 | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | WG-1620-P12-MS-20250110 | 1-10-25 | 1435 | W | 8 | 2 | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | WG-1620-P12-MSD-20250110 | 1-10-25 | 1435 | W | 8 | 2 | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Sampler(s) Please Print & Sign: Charles Young

Shipment Method: Hand Carry

Required Turnaround Time: (Check Box)

Results Due Date:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Relinquished by: | Date: 1-10-2025 | Time: 1601 | Received by: | Notes: | |
| Relinquished by: | Date: 1/10/25 | Time: 1725 | Received by (Laboratory): | Cooler ID | Cooler Temp. |
| Logged by (Laboratory): | Date: | Time: | Checked by (Laboratory): | 49218 | 3.8 |
| | | | | | 1236 |

QC Package: (Check One Box Below)

Preservative Key: 1-HCl 2-$HNO_3$ 3-$H_2SO_4$ 4-NaOH 5-$Na_2S_2O_3$ 6-$NaHSO_4$ 7-Other 8-4°C 9-5035

Note: 1. Any changes must be made in writing once samples and COC Form have been submitted to ALS Environmental.
2. Unless otherwise agreed in a formal contract, services provided by ALS Environmental are expressly limited to the terms and conditions stated on the reverse.
3. The Chain of Custody is a legal document. All information must be completed accurately.

10450 Stancliff Rd. Suite 210
Houston, TX 77099
T: +1 281 530 5656
F: +1 281 530 5887

January 30, 2025

Manny Higa
WSP Austin
1601 S. MoPac Expressway
Suite 325D
Austin, TX 78746

Work Order: **HS25010681**

Laboratory Results for: **Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works**

Dear Manny Higa ,

ALS Environmental received 1 sample(s) on Jan 15, 2025 for the analysis presented in the following report.

The analytical data provided relates directly to the samples received by ALS Environmental and for only the analyses requested. Results are expressed as "as received" unless otherwise noted.

QC sample results for this data met EPA or laboratory specifications except as noted in the Case Narrative or as noted with qualifiers in the QC batch information. Should this laboratory report need to be reproduced, it should be reproduced in full unless written approval has been obtained by ALS Environmental. Samples will be disposed in 30 days unless storage arrangements are made.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

**Generated By: JUMOKE.LAWAL**
Hussam Kelany

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Client:** | WSP Austin | **TRRP Laboratory Data Package Cover Page** |
| **Project:** | Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | |
| **WorkOrder:** | **HS25010681** | |

This data package consists of all or some of the following as applicable:

This signature page, the laboratory review checklist, and the following reportable data:

R1 Field chain-of-custody documentation;

R2 Sample identification cross-reference;

R3 Test reports (analytical data sheets) for each environmental sample that includes:

a) Items consistent with NELAC Chapter 5,
b) dilution factors,
c) preparation methods,
d) cleanup methods, and
e) if required for the project, tentatively identified compounds (TICs).

R4 Surrogate recovery data including:

a) Calculated recovery (%R), and
b) The laboratory's surrogate QC limits.

R5 Test reports/summary forms for blank samples;

R6 Test reports/summary forms for laboratory control samples (LCSs) including:

a) LCS spiking amounts,
b) Calculated %R for each analyte, and
c)The laboratory's LCS QC limits.

R7 Test reports for project matrix spike/matrix spike duplicates (MS/MSDs) including:

a) Samples associated with the MS/MSD clearly identified,
b) MS/MSD spiking amounts,
c) Concentration of each MS/MSD analyte measured in the parent and spiked samples,
d) Calculated %Rs and relative percent differences (RPDs), and
e) The laboratory's MS/MSD QC limits.

R8 Laboratory analytical duplicate (if applicable) recovery and precision:

a) the amount of analyte measured in the duplicate,
b) the calculated RPD, and
c) the laboratory's QC limits for analytical duplicates.

R9 List of method quantitation limits (MQLs) and detectability check sample results for each analyte for each method and matrix.

R10 Other problems or anomalies.
The Exception Report for each "No" or "Not Reviewed (NR)" item in Laboratory Review Checklist and for each analyte, matrix, and method for which the laboratory does not hold NELAC accreditation under the Texas Laboratory Accreditation Program.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Client:** | WSP Austin |
| **Project:** | Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works |
| **WorkOrder:** | **HS25010681** |

**TRRP Laboratory Data Package Cover Page**

Release Statement: I am responsible for the release of this laboratory data package. This laboratory is NELAC accredited under the Texas Laboratory Accreditation Program for all the methods, analytes and matrices reported in this data package except as noted in the Exception Reports. The data have been reviewed and are technically compliant with the requirements of the methods used, except where noted by the laboratory in the attached exception reports. By my signature below, I affirm to the best of my knowledge, all problems/anomalies, observed by the laboratory have been identified by the laboratory in the Laboratory Review Checklist, and no information affecting the quality of the data has been knowingly withheld.

Check, if applicable: [NA] This laboratory meets an exception under 30 TAC §25.6 and was last inspected by [ ] TCEQ or [ ] _____ on (enter date of last inspection). Any findings affecting the data in this laboratory data package are noted in the Exception Reports herein. The official signing the cover page of the report in which these data are used is responsible for releasing this data package and is by signature affirming the above release statement is true.

Hussam Kelany

| Laboratory Review Checklist: Reportable Data | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Laboratory Name: ALS Laboratory Group | | | LRC Date: 01/30/2025 | | | | | |
| Project Name: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | | | Laboratory Job Number: HS25010681 | | | | | |
| Reviewer Name: Hussam Kelany | | | Prep Batch Number(s): 223046 | | | | | |
| #[1] | A[2] | Description | Yes | No | NA[3] | NR[4] | ER#[5] | |
| **R1** | OI | **Chain-of-custody (C-O-C)** | | | | | | |
| | | Did samples meet the laboratory's standard conditions of sample acceptability upon receipt? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were all departures from standard conditions described in an exception report? | X | | | | | |
| **R2** | OI | **Sample and quality control (QC) identification** | | | | | | |
| | | Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the laboratory ID numbers? | X | | | | | |
| | | Are all laboratory ID numbers cross-referenced to the corresponding QC data? | X | | | | | |
| **R3** | OI | **Test reports** | | | | | | |
| | | Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times? | X | | | | | |
| | | Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values bracketed by calibration standards? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were calculations checked by a peer or supervisor? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were all analyte identifications checked by a peer or supervisor? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were sample detection limits reported for all analytes not detected? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were all results for soil and sediment samples reported on a dry weight basis? | | | X | | | |
| | | Were % moisture (or solids) reported for all soil and sediment samples? | | | X | | | |
| | | Were bulk soils/solids samples for volatile analysis extracted with methanol per SW-846 Method 5035? | | | X | | | |
| | | If required for the project, TICs reported? | | | X | | | |
| **R4** | O | **Surrogate recovery data** | | | | | | |
| | | Were surrogates added prior to extraction? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the laboratory QC limits? | X | | | | | |
| **R5** | OI | **Test reports/summary forms for blank samples** | | | | | | |
| | | Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical process, including preparation and, if applicable, cleanup procedures? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were blank concentrations < MQL? | X | | | | | |
| **R6** | OI | **Laboratory control samples (LCS):** | | | | | | |
| | | Were all COCs included in the LCS? | X | | | | | |
| | | Was each LCS taken through the entire analytical procedure, including prep and cleanup steps? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were LCSs analyzed at the required frequency? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were LCS (and LCSD, if applicable) %Rs within the laboratory QC limits? | X | | | | | |
| | | Does the detectability data document the laboratory's capability to detect the COCs at the MDL used to calculate the SDLs? | X | | | | | |
| | | Was the LCSD RPD within QC limits? | X | | | | | |
| **R7** | OI | **Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) data** | | | | | | |
| | | Were the project/method specified analytes included in the MS and MSD? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were MS/MSD analyzed at the appropriate frequency? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were MS (and MSD, if applicable) %Rs within the laboratory QC limits? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were MS/MSD RPDs within laboratory QC limits? | X | | | | | |
| **R8** | OI | **Analytical duplicate data** | | | | | | |
| | | Were appropriate analytical duplicates analyzed for each matrix? | | | X | | | |
| | | Were analytical duplicates analyzed at the appropriate frequency? | | | X | | | |
| | | Were RPDs or relative standard deviations within the laboratory QC limits? | | | X | | | |
| **R9** | OI | **Method quantitation limits (MQLs):** | | | | | | |
| | | Are the MQLs for each method analyte included in the laboratory data package? | X | | | | | |
| | | Do the MQLs correspond to the concentration of the lowest non-zero calibration standard? | X | | | | | |
| | | Are unadjusted MQLs and DCSs included in the laboratory data package? | X | | | | | |
| **R10** | OI | **Other problems/anomalies** | | | | | | |
| | | Are all known problems/anomalies/special conditions noted in this LRC and ER? | X | | | | | |
| | | Were all necessary corrective actions performed for the reported data? | X | | | | | |
| | | Was applicable and available technology used to lower the SDL and minimize the matrix interference affects on the sample results? | X | | | | | |
| | | Is the laboratory NELAC-accredited under the Texas Laboratory Program for the analytes, matrices and methods associated with this laboratory data package? | X | | | | | |

Items identified by the letter "R" must be included in the laboratory data package submitted in the TRRP-required report(s). Items identified by the letter "S" should be retained and made available upon request for the appropriate retention period.
O = Organic Analyses; I = Inorganic Analyses (and general chemistry, when applicable);NA = Not Applicable; NR = Not Reviewed;
R# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked).

| Laboratory Review Checklist: Supporting Data | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Laboratory Name: ALS Laboratory Group | | | LRC Date: 01/30/2025 | | | | |
| Project Name: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | | | Laboratory Job Number: HS25010681 | | | | |
| Reviewer Name: Hussam Kelany | | | Prep Batch Number(s): 223046 | | | | |
| #[1] | A[2] | Description | Yes | No | NA[3] | NR[4] | ER#[5] |
| **S1** | OI | **Initial calibration (ICAL)** | | | | | |
| | | Were response factors and/or relative response factors for each analyte within QC limits? | X | | | | |
| | | Were percent RSDs or correlation coefficient criteria met? | X | | | | |
| | | Was the number of standards recommended in the method used for all analytes? | X | | | | |
| | | Were all points generated between the lowest and highest standard used to calculate the curve? | X | | | | |
| | | Are ICAL data available for all instruments used? | X | | | | |
| | | Has the initial calibration curve been verified using an appropriate second source standard? | X | | | | |
| **S2** | OI | **Initial and continuing calibration verification (ICCV and CCV) and continuing calibration blank (CCB)** | | | | | |
| | | Was the CCV analyzed at the method-required frequency? | X | | | | |
| | | Were percent differences for each analyte within the method-required QC limits? | X | | | | |
| | | Was the ICAL curve verified for each analyte? | X | | | | |
| | | Was the absolute value of the analyte concentration in the inorganic CCB < MDL? | | | X | | |
| **S3** | O | **Mass spectral tuning:** | | | | | |
| | | Was the appropriate compound for the method used for tuning? | X | | | | |
| | | Were ion abundance data within the method-required QC limits? | X | | | | |
| **S4** | O | **Internal standards (IS):** | | | | | |
| | | Were IS area counts and retention times within the method-required QC limits? | X | | | | |
| **S5** | OI | **Raw data** (NELAC section 1 appendix A glossary, and section 5.12 or ISO/IEC 17025 section | | | | | |
| | | Were the raw data (for example, chromatograms, spectral data) reviewed by an analyst? | X | | | | |
| | | Were data associated with manual integrations flagged on the raw data? | X | | | | |
| **S6** | O | **Dual column confirmation** | | | | | |
| | | Did dual column confirmation results meet the method-required QC? | | | X | | |
| **S7** | O | **Tentatively identified compounds (TICs):** | | | | | |
| | | If TICs were requested, were the mass spectra and TIC data subject to appropriate checks? | | | X | | |
| **S8** | I | **Interference Check Sample (ICS) results:** | | | | | |
| | | Were percent recoveries within method QC limits? | | | X | | |
| **S9** | I | **Serial dilutions, post digestion spikes, and method of standard additions** | | | | | |
| | | Were percent differences, recoveries, and the linearity within the QC limits specified in the method? | | | X | | |
| **S10** | OI | **Method detection limit (MDL) studies** | | | | | |
| | | Was a MDL study performed for each reported analyte? | X | | | | |
| | | Is the MDL either adjusted or supported by the analysis of DCSs? | X | | | | |
| **S11** | OI | **Proficiency test reports:** | | | | | |
| | | Was the laboratory's performance acceptable on the applicable proficiency tests or evaluation studies? | X | | | | |
| **S12** | OI | **Standards documentation** | | | | | |
| | | Are all standards used in the analyses NIST-traceable or obtained from other appropriate sources? | X | | | | |
| **S13** | OI | **Compound/analyte identification procedures** | | | | | |
| | | Are the procedures for compound/analyte identification documented? | X | | | | |
| **S14** | OI | **Demonstration of analyst competency (DOC)** | | | | | |
| | | Was DOC conducted consistent with NELAC Chapter 5C or ISO/IEC 4? | X | | | | |
| | | Is documentation of the analyst's competency up-to-date and on file? | X | | | | |
| **S15** | OI | **Verification/validation documentation for methods** (NELAC Chap 5 or ISO/IEC 17025 Section 5) | | | | | |
| | | Are all the methods used to generate the data documented, verified, and validated, where applicable? | X | | | | |
| **S16** | OI | **Laboratory standard operating procedures (SOPs):** | | | | | |
| | | Are laboratory SOPs current and on file for each method performed? | X | | | | |

Items identified by the letter "R" must be included in the laboratory data package submitted in the TRRP-required report(s). Items identified by the letter "S" should be retained and made available upon request for the appropriate retention period.
O = Organic Analyses; I = Inorganic Analyses (and general chemistry, when applicable);
NA = Not Applicable; NR = Not Reviewed;
R# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked).

| Laboratory Review Checklist: Exception Reports | |
|---|---|
| Laboratory Name: ALS Laboratory Group | LRC Date: 01/30/2025 |
| Project Name: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | Laboratory Job Number: HS25010681 |
| Reviewer Name: Hussam Kelany | Prep Batch Number(s): 223046 |

| ER#[5] | Description |
|---|---|
| | No Exceptions |

Items identified by the letter "R" must be included in the laboratory data package submitted in the TRRP-required report(s). Items identified by the letter "S" should be retained and made available upon request for the appropriate retention period.
O = Organic Analyses; I = Inorganic Analyses (and general chemistry, when applicable);
NA = Not Applicable;
NR = Not Reviewed;
R# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked).

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**Work Order:** HS25010681

## SAMPLE SUMMARY

| Lab Samp ID | Client Sample ID | Matrix | TagNo | Collection Date | Date Received | Hold |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HS25010681-01 | WG-1620-MW08-20250115 | Water | | 15-Jan-2025 11:10 | 15-Jan-2025 15:10 | ☐ |

Client: WSP Austin
Project: Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
Sample ID: WG-1620-MW08-20250115
Collection Date: 15-Jan-2025 11:10

**ANALYTICAL REPORT**
WorkOrder:HS25010681
Lab ID:HS25010681-01
Matrix:Water

| ANALYSES | RESULT | QUAL | SDL | MQL | UNITS | DILUTION FACTOR | DATE ANALYZED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D** | **Method:SW8270** | | | | Prep:SW3510 / 17-Jan-2025 | | Analyst: GEY |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | < 0.000019 | | 0.000019 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| Acenaphthene | < 0.000027 | | 0.000027 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.000015 | | 0.000015 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| Anthracene | < 0.000014 | | 0.000014 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| **Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate** | **0.000065** | J | **0.000037** | **0.00020** | **mg/L** | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| Dibenzofuran | < 0.000020 | | 0.000020 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| Fluoranthene | < 0.000010 | | 0.000010 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| Fluorene | < 0.000030 | | 0.000030 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| **Naphthalene** | **0.00016** | | **0.000020** | **0.00010** | **mg/L** | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| Phenanthrene | < 0.000021 | | 0.000021 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| Pyrene | < 0.000019 | | 0.000019 | 0.00010 | mg/L | 1 | 27-Jan-2025 13:58 |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *85.5* | | | *40-125* | *%REC* | *1* | *27-Jan-2025 13:58* |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *88.5* | | | *40-135* | *%REC* | *1* | *27-Jan-2025 13:58* |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *79.4* | | | *41-120* | *%REC* | *1* | *27-Jan-2025 13:58* |

Note: See Qualifiers Page for a list of qualifiers and their explanation.

**Weight / Prep Log**

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010681

**Batch ID:** 223046 **Start Date:** 17 Jan 2025 11:25 **End Date:** 17 Jan 2025 11:25
**Method:** SV AQ SEP FUN EXTRACT-LOWLEV - 3510C **Prep Code:** 3510_B_LOW

| Sample ID | Container | Sample Wt/Vol | Final Volume | Prep Factor | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HS25010681-01 | 1 | 1000 (mL) | 1 (mL) | 0.001 | 1-liter amber glass, Neat |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010681

## DATES REPORT

| Sample ID | Client Samp ID | Collection Date | Leachate Date | Prep Date | Analysis Date | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Batch ID:** 223046 ( 0 ) | **Test Name :** LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D | | | | **Matrix:** Water | |
| HS25010681-01 | WG-1620-MW08-20250115 | 15 Jan 2025 11:10 | | 17 Jan 2025 11:25 | 27 Jan 2025 13:58 | 1 |

WorkOrder: HS25010681
InstrumentID: SV-8
Test Code: 8270_LOW_W
Test Number: SW8270
Test Name: Low-Level Semivolatiles by 8270D

**METHOD DETECTION / REPORTING LIMITS**

**Matrix:** Aqueous **Units:** mg/L

| Type | Analyte | CAS | DCS Spike | DCS | MDL | PQL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 2-Methylnaphthalene | 91-57-6 | 0.000050 | 0.000032 | 0.000019 | 0.00010 |
| A | Acenaphthene | 83-32-9 | 0.000050 | 0.000034 | 0.000027 | 0.00010 |
| A | Acenaphthylene | 208-96-8 | 0.000050 | 0.000031 | 0.000015 | 0.00010 |
| A | Anthracene | 120-12-7 | 0.000050 | 0.000035 | 0.000014 | 0.00010 |
| A | Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 117-81-7 | 0.00010 | 0.000090 | 0.000037 | 0.00020 |
| A | Dibenzofuran | 132-64-9 | 0.000050 | 0.000035 | 0.000020 | 0.00010 |
| A | Fluoranthene | 206-44-0 | 0.000050 | 0.000036 | 0.000010 | 0.00010 |
| A | Fluorene | 86-73-7 | 0.000050 | 0.000032 | 0.000030 | 0.00010 |
| A | Naphthalene | 91-20-3 | 0.000050 | 0.000033 | 0.000020 | 0.00010 |
| A | Phenanthrene | 85-01-8 | 0.000050 | 0.000037 | 0.000021 | 0.00010 |
| A | Pyrene | 129-00-0 | 0.000050 | 0.000035 | 0.000019 | 0.00010 |
| S | 2-Fluorobiphenyl | 321-60-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | 4-Terphenyl-d14 | 1718-51-0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |
| S | Nitrobenzene-d5 | 4165-60-0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00020 |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010681

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 223046 ( 0 )** **Instrument: SV-8** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**MBLK** Sample ID: **MBLK-223046** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **23-Jan-2025 19:58**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-8_504980** SeqNo: **8645291** PrepDate: **17-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | < 0.019 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Acenaphthene | < 0.027 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Acenaphthylene | < 0.015 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Anthracene | < 0.014 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | < 0.037 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | |
| Dibenzofuran | < 0.020 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Fluoranthene | < 0.010 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Fluorene | < 0.030 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Naphthalene | < 0.020 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Phenanthrene | < 0.021 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Pyrene | < 0.019 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *4.072* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *81.4* | *40 - 125* | | | | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *4.729* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *94.6* | *40 - 135* | | | | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *3.963* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *79.3* | *41 - 120* | | | | |

**LCS** Sample ID: **LCS-223046** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **23-Jan-2025 20:20**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-8_504980** SeqNo: **8645292** PrepDate: **17-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 4.332 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 86.6 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthene | 4.94 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 98.8 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthylene | 4.927 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 98.5 | 47 - 120 | | | | |
| Anthracene | 5.064 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 101 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 5.789 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 116 | 40 - 139 | | | | |
| Dibenzofuran | 4.816 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 96.3 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Fluoranthene | 5.178 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 104 | 45 - 125 | | | | |
| Fluorene | 4.871 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 97.4 | 49 - 120 | | | | |
| Naphthalene | 4.768 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 95.4 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Phenanthrene | 5.068 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 101 | 45 - 121 | | | | |
| Pyrene | 4.988 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 99.8 | 40 - 130 | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *5.059* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *101* | *40 - 125* | | | | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *5.56* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *111* | *40 - 135* | | | | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *5.146* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *103* | *41 - 120* | | | | |

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** HS25010681

**QC BATCH REPORT**

**Batch ID: 223046 ( 0 )** **Instrument: SV-8** **Method: LOW-LEVEL SEMIVOLATILES BY 8270D**

**MS** Sample ID: **HS25010657-05MS** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **27-Jan-2025 12:51**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-8_505058** SeqNo: **8646720** PrepDate: **17-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | RPD %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 3.995 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 79.9 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthene | 4.367 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 87.3 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Acenaphthylene | 4.38 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 87.6 | 47 - 120 | | | | |
| Anthracene | 4.713 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 94.3 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 5.252 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 105 | 40 - 139 | | | | |
| Dibenzofuran | 4.308 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 86.2 | 50 - 120 | | | | |
| Fluoranthene | 4.918 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 98.4 | 45 - 125 | | | | |
| Fluorene | 4.45 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 89.0 | 49 - 120 | | | | |
| Naphthalene | 4.638 | 0.10 | 5 | 0.2217 | 88.3 | 45 - 120 | | | | |
| Phenanthrene | 4.803 | 0.10 | 5 | 0.08601 | 94.3 | 45 - 121 | | | | |
| Pyrene | 4.544 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 90.9 | 40 - 130 | | | | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *4.274* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *85.5* | *40 - 125* | | | | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *5.067* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *101* | *40 - 135* | | | | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *4.134* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *82.7* | *41 - 120* | | | | |

**MSD** Sample ID: **HS25010657-05MSD** Units: **ug/L** Analysis Date: **23-Jan-2025 22:33**
Client ID: Run ID: **SV-8_504981** SeqNo: **8646721** PrepDate: **17-Jan-2025** DF: **1**

| Analyte | Result | MQL | SPK Val | SPK Ref Value | %REC | Control Limit | RPD Ref Value | RPD %RPD | RPD Limit | Qual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 3.617 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 72.3 | 50 - 120 | 3.995 | 9.92 | 20 | |
| Acenaphthene | 4.056 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 81.1 | 45 - 120 | 4.367 | 7.4 | 20 | |
| Acenaphthylene | 4.195 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 83.9 | 47 - 120 | 4.38 | 4.32 | 20 | |
| Anthracene | 4.526 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 90.5 | 45 - 120 | 4.713 | 4.05 | 20 | |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 5.088 | 0.20 | 5 | 0 | 102 | 40 - 139 | 5.252 | 3.16 | 20 | |
| Dibenzofuran | 3.999 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 80.0 | 50 - 120 | 4.308 | 7.44 | 20 | |
| Fluoranthene | 4.648 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 93.0 | 45 - 125 | 4.918 | 5.65 | 20 | |
| Fluorene | 4.089 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 81.8 | 49 - 120 | 4.45 | 8.44 | 20 | |
| Naphthalene | 4.234 | 0.10 | 5 | 0.2217 | 80.3 | 45 - 120 | 4.638 | 9.1 | 20 | |
| Phenanthrene | 4.585 | 0.10 | 5 | 0.08601 | 90.0 | 45 - 121 | 4.803 | 4.65 | 20 | |
| Pyrene | 4.409 | 0.10 | 5 | 0 | 88.2 | 40 - 130 | 4.544 | 3.01 | 20 | |
| *Surr: 2-Fluorobiphenyl* | *3.887* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *77.7* | *40 - 125* | *4.274* | *9.46* | *20* | |
| *Surr: 4-Terphenyl-d14* | *4.642* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *92.8* | *40 - 135* | *5.067* | *8.75* | *20* | |
| *Surr: Nitrobenzene-d5* | *3.888* | *0.20* | *5* | *0* | *77.8* | *41 - 120* | *4.134* | *6.15* | *20* | |

**The following samples were analyzed in this batch:** HS25010681-01

**Client:** WSP Austin
**Project:** Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works
**WorkOrder:** **HS25010681**

**QUALIFIERS, ACRONYMS, UNITS**

| Qualifier | Description |
|---|---|
| * | Value exceeds Regulatory Limit |
| a | Not accredited |
| B | Analyte detected in the associated Method Blank above the Reporting Limit |
| E | Value above quantitation range |
| H | Analyzed outside of Holding Time |
| J | Analyte detected below quantitation limit |
| M | Manually integrated, see raw data for justification |
| n | Not offered for accreditation |
| ND | Not Detected at the Reporting Limit |
| O | Sample amount is > 4 times amount spiked |
| P | Dual Column results percent difference > 40% |
| R | RPD above laboratory control limit |
| S | Spike Recovery outside laboratory control limits |
| U | Analyzed but not detected above the MDL/SDL |

| Acronym | Description |
|---|---|
| DCS | Detectability Check Study |
| DUP | Method Duplicate |
| LCS | Laboratory Control Sample |
| LCSD | Laboratory Control Sample Duplicate |
| MBLK | Method Blank |
| MDL | Method Detection Limit |
| MQL | Method Quantitation Limit |
| MS | Matrix Spike |
| MSD | Matrix Spike Duplicate |
| PDS | Post Digestion Spike |
| PQL | Practical Quantitaion Limit |
| SD | Serial Dilution |
| SDL | Sample Detection Limit |
| TRRP | Texas Risk Reduction Program |

| Unit Reported | Description |
|---|---|
| mg/L | Milligrams per Liter |

## CERTIFICATIONS,ACCREDITATIONS & LICENSES

| Agency | Number | Expire Date |
|---|---|---|
| Arizona | AZ0793 | 27-May-2025 |
| Arkansas | 88-00356_2024 | 27-Mar-2025 |
| California | 2919; 2025 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Dept of Defense | L24-240 | 30-Apr-2026 |
| Dept of Defense | L24-239 | 30-Apr-2026 |
| Florida | E87611-38 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Illinois | 2000322023-11 | 31-Jul-2025 |
| Kansas | E-10352 2023-2024 | 31-Jul-2025 |
| Kentucky | 123043 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Louisiana | 03087 2023-2024 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Maine | 2024017 | 23-Jun-2026 |
| Michigan | 9971 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Nebraska | NE-OS-25-13 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| New Jersey | TX008 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Pennsylvania | 018 | 30-Jun-2025 |
| Tennessee | 04016 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Texas | T104704231 TX-C24-00130 | 30-Apr-2025 |
| Utah | TX026932023-14 | 31-Jul-2025 |

## Sample Receipt Checklist

**Work Order ID:** HS25010681 **Date/Time Received:** **15-Jan-2025 15:10**

**Client Name:** PBW **Received by:** **Paresh M. Giga**

| **Completed By:** | /S/ Jacob Coronado | 16-Jan-2025 16:46 | **Reviewed by:** | /S/ salina zaid | 16-Jan-2025 17:36 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | eSignature | Date/Time | | eSignature | Date/Time |

Matrices: **w** Carrier name: **Client**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Shipping container/cooler in good condition? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | Not Present ☐ |
| Custody seals intact on shipping container/cooler? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| Custody seals intact on sample bottles? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| VOA/TX1005/TX1006 Solids in hermetically sealed vials? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | Not Present ☑ |
| Chain of custody present? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | 1 Page(s) |
| Chain of custody signed when relinquished and received? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | COC IDs:320567 |
| Samplers name present on COC? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Chain of custody agrees with sample labels? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Samples in proper container/bottle? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Sample containers intact? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Sufficient sample volume for indicated test? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| All samples received within holding time? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Container/Temp Blank temperature in compliance? | Yes ☑ | No ☐ | |
| Temperature(s)/Thermometer(s): | 2.5uc/2.5c | ir34 | |
| Cooler(s)/Kit(s): | 52754 | | |
| Date/Time sample(s) sent to storage: | 1/16/2025 1646 | | |
| Water - VOA vials have zero headspace? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | No VOA vials submitted ☑ |
| Water - pH acceptable upon receipt? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | N/A ☑ |
| pH adjusted? | Yes ☐ | No ☐ | N/A ☑ |
| pH adjusted by: | | | |

Login Notes:

Client Contacted: Date Contacted: Person Contacted:

Contacted By: Regarding:

Comments:

Corrective Action:

Cincinnati, OH +1 513 733 5336
Fort Collins, CO +1 970 490 1511
Everett, WA +1 425 356 2600
Holland, MI +1 616 399 6070

# Chain of Custody Form

Page 1 of 1

COC ID: 320567

HS25010681

WSP Austin
Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works

ALS Project Manager:

| Customer Information | | Project Information | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Purchase Order | UPRR/Kevin Feterburs | Project Name | Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works | A | ~~8296_LL_W(8260 Volatile Organics SS (W))~~ |
| Work Order | 4300241947 | Project Number | 1620-21-Rev0 SR 92683 | B | ~~8270_LOW_W (Semi Volatiles Select List (ATZ))~~ |
| Company Name | WSP Austin | Bill To Company | Union Pacific Railroad- A/P | C | ~~ICP_TW(ICP Arsenic)~~ |
| Send Report To | ~~Eric Metzner~~ Manny Higa | Invoice Attn | Accounts Payable | D | 8270-Low_W(Semi Volatile, Select List ATZ |
| Address | 1601 S. MoPac Expressway Suite 325D | Address | 1400 Douglas Street Stop 0750 | E | |
| | | | | F | |
| City/State/Zip | Austin, TX 78745 | City/State/Zip | Omaha NE 681790750 | G | |
| Phone | (512) ~~474-3451~~ 275-0593 | Phone | | H | |
| Fax | ~~(512) 671-3445~~ 832-792-6659 | Fax | | I | |
| e-Mail Address | ~~eric.metzner@wsp.com~~ emmanuel.higa@wsp.com | e-Mail Address | arthur.gibson@alsglobal.com | J | |

| No. | Sample Description | Date | Time | Matrix | Pres. | # Bottles | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | Hold |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | WG-1620-MW08-20250115 | 1-15-2025 | 1110 | W | 8 | 2 | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Sampler(s) Please Print & Sign: Charles Young

Shipment Method:

Required Turnaround Time: (Check Box) [X] STD 10 Wk Days [ ] 5 Wk Days [ ] 3 Wk Days [ ] 24 Hour

Results Due Date:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Relinquished by: | | Date: 1-15-2025 | Time: 1100 | Received by: | |
| Relinquished by: | | Date: 1/15/25 | Time: 1510 | Received by (Laboratory): | 1/15/25 15:10 |
| Logged by (Laboratory): | | Date: | Time: | Checked by (Laboratory): | |

Notes: UPRR HWPW 1620-21

| Cooler ID | Cooler Temp. |
|---|---|
| 52754 | 2.5° |
| 49454 | 1.0° |
| 52333 | 1.7° |

QC Package: (Check One Box Below)
- [ ] Level II Std QC
- [ ] Level III Std QC/Raw Data
- [ ] Level IV SW846/CLP
- [ ] Other
- [X] TRRP Checklist
- [ ] TRRP Level IV

Preservative Key: 1-HCl 2-$HNO_3$ 3-$H_2SO_4$ 4-NaOH 5-$Na_2S_2O_3$ 6-$NaHSO_4$ 7-Other 8-4°C 9-5035

Note: 1. Any changes must be made in writing once samples and COC Form have been submitted to ALS Environmental.
2. Unless otherwise agreed in a formal contract, services provided by ALS Environmental are expressly limited to the terms and conditions stated on the reverse.
3. The Chain of Custody is a legal document. All information must be completed accurately.

-136
C11-50

# Data Validation Report

**March 21, 2025**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **To** | Matthew Wickham (matthew.wickham@wsp.com) | **Project No.** | 12653513 06.1620 |
| **Copy to** | Jesse Orth | **DVR No.** | 97 |
| **From** | Chris G. Knight/eew | **Contact No.** | 512-777-5833 |
| **Project Name** | UPRR - Various Data Mgmt | **Email** | christopher.knight@ghd.com |
| **Subject** | Data Usability Summary<br>HWPW - Semiannual SWMU 1 Groundwater Monitoring<br>Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)/Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works<br>Houston, Texas<br>January 2025 | | |

*The services undertaken by GHD in connection with preparing this report were limited to those specifically detailed in the report and are subject to the scope limitations set out in the report.*

## 1. Scope of Data Usability Summary

This document details a Data Usability Summary (DUS) of analytical results for samples collected in support of the HWPW - Semi-Annual SWMU 1 Groundwater Monitoring at the UPRR/Houston TX-Wood Preserving Works site during January 2025. Samples were submitted to ALS Global, located in Houston, Texas and are reported in data packages HS24071389 and HS24071568. The intended use of the data is to support the HWPW - Semiannual SWMU 1 Groundwater Monitoring at the site by providing current concentrations of chemicals of concern.

Data were reviewed and validated by Chris G. Knight of GHD Services Inc. (GHD)., in accordance with Title 30 of the Texas Risk Reduction Program (TRRP) Texas Administrative Code Section 350.54 (30 TAC 350.54) as described in the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Regulatory Guidance document entitled "Review and Reporting of COC Concentration Data under TRRP", (RG-366/TRRP-13), revised May 2010, herein referred to as "TRRP-13 Guidance". Evaluation of the data was based on information obtained from the chain of custody forms, finished report forms, method blank data, recovery data from surrogate spikes/laboratory control samples (LCS)/matrix spikes (MS), field quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) samples, the laboratory review checklist (LRC), and the laboratory exception reports (ER).

A sample collection and analysis summary are presented in Table 1. This summary provides a cross-reference of field sample identification numbers and location identification. Each sample is assigned a unique field identification number.

The validated sample results are presented in Table 2. A summary of the analytical methodology is presented in Table 3. Each data packages includes a cross-reference list of field sample identifications to laboratory sample designations.

# 2. Laboratory Qualifications

The Laboratory's quality assurance program is consistent with the quality standards outlined in the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (NELAP). This laboratory was accredited under Texas Certification number # T104704231 at the time the analysis was performed, and the certificate is included in Attachment A.

# 3. Project Objectives

## 3.1 Sampling/Analytical QA/QC Objectives

The QA/QC program was designed to identify contamination resulting from the sampling, sample transport and analytical process through the analysis of a field blank sample, field duplicate sample sets, and method blanks. The QA/QC program was designed to evaluate the quality of the resulting data with respect to bias and precision through analysis of LCS and MS analyses.

# 4. Data Review/Validation Results

## 4.1 Sample Holding Time and Preservation

Samples were shipped with chains of custody and the paperwork was filled out properly. All samples were properly preserved, delivered on ice, and stored by the laboratory at the required temperature (0-6°C).

Sample chain of custody documents and analytical reports were used to determine sample holding times. All samples were prepared and analyzed within the required holding time.

## 4.2 Sample Containers

Sample containers used were certified pre-cleaned glass containers provided by the laboratory. These containers meet or exceed analyte specifications established in the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) *Specifications and Guidance for Contaminant-Free Sample Containers*.

## 4.3 Calibrations

According to the LRC, initial calibration and continuing calibration data met the criteria for the selected methods.

## 4.4 Laboratory Method Blank Analyses

Method blanks are prepared from a purified matrix and analyzed with investigative samples to determine the existence and magnitude of sample contamination introduced during the analytical procedures. As these were not discrete samples managed in the field, these blanks are not listed on the sample identification cross-reference list found in the data packages.

For this summary, laboratory method blanks were analyzed at a minimum frequency of one per analytical batch and results are reported in the laboratory data packages.

The method blank results were non-detect or below the method quantitation limit (MQL), indicating that laboratory contamination was not a factor for this investigation.

## 4.5 Internal Standard and Surrogate Spike Recoveries

Recoveries of internal standards (IS) are addressed in the LRC of the data packages. Most IS recoveries associated with the compounds of interest were acceptable per the LRC. The following outliers were noted:

i.) The semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) IS recoveries for the following samples were outside the control limit for 1,4-Dichlorobenzene, Chrysene-d12, and Perylene-d12: WG-1620-MW07-20250107, WG-1620-P10-20250107, and WG-1620-FDD1-20250107. These IS failures did not affect the target compounds, and no qualification of the data was deemed necessary.

In accordance with the methods employed, all samples, blanks, and QC samples analyzed for organic determinations are spiked with the appropriate number of surrogate compounds prior to sample extraction and analysis. Surrogate recoveries provide a means to evaluate the effects of laboratory performance on individual sample matrices. The recovery ranges established by the laboratory are adopted as the acceptance criteria for the project. Each individual surrogate compound is expected to meet the laboratory control limits. According to the TRRP-13 Guidelines, one outlying surrogate is acceptable for methods with multiple surrogate spike compounds if the recovery is at least ten percent.

Surrogate recoveries were assessed against laboratory control limits and/or the guidance in TRRP-13. Samples analyzed at elevated sample dilutions (five times or greater) were not assessed. All surrogate recoveries met the above criteria.

## 4.6 Laboratory Control Sample Analyses

LCS or LCS/laboratory control sample duplicates (LCSD) are prepared and analyzed as samples to assess the analytical efficiencies of the methods employed, independent of sample matrix effects. The relative percent difference (RPD) of the LCS/LCSD recoveries is used to evaluate analytical precision.

For this study, LCS or LCS/LCSD were analyzed at a minimum frequency of one per analytical batch.

The LCS or LCS/LCSD contained all compounds of interest. All LCS recoveries and RPDs were within the laboratory control limits, demonstrating acceptable analytical accuracy and/or precision (where applicable).

## 4.7 Matrix Spike Analyses

To evaluate the effects of sample matrices on the preparation process, measurement procedures, and accuracy of a particular analysis, samples are spiked with a known concentration of the analytes of concern and analyzed as MS/matrix spike duplicate (MSD) samples. The RPD between the MS and MSD is used to assess analytical precision.

The MS/MSD samples were spiked with all compounds of interest. All percent recoveries and RPD values were within the laboratory control limits, demonstrating acceptable analytical accuracy and precision.

The laboratory also performed additional MS/MSD analyses on non-site samples. These cannot be used to assess accuracy and precision for the site samples.

## 4.8 Field QA/QC Samples

The field QA/QC consisted of one field blank sample and two field duplicate sample sets.

### Field Blank Sample Analysis

To assess ambient conditions at the site, one field blank samples were submitted for SVOCs analysis. All results were non-detect for the compounds of interest.

### Field Duplicate Sample Analysis

To assess the analytical and sampling protocol precision, two field duplicate sample sets were collected and submitted to the laboratory, as specified in Table 1. The RPDs associated with these duplicate samples must be less than thirty percent for water samples. The RPDs are only used when sample concentrations are above the estimated regions of detection.

Field duplicate summary data are presented in Table 2. Most field duplicate results met the above criteria demonstrating acceptable sampling and analytical precision. The following outliers were noted (see Table 5):

i.) WG-1620-MW01A-20250107 and WG-1620-FD-02-20250107 were reported with variability in several SVOCs and were qualified as estimated.

## 4.9 Field Procedures

WSP USA, Inc. collected groundwater and surface water samples in accordance with their Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for sample collection.

## 4.10 Analyte Reporting

The laboratory reported detected results for each analyte down to the sample detection limit (SDL), which is defined as the method detection limit (MDL) with sample-specific adjustments for dilutions, aliquot size, volumes, etc. Positive analyte detections less than the MQL but greater than the SDL were qualified as estimated (J) in Table 2 unless qualified otherwise in this report.

All detectability check standard (DCS) results supported the laboratory MDLs.

# 5. Conclusion

Based on the assessment detailed in the foregoing, the analytical data summarized in Table 2 are usable for the purpose of supporting the HWPW - Semiannual SWMU 1 Groundwater Monitoring at the site with the specific qualifications noted herein.

Regards

**Chris G. Knight**
**NA Environmental – Mid-Con / Chemistry Data Validator / Analytical Coordinator / Chemistry Team Lead**

**Table 1**

**Sample Collection and Analysis Summary**
**HWPW - Semiannual SWMU 1 Groundwater Monitoring**
**Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)/Houston, TX-Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**
**January 2025**

| | | | | | Analysis/Parameters | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sample Identification** | **Location** | **Matrix** | **Collection Date (mm/dd/yyyy)** | **Collection Time (hr:min)** | **SVOCs** | **Comments** |
| WG-1620-P10-20250107 | P-10 | Water | 01/07/2025 | 12:25 | X | |
| WG-1620-FDD1-20250107 | P-10 | Water | 01/07/2025 | 12:25 | X | Field duplicate of P-10 |
| WG-1620-MW07-20250107 | MW-07 | Water | 01/07/2025 | 13:29 | X | |
| WG-1620-MW02-20250107 | MW-02 | Water | 01/07/2025 | 14:58 | X | |
| WG-1620-FB-01-20250107 | - | Water | 01/07/2025 | 15:30 | X | Field Blank |
| WG-1620-MW01A-20250107 | MW-01A | Water | 01/07/2025 | 15:43 | X | |
| WG-1620-FD-02-20250107 | MW-01A | Water | 01/07/2025 | 15:43 | X | Field duplicate of MW-01A |
| WG-1620-MW11B-20250110 | MW-11B | Water | 01/10/2025 | 09:13 | X | |
| WG-1620-MW11A-20250110 | MW-11A | Water | 01/10/2025 | 09:55 | X | |
| WG-1620-MW10B-20250110 | MW-10B | Water | 01/10/2025 | 10:49 | X | |
| WG-1620-MW10A-20250110 | MW-10A | Water | 01/10/2025 | 13:25 | X | |
| WG-1620-P12-20250110 | P-12 | Water | 01/10/2025 | 14:35 | X | MS/MSD |
| WG-1620-MW08-20250115 | MW-08 | Water | 01/15/2025 | 11:10 | X | |

Notes:

SVOCs - Semi-volatile Organic Compounds
MS/MSD - Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate
"-" - Not Applicable

**Table 2**

**Analytical Results Summary**
**HWPW - Semiannual SWMU 1 Groundwater Monitoring**
**Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)/Houston, TX-Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**
**January 2025**

| Location ID: | | MW-01A | MW-01A | MW-02 | MW-07 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample Name: | | WG-1620-MW01A-20250107 | WG-1620-FD-02-20250107 | WG-1620-MW02-20250107 | WG-1620-MW07-20250107 |
| Sample Date: | | 01/07/2025 | 01/07/2025 | 01/07/2025 | 01/07/2025 |
| | | | Duplicate | | |
| **Parameters** | **Unit** | | | | |
| **Semi-volatile Organic Compounds** | | | | | |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | mg/L | 0.0035 | 0.0026 | 0.0022 | <0.000019 |
| Acenaphthene | mg/L | 0.051 J | 0.033 J | <0.000027 | 0.000076 J |
| Acenaphthylene | mg/L | 0.00058 J | 0.00034 J | <0.000015 | <0.000015 |
| Anthracene | mg/L | 0.0016 J | 0.0011 J | 0.00024 | 0.000061 J |
| bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) | mg/L | 0.000059 J | <0.000037 | <0.000037 | <0.000037 |
| Di-n-butylphthalate (DBP) | mg/L | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Dibenzofuran | mg/L | 0.016 J | 0.0092 J | 0.00015 | <0.000020 |
| Fluoranthene | mg/L | 0.0025 J | 0.0017 J | 0.0014 | <0.000010 |
| Fluorene | mg/L | 0.027 J | 0.017 J | 0.0048 | <0.000030 |
| Naphthalene | mg/L | 0.00046 | 0.00036 | <0.000020 | <0.000020 |
| Phenanthrene | mg/L | 0.0033 | 0.0025 | 0.00042 | 0.000086 J |
| Phenol | mg/L | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Pyrene | mg/L | 0.0011 J | 0.00076 J | 0.00085 | <0.000019 |

**Table 2**

**Analytical Results Summary**
**HWPW - Semiannual SWMU 1 Groundwater Monitoring**
**Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)/Houston, TX-Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**
**January 2025**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Location ID:** | | **MW-08** | **MW-10A** | **MW-10B** | **MW-11A** |
| **Sample Name:** | | **WG-1620-MW08-20250115** | **WG-1620-MW10A-20250110** | **WG-1620-MW10B-20250110** | **WG-1620-MW11A-20250110** |
| **Sample Date:** | | **01/15/2025** | **01/10/2025** | **01/10/2025** | **01/10/2025** |
| **Parameters** | **Unit** | | | | |
| **Semi-volatile Organic Compounds** | | | | | |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | mg/L | <0.000019 | 0.0033 | -- | 0.00066 |
| Acenaphthene | mg/L | <0.000027 | 0.013 | 0.013 | 0.0044 |
| Acenaphthylene | mg/L | <0.000015 | 0.00016 | 0.00018 | <0.000015 |
| Anthracene | mg/L | <0.000014 | 0.00017 | 0.00041 | 0.00058 |
| bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) | mg/L | 0.000065 J | <0.000037 | 0.000059 J | <0.000037 |
| Di-n-butylphthalate (DBP) | mg/L | -- | -- | <0.000020 | -- |
| Dibenzofuran | mg/L | <0.000020 | 0.0027 | 0.0028 | 0.0011 |
| Fluoranthene | mg/L | <0.000010 | 0.000072 J | 0.00066 | 0.0011 |
| Fluorene | mg/L | <0.000030 | 0.0040 | 0.0044 | 0.0010 |
| Naphthalene | mg/L | 0.00016 | 0.052 | 0.0089 | 0.0033 |
| Phenanthrene | mg/L | <0.000021 | 0.00095 | -- | 0.0016 |
| Phenol | mg/L | -- | -- | <0.000035 | -- |
| Pyrene | mg/L | <0.000019 | 0.000040 J | 0.00034 | 0.00059 |

**Table 2**

**Analytical Results Summary**
**HWPW - Semiannual SWMU 1 Groundwater Monitoring**
**Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)/Houston, TX-Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**
**January 2025**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Location ID:** | | **MW-11B** | **P-10** | **P-10** | **P-12** |
| **Sample Name:** | | **WG-1620-MW11B-20250110** | **WG-1620-P10-20250107** | **WG-1620-FDD1-20250107** | **WG-1620-P12-20250110** |
| **Sample Date:** | | **01/10/2025** | **01/07/2025** | **01/07/2025** | **01/10/2025** |
| | | | | **Duplicate** | |
| **Parameters** | **Unit** | | | | |
| **Semi-volatile Organic Compounds** | | | | | |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | mg/L | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Acenaphthene | mg/L | 0.14 | 0.047 | 0.046 | <0.000027 |
| Acenaphthylene | mg/L | 0.0023 | <0.000015 | <0.000015 | <0.000015 |
| Anthracene | mg/L | 0.0056 | 0.0030 | 0.0033 | <0.000014 |
| bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) | mg/L | 0.000067 J | <0.000037 | <0.000037 | <0.000037 |
| Di-n-butylphthalate (DBP) | mg/L | <0.000020 | <0.000020 | <0.000020 | <0.000020 |
| Dibenzofuran | mg/L | 0.031 | 0.0035 | 0.0030 | <0.000020 |
| Fluoranthene | mg/L | 0.014 | 0.0027 | 0.0031 | <0.000010 |
| Fluorene | mg/L | 0.057 | 0.018 | 0.018 | <0.000030 |
| Naphthalene | mg/L | 0.0077 | 0.014 | 0.016 | <0.000020 |
| Phenanthrene | mg/L | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Phenol | mg/L | <0.000035 | <0.000035 | <0.000035 | <0.000035 |
| Pyrene | mg/L | 0.0056 | 0.0011 | 0.0013 | 0.00064 |

Notes:

< - Not detected at the associated reporting limit

J - Estimated concentration

"--" - Not analyzed

**Table 3**

**Analytical Methods**
**HWPW - Semiannual SWMU 1 Groundwater Monitoring**
**Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)/Houston, TX-Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**
**January 2025**

| | | | Holding Time | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Parameter** | **Method** | **Matrix** | **Collection to Extraction (Days)** | **Extraction to Analysis (Days)** |
| SVOCs | SW-846 8270D | Water | 7 | 40 |

Notes:

SVOCs - Semi-volatile Organic Compounds

Method References:

SW-846 - "Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods", SW-846, Third Edition, 1986, with subsequent revisions

**Table 4**

**Qualified Sample Data Due to Variability in Field Duplicate Results**
**HWPW - Semiannual SWMU 1 Groundwater Monitoring**
**Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)/Houston, TX-Wood Preserving Works**
**Houston, Texas**
**January 2025**

| Parameter | Analyte | RPD | Diff | Sample ID | Qualified Result | Field Duplicate Sample ID | Qualified Result | Units |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SVOCs | Acenaphthene | 42.9 | 0.018 | WG-1620-MW01A-20250107 | 0.051 J | WG-1620-FD-02-20250107 | 0.033 J | mg/L |
| | Acenaphthylene | 52.2 | 0.0002 | | 0.00058 J | | 0.00034 J | mg/L |
| | Anthracene | 37.0 | 0.0005 | | 0.0016 J | | 0.0011 J | mg/L |
| | Dibenzofuran | 54.0 | 0.0068 | | 0.016 J | | 0.0092 J | mg/L |
| | Fluoranthene | 38.1 | 0.0008 | | 0.0025 J | | 0.0017 J | mg/L |
| | Fluorene | 45.5 | 0.010 | | 0.027 J | | 0.017 J | mg/L |
| | Pyrene | 36.6 | 0.0003 | | 0.0011 J | | 0.00076 J | mg/L |

Notes:

RPD - Relative Percent Difference
Diff - Difference
SVOCs - Semi-volatile Organic Compounds
J - Estimated concentration

# Attachment A

## Laboratory NELAP Certificate

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

# Certificate of Accreditation

*Accreditation is hereby granted to*

## ALS Laboratory Group, Environmental Services Division (Houston, Texas)

10450 Stancliff Road, Suite 210
Houston, TX 77099-4338

State Lab ID: T104704231
Effective Date: 05/01/2024
Expiration Date: 04/30/2025
Document ID: TX-C24-00130

### Conditions of Accreditation

This laboratory has been found to conform with TCEQ rules and applicable standards for laboratory accreditation. The scope of accreditation is limited to the Fields of Accreditation specifically listed on the subsequent page(s) of this certificate. Accreditation is for all version of a method approved per 40 CFR 136, 40 CFR 141, and/ or 40 CFR 143. Continued accreditation requires ongoing compliance with all applicable standards and requirements.

Issued By: Kelly Keel, Executive Director Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Date Issued: 05/01/2024

**APPENDIX D**

# Waste Manifest

027082578JJK

Please print or type. Form Approved. OMB No. 2050-0039

| UNIFORM HAZARDOUS WASTE MANIFEST | 1. Generator ID Number TXD000820266 | 2. Page 1 of 1 | 3. Emergency Response Phone (888) 877-7267 | 4. Manifest Tracking Number 027082578 JJK |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**GENERATOR**

5. Generator's Name and Mailing Address: UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD C/O GHD SERVICES, INC.
9100 CENTRE POINTE DRIVE SUITE 240
WEST CHESTER, OH 45069 (414) 267-4164
Generator's Phone:

Generator's Site Address (if different than mailing address): 4910 Liberty Road, Houston, TX 77026

6. Transporter 1 Company Name: Enhanced Environmental & Emergency Services — U.S. EPA ID Number: TXR000083939

7. Transporter 2 Company Name: US Ecology — U.S. EPA ID Number: MIK593743838

8. Designated Facility Name and Site Address: US Ecology-Robstown
3277 County Rd 69
Robstown, TX 78380 (361) 387-3518
Facility's Phone:
U.S. EPA ID Number: TXD069452340

| 9a. HM | 9b. U.S. DOT Description (including Proper Shipping Name, Hazard Class, ID Number, and Packing Group (if any)) | 10. Containers No. | 10. Containers Type | 11. Total Quantity | 12. Unit Wt./Vol. | 13. Waste Codes | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| X | 1. RQ, NA3082, Hazardous Waste, liquid, n.o.s., (creosote), 9, PG III (F034) | 4 | DM | 1600 | P | F034 | 0914 | 101H |
| | 2. | | | | | | | |
| | 3. | | | | | | | |
| | 4. | | | | | | | |

14. Special Handling Instructions and Additional Information
1. Profile# 090129643-0/WR#021144
Bill to: E3 Environmental- PO Box 7, Clinton, MS 39060
Email invoices: e3admin@e3enviro.com/claraque@e3enviro.com
Job: 135-25-0018
PO: 135-2025-0145

15. GENERATOR'S/OFFEROR'S CERTIFICATION: I hereby declare that the contents of this consignment are fully and accurately described above by the proper shipping name, and are classified, packaged, marked and labeled/placarded, and are in all respects in proper condition for transport according to applicable international and national governmental regulations. If export shipment and I am the Primary Exporter, I certify that the contents of this consignment conform to the terms of the attached EPA Acknowledgment of Consent.
I certify that the waste minimization statement identified in 40 CFR 262.27(a) (if I am a large quantity generator) or (b) (if I am a small quantity generator) is true.

Generator's/Offeror's Printed/Typed Name: Anthony McMullins OBO UPRR — Signature: [signature] — Month / Day / Year:

**INT'L**

16. International Shipments ☐ Import to U.S. ☐ Export from U.S. Port of entry/exit:
Transporter signature (for exports only): Date leaving U.S.:

**TRANSPORTER**

17. Transporter Acknowledgment of Receipt of Materials

Transporter 1 Printed/Typed Name: James Henry — Signature: [signature] — Month: 4 Day: 3 Year: 25

Transporter 2 Printed/Typed Name: Richard Almaguer — Signature: [signature] — Month: 4 Day: 3 Year: 25

**DESIGNATED FACILITY**

18. Discrepancy

18a. Discrepancy Indication Space ☐ Quantity ☐ Type ☐ Residue ☐ Partial Rejection ☐ Full Rejection
Generator signed date is 4/3/25 per Anthony McMullins - JJK 4/7
Manifest Reference Number:

18b. Alternate Facility (or Generator) — U.S. EPA ID Number
Facility's Phone:

18c. Signature of Alternate Facility (or Generator) — Month / Day / Year

19. Hazardous Waste Report Management Method Codes (i.e., codes for hazardous waste treatment, disposal, and recycling systems)
1. H042 2. 3. 4.

20. Designated Facility Owner or Operator: Certification of receipt of hazardous materials covered by the manifest except as noted in Item 18a
Printed/Typed Name: Noah Eadie — Signature: [signature] — Month: 4 Day: 7 Year: 25

EPA Form 8700-22 (Rev. 12-17) Previous editions are obsolete.

DESIGNATED FACILITY TO EPA's e-MANIFEST SYSTEM

APPENDIX E

# POC Concentration vs. Time Graphs

Figure E-1
2-Methylnaphthalene Concentrations vs Time - A-TZ Unit
UPRR HWPW Facility - RCRA SWMU No. 1



Figure E-2
Dibenzofuran Concentrations vs Time - A-TZ Unit
UPRR HWPW Facility - RCRA SWMU No. 1



Figure E-3
Naphthalene Concentrations vs Time - A-TZ Unit
UPRR HWPW Facility - RCRA SWMU No. 1



Figure E-4
Dibenzofuran Concentrations vs Time - B-TZ Unit
UPRR HWPW Facility - RCRA SWMU No. 1



Figure E-5
Naphthalene Concentrations vs Time - B-TZ Unit
UPRR HWPW Facility - RCRA SWMU No. 1



**APPENDIX F**

# Updated Compliance Schedule

| ID | Task Name/Permit or CP Section No. |
|---|---|
| 1 | **Facility Management** |
| 2 | **RCRA Permit/Compliance Plan Renewal and Major Amendments** |
| 15 | Permit Revision No. 5, 6, and 7 |
| 16 | Preliminary Decision and Final Draft Permit Issued |
| 17 | Public Meeting |
| 18 | Public Comment Period |
| 19 | General Inspection Requirements (quaterly) [Permit Section III.D; Table III.D] |
| 103 | **Corrective Measures Implementation (CMI)/Response Action Plan (RAP) [CP Section VIII.F]** |
| 110 | Implement Corrective Action as detailed in RAP (pending approval of Permit Renewal/Compliance Plan) |
| 111 | **Ground-Water Monitoring Program [Permit Section VI.A.; CP Section VI.]** |
| 112 | Water Level Measurements (Semiannually) [CP Section VI.C.4.a]1 |
| 152 | Monitoring Well Inspections (Semiannually) [CP Section VI.C.4.a]1 |
| 193 | **Groundwater Sampling and Data Evaluation [CP Section VI.C.2]** |
| 244 | **Response and Reporting [Permit Section II.B.7; CP Section VII.)** |
| 245 | First Semi-Annual GW Monitoring Report - July 21 [CP Section VII.C.2] |
| 265 | Second Semi-Annual GW Monitoring Report - January 21 [CP Section VII.C.2] |




Compliance Schedule
UPRR Houston Wood Preserving Works Site
Houston, Texas

Task
Milestone
Summary
Rolled Up Task
Rolled Up Milestone
Rolled Up Progress
External Tasks
Manual Summary

APPENDIX G

# Laboratory Data QA/QC Report Checklist

**FORMER HOUSTON WOOD PRESERVING WORKS**
**LABORATORY DATA QA/QC REPORT CHECKLIST**
**ANALYTICAL REPORT HS25010364**
**March 28, 2025**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Facility Name: Former Houston Wood Preserving Works SWMU 1** | **Permit/ISW Reg No.: 50343** | **For TCEQ Use Only** |
| **Laboratory Name: ALS Environmental** | **EPA I.D. No.:** | **Project Mgr:** |
| **Reviewer Name: Gabriel Garcia** | | |
| **Date: 03/28/2025** | **Date:** | |

| Description | Status | More in Case Narrative (Check Box) | Technically Complete |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Were laboratory analyses performed by a laboratory accredited by TCEQ, whose accreditation included the matrix (ces), methods, and parameters associated with the data?<br><br>If not was an explanation given in the Case-Narrative (e.g., laboratory exemption, accreditation for method /parameter not available from TCEQ)? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 2. Was a Case Narrative from laboratory (QC data description summary) submitted with the data set? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 3. Are the sample collection, preparation and analyses methods listed in the permit, preparation and analysis methods listed in the permit or other documents specifying criteria the ones used on the final report? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 4. Were there any modifications to the sample collection, preparation and/or analytical methodology (ies)?<br>If so was the description included on the Case-Narrative? | **Yes☐ No☒ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 5. Were all samples prepared and analyzed within required holding times? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 6. Were samples properly preserved according to method and QAPP requirements? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |

| Description | Status | More in Case Narrative (Check Box) | Technically Complete |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Have the method detection limits (MDL) and/or practical quantitation limit (PQL) been defined in the final report? Note: NELAC uses terms limit of detection (LOD) and Limit of Quantitation respectively. | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 8. Do parameters listed on final report match regulatory parameters of concern (POC) specified in permit and/or Waste Analysis Plan or other required document?<br>Note: POC may also be referred to chemicals of concern (COCs) | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 9. Are the POCs included within the analytical methods target analyte list? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 10. Were the appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | |
| 11. Did any blank samples contain POC concentrations >5x or 10x of MDL?<br>If so, please explain potential bias? | **Yes☐ No☒ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 12. Were method blanks taken through the entire preparation and analytical process? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 13. Did the calibration curve and continuing calibration verification meet regulatory (e.g. NELAC Standards) method specifications (No. of standards, acceptance criteria, etc.)? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 14. Do the initial calibration standards include a concentration below the regulatory limit/decision level? If not please explain?<br>If an MDL and PQL are each used on a report then the relationship between the two must be defined for each method. | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 15. Were manual peak integrations performed?<br>If so pre and post chromatograms and method change histories may be requested? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 16. Were all results bracketed by a lower and upper range calibration standard? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 17. Was any result reported outside of the range of the calibration standards? | **Yes☐ No☒ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 18. Were all matrix spike (MS) and MS duplicate (MSD) recoveries within the data decision making goals of QC data in the RCRA/UIC QAPP and/or within the laboratories control charts?<br>If not were data flagged with explanation in case narrative? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 19. Were all of the MS and MSD relative percent differences (RPDs) within the data decision making goals of QC data in the RCRA/UIC QAPP? If not were data flagged with explanation in case narrative? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 20. Were all laboratory control sample (LCS) recoveries at least within the MS and MSD ranges of recoveries and within laboratories control charts? If not were data flagged with explanation in Case Narrative? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |

| Description | Status | More in Case Narrative (Check Box) | Technically Complete |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21. Were all POCs (COCs) in the LCS? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 22. Were the MS and MSD from samples collected for this work order or other samples in the analytical batch as defined by the NELAC Standards? *This information is used to identify factors contributing to matrix interferences. It should not be assumed, unless it is understood by the laboratory, that samples relating to this report were the ones selected to be fortified with the POCs.* | **Yes☐ No☒ NA☐** | ☒ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 23. Were any of the samples diluted? If so were appropriate calculations made to the MDL and/or PQL of the final report? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |

## LABORATORY DATA REPORT QA/QC CHECKLIST
## LABORATORY CASE-NARRATIVE
## (To accompany laboratory checklist)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Facility Name: Former Houston Wood Preserving Works SWMU 1** | **Permit/ISW Reg No.: 50343** |
| **Laboratory Name: ALS Environmental** | **EPA I.D. No.:** |

| Method No. | Non-conformance Description | Method Modification Description |
|---|---|---|
| SW8270 | LCS/LCSD were analyzed and reported in lieu of an MS/MSD for this batch. The batch quality control criteria were met. | |
| SW8270 | Internal standard recoveries for 1,4-Dichlorobenzene, Chrysene-d12, and Perylene-d12 were outside the control limit. Internal standard failures did not affect target analyte, no qualification necessary. | |

**FORMER HOUSTON WOOD PRESERVING WORKS**
**LABORATORY DATA QA/QC REPORT CHECKLIST**
**ANALYTICAL REPORT HS25010430**
**March 28, 2025**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Facility Name: Former Houston Wood Preserving Works SWMU 1** | **Permit/ISW Reg No.: 50343** | **For TCEQ Use Only** |
| **Laboratory Name: ALS Environmental** | **EPA I.D. No.:** | **Project Mgr:** |
| **Reviewer Name: Gabriel Garcia** | | |
| **Date: 3/28/2025** | **Date:** | |

| Description | Status | More in Case Narrative (Check Box) | Technically Complete |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Were laboratory analyses performed by a laboratory accredited by TCEQ, whose accreditation included the matrix (ces), methods, and parameters associated with the data?<br><br>If not was an explanation given in the Case-Narrative (e.g., laboratory exemption, accreditation for method /parameter not available from TCEQ)? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 2. Was a Case Narrative from laboratory (QC data description summary) submitted with the data set? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 3. Are the sample collection, preparation and analyses methods listed in the permit, preparation and analysis methods listed in the permit or other documents specifying criteria the ones used on the final report? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 4. Were there any modifications to the sample collection, preparation and/or analytical methodology (ies)?<br>If so was the description included on the Case-Narrative? | **Yes☐ No☒ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 5. Were all samples prepared and analyzed within required holding times? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 6. Were samples properly preserved according to method and QAPP requirements? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |

| Description | Status | More in Case Narrative (Check Box) | Technically Complete |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Have the method detection limits (MDL) and/or practical quantitation limit (PQL) been defined in the final report? Note: NELAC uses terms limit of detection (LOD) and Limit of Quantitation respectively. | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 8. Do parameters listed on final report match regulatory parameters of concern (POC) specified in permit and/or Waste Analysis Plan or other required document?<br>Note: POC may also be referred to chemicals of concern (COCs) | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 9. Are the POCs included within the analytical methods target analyte list? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 10. Were the appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | |
| 11. Did any blank samples contain POC concentrations >5x or 10x of MDL?<br>If so, please explain potential bias? | **Yes☐ No☒ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 12. Were method blanks taken through the entire preparation and analytical process? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 13. Did the calibration curve and continuing calibration verification meet regulatory (e.g. NELAC Standards) method specifications (No. of standards, acceptance criteria, etc.)? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 14. Do the initial calibration standards include a concentration below the regulatory limit/decision level? If not please explain?<br>If an MDL and PQL are each used on a report then the relationship between the two must be defined for each method. | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 15. Were manual peak integrations performed?<br>If so pre and post chromatograms and method change histories may be requested? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 16. Were all results bracketed by a lower and upper range calibration standard? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 17. Was any result reported outside of the range of the calibration standards? | **Yes☐ No☒ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 18. Were all matrix spike (MS) and MS duplicate (MSD) recoveries within the data decision making goals of QC data in the RCRA/UIC QAPP and/or within the laboratories control charts?<br>If not were data flagged with explanation in case narrative? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 19. Were all of the MS and MSD relative percent differences (RPDs) within the data decision making goals of QC data in the RCRA/UIC QAPP? If not were data flagged with explanation in case narrative? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 20. Were all laboratory control sample (LCS) recoveries at least within the MS and MSD ranges of recoveries and within laboratories control charts? If not were data flagged with explanation in Case Narrative? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |

| Description | Status | More in Case Narrative (Check Box) | Technically Complete |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21. Were all POCs (COCs) in the LCS? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 22. Were the MS and MSD from samples collected for this work order or other samples in the analytical batch as defined by the NELAC Standards? *This information is used to identify factors contributing to matrix interferences. It should not be assumed, unless it is understood by the laboratory, that samples relating to this report were the ones selected to be fortified with the POCs.* | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 23. Were any of the samples diluted? If so were appropriate calculations made to the MDL and/or PQL of the final report? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |

## LABORATORY DATA REPORT QA/QC CHECKLIST
## LABORATORY CASE-NARRATIVE
## (To accompany laboratory checklist)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Facility Name: Former Houston Wood Preserving Works SWMU 1** | **Permit/ISW Reg No.: 50343** |
| **Laboratory Name: ALS Environmental** | **EPA I.D. No.:** |

| Method No. | Non-conformance Description | Method Modification Description |
|---|---|---|
| SW8270 | Sample WG-1620-MW11B-20250110: The surrogate recoveries could not be determined due to dilution below the calibration range. | |
| SW8270 | Samples WG-1620-MW11A-20250110, WG-1620-MW10B-20250110, WG-1620-MW10A-20250110: Surrogate recoveries were outside of the control limits due to matrix interference. 2,4,6-Tribromophenol. | |
| SW8270 | Sample WG-1620-MW10B-20250110, Surrogate recoveries were outside of the control limits due to matrix interference. | |

**FORMER HOUSTON WOOD PRESERVING WORKS**
**LABORATORY DATA QA/QC REPORT CHECKLIST**
**ANALYTICAL REPORT HS25010681**
**March 28, 2025**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Facility Name: Former Houston Wood Preserving Works SWMU 1** | **Permit/ISW Reg No.: 50343** | **For TCEQ Use Only** |
| **Laboratory Name: ALS Environmental** | **EPA I.D. No.:** | **Project Mgr:** |
| **Reviewer Name: Gabriel Garcia** | | |
| **Date: 03/28/2025** | **Date:** | |

| Description | Status | More in Case Narrative (Check Box) | Technically Complete |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Were laboratory analyses performed by a laboratory accredited by TCEQ, whose accreditation included the matrix (ces), methods, and parameters associated with the data?<br><br>If not was an explanation given in the Case-Narrative (e.g., laboratory exemption, accreditation for method /parameter not available from TCEQ)? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 2. Was a Case Narrative from laboratory (QC data description summary) submitted with the data set? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 3. Are the sample collection, preparation and analyses methods listed in the permit, preparation and analysis methods listed in the permit or other documents specifying criteria the ones used on the final report? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 4. Were there any modifications to the sample collection, preparation and/or analytical methodology (ies)?<br>If so was the description included on the Case-Narrative? | **Yes☐ No☒ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 5. Were all samples prepared and analyzed within required holding times? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 6. Were samples properly preserved according to method and QAPP requirements? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |

| Description | Status | More in Case Narrative (Check Box) | Technically Complete |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Have the method detection limits (MDL) and/or practical quantitation limit (PQL) been defined in the final report? Note: NELAC uses terms limit of detection (LOD) and Limit of Quantitation respectively. | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 8. Do parameters listed on final report match regulatory parameters of concern (POC) specified in permit and/or Waste Analysis Plan or other required document?<br>Note: POC may also be referred to chemicals of concern (COCs) | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 9. Are the POCs included within the analytical methods target analyte list? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 10. Were the appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | |
| 11. Did any blank samples contain POC concentrations >5x or 10x of MDL?<br>If so, please explain potential bias? | **Yes☐ No☒ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 12. Were method blanks taken through the entire preparation and analytical process? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 13. Did the calibration curve and continuing calibration verification meet regulatory (e.g. NELAC Standards) method specifications (No. of standards, acceptance criteria, etc.)? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 14. Do the initial calibration standards include a concentration below the regulatory limit/decision level? If not please explain?<br>If an MDL and PQL are each used on a report then the relationship between the two must be defined for each method. | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 15. Were manual peak integrations performed?<br>If so pre and post chromatograms and method change histories may be requested? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 16. Were all results bracketed by a lower and upper range calibration standard? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 17. Was any result reported outside of the range of the calibration standards? | **Yes☐ No☒ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 18. Were all matrix spike (MS) and MS duplicate (MSD) recoveries within the data decision making goals of QC data in the RCRA/UIC QAPP and/or within the laboratories control charts?<br>If not were data flagged with explanation in case narrative? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 19. Were all of the MS and MSD relative percent differences (RPDs) within the data decision making goals of QC data in the RCRA/UIC QAPP? If not were data flagged with explanation in case narrative? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 20. Were all laboratory control sample (LCS) recoveries at least within the MS and MSD ranges of recoveries and within laboratories control charts? If not were data flagged with explanation in Case Narrative? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐**<br>**Yes☐ No☐ NA☒** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |

| Description | Status | More in Case Narrative (Check Box) | Technically Complete |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21. Were all POCs (COCs) in the LCS? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 22. Were the MS and MSD from samples collected for this work order or other samples in the analytical batch as defined by the NELAC Standards? *This information is used to identify factors contributing to matrix interferences. It should not be assumed, unless it is understood by the laboratory, that samples relating to this report were the ones selected to be fortified with the POCs.* | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |
| 23. Were any of the samples diluted? If so were appropriate calculations made to the MDL and/or PQL of the final report? | **Yes☒ No☐ NA☐** | ☐ | **Yes☐ No☐ NA☐** |

## LABORATORY DATA REPORT QA/QC CHECKLIST
## LABORATORY CASE-NARRATIVE
## (To accompany laboratory checklist)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Facility Name: Former Houston Wood Preserving Works SWMU 1** | **Permit/ISW Reg No.: 50343** |
| **Laboratory Name: ALS Environmental** | **EPA I.D. No.:** |

| Method No. | Non-conformance Description | Method Modification Description |
|---|---|---|
| SW8270 | | |
| SW8270 | | |