February 28, 2006

Mr. Mark Riggle
Project Manager
Voluntary Cleanup Section
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Mail Code 221
12118 North IH 35, Building D
Austin, Texas 78753
P

Project No. 0043480

Subject: First Quarter 2006 Monitoring Data Transmittal

Former Cameron Iron Works Facility, Houston, Texas

VCP No. 221

Dear Mr. Riggle:

On behalf of Cooper Cameron Corporation (Cooper Cameron), Environmental Resources Management (ERM) is providing this transmittal of surface water and ground water data collected on January 17, 2006 for your records. A total of five samples were collected at one surface water sample location (SWD-14) and four monitor well locations (MW-70, MW-81, MW-93 and MW-125) and analyzed for the site-specific constituents of concern (COCs). These sample locations are located in the residential neighborhood south of the Former Cameron Iron Works Facility (the facility). This quarterly sampling event was performed at these locations because the results for October 2005 exceeded the following trigger levels:

- 80% of the critical Protective Concentration Level (PCL) at SWD-14;
- the method quantitation limit (MQL) at MW-70; and
- the critical PCL at MW-81, MW-93 and MW-125.

The following discussion presents the results from the January 17, 2006 sampling event for each location and a recommendation for the appropriate course of action.

SWD-14

The COCs analyzed in the surface water sample collected at SWD-14 were reported as *Not Detected* above the MQL with one exception. 1,1-dichloroethene had a reported concentration of 0.0083 mg/L above a MQL of 0.0050 mg/L (Attachment 1, Table 1). 1,1-dichloroethane had an estimated concentration of 0.0014 mg/L below a MQL of 0.0050 mg/L (indicated by a J qualifier in the laboratory report, Attachment 2). These concentrations are below the 80% critical PCL; therefore, it is proposed that the surface water sampling at this location return to the semiannual sampling schedule. The next semiannual sampling event is scheduled for April 2006.

Environmental Resources Management

15810 Park Ten Place Suite 300 Houston, Texas 77084 (281) 600-1000 (281) 600-1001 (fax)



February 28, 2006 Mr. Mark Riggle Texas commission on Environmental Quality Page 2

MW-70

The reported concentrations at MW-70 for 1,1-dichloroethane, 1,1-dichloroethene, cis-1,2-dichloroethene, and trichloroethene were 0.011 mg/L, 0.0032 mg/L, 0.0065 mg/L, and 0.0011 mg/L, respectively. The reported concentrations for the COCs do not exceed the critical PCLs. 1,1-dichloroethene and trichloroethene have estimated concentrations (indicated by a J qualifiers in the laboratory report, Attachment 2) below MQLs of 0.0050 mg/L. The reported concentrations for 1,1-dichloroethane and cis-1,2-dichloroethene at MW-70 are above the MQL of 0.0050 mg/L (Attachment 1, Table 2). The reported concentrations at MW-70 have been stable or decreasing over time.

MW-70 is located approximately 200 feet south of the I-10 feeder road on Buckingham Drive. It is possible that the concentrations are related to ground water flow conditions from subsurface construction and dewatering activities related to the expansion of Interstate 10. For a response action, Cooper Cameron will continue quarterly monitoring for the chemicals of concern (COCs) at MW-70. The quarterly sampling events would be completed in April 2006 and July 2006, unless further action is necessary.

MW-81

The constituents analyzed in the ground water sample collected at MW-81 were reported as *Not Detected* above the MQLs (Attachment 1, Table 2). It is proposed that the ground water sampling at this location return to the semiannual sampling schedule. The next semiannual sampling event will be in April 2006.

MW-93

The constituents analyzed in the ground water sample collected at MW-93 were reported as *Not Detected* above the MQLs with one exception. Tetrachloroethene had a reported concentration of 0.087 mg/L (Attachment 1, Table2). This concentration is in exceedance of the 0.0050 mg/L critical PCL for tetrachloroethene. The reported concentrations at MW-91 have been stable or decreasing over time.

As a response action, Cooper Cameron injected a chemical oxidant (potassium permanganate) in the vicinity (six injection wells) of MW-93, on September 21, 2005, to address the elevated concentration of tetrachloroethene. Cooper Cameron will continue quarterly monitoring for tetrachloroethene at MW-93.

February 28, 2006 Mr. Mark Riggle Texas commission on Environmental Quality Page 3

MW-125

The reported concentration at MW-125 for tetrachloroethene was 0.0062 mg/L (Attachment 1, Table 2). This concentration is in exceedance of the 0.0050 mg/L critical PCL for tetrachloroethene by a trace level. The remaining constituents were reported as *Not Detected* above the MQLs. The reported concentrations at MW-125 have decreased from October 2005 to January 2006.

For a response action, Cooper Cameron will continue quarterly monitoring for the COCs at MW-125. The quarterly sampling events would be completed in April 2006 and July 2006, unless further action is necessary.

Conclusion

Cooper Cameron will transmit a summary of the data for the quarterly sampling events to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality within 30 days after it receives a Final Laboratory Report.

As described in the past, the reported concentrations at MW-93 and MW-125 are not associated with a release from the facility. Despite this fact, Cooper Cameron will follow the plan outlined in the approved Response Action Plan.

Please contact Mr. Ted Fasting of Cooper Cameron Corporation at (713) 513-3325 or me at (218) 600-1074 with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Environmental Resources

Gregory J. Wheeler, P.G

GJW/rjp Attachments

cc: Ted Fasting, Cooper Cameron Corporation
Bruce Himmelreich, Cooper Cameron Corporation, (without attachments)
Paul Stefan, Environmental Resources Management (Houston)
Marsha Hill, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Region X II
Robin Morse, Crain, Caton & James (without attachments)
Alan Feinsilver, Creekstone Builders Inc.

Tables

Attachment 1

February 28, 2006 Project No. 0043480

Environmental Resources Management 15810 Park Ten Place, Suite 300 Houston, Texas 77084

(281) 600-1000

TABLE 1

Summary of Surface Water Data First Quarter 2006 Monitoring Data Transmittal

Former Cameron Iron Works Facility Houston, Texas

	: 0	; (;	!	
	80% Critical	Critical	Location:	-dws	14
Constituent	PCL (a)	PCLs (a)	Date:	10/27/2005	1/17/2006
1,1-Dichloroethane	4.10	5.13		0.0083	0.0014
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.05	90'0		0.054	0.0083
1,2-Dichloroethane	0.443	0.554		ND (0.0050)	ND (0.0050)
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	7.49	9.36		0.0020	ND (0.0050)
Tetrachloroethene	0.632	0.790		0.0037 J	ND (0.0050)
Trichloroethene	0.888	1.110		0.0043 J	ND (0.0050)
Vinyl Chloride	0.0269	0.0336		0.0063 ND (0.0020)	ND (0.0020)

NOTES:

The reported concentrations are in mg/L.

ND (0.0050) = Not Defected above the method quantitation limit given in parentheses.

J = Estimated data, the reported sample concentration is below the quanititation limit.

Bold value indicates an exceedence of the 80% critical Protective Concentration Level (PCL).

(a) Taken from the critical PCLs calculated in the Human Health Ecological Risk Assessment for Surface Water and Sediment, dated June 2003.

SWD = Surface Water Harris County Flood Control Ditch.

TABLE 2

First Quarter 2006 Monitoring Data Transmittal Summary of Monitor Well Ground Water Data

Former Cameron Iron Works Facility Houston, Texas

	1/17/2006 ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050)
1/17/2006 ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050)	MW-125 32 11/22/2005 ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050)
MW-81 28 11/22/2005 ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050)	10/27/2005 ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050)
10/26/2005 0.094 0.011 ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) J ND (0.0050) 0.0039	7/19/2006 ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050)
1/17/2006 0.011 0.0032 ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) 0.0011 ND (0.0020)	43 11/22/2005 ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050)
NWV-70 25 10/26/2005 0.0035 J ND (0.0050) 0.0073 ND (0.0050) 0.0012 J ND (0.0020)	10/27/2005 ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050) ND (0.0050)
Location: Depth: (b) Date:	Location: Depth: (b) Date:
Critical PCLs (a) 2.4 0.0070 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050	Critical PCLs (a) 2.4 0.0070 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050
MQL 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050	MQL 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050 0.0050
Constituent 1,1-Dichloroethane 1,1-Dichloroethane 1,2-Dichloroethane cis-1,2-Dichloroethene Tetrachloroethene Trichloroethene	Constituent 1,1-Dichloroethane 1,1-Dichloroethane 1,2-Dichloroethane cis-1,2-Dichloroethene Tetrachloroethene Trichloroethene Vinyl Chloride

NOTES:

0.039 = exceedance of TCEQ Texas Risk Reduction Program (TRRP) Tier 1 Residential Class 2 Groundwater critical PCLs.

Bold values exceed the MQL.

The reported concentrations are in mg/L.

ND (0.0050) = Not Detected above the method quantitation limit given in parentheses.

MQL = Method Quantitation Limit.

(a) TCEQ Texas Risk Reduction Program (TRRP) Tier 1 Residential Class 2 Groundwater PCLs, 30-acre source area, Table 3, table for TRRP Rule dated April 12, 2005.

(b) The sample depths are reported in feet below ground surface.
 J = Estimated data, the reported sample concentration is below the sample quantitation limit.

Data Usability Summary and Laboratory Report

Attachment 2

February 28, 2006 Project No. 0043480

Environmental Resources Management 15810 Park Ten Place, Suite 300 Houston, Texas 77084 (281) 600-1000

Attachment 2

Data Usability Summary (0601187) First Quarter 2006 Monitoring Event

Former Cameron Iron Works Facility Houston, Texas

Environmental Resources Management Southwest, Inc. (ERM) reviewed a laboratory analytical data package (0601187) from e-Lab Analytical, Inc. of Houston, Texas for the analysis of five ground water samples and one surface water sample collected on January 17, 2006 at the Former Cameron Iron Works Site in Houston, Texas (the facility). Data were reviewed to assess conformance with the requirements of the *Review and Reporting of COC Concentration Data* TRRP-13 (December 2002), and adherence to project data quality objectives.

Purpose of Sampling Event: Quarterly sampling event to monitor select VOCs beneath and downgradient of the facility.

The data generated were evaluated in terms of representativeness, precision, accuracy, completeness and comparability.

Analysis requested included:

SW-846 8260 – Volatile Organic Compounds by Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry (GC/MS)

Data were reviewed and validated as described in the TRRP-13 Guidance Document and the results of the review/validation are discussed in this Data Usability Summary (DUS).

Introduction

One surface water sample and five ground water samples including one duplicate and were collected and analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs). One field blank was collected. A trip blank, rinsate blank, and equipment blank were not provided to the laboratory for analysis. Table 1 lists the sample identifications cross-referenced to laboratory identifications.

Data Review / Validation Results

Analytical Results

Sample data is reported in mg/L for ground water samples. *Not Detected* results are reported as less than the value of the sample quantitation limit as defined by the TRRP rule. Method detection limits (MDLs) and method quantitation limits (MQLs) were also provided as part of the analytical results.

Preservation and Holding Times

The samples were evaluated for agreement with the chain-of-custody (COC). The samples were received in the appropriate containers and in good condition with the paperwork filled out properly. Sample receipt temperature was within the acceptance criteria of 4 +/- 2 degrees C. The samples were preserved in the field as specified in SW-846 TABLE 2-36. Samples were prepared and analyzed within holding times as specified in SW-846 TABLE 2-36.

Calibrations and Tunes

Initial and continuing calibration verification was within method acceptance limits for the VOC analysis as per the laboratory review checklist (LRC). The LRC also documented satisfactory instrument performance calibrations (GC/MS tunes) for the VOC analysis.

Blanks

VOCs were reported as Not Detected in the method blank and the field blank.

Surrogate Recoveries

VOC sample surrogate recoveries were within the laboratory control limits.

Internal Standards

According to the LRC, the internal standards were within method-required limits.

Laboratory Control Samples

The laboratory control sample/ laboratory control sample duplicates (LCS/LCSD) recoveries met the laboratory-defined acceptable ranges for VOCs.

Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The MS/MSD sample was not project related for Batch (0601187); therefore, the MS/MSD was not assessed.

Field Precision

One field duplicate sample was collected during this sampling event (MW-93/ DUP-011706). Sample MW-93 and duplicate sample DUP-011706 were reported as detected for tetrachloroethene. The sample/duplicate precision comparison had RPD less than the 20% acceptance criteria for the compounds listed. Sample/duplicate precision calculations are included in Table 2.

Field Procedures

The samples were collected using documented sampling procedures.

SUMMARY

The data quality objectives and characteristics (i.e., representativeness, precision and accuracy, completeness, and comparability) for the project were met. Therefore, the ground water analytical data are useable for the purpose of providing current data on concentrations of chemicals of concern (COCs) in the ground water beneath and downgradient of the Former Cameron Iron Works Facility.

TABLE 1

Cross Reference Field Sample Identifications and Laboratory Identifications

Field ID	Laboratory ID	
SWD-14	0601187-01	
MW-81	0601187-02	
MW-70	0601187-03	
MW-93	0601187-04	
FB-011706	0601187-05	
MW-125	0601187-06	
Dup-011706	0601187-07	

TABLE 2

Field Precision

Field Identification	Analyte	Sample Result	Duplicate Result	RPD	Qualified
SWD-14/Dup-011706	tetrachloroethene	0.087	0.091	4.494	A
Notes:					
Values are in mg/L. RPD = $((SR-DR)*200)/$	(SR+DR).				



10450 Standiff Rd, Suite 210 Houston, Texas 77099-4338 281-530-5656 Fax 281-530-5887

February 01, 2006

Greg Wheeler ERM - Southwest, Inc. 15810 Park Ten Place Suite 300 Houston, TX 77084

Tel: (281) 600-1000 Fax: (281) 600-1001

Re: Cameron Iron Works Work Order: 0601187

Dear Greg Wheeler,

e-Lab Analytical, Inc. received 7 samples on 1/18/2006 7:00:00 AM for the analyses presented in the following report.

The analytical data provided relates directly to the samples received by e-Lab Analytical, Inc. 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 e-Lab Analytical, Inc. Samples will be disposed in 30 days unless storage arrangements are made.

The total number of pages in this report is 19.

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

Sincerely,

Electronically approved by: Patrina A. Dathorne

Lora Terrill

Lora Terrill

VP Lab Operations

Certificate No: LA 03087

Laboratory Data Package Cover Page

This data package consists of:

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 5.13 or ISO/IEC 17025 Section 5.10
 - 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) for each analyte for each method and matrix;?
- R10 Other problems or anomalies.

The Exception Report for every "No" or "Not Reviewed (NR)" item in laboratory review checklist.

Release Statement: I am responsible for the release of this laboratory data package. This data package has been reviewed by the laboratory and is complete and 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 as having the potential to affect the quality of the data, have been identified by the laboratory in the Laboratory Review Checklist, and no information or data have been knowingly withheld that would affect the quality of the data.

Check, if applicable: [NA] This laboratory is an in-house laboratory controlled by the person responding to rule. The official signing the cover page of the rule-required report (for example, the APAR) in which these data are used is responsible for releasing this data package and is by signature affirming the above release statement is true.

e-Lab Analytical, Inc. Work Order Number: 0601187

Lora Terrill	Lora Torrill	V.P. Laboratory Operations	02/01/06
Name (Printed)	Signature	Official Title (printed)	Date

		Laboratory Review Checkli						
Lab	orato	ory Name: e-Lab Analytical, Inc. LRC	Date: 02/01/2006					
Pro	ject N	Name: Cameron Iron Works Labor	ratory Job Number: 0601187					
Rev	iewe	r Name: Lora Terrill Prep 1	Batch Number(s): R34546					
# ¹	A ²	Description		Yes	No	NA ³	NR ⁴	ER#
R1	OI	CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY (C-O-C)						
	1	1) Did samples meet the laboratory's standard conditions of sam	ple acceptability upon receipt?	X				
		2) Were all departures from standard conditions described in an		X				
R2	OI	SAMPLE AND QUALITY CONTROL (QC) IDENTIFICAT				-	-	
I\Z	OI.	1) Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the labor		X		 		
		2) Are all laboratory ID numbers cross-referenced to the corresponding t		X				
R3	OI	TEST REPORTS	onding QC data:	^		 	 	
100	101	1) Were all samples prepared and analyzed within holding times	.9	X		 	 	
		2) Other than those results < MQL, were all other raw values broadless.		X				
		3) Were calculations checked by a peer or supervisor?	texeted by canoration standards.	X		 	-	
		4) Were all analyte identifications checked by a peer or supervisor:	or ⁹	X				
		5) Were sample quantitation limits reported for all analytes not of		X		\vdash		
		6) Were all results for soil and sediment samples reported on a d				\mathbf{x}		
		7) Was % moisture (or solids) reported for all soil and sediment:				X		_
	İ	8) If required for the project, TICs reported?				X		
R4	0	SURROGATE RECOVERY DATA				1		
		1) Were surrogates added prior to extraction?		X				
		2) Were surrogate percent recoveries in all samples within the la	boratory QC limits?	X		1		
R5	OI	TEST REPORTS/SUMMMARY FORMS FOR BLANK SAM						
		1) Were appropriate type(s) of blanks analyzed?		X		<u> </u>		
		2) Were blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency?		X				
		3) Were method blanks taken through the entire analytical proce	ss, including preparation and, if	X				
		applicable, cleanup procedures?						
		4) Were blank concentrations < MQL?		X				
R6	OI	LABORATORY CONTROL SAMPLES (LCS):						
		1) Were all COCs included in the LCS?		X				
		2) Was each LCS taken through the entire analytical procedure, i	ncluding prep and cleanup steps?	X				
		3) Were LCSs analyzed at the required frequency?		X		ļ		
	l	4) Were LCS (and LCSD, if applicable) %Rs within the laborato		X				
		5) Does the detectability data document the laboratory's capability	ty to detect the COCs at the MDL	X				
		used to calculate the SQLs?						
		6) Was the LCSD RPD within QC limits?				X		
R7	OI	MATRIX SPIKE (MS) AND MATRIX SPIKE DUPLICATE		77				
	İ	1) Were the project/method specified analytes included in the M	S and MSD?	X				
		2) Were MS/MSD analyzed at the appropriate frequency?	001: 3:0	X		ļ		
		3) Were MS (and MSD, if applicable) %Rs within the laboratory	QC limits?	X				
R8	OI	4) Were MS/MSD RPDs within laboratory QC limits?		X		 		
No	OI	ANALYTICAL DUPLICATE DATA 1) Were appropriate analytical duplicates analyzed for each matrix	iv?	X				
		2) Were analytical duplicates analyzed at the appropriate frequent		X				
		3) Were RPDs or relative standard deviations within the laborate		X				
R9	OI	METHOD QUANTITATION LIMITS (MQLS):	15 VC mmts.	^	-		<u> </u>	-
	<u> </u>	1) Are the MQLs for each method analyte listed and included in	the laboratory data package?	X				
		2) Do the MQLs correspond to the concentration of the lowest no		X				
		3) Are unadjusted MQLs included in the laboratory data package		$\frac{x}{X}$				
R10	OI	OTHER PROBLEMS/ANOMALIES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-11				
- •		1) Are all known problems/anomalies/special conditions noted in	this LRC and ER?	X				
		2) Were all necessary corrective actions performed for the reported for th		X		 		
		3) If requested, is the justification for elevated SQLs documented		X				
	 		·					

¹ Items identified by the letter "R" should be included in the laboratory data package submitted in 0 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; 1 = inorganic analyses (and general chemistry, when applicable);

NA = Not applicable;

NR = Not Reviewed;

ER# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked).

		Laboratory Review Che	ecklist: Supporting Data					
Lat	orato	ory Name: e-lab Analytical, Inc	C Date: 02/01/2006					
Pro	ject N	Name: Cameron Iron Works Lab	poratory Job Number: 0601187					
Rev	viewe	r Name: Lora Terrill Pre	p Batch Number(s): R34546					
#1	A^2	Description	r	Yes	No	NA ³	NR ⁴	ER#5
S1	OI	INITIAL CALIBRATION (ICAL)		1103	1110	17471	1	T
31	OI.	1) Were response factors (RFs) and/or relative response factor	are (PPEs) for each analyte within the OC	X			-	+
		limits?						
		2) Were percent RSDs or correlation coefficient criteria met?		X				<u> </u>
		3) Was the number of standards recommended in the method	used for all analytes?	X				
		4) Were all points generated between the lowest and highest	standard used to calculate the curve?	X				
		5) Are ICAL data available for all instruments used?		X				
		6) Has the initial calibration curve been verified using an app	ropriate second source standard?	X				
S2	OI	INITIAL AND CONTINUING CALIBRATION VERI	FICATION (ICCV AND CCV) AND					
		1) Was the CCV analyzed at the method-required frequency?		X				
		2) Were percent differences for each analyte within the method		X				
		3) Was the ICAL curve verified for each analyte?		X				
		4) Was the absolute value of the analyte concentration in the	inorganic CCB < MDL?	X				
S3	0	MASS SPECTRAL TUNING:						1
	Ť	1) Was the appropriate compound for the method used for tur	ning?	X				
		2) Were ion abundance data within the method-required QC I		X			†	1
<u>\$4</u>	О	INTERNAL STANDARDS (IS):						
-		Were IS area counts and retention times within the method-re	equired OC limits?	X			1	
S5	OI	RAW DATA (NELAC SECTION 1 APPENDIX A GI	- 1		á i	852 20	3 5	
55	01	1) Were the raw data (e.g., chromatograms, spectral data) rev		X				-
		2) Were data associated with manual integrations flagged on		X				
S6	0	DUAL COLUMN CONFIRMATION	the raw data:	^-		ar dipart	58	1 2
30	0		1 OC2			X		+
S7	_	Did dual column confirmation results meet the method-requir	rea QC?	man (w.r.	10.000	<u> </u>	7 - 72 - 1	
3/	0_	TENTATIVELY IDENTIFIED COMPOUNDS (TICS):	1	e . s.	1,4,45,00	37		
60		If TICs were requested, were the mass spectra and TIC data s	subject to appropriate checks?			X		-
S8	1	INTERFERENCE CHECK SAMPLE (ICS) RESULTS:		193		-		4_
		Were percent recoveries within method QC limits?				X		ļ
S9	I	SERIAL DILUTIONS, POST DIGESTION SPIKES,						-
		Were percent differences, recoveries, and the linearity within	the QC limits specified in the method?			X		
S10	OI	PROFICIENCY TEST REPORTS:					ļ	<u> </u>
	ļ	Are proficiency testing or inter-laboratory comparison results	s on file?	<u>X</u>			ļ	ļ
S11	OI	METHOD DETECTION LIMIT (MDL) STUDIES						
		1) Was a MDL study performed for each reported analyte?		X				
		2) Is the MDL either adjusted or supported by the analysis of	DCSs?	<u>X</u>				
S12	OI	STANDARDS DOCUMENTATION				·		
		Are all standards used in the analyses NIST-traceable or obta		X				
S13	OI	COMPOUND/ANALYTE IDENTIFICATION PROCED	URES					
		Are the procedures for compound/analyte identification documents	mented?	X				
S14	OI	DEMONSTRATION OF ANALYST COMPETENCY (D	OC)					
		1) Was DOC conducted consistent with NELAC 5C or ISO/II	EC 4.2.2?	X				
		2) Is documentation of the analyst's competency up-to-date a		X				
S15	OI	VERIFICATION/VALIDATION DOCUMENTATION F						
		Are all the methods used to generate the data documented, v (NELAC 5.10.2 or ISO/IEC 17025 Section 5.4.5)?		X				
S16	OI	LABORATORY STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDU	DES (SOPS).					+-
210	OI.	Are laboratory SOPs current and on file for each method performance.		X			 	+

Items identified by the letter "R" should be included in the laboratory data package submitted to the TCEQ 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.
- ER# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked).

Laborato	ry Review Checklist: Exception Report
Laboratory Name: e-Lab Analytical, Inc.	LRC Date: 02/01/2006
Project Name: Cameron Iron Works	Laboratory Job Number: 0601187
Reviewer Name: Lora Terrill	Prep Batch Number(s): R34546
ER # ¹ DESCRIPTION	
No Exceptions	

¹ ER# = Exception Report identification number (an Exception Report should be completed for an item if "NR" or "No" is checked on the LRC)

CLIENT: ERM Southwest, Inc.

Project: Cameron Iron Works

Work Order: 0601187

Work Order Sample Summary

Date: February 01, 2006

Lab Sample I	D Client Sample ID	<u>Matrix</u>	Tag Number	Collection Date	Date Received	Hold
0601187-01	SWD-14	Water		1/17/2006 09:40	1/18/2006 07:00	
0601187-02	MW-81	Water		1/17/2006 13:10	1/18/2006 07:00	
0601187-03	MW-70	Water		1/17/2006 13:52	1/18/2006 07:00	
0601187-04	MW-93	Water		1/17/2006 14:47	1/18/2006 07:00	
0601187-05	FB-011706	Water		1/17/2006 15:00	1/18/2006 07:00	
0601187-06	MW-125	Water		1/17/2006 16:09	1/18/2006 07:00	
0601187-07	Dup-011706	Water		1/17/2006 12:00	1/18/2006 07:00	

CLIENT:

ERM - Southwest, Inc.

Work Order:

0601187

Project:

Cameron Iron Works

Lab ID:

0601187-01

Date: February 01, 2006

Client Sample ID: SWD-14

Collection Date: 1/17/2006 9:40:00 AM

Analyses	Result	SQL	MQL	Qual	Units	Dilution Factor	Date Analyzed
TCL VOLATILE ORGANICS		Method: S	W8260				Analyst: PC
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.0014	0.00050	0.0050	J	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.0083	0.00060	0.0050		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,2-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	U	0.00050	0.0050		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Tetrachloroethene	U	0.00050	0.0050		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Trichloroethene	U	0.00070	0.0050		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Vinyl chloride	U	0.00060	0.0020		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	108	0	70-125		%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenzene	89.6	0	72.4-125		%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Dibromofluoromethane	109	0	71.2-125		%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Toluene-d8	93.6	0	75-125		%REC	1	1/18/2006

B - Analyte detected in the associated Method Blank

^{* -} Value exceeds Maximum Contaminant Level

S - Spike Recovery outside accepted recovery limits

P - Dual Column results RPD > 40%

E - Value above quantitation range

CLIENT:

ERM - Southwest, Inc.

Work Order:

0601187

Project:

Cameron Iron Works

Lab ID:

0601187-02

Date: February 01, 2006

Client Sample ID: MW-81

Collection Date: 1/17/2006 1:10:00 PM

Analyses	Result	SQL	MQL	Qual Units	Dilution Factor	Date Analyzed
TCL VOLATILE ORGANICS		Method: S	W8260			Analyst: PC
1,1-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,1-Dichloroethene	U	0.00060	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,2-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Tetrachloroethene	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Trichloroethene	U	0.00070	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Vinyl chloride	U	0.00060	0.0020	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	84.7	0	70-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenzene	89.6	0	72.4-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Dibromofluoromethane	94.2	0	71.2-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Toluene-d8	91.2	0	75-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006

U - Analyzed for but Not Detected

J - Analyte detected below quantitation limits

B - Analyte detected in the associated Method Blank

^{* -} Value exceeds Maximum Contaminant Level

S - Spike Recovery outside accepted recovery limits

P - Dual Column results RPD > 40%

E - Value above quantitation range

CLIENT: ERM - Southwest, Inc.

Work Order: 0601187

Project: Cameron Iron Works

Lab ID: 0601187-03 Matrix: WATER

Analyses	Result	SQL	MQL	Qual	Units	Dilution Factor	Date Analyzed
TCL VOLATILE ORGANICS		Method: S	W8260				Analyst: PC
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.011	0.00050	0.0050		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.0032	0.00060	0.0050	J	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,2-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	0.0065	0.00050	0.0050		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Tetrachloroethene	U	0.00050	0.0050		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Trichloroethene	0.0011	0.00070	0.0050	J	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Vinyl chloride	U	0.00060	0.0020		mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	110	0	70-125		%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenzene	89.2	0	72.4-125		%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Dibromofluoromethane	110	0	71.2-125		%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Toluene-d8	93.1	0	75-125		%REC	1	1/18/2006

Qualifiers:

U - Analyzed for but Not Detected

J - Analyte detected below quantitation limits

B - Analyte detected in the associated Method Blank

* - Value exceeds Maximum Contaminant Level

S - Spike Recovery outside accepted recovery limits

P - Dual Column results RPD > 40%

E - Value above quantitation range

H - Analyzed outside of Hold Time

AR Page 3 of 7

Date: February 01, 2006

Client Sample ID: MW-70

Collection Date: 1/17/2006 1:52:00 PM

CLIENT: ERM - Southwest, Inc.

Work Order: 0601187

Project: Cameron Iron Works

Lab 1D: 0601187-04

Date: February 01, 2006

Client Sample ID: MW-93

Collection Date: 1/17/2006 2:47:00 PM

Matrix: WATER

Analyses	Result	SQL	MQL	Qual Units	Dilution Factor	Date Analyzed
TCL VOLATILE ORGANICS		Method: S	SW8260			Analyst: PC
1,1-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,1-Dichloroethene	U	0.00060	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,2-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Tetrachloroethene	0.087	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Trichloroethene	U	0.00070	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Vinyl chloride	U	0.00060	0.0020	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	81.0	0	70-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenzene	93.2	0	72.4-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Dibromofluoromethane	83.6	0	71.2-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Toluene-d8	90.4	0	75-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006

Qualifiers:

U - Analyzed for but Not Detected

J - Analyte detected below quantitation limits

B - Analyte detected in the associated Method Blank

* - Value exceeds Maximum Contaminant Level

S - Spike Recovery outside accepted recovery limits

P - Dual Column results RPD > 40%

E - Value above quantitation range

H - Analyzed outside of Hold Time

AR Page 4 of 7

CLIENT:

ERM - Southwest, Inc.

Work Order:

0601187

Project:

Cameron Iron Works

Lab ID:

0601187-05

Date: February 01, 2006

Client Sample ID: FB-011706

Collection Date: 1/17/2006 3:00:00 PM

Analyses	Result	SQL	MQL	Qual Units	Dilution Factor	Date Analyzed
TCL VOLATILE ORGANICS		Method: S	W8260			Analyst: PC
1,1-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,1-Dichloroethene	U	0.00060	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,2-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Tetrachloroethene	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Trichloroethene	U	0.00070	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Vinyl chloride	U	0.00060	0.0020	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	73.5	0	70-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenzene	92.0	0	72.4-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Dibromofluoromethane	78.6	0	71.2-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Toluene-d8	88.2	0	75-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006

U - Analyzed for but Not Detected

J - Analyte detected below quantitation limits

B - Analyte detected in the associated Method Blank

^{* -} Value exceeds Maximum Contaminant Level

S - Spike Recovery outside accepted recovery limits

P - Dual Column results RPD > 40%

E - Value above quantitation range

CLIENT: ERM - Southwest, Inc.

Work Order: 0

0601187

Cameron Iron Works

Project: Lab ID:

0601187-06

Date: February 01, 2006

Client Sample ID: MW-125

Collection Date: 1/17/2006 4:09:00 PM

Analyses	Result	SQL	MQL	Qual Units	Dilution Factor	Date Analyzed
TCL VOLATILE ORGANICS		Method: S	W8260			Analyst: PC
1,1-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,1-Dichloroethene	U	0.00060	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,2-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Tetrachloroethene	0.0062	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Trichloroethene	U	0.00070	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Vinyl chloride	U	0.00060	0.0020	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	80.5	0	70-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenzene	90.1	0	72.4-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Dibromofluoromethane	85.8	0	71.2-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Toluene-d8	88.6	0	75-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006

U - Analyzed for but Not Detected

J - Analyte detected below quantitation limits

B - Analyte detected in the associated Method Blank

^{* -} Value exceeds Maximum Contaminant Level

S - Spike Recovery outside accepted recovery limits

P - Dual Column results RPD > 40%

E - Value above quantitation range

CLIENT: ERM - Southwest, Inc.

Work Order:

0601187

0001167

Project: Lab ID: Cameron Iron Works

0601187-07

Date: February 01, 2006

Client Sample ID: Dup-011706

Collection Date: 1/17/2006 12:00:00 PM

Analyses	Result	SQL	MQL	Qual Units	Dilution Factor	Date Analyzed
TCL VOLATILE ORGANICS		Method: S	W8260			Analyst: PC
1,1-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,1-Dichloroethene	U	0.00060	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
1,2-Dichloroethane	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	U	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Tetrachloroethene	0.091	0.00050	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Trichloroethene	U	0.00070	0.0050	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Vinyl chloride	U	0.00060	0.0020	mg/L	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	73.8	0	70-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenzene	91.9	0	72.4-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Dibromofluoromethane	77.4	0	71.2-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006
Surr: Toluene-d8	87.5	0	75-125	%REC	1	1/18/2006

U - Analyzed for but Not Detected

J - Analyte detected below quantitation limits

B - Analyte detected in the associated Method Blank

^{* -} Value exceeds Maximum Contaminant Level

S - Spike Recovery outside accepted recovery limits

P - Dual Column results RPD > 40%

E - Value above quantitation range

Date: Feb 01, 2006

Test Code:

8260_TCL_W

Test Number:

SW8260

Test Name:

TCL Volatile Organics

Matrix:

Aqueous

Units: mg/L

METHOD DETECTION / REPORTING LIMITS

Туре	Analyte	CAS	MDL	Unadjusted MQL
A	1,1-Dichloroethane	75-34-3	0.0005	0.005
Α	1,1-Dichloroethene	75-35-4	0.0006	0.005
Α	1,2-Dichloroethane	107-06-2	0.0005	0.005
Α	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	156-59-2	0.0005	0.005
Α	Tetrachloroethene	127-18-4	0.0005	0.005
Α	Trichloroethene	79-01-6	0.0007	0.005
Α	Vinyl chloride	75-01-4	0.0006	0.002
S	Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	17060-07-0	0	0
S	Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenzene	460-00-4	0	0
S	Surr: Dibromofluoromethane	1868-53-7	0	0
S	Surr: Toluene-d8	2037-26-5	0	0

CLIENT:

ERM Southwest, Inc.

Work Order:

0601187

Project:

Cameron Iron Works

Date: Feb 01 2006

QC BATCH REPORT

Batch ID: R34546 InstrumentID:	VOA1		-							
MBLK Sample ID: VBLKW-0118			Tes	st Code: SW826	50	Units: µg	/L	Analysis D	ate: 01/18	/06 17:48
Client ID:	Run ID:	VOA1_	060118A	SeqNo:	788	327 F	Prep Date:		DF: 1	
Analyte	Result	MQL	SPK Val	SPK Ref Value	%REC	Control Limit	RPD Ref Value	%RPD	RPD Limit	Qual
, many to					701.120					
1,1-Dichloroethane	U	5.0								
1,1-Dichloroethene	U	5.0								
1,2-Dichloroethane	U	5.0								
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	U	5.0								
Tetrachloroethene	U	5.0								
Trichloroethene	U	5.0								
Vinyl chloride	U	2.0								
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	45.42	5.0	50	0	90.8	70-125		0		
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenzene	46.38	5.0	50	0	92.8	72.4-125		0		
Surr: Dibromofluoromethane	45.62	5.0	50	0	91.2	71.2-125		0		
Surr: Toluene-d8	45.28	5.0	50	0	90.6	75-125		0		•
LCS Sample ID: VLCSW-0118			Tes	st Code: SW826	60	Units: µg	/L	Analysis D	ate: 01/18	/06 16:52
Client ID:	Run ID:	VOA1_	060118A	SeqNo:	788	326 F	Prep Date:		DF: 1	
Analyte	Result	MQL	SPK Val	SPK Ref Value	%REC	Control Limit	RPD Ref Value	%RPD	RPD Limit	Qual
1.1-Dichloroethane	47.08	5.0	50	0	94.2	74.2-122		0		
1.1-Dichloroethene	47.53	5.0	50	0	95.1	75.8-122		0		
1,2-Dichloroethane	49.07	5.0	50	0	98.1	78.8-120		0		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	47.64	5.0	50	0	95.3	80-120		0		
Tetrachloroethene	50.65	5.0	50	0	101	80-120		0		
Trichloroethene	50.53	5.0	50	0	101	80-120		0		
Vinyl chloride	45.39	2.0	50	0	90.8	76.2-121		0		
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	47.74	5.0	50	0	95.5	70-125		0		
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenzene	44.4	5.0	50	0	88.8	72.4-125		0		
Surr: Dibromofluoromethane	45.34	5.0	50	0	90.7	71.2-125		0		
Surr: Toluene-d8	44.54	5.0	50	0	89.1	75-125		0		

ND - Not Detected at the Reporting Limit

J - Analyte detected below quantitation limits

O - Referenced analyte value is > 4 times amount spiked

S - Spike Recovery outside accepted recovery limits

R - RPD outside accepted recovery limits

P - Dual Column results percent difference > 40%

B - Analyte detected in assoc. Method Blank

U - Analyzed for but not detected

E - Value above quantitation range

CLIENT:

ERM Southwest, Inc.

Work Order:

0601187

Project:

Cameron Iron Works

Batch ID: R34546	InstrumentID: VOA1									
MS Sample ID: 06	601154-06AMS		Tes	t Code: SW82	60	Units: µg/	L	Analysis Da	ate: 01/18	/06 20:07
Client ID:	Run ID:	VOA1_	060118A	SeqNo	788	329 P	rep Date:		DF: 50	
Analyte	Result	MQL	SPK Val	SPK Ref Value	%REC	Control Limit	RPD Ref Value	%RPD	RPD Limit	Qual
1,1-Dichloroethane	2868	250	2500	0	115	74.2-122		0		
1,1-Dichloroethene	2857	250	2500	0	114	75.8-122		0		
1,2-Dichloroethane	2923	250	2500	0	117	78.8-120		0		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	2932	250	2500	0	117	80-120		0		
Tetrachloroethene	2367	250	2500	0	94.7	80-120		0		
Trichloroethene	2622	250	2500	0	105	80-120		0		
Vinyl chloride	2107	100	2500	0	84.3	76.2-121		0		
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-	34 2710	250	2500	0	108	70-125		0		
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenze	ne 2229	250	2500	0	89.2	72.4-125		0		
Surr: Dibromofluorometha	ne 2674	250	2500	0	107	71.2-125		0		
Surr: Toluene-d8	2288	250	2500	0	91.5	75-125		0		
MSD Sample ID: 06	601154-06AMSD		Tes	t Code: SW82	60	Units: µg/	L	Analysis Da	ate: 01/18	06 20:3
Client ID:	Run ID:	VOA1_	060118A	SeqNo	788		rep Date:	•	DF: 50	
				SPK Ref		Control	RPD Ref		RPD	
Analyte	Result	MQL	SPK Val	Value	%REC	Limit	Value	%RPD	Limit	Qual
,										
1,1-Dichloroethane	2879	250	2500	0	115	74.2-122	286			
1,1-Dichloroethene	2813	250	2500	0	113	75.8-122	285			
1,2-Dichloroethane	2956	250	2500	0	118	78.8-120	292			
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	2972	250	2500	0	119	80-120	293			
Tetrachloroethene	2409	250	2500	0	96.4	80-120	236			
Trichloroethene	2618	250	2500	0	105	80-120	262		20	
Vinyl chloride	2049	100	2500	0	81.9	76.2-121	210			
Surr: 1,2-Dichloroethane-c		250	2500	0	109	70-125	271			
Surr: 4-Bromofluorobenze		250	2500	0	88.8	72.4-125	222			
Surr: Dibromofluorometha		250	2500	0	108	71.2-125	267		-	
Surr: Toluene-d8	2288	250	2500	0	91.5	75-125	228	8 0.0239	20	
The following samples wer	e analyzed in this batch:	06	601187-01A 601187-04A 601187-07A		87-02A 87-05A		187-03A 187-06A	:		

QC BATCH REPORT

ND - Not Detected at the Reporting Limit

J - Analyte detected below quantitation limits

O - Referenced analyte value is > 4 times amount spiked

S - Spike Recovery outside accepted recovery limits

R - RPD outside accepted recovery limits

P - Dual Column results percent difference > 40%

B - Analyte detected in assoc. Method Blank

U - Analyzed for but not detected

E - Value above quantitation range



e-Lab Analytical, Inc. 10450 Stancliff Rd. #210 Houston, Texas 77099 (Tel) 281.530.5656 (Fax) 281.530.5887

 \triangleright

Chain of Custody Form

Page of

e-Lab Analytical, Inc.
3352 128th Avenue
Holland, Michigan 49424
(Tel) 616.399.6070
(Fax) 616.399.6185

				e-Lab Pro	e-Lab Project Manager:		e-Lab Work Order #; ()\d()\ld()	
	Customer Information		Project	Project Information		Para	eter/Method Request	
Purchase Order		Project Nar	ame Camer	Cameron Iron Works	A. C.	A Volatiles (List B)		
Work Order		Project Number		0842400		a		
Company Name	ERM Southwest, Inc.	Bill To Compa	pany ERM S	ERM Southwest, Inc.		O	Unit 1 may	
Send Report To	Greg Wheeler	Invoice A	Attn Greg V	Greg Wheeler		Q		
	15810 Park Ten Place		15810	15810 Park Ten Place		, u		
Address	Suite 300	Addre	ress Suite 300	00		i u		
City/State/Zip	Houston, TX 77084	City/State/Zip		Houston, TX 77084	THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O	ø		
Phone	(281) 600-1015	Pho	ione (281) ((281) 600-1000			AND THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE P	-
EBX	(281) 600-1001	1	Fax (281) ((281) 600-1001				
e-Mail Address		e-Mall Address	S	1		7		
No.	Sample Description	Date	Tme	Matrix Pres.	s. # Bottles	ABC	D E E G H	Hotel
H-QMS		1/17/08	046	UATER HCL	M	×		
18-MW 2	/8		1310		M	×		
3 M \ − 70	01		1352		M	X	And of the state o	THE RESERVE AND THE PARTY AND
4 MW- 93	3		しかせ			×		
5 FB - 011706	9011		1500		~	×		
221 - MM - 125	25		1609		٣	×		
7 DUP-011706	90711	7	1200	ラ	~	×		
&								
ő			- Charles	man () () () () () () () () () () () () ()	CONTRACT CONTRACT OF THE PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY			
10				7.700				i i i
ese F	rint & Sign Elvs Su	Shipment P.ck	t Method	Required Tu	Required Turnaround Time: (Check Box)		Days (2) 24 Hour	i de la companya de l
Relinquished by:	(m/06	245	Galved by:	July S	Long 1-1806	Notes: 24 Hr IA I		
Religious ped by:	Story Date:	Time: 07 35	Tecelived by That	-	16.00 0735	e jab Cooler Cooler Temp.	OC Package: (Check One Box Below)	TRRP CNOCKLIST
(Logged by (Laboratory)	ii Datei	Time:	Checked by (Laboratory):				Level III SIN OCKRAW Data TRRR	TRRP Level IV
Preservative Key:	Preservative Key: 1-HCl 2-HNO, 3-H ₂ SO, 4-NaOH 5-Na ₂ S ₂ O,	aOH 6-Na ₂ S ₂ O ₃	6-NaHSO.	7-Other 8-4°C	PC 9-5035		Other C	

Note: 1. Any changes must be made in writing once sumples and COC Form have been submitted to e-Lab Analytical, Inc.

2. Unless otherwise agreed in a formal contract, services provided by c-Lab Analytical, Inc. are expressly limited to the terms and conditions stated on the reverse.

Copyright 2004 by e-Lab Analytical, Inc.

Sample Receipt Checklist

Client Name <u>ERMSW-HOU</u>		Date/Time Received:	1/18/2006 7:00:00 AM
Work Order Number <u>0601187</u>		Received by: PS	ı
Checklist completed by Signature	1-19-06 Date	Reviewed by Initials	Dale Dale
Matrix: W	name <u>E-Lab</u>		
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	$ \mathbf{Z} $
Chain of custody present?	Yes 🗹	No 🗆	
Chain of custody signed when relinquished and received?	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):	2.2c	002	
Water - VOA vials have zero headspace?	Yes 🗹	No O No VOA vials sul	omitted
Water - pH acceptable upon receipt?	Yes 🗌	No 🗌 N/A 🔽	
Adjusted?	Che	ecked by	and a second
Login Notes:			
Any No and/or NA (not applicable) response must be detailed in	the comments section	below.	
Client contacted Date contacted	i: 1/18/6	Person contacted	
Contacted by: Green Regarding:) L	t:37	
Comments:) Not	Rush		
Corrective Action			
			Commercial and a characteristic designation of the commercial control of the control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the commercial control of the comm



e-Lab Analytical, Inc. 10450 Stancliff Rd., Suite 210 Houston, Texas 77099 Tel. 281.530.5656 Fax. 218.530.5887

Company: ...

CUSTODY SEAL

Dicking FRM-SW