



November 10, 2017

Patrick J. Rhodes  
Vice President, Senior Project Manager  
The IDI Group Companies  
1700 N. Moore Street, Suite 2020  
Arlington, VA 22209

RE: Yellow House Conditions Assessment  
10606 Cedar Avenue  
Fairfax, Virginia

## **OVERVIEW**

The McKeever Services Corporation (MSC) Team was engaged to perform an assessment of the existing Yellow House located at 10606 Cedar Avenue in Fairfax, Virginia. The focus of the assessment was to evaluate the condition of the building. We respectfully submit this letter report of our assessment. This report summarizes our findings based on our site visit investigation and provides our comments and recommendations. The attached Appendix contains photographic documentation of observations.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The property located at 10606 Cedar Avenue in Fairfax, Virginia consists of a two-story residential building with a partial basement and crawl space that is approximately 2,600 square feet. The oldest portion of the building was reportedly built in 1898. It was readily apparent that multiple additions were added to the original building at different time periods.

The MSC Team was engaged to perform an assessment of the observed building condition. Representatives of the team visited the property on November 10, 2017 to visually review the accessible portions of the structure. The exterior façades of the building and interior spaces that were accessible were visually reviewed by the team. Where existing conditions are concealed by finishes, the team examined the existing conditions for evidence of distress.

Deficiencies in structural members and connections, unusual structural features, previous modifications, and material deterioration were intended to be noted if observed. The structural review performed was not intended to be a comprehensive assessment of the complete building systems. A digital camera was utilized to record areas of interest and descriptive information was recorded in field notes. No existing building drawings or documents regarding the original construction were available for use.



## **OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS**

The information in this report is relative to information gathered from our site visit and is based solely on visual observations of existing conditions. No selective demolition or testing was performed. The following narratives document our observations. See attached Appendix A for photographic documentation of observations.

**1. Existing Residence.** The main residence was observed to consist of wood framed floors, supported on interior wood stud bearing walls and perimeter, brick bearing walls. The house has a full height cellar level under the south side of the structure that encompasses approximately 40% of the footprint. The floor is a conventional slab on grade and a sump pit is present at the northeast side of the space. The remaining footprint of the building was constructed over a crawl space or was built on grade. The foundation walls are a combination of brick masonry and concrete masonry unit (CMU) walls.

The house includes a slab on grade side porch on the east side, covered garage addition on the west, rear entrance addition, and an accessible attic. Multiple roof systems are present, including a pitched asphalt shingle and flat, bitumen, roof over the garage and porches. The building also has three brick masonry chimneys which extend notably above the roof elevations.

**2. Exterior Bearing Walls.** The exterior structure of the main building consists of brick masonry walls, clad in siding, which are supported on masonry foundations. The siding present does not appear historic. Along the perimeter of the residence a large amount of organic growth is present along the bottom of the wall, at grade. Organic growth also is growing from the gutters on the roof, on the west side of the building on the side porch, and on the exterior walls of the garage. The growth present has spread from grade to behind the siding. This condition enables water and insects to penetrate the siding and into the brick exterior walls. The wood siding appears to have begun separating in areas. The condition of the brick walls could not be readily observed.

**3. Wood Window Deterioration.** Along the exterior of buildings, wood window frames are typically one of the more historic portions of structures. Significant deterioration of the wood window frames was observed. The wood appears to have not been maintained and protected, and water has damaged the frames to the point that many are not salvageable.

**4. Soil Erosion.** Erosion of soil along the rear chimney and areas around the perimeter of the structure is present. It is typically recommended that exterior grades are sloped away from the structure to avoid excess water from damaging the building. Many low spots are present immediately against the structure and this condition has caused



deterioration of masonry and washout of grades, possibly undermining foundations. Long-term, these conditions will typically cause settlement cracking. We could not observe enough of the exterior walls to determine if settlement cracking has occurred due to the present of the wood siding.

**5. Gutters and Downspout.** Multiple downspouts are present along the perimeter of the building. Some of the downspouts were not connected to a path of drainage for water to move away from the building. This condition may cause erosion of the soil around the foundation or create ways for water to penetrate the foundation and enter the property. Gutters observed along the roof edge are not functional. The gutters are sagging and not securely attached to the building and debris is present blocking the gutters from functioning properly. These conditions will cause damage to the building soffits and fascia and may also result in soil erosion, washout of soil at the foundation, and settlement issues caused by improper drainage.

**6. Roof Condition.** Multiple types of roofs are present on the residence. The main structure consists of a gabled roof with asphalt shingles. Flat roofs which appear to be modified bitumen roofing were observed over the garage, porch, sun room and other features of the building. The roofing observed are in poor condition and the material appear to have reached the end of their useful life. Multiple holes and gaps in the roofing material is present.

**7. Brick Chimney.** The existing chimneys were observed to be in fair to poor condition. Loss of mortar in brick joints can accelerate deterioration of the masonry and result in instabilities of the assembly, which can lead to a structural instability. The east chimney has significant mortar loss in joints. This condition appears to have results in movement and isolated dislocation of bricks. In addition, large voids between bricks were observed. The north and west chimneys were in fair condition. There appear to be mortar loss in the brick joints at the upper half of the chimneys.

**8. Covered Garage.** On the west side of the property, an attached garage was added after the original construction. The structure consists of wood roof sheathing and open web steel joists, supported on wood framed bearing walls. The floor appears to be a conventional slab on grade. Water damage was observed on the underside of the structure throughout the garage. This is an indication of issues with the roofing material. Water staining on the sheathing does not appear to have caused deterioration of the wood. Surface rusting on the steel is present. We did not observe steel section loss. If left unaddressed, the rusting will worsen and lead to reduction in the load carrying capacity of the steel. The condition of the wood bearing walls could not be readily observed. The walls are concealed in finishes. Since the garage is open to the weather



and signs of water infiltration is present, it is our assumption that the walls are very likely to be deteriorated.

In addition, during the course of our site visit, we observed signs of ponding water on top of the roof. This condition appears to have caused the roof framing to sag.

**9. Covered Garage.** On the west side of the property, an attached garage was added after the original construction. The structure consists of wood roof sheathing and open web steel joists, supported on wood framed bearing walls. The floor appears to be a conventional slab on grade. Water damage was observed on the underside of the structure throughout the garage. This is an indication of issues with the roofing material. Water staining on the sheathing does not appear to have caused deterioration of the wood. Surface rusting on the steel is present. We did not observe steel section loss. If left unaddressed, the rusting will worsen and lead to reduction in the load carrying capacity of the steel.

**10. Cellar Level.** The house has a full height cellar level under the south side of the structure. The remaining sections of the building was constructed over a crawl space or is constructed on grade. The foundations within the crawl space consist of brick masonry and was observed to be in poor condition. Mortar joints are deteriorated and sections of the foundations have partially collapsed. Organic growth was observed penetrating through the exterior walls. The extent of the growth has not yet significantly damaged the structure but if left unaddressed, the integrity of the structure will become compromised.

**11. Interior Structure.** The interior structure of the building typically consists of wood joists framing the floors and interior wood stud, bearing walls. The exterior brick walls are assumed to support the floors along the perimeter. One area above the kitchen was observed to be supported by beams which were encased in finish material. Drywall generally covers both the ceiling and walls in all of the rooms. Historic finish materials were not observed. The majority of the floors observed are level with the notable exception of an area within the kitchen which is displaced approximately 1.5" over a five-foot length. This area is over the crawl space and appears associated with foundation issues.

Most of the rooms throughout the property have paint peeling from the ceilings and walls, which is due to high moisture exposure that causes the paint to debond from the substrate. Some water pockets were observed to have formed in the ceiling of various rooms. Readily apparent water damaged finishes were soft to the touch and will require removal and replacement to repair. Swelling of floor finish material is present throughout. These conditions are indications of large amounts of moisture within the space. While the finish surfaces are generally not an integral part of the structure, observed damage can provide an indication as to the condition of the concealed framing. Water damage on





finishes indicates framing is exposed to moisture which can result in wood rot and a loss of strength.

**12. Wall Finish Cracking.** Diagonal cracks on the walls and ceilings throughout the inside of the building was observed. The majority of the cracks seen start or terminate near reentrant corners of wall openings such as door frames. Multiple cracks were observed to be greater than 1/16" in width, which can be indicative of settlement cracking or insufficient lateral resistance of the structure. Corners where materials change or wall opening corners are present are common areas for cracking. Cracks at these locations can be the result of differential movement of materials, settlement, or overstressing of framing. A more detailed review is necessary to determine if cracks are an indication of a structural issue.

**13. Wall Finish Cracks.** Diagonal cracks on the walls and ceilings throughout the inside of the building was observed. The majority of the cracks seen start or terminate near reentrant corners of wall openings such as door frames. Multiple cracks were observed to be greater than 1/16" in width, which can be indicative of settlement cracking or insufficient lateral resistance of the structure.

**14. Roof Collapse.** As observed from the second floor, a collapsed area of roof and ceiling was observed from inside of the building. The hole has allowed water, debris, and animals inside the building. The wood flooring below the hole is damaged by the water infiltration. It is not clear what caused the collapse. If the resulting hole is not addressed, moisture and debris intrusion will continue and result in structural deterioration of the framing, expanding beyond the immediate collapse area.

**15. Roof Framing.** The framing of the roof along the main portion of the property consists of old growth wood rafters that abut along the ridge, without the presence of a ridge plate. A number of structural issues were observed within the attic space. Roof rafters have displaced out of plane along ridge line. The connection between the rafters appear to have been inadequate. Blocking between the rafters is missing. The displacement indicates movement of the roof structure. Water staining was observed at isolated locations, indicating infiltration at water through the roofing. One location was observed where the roof framing has partially cracked and failed. Some roof rafters were observed to be wrapped and excessively deformed. In addition, the bases of the rafters appear to have displaced outward.

**16. Environmental Condition.** A Hazardous Materials review was performed by ECS. The primary focus was a survey for asbestos-containing materials, lead based paint, universal waste materials, and mold and moisture for the structure. The full report is included as Appendix B. From the report, it is recommended that any persons entering



the structure use proper Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) due to the presence of lead, asbestos, and mold.

It was determined that asbestos containing materials is present throughout the structure. Materials found that contain asbestos include floor tile, wall caulk, drywall joint compound, undercoat, roof sealant, roof cement, chimney caulk, and siding cement board.

The readily accessible interior and exterior surfaces and substrates were evaluated for lead based paint (LBP) within the structure. Using a Direct-Read X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) Spectrometer, a number of building components were detected to contain lead above 1.0 milligrams per square centimeter.

Peeling and chipped paint was observed in several areas, interior and exterior, of the structure. The floor surfaces were indicated that they should be assumed to contain lead dust from the degradation of the painted surfaces. In addition, lead in soil sampling along the exterior drip-line/foundation surrounding the structure was also performed. The sample collected from the front of the structure was reported to have a lead concentration of 660 parts per million (ppm), and the soil sample collected from the rear side of the house was reported at 160 ppm. The concentrations of lead were reported to be below the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) criteria for lead in bare soils at drip line/foundation areas at 1,200 ppm.

Various building materials were found to be classified as hazardous and/or universal wastes which will require special handling or disposal if removed. Testing was provided for temperature, relative humidity, and fungal spore concentrations in representative areas. Visible mold and water staining was present in areas. Interior wall, ceiling, and floor cavities are assumed to be impacted with mold and water staining due to the unconditioned environment of the structure. Airborne fungal spore counts can be used as an indicator of the possible presence of mold growth generated by sources of moisture.

Lack of elevations in spore count levels does not necessarily indicate that moisture intrusion concerns do not exist. It was determined that the elevations of fungal spore concentrations are greater within the interior areas of the structure as compared to the exterior. Based on the Delmhorst moisture meter scales for materials, moisture levels greater than 0.5% are considered elevated for drywall wallboard materials and are considered at risk for mold growth. Levels greater than 15% for wood materials and greater than 85% for plaster surfaces are considered elevated. Moisture levels within the building were found to be between 20% to 40%.



## **CONCLUSIONS**

From our review of the existing conditions, the existing property is in poor condition. The environmental and structural conditions of the residence presents serious life safety risks to any inhabitation of the home. We do not recommend that the building be inhabited in its current condition.

## **CLOSING**

The engineering observations and recommendations within this report are related to a visual examination of exposed surfaces and the professional judgment and experience of Jon Tung, Structural Engineer. We believe the review was sufficient for us to form a reasonable engineering opinion of the condition of the existing structure. The review was not intended to be a comprehensive investigation and assessment of the complete building systems.

If documentation of the original construction is located, these documents may reveal other issues that may necessitate modifications to our report and recommendations.

With the nature of our scope of work, we cannot take responsibility for issues with the property that were not examined under this scope of work, defects with the property that may appear in the future, or differing opinions of other qualified professionals.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service. Please contact us if you have any questions or comments regarding the information presented in this report.

Sincerely,

Jaw (jon) Tung, PE  
Structural Engineer

Attachments:

- Appendix A – Photographic Documentation
- Appendix B – ECS Report dated August 28, 2017





---

*Consulting and Regulatory Process Management for the Construction Industry*

# Appendix A

---

Yellow House  
10606 Cedar Avenue  
Fairfax, Virginia

Conditions Assessment

Photographic Documentation

November 9, 2017



# McKeever Services Corporation

Jon Tung, Structural Engineer

Yellow House Conditions Assessment  
November 9, 2017, Page A2 of A12



Front elevation / main entrance of property. South facing.



South elevation of property.



Southeast corner of building.



West side of building.



# McKeever Services Corporation

Jon Tung, Structural Engineer

Yellow House Conditions Assessment  
November 9, 2017, Page A3 of A12



North elevation of property.



North elevation of property.







Crawl space under main portion of structure. Significant deterioration of masonry support.



Displacement of floor beam. Beam appears undersized.



Partial collapse of masonry foundation.



Wood post with crawl space, supporting floor. Wood deterioration.





Crawl space under main portion of structure.



Partially collapsed masonry foundation.



Significant deterioration of masonry foundation.







Significant deterioration of masonry foundation.



Floor support beam spanning opening.



Cellar level under structure.



Sump pit within Cellar level. Pit was dry.






Significant displacement of floor structure within kitchen. Estimated 1.5" within five feet.



Collapsed ceiling observed on First Floor caused by water infiltration.



Collapsed ceiling debris on floor.





Typical main building gable roof framing.



Typical roof rafter.



Roof rafters have displaced out of plane along ridge.



Water infiltration at roof framing. Partial failure of wood framing.





Partial failure of roof framing.



Base of roof rafters appear to have displaced outward. Wood framing appear bowed and twisted.



Wood framing appear bowed and twisted.



Brick wall at gable end.





Partial collapse of roof structure.



Floor debris at partial collapse of roof structure.



# McKeever Services Corporation

Jon Tung, Structural Engineer

Yellow House Conditions Assessment  
November 9, 2017, Page A11 of A12



Typical diagonal cracking through wall finish at opening corners.



Peeling paint typical throughout building.



Peeling paint typical throughout building.



Peeling paint and mold growth.





Peeling paint typical throughout building.



Peeling paint and mold growth.



Peeling paint typical throughout building.



Water damage to finishes.



---

*Consulting and Regulatory Process Management for the Construction Industry*

# Appendix B

---

Yellow House  
10606 Cedar Avenue  
Fairfax, Virginia

Conditions Assessment

ECS Hazardous Materials and Structural Survey  
Dated August 28, 2017

November 9, 2017



HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND STRUCTURAL SURVEY

YELLOW HOUSE AT 10606 CEDAR AVENUE

10606 CEDAR AVENUE

FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA

ECS PROJECT NO. 46:3107 & 47:4166

FOR

IDI GROUP COMPANIES

AUGUST 28, 2017





August 28, 2017

Mr. Carlos Cecchi  
IDI Group Companies  
1700 North Moore Street, Suite 2020  
Arlington, VA 22209

ECS Project No. 47:4166 and 46:3107 & 47:4166

Reference: Report of Hazardous Materials and Structural Survey, Yellow House at 10606 Cedar Avenue, 10606 Cedar Avenue, Fairfax, Virginia

Dear Mr. Cecchi:

ECS Mid-Atlantic, LLC (ECS) is pleased to provide the results of the Hazardous Materials and Structural Survey for the Yellow House at 10606 Cedar Avenue. ECS services were provided in general accordance with ECS Proposal No. 46:47:4214-EPR authorized on May 31, 2017.

We are pleased to have this opportunity to provide consulting services for this project. If you have any questions or comments concerning this report, please do not hesitate to contact us.

ECS Mid-Atlantic, LLC

M. Alexis Herr, PE  
Senior Project Manager  
aherr@ecslimited.com  
703-471-8400

Michael J. Sladki  
Principal Engineer  
msladki@ecslimited.com  
703-471-8400

Beverly Sedon  
Project Manager  
bsedon@ecslimited.com  
703-471-8400



<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>		<b>PAGE</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1	Project Information .....	1
1.2	Scope of Services .....	1
1.3	Limitations .....	1
<b>2.0</b>	<b>STRUCTURAL SURVEY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
2.1	Exterior observation .....	2
2.1.1	Structure .....	2
2.1.2	Organic growth .....	2
2.1.3	Wood rot .....	3
2.1.4	Front step damaged .....	4
2.1.5	Soil Erosion .....	5
2.1.6	Downspout damaged .....	6
2.1.7	Gutters damaged .....	7
2.1.8	Roof Condition .....	8
2.1.9	Chimney Repointing .....	10
2.2	Garage .....	12
2.3	Interior Observations .....	14
2.3.1	Structure .....	14
2.3.2	Water Damage .....	15
2.3.3	Ceiling Sag .....	17
2.3.4	Cracks in Ceiling and Walls .....	18
2.3.5	Roof Collapse .....	19
2.3.6	Laundry Room Ceiling Hole .....	20
2.4	Basement .....	21
<b>3.0</b>	<b>STRUCTURAL EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY</b> .....	<b>26</b>
4.1	Methods and Results .....	28
4.1.1	Asbestos-Containing Materials .....	28
4.1.1.1	Materials Assumed to Contain Asbestos .....	30
4.1.2	Lead-Based Paints and Glazes .....	30
4.1.2.1	Lead in Soils .....	32

4.1.3	Universal Waste .....	33
4.1.3.1	Suspect Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) .....	33
4.1.3.2	Mercury Containing COmponents .....	33
4.1.3.3	Other Potential Hazardous/Regulated Substances and Building Condition Concerns .....	34
4.1.4	Mold and Moisture Testing .....	34
4.1.4.1	Spore-Trap Air Sampling .....	34
4.1.4.2	Swab/Bulk Surface Samples .....	35
4.1.4.3	Temperature and Relative Humidity .....	36
4.1.4.4	Delmhorst Moisture Meter .....	37
<b>5.0</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>39</b>
5.1	Asbestos-Containing Materials .....	39
5.2	Lead-Based Paints and Glazes .....	40
5.3	Universal Waste .....	40
5.4	Mold and Moisture .....	41
5.5	General .....	43
5.6	Limitations .....	43



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Project Information

ECS Mid-Atlantic, LLC (ECS) is pleased to provide you with the results of our Hazardous Materials and Structural Survey for 10606 Cedar Avenue located in Fairfax, Virginia.

The property consists of a two-story residential building that is approximately 2,654 square feet and is located at 10606 Cedar Avenue in Fairfax, Virginia. The building was reportedly built in 1898 and is currently zoned as a historic building. Based on the information provided by the client, a pipe rupture occurred within the building several years ago which caused a flood within the structure. The building is currently vacant. ECS has performed a Hazardous Materials and Structural Survey of the building.

### 1.2 Scope of Services

ECS is pleased to provide you with the results of our Report of Hazardous Materials and Structural Survey for the Yellow House at 10606 Cedar Avenue project. ECS services were provided in general accordance with ECS Proposal No. 46:47:4214-EPR authorized on May 31, 2017.

### 1.3 Limitations

Our observations of the building were limited to readily accessible areas only. Exterior areas obscured by vegetation, debris, equipment, etc are not considered readily accessible areas. Interior areas such as crawl spaces or areas obscured by stored items, furniture, equipment, etc. are not considered readily accessible.



## 2.0 STRUCTURAL SURVEY

On June 7, 2017, ECS Senior Project Manager Alexis Herr, PE , ECS Staff Project Manager Peter Mamola, and ECS intern Norrington Peng visited the site to perform observations of the accessible structure features.

The building is a two-story single family house located at the center of the site. The main residence was observed to consist of wood framed floors supported by wood stud walls and brick exterior walls. The house featured a basement under the south side of the structure and a crawl space under the west side of the structure. The basement was observed to be slab on grade floor construction with parged masonry walls. The crawl space was elevated wood floor framing supported by wooden beams, posts, and masonry foundation walls.

The house features included three brick chimneys, a slab on grade side porch, a garage extension, and an accessible attic. Multiple roof systems were observed including a pitched asphalt shingle and flat, likely bitumen, roof over the garage and porches.

### 2.1 Exterior observation

#### 2.1.1 Structure

The exterior structure of the building consists of brick walls covered by siding. The brick exterior walls are supported by a brick foundation/basement wall.

#### 2.1.2 Organic growth

ECS observed organic growth along the bottom of the exterior of the building. Organic growth also appeared to be growing from the gutters on the roof, on the west side of the building on the side porch, and on the exterior walls of the garage. This growth had spread from the earth to inside of the wood siding. This enables water and insects to be able to penetrate the siding and into the brick exterior. It will also cause the wood siding to separate.

## Photographs



Organic grow into the wall



Organic on the wall



Growth on side porch



Growth on side door near porch

### 2.1.3 Wood rot

ECS observed that the wood window frames of various windows are rotted. ECS tested the severity of the wood rot using hand force which resulted in the wood falling off. This indicates that there is water damage in the wood. The rot will allow for more water to become trapped and penetrate farther into the frame causing more deterioration.



**Photographs**



Window frame wood rot



Window frame wood rot



Window frame wood rot



Window frame wood rot

**2.1.4 Front step damaged**

The steps in front of the main entrance are made of bricks. Some pieces of brick are missing at the right section. This may be a safety concern for people walking on them.



**Photographs**



Bricks missing

**2.1.5 Soil Erosion**

Soil erosion was observed at the rear chimney. In particular, the concrete foundation slab appeared to be exposed. The soil was soft and easily movable to the touch. This may cause washout or settlement of the chimney that can result in instabilities or cracking.

**Photographs**



Rear chimney bottom



Rear chimney bottom



Rear chimney bottom

### 2.1.6 Downspout damaged

Observations were made of the downspouts on the exterior of the building. Some of these downspouts were not connected to the path of drainage for water to safely move away from the foundation soil. This may cause erosion of the soil around the foundation or create ways for water to penetrate the foundation.

### Photographs



Downspout path blocked



Downspout path blocked





Downspout damaged



Downspout damaged

### 2.1.7 Gutters damaged

ECS observed that the gutters around the roof edge are not functional. The gutter on the front of the roof is sagging. There is also debris that fills some areas of the gutters. This may result in water not being able to drain properly into the downspouts and causing damage to the building soffits and fascia. Improper drainage may also result in soil erosion, washout of soil at the foundation, or settlement issues.

### Photographs



Gutters filled with debris



Gutter sagging



Gutters at the front



damaged gutters

**2.1.8 Roof Condition**

There were multiple types of roof observed on the residence. The main structure featured a gabled roof which appeared to have asphalt shingles. Flat roofs were observed over the garage, porch, sun room and other features of the building. The flat roofs appeared to have modified bitumen roofing.

ECS observed the roofs to be in poor condition with the materials at the end of their useful life.

There is a hole in the roof that penetrated through the building into the second floor allowing for debris, water, and animals to collect inside.

**Photographs**



Typical roof condition



Typical roof condition





Flat roof at garage and laundry area



Shingles over bay window



Garage roof



Hole in Roof





Hole in Roof

### **2.1.9 Chimney Repointing**

The residence featured three chimneys. The chimneys were observed to be in fair to poor condition.

The east chimney was in poor condition. The east chimney of the building was observed to have extensive mortar loss. Mortar loss (loss of the binder material) appears to have resulted in movement and dislocation of the bricks. In particular large voids between bricks were observed along the mortar joints.

The north and west chimneys were in fair condition. There appeared to be mortar loss in the joints at the upper half of the chimneys.

Loss of mortar may result in instabilities of the chimneys and lead to eventually collapse.

**Photographs**



East chimney



East chimney



West chimney



West chimney



North chimney



North chimney

## 2.2 Garage

On the west side of the structure is an attached garage which appeared to have been added after original construction. The garage structure was observed to have wood roof sheathing supported by steel joists. The steel joists bear on wood framed walls. The garage floor appeared to be slab on grade construction.

Water damage was observed at locations throughout the garage. In particular, water damage was observed on the underside of the roof sheathing. This may be an indication of problems with the roofing material on the garage. Additionally, water damage can result in a loss of strength to the sheathing. Damaged sheathing will require replacement.

Damage was also observed at the door and garage door frames. These damages appeared to include wood rot and deterioration, likely the result of water intrusion. Areas of damaged wood will require replacement. Shorting maybe be required in order to safely perform this work.

The bearing walls had interior finishes, however the garage was open to the weather and there are concerns as to the condition of the wood studs forming the bearing walls. A further study would be required to determine if the studs have damage that would affect their bearing capacity.

The steel joints were observed to have corrosion throughout. The corrosion appeared to be surface rust with some pitting. At this time the joist strength did not appear to be reduced due to the corrosion. If not addressed, the corrosion will continue to worsen which may eventually lead to section loss of the steel and reduced strength. To address this concern, the garage will either need to be enclosed and conditioned to prevent high humidity and other moisture from corroding the steel further, or it may be cleaned and painted with a protective coating.



**Photographs**



Wood roof water damaged



Door Frame damaged



Door Frame damaged



Door Frame damaged





Steel surface rusted

## 2.3 Interior Observations

### 2.3.1 Structure

The structure of the building consists of wood joists framing the floors and wood stud walls. One area of floor above the kitchen was observed to be supported by beams which were encased in finish material. At a damaged area of the finish, ECS observed a steel wide flange beam at this location.

Drywall generally covers both the ceiling and walls in various rooms. The floors in many of the rooms are hardwood floors but some rooms have tiled flooring. There is an accessible attic and multiple roof systems were observed including a pitched asphalt shingle and flat, likely bitumen, roofs over the garage and porches. The pitched room was observed to be supported by wood rafters with collar ties and purlins.

## Photographs



Exposed joists in room adjacent to garage



Dry wall with hardwood floor



Rafter system supporting roof

### 2.3.2 Water Damage

Most of the rooms throughout the building have paint peeling from the ceilings and walls. This is most likely due to moisture exposure that causes the paint to de-bond from the substrate. Some water pockets were observed to have formed in the ceiling of various rooms. Water in this amount is typically the result of leaks, either in the building envelope or from plumbing.

ECS tested the severity of the condition of the dry wall by applying some force to a water damaged section of the ceiling in the kitchen and it penetrated through the dry wall easily.

While the drywall is not an integral part of the building's structure, it can provide an indication as to the condition of the wooden members behind it. Water damage to the drywall may indicate

the members beyond were also exposed to moisture which can result in wood rot and a loss of strength. Damaged areas of drywall throughout the should should be removed to allow for structural observations of the members beyond.

### Photographs



Water damaged drywall in kitchen



Ceiling paint peeling



Water damage on ceiling in room adjacent to garage



Paint peeling above door frame



Paint peeling from wall in laundry room

### 2.3.3 Ceiling Sag

On the second floor of the building, ECS observed that the ceiling under the attic in the main hallway appears to be sagging toward the center of the room. ECS was able to perform limited observations from the attic hatch. The cause and extent of the sagging (if it was limited to the ceiling or a result of damaged floor joists) could not be observed due to a attic platform floor in that location. The floor did appear to be level.

The sagging ceiling may be a result of moisture intrusion or of a damaged joist either from overstress or cracking. Further investigation of this area may be required, however shoring should be used to support the attic prior to entrance.

### Photographs



Second floor hallway ceiling sag



### 2.3.4 Cracks in Ceiling and Walls

ECS observed cracks on the walls and ceilings throughout the inside of the building. Generally, the cracking was in dry wall or other finishes. In particular, many cracks started or terminated near reentrant corners of door frames. Cracks were observed in most rooms, however cracks did not appear to be continuous between the first and second levels. Multiple cracks were observed to be greater than 1/16" in thickness, which may be considered significant.


The cracks in the ceiling finishes may have resulted from swelling of the wooden joists, deflections of the joists or from moisture intrusion. Cracks in the walls may be caused by the wood studs moving due to foundation settlement issues or by moisture intrusion.

Corners where materials (both structural or finish) may change or door frame corners are common areas to observe cracks. Cracks in these locations may be the result of differential movements between materials or of slightly unintended settlement or loading. These cracks are often not an indication of large structural problems. However, the size of the observed cracks observed in the residence was noted to be greater than those expected under typical conditions. Lack of moisture control may have resulted in larger differential movements, or settlement may have occurred. Cracks may also be an indication of problems with the structural studs and joists behind the finishes. Further investigation, such as observations of the wood substrate after finishes are removed, is likely required.

### Photographs



Cracks along a wall



Cracks along a wall



Crack along a wall



Crack along a wall



Cracks on a ceiling

### 2.3.5 Roof Collapse

A collapsed area of roof and ceiling was observed from inside of the building on the second floor. The resulting hole has allowed water, debris and animals to collect inside of the building. The wood flooring below the hole appears to be damaged by water let in from the hole in the roof. The floor in the area below the hole was discolored and soft. The roof sheathing around the hole also showed signs of damage which may effect the strength of the roof. At this time, damage to the ceiling joists was not observed.

If the resulting hole is not addressed, moisture and debris intrusion will result in continued structural deterioration and the collapsed area expanding. While the specific cause of the hole is unknown, the most likely explanation is that the roofing material failed resulting in leaks and water damage to the structure and ultimately collapse. Other possible causes would include an impact load of a falling tree branch or similar.

The collapsed area is a serious condition and failure of the structural system.

### Photographs



Hole penetrating from roof



Hole penetrating from roof



Debris fallen through hole creating possible water damage

### 2.3.6 Laundry Room Ceiling Hole

ECS observed a hole in the ceiling of the laundry room. In this area, the drywall that had not fallen completely was observed to have detached from the wood joists running across the ceiling resulting in a sag and instability. At this time damage to the exposed floor joists was not observed. The floor of the laundry was observed to be laminate tile on slab on grade. While damages to the tile were observed, the slab appeared intact.



The hole is likely the result of a water leak from above the ceiling. In particular this may be caused by a leak in plumbing. Water from the leak was trapped in the ceiling and over time resulted in the ceiling failure.

The overall structure in this location appears stable, however the finishes which have not fallen remain a safety concern should they fall at a later time.


### Photographs



Hole in Laundry Room



Hole in Laundry Room



Insulation from ceiling in laundry room exposed



Flooring in the laundry room

### 2.4 Basement

The basement was observed to be comprised of a slab on grade floor with parged masonry walls. To the west of the basement was a crawl space constructed of elevated wood floor framing supported by wooden beams, posts, and masonry foundation walls.

ECS observed organic growth penetrating through the exterior walls of the building into the basement. The base of the walls appeared to have been affected by the pipe burst as stated in section 1.1. There were also extensive cracking visible in the parged masonry foundation walls. This may be a result of settlement movement or water penetration.

One area of the east wall was observed to have exposed brick. The mortar in this area was sandy and loose to the touch. Mortar and binder loss of this type are typically caused by water intrusion and moisture damage and can result in cracking and instabilities.

In particular, severe damage was observed at the basement window sill. Cracking and overall material deterioration were observed. This window will likely require replacement with some amount of demolition and rebuilding of the brick adjacent to it.

### Photographs



Organic growth penetrating from outside into basement



Water damage of the walls



Cracks in the parged walls



Exposed area of basement wall



Crawl space



Basement window



### 3.0 STRUCTURAL EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At this time, the residence was in poor condition. The structural frame of the building appeared to have integrity in most areas, however finishes prevented observations of all areas of concern. In particular, water damage to finishes observed throughout the building may be an indication that damage has also occurred to the structural members in these locations.

A few severe conditions were noted and should be addressed. These include the collapsed area of roof, collapsed ceiling in the laundry room, and wood rot observed on window and door frames.

The following recommendations are provided;

The area of the collapsed roof needs to be repaired. The hole creates an entry point into the structure for water, debris, and animals to enter. Further more severe structural damages will occur if left untreated. ECS recommends patching all holes found on the roof to prevent any further damages to the structure.

The wood rot throughout the structure, on the exterior windows and window frames creates another entry point for water, harmful penetration of bacteria and animals to collect inside the structure. This may lead to holes forming where wood rot deteriorates. ECS recommends that wood rot throughout the structure as well as inside be taken out and replaced with new wood and framing.

The organic growth that is present growing on the exterior of the structure and inside the basement walls needs to be removed. This can lead to more entry points of water and deteriorating mortar integrity. The basement walls will eventually lose its structural strength if left untreated. ECS recommends removing the growth however extensive removal is required to prevent further damages.

The downspouts around the perimeter of the structure should be replaced and extended away from the building foot print. Allowing water to not drain properly gives a passage way for it to seep into the soil beneath the foundation and cause settlement movement overtime. Additional drainage system may be required. ECS recommends that the gutters on the structure's roof, including areas of fascia and soffit damage should be replaced to allow water to flow from the roof and away from the structure. Gutters that are filled with debris or damaged in anyway can cause damage to the roof.

The drywall throughout the structure including walls and ceilings should be replaced. Water damage to the drywall was present which causes other bacteria to grow. If left untreated the bacteria will continue to grow and move into different areas of the interior. During replacement, ECS recommends a structural engineer or knowledgeable contractor observe the condition of the exposed studs, beams, and joists. If areas of wood rot, deflection, splitting, or other damages are observed the damaged member is to be replaced.

The flat roof above the garage and the gabled roof above the main structure need to be replaced. Debris and water will continue to collect and damage the roof overtime. ECS recommends that when replacing the original roof that it be completely removed so that repairs to the roof sheathing and substrate can be made as needed.

The chimneys and basement wall of the structure should be replaced. Continuing damage to the chimneys may cause them to collapse which is a safety concern and may create further damage to the structure. ECS recommends either re-pointing the chimneys or replacing them fully.

The basement wall if left untreated will allow a passage way for water intrusion which creates an opportunity for settlement movement or foundation issues. The window in the basement area of the structure including the brick area near this location should also be replaced. Water, debris and animals are able to enter the structure through this area. ECS recommends patching or replacing any damaged part of the wall and near the window to prevent any further damage to the foundation. Re-pointing of areas of the basement wall is also recommended.

The steel joists supporting the flat roof of the garage may require coating with a protective material to ensure structural stability and integrity. Overtime the steel can rust and lose its strength by coming into contact with water. ECS recommends treating the steel member in the garage to ensure structural stability and a prolonged lifespan.

The front steps of the structure should be repaired or replaced. The bricks that create the steps have sharp edges that can cause harm to people walking on them. ECS recommends a full replacement of the stairs or repair the existing bricks to prevent people from getting hurt on them.

Although not observed for nonstructural concerns; the additional systems require investigation and replacement.

- Plumbing
- HVAC
- New building insulation
- Electrical work
- Clearing of the chimneys and ducts
- Replacement of the water heater and boiler



#### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY

ECS performed a survey for asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, universal waste materials, and mold and moisture for the structure. The purpose of this evaluation was to determine if the materials within the building that may become disturbed as part of renovations or demolition efforts will require special handling, worker protection, and/or proper disposal efforts.

To assess the building for suspect asbestos-containing materials, ECS performed a survey of the interior, exterior, and roofing materials within areas that were readily accessible. Based on the analytical results of the collected samples, the following materials were reported to contain asbestos:

- 9" x 9" Black Floor Tile with Green Streaks
- Interior Light Gray Wall Caulk
- Drywall Joint Compound
- White Sink Undercoat
- Black Sealant on Roof
- Black Cement on Roof Vent
- Exterior Tan Caulk on Chimney
- Exterior Gray Siding Cement Board

The drywall joint compound was observed to be within the debris on the floor in some areas. The 9" x 9" black floor tiles were also observed to be broken in some areas of the dining room. The floor surfaces within the structure should be assumed to contain asbestos in the dust from the degradation of the wall materials containing drywall joint compound.

The readily accessible interior and exterior surfaces and substrates were evaluated for lead based paint (LBP) within the structure. The survey was performed as a preliminary screening to assess the substrates and components for lead concentrations. The screening at this time, does not intend to represent a HUD scope survey or for lead clearance purposes. Painted and/or glazed surfaces were assessed for lead content using a Direct-Read X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) Spectrometer. Based on the collected readings, the following surfaces were detected to contain lead above 1.0 milligrams per square centimeter ( $\geq 1.0 \text{ mg/cm}^2$ ):

- Brick - White Wall
- Ceramic - Blue Walls; White Walls White Floor; White Sink; White Toilet; White Tub
- Concrete Block - White Wall
- Plaster - White Wall; Yellow Wall
- Wood - Gray Stair Riser
- Wood - Natural Door Jamb; Red Door; White Door; White Door Casing; White Baseboard; White Chair Rail; White Door Jamb; White Window Casing; Black Shutter; White Window Casing; Yellow Wall; White Wall

Peeling and chipped paint was observed in several areas, interior and exterior, of the structure. The floor surfaces within the structure should be assumed to contain lead dust from the degradation of the painted surfaces. Table 8 attached to this report contains a list of the collected readings, associated locations, and results.





In addition, ECS was requested to perform lead in soil sampling along the exterior drip-line/foundation surrounding the structure. Two representative composite samples were obtained from the front and rear sides of the structure. The sample collected from the front of the structure was reported to have a lead concentration of 660 parts per million (ppm), and the soil sample collected from the rear side of the house was reported at 160 ppm. The concentrations of lead were reported to be below the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) criteria for lead in bare soils at drip line/foundation areas at 1,200 ppm.

ECS surveyed the building for various materials classified as hazardous and/or universal wastes which may require special handling or disposal if removed. The following materials were identified within the building:

- Fluorescent Lamps and Light Ballasts
- Mercury Thermostats
- Lead- Acid Batteries associated with Alarm Panels, Emergency Lights, etc.
- Roadway Salt Stockpile in the Garage

ECS also collected two representative composite samples of window caulk/glaze from the structure. The samples were analyzed for Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs). Based on the analytical results, PCBs were not detected above the laboratory reporting limits.

Observations and testing services were performed for obvious conditions such as mold and/or moisture on readily accessible surfaces that may contribute to poor indoor air quality. Testing services were provided for temperature, relative humidity, and fungal spore concentrations in representative areas. Briefly summarized are our findings at the time of our site visit.

- Visible Mold and/or Water Staining on Interior Surfaces (walls, ceilings, floors) Throughout the Structure
- Peeling Paint/Delaminating Plaster/Drywall Materials
- Large Opening in Roof, Roof Leaks
- Bird Guano, Dead Animals and Other Pests
- Elevated Relative Humidity Levels associated with Unconditioned Environmental Conditions
- Elevated Levels of Airborne and Surface Fungal Concentrations

Building materials located beneath the areas of the roof leaks were impacted on each floor level from rainfall (water intrusion) events. Visible mold and water staining was present in these areas. Interior wall, ceiling, and floor cavities are assumed to be impacted with mold and water staining due to the unconditioned environment of the structure.

ECS recommends that during entry or use of the structure by visitors or contractors, proper Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) should be used due to the presence of lead, asbestos, and mold on materials that appear to be present on surfaces or within debris throughout various areas of the structure. Mold remediation efforts would need to be performed for all surfaces and materials within each room of the structure. These efforts would need to be performed in coordination with regulated work performed for asbestos and lead.



Since the structure has been vacant and unmaintained for a long period of time with active roof leaks, interior wall, floor, and ceiling cavities are likely compromised by hidden mold and water impacts as either a result of leaks or high humidity and unconditioned environment. Consideration should be made in regards to the cost for mold/asbestos/lead removal efforts and the value of the structure.

#### 4.1 Methods and Results

##### 4.1.1 Asbestos-Containing Materials

The asbestos survey was performed by a Commonwealth of Virginia licensed asbestos inspector (VA License No. 3303003186). Samples were collected in general accordance with US EPA NESHAP Regulations (40 CFR 61 Subpart E) and OSHA Standard 29 CFR 1926.1101 Inspection Protocol. Multiple samples of each unique material were submitted. Samples were analyzed using "Positive Stop" methodology. If one sample of a homogeneous material is detected to contain asbestos, the remaining samples of that material are not analyzed. EPA regulations stipulate that if one sample contains asbestos the entire quantity of that material contains asbestos, regardless of additional analysis.

Samples of suspect Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs) were collected utilizing hand tools and placed into individual, labeled plastic bags. Unique bulk suspect ACM samples were sent to Scientific Analytical Institute, Inc. (SAI) in Greensboro, North Carolina for analysis via Polarized Light Microscopy (PLM) in accordance with current EPA-600 methodology. Materials consisting of additional layers were analyzed separately. SAI is listed as an accredited laboratory by the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Plan (NVLAP) managed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) for bulk sample analysis. In total, 78 bulk representative samples were submitted to the laboratory of which 109 layers were analyzed.

An ACM is defined as any building material containing more than one percent (>1%) asbestos as determined using the method specified in Appendix A, Subpart F, 40 CFR Part 763, Section 1, PLM. Friable ACMs are defined as any ACM that, when dry, can be crumbled, pulverized or reduced to powder by hand pressure. A non-friable ACM is defined as any ACM that, when dry, cannot be crumbled, pulverized, or reduced to powder by hand pressure. Category I non-friable ACMs include: packing, gaskets, resilient floor coverings and asphalt roofing products containing more than one percent (>1%) asbestos. Category II non-friable ACMs are any non-friable material, excluding Category I non-friable ACBM, containing more than one percent (>1%) asbestos.

Table 1 below summarizes the materials reported to contain asbestos. A list of the sampled materials and reported results is located in Table 7 attached to this report. Photographs of collected samples reported as asbestos containing are also attached to this report.

**Table 1 - Asbestos Containing Building Materials Summary**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Material</b>	<b>Friability</b>
Den (Room off Garage)	9" x 9" Black Floor Tile with Green Streaks	Category I Non-Friable

<b>Location</b>	<b>Material</b>	<b>Friability</b>
Den (Room off Garage) – Near Fireplace	Light Gray Interior Wall Caulk	Category II Non-Friable
Drywall (Gypsum) Wall/Ceiling Board Systems	Drywall Joint Compound	Category II Non-Friable
Kitchen	White Sink Undercoat	Category II Non-Friable
Roof Over Northwest Bedroom	Black Seam Sealant on Asphalt Shingle Roll	Category II Non-Friable
Roof Over Northwest Bedroom	Black Cement on Roof Vent	Category II Non-Friable
Side Porch	Exterior Tan Caulk on Chimney	Category II Non-Friable
Exterior Siding	Exterior Gray Siding Cement Board	Category II Non-Friable

*Note:* The location provided specifies the general location of the material. Please see below for a narrative of the identified locations of ACMs. Materials identified as asbestos containing should be assumed to be located in other areas of the building if not otherwise identified.

The asbestos containing 9" x 9" black floor tile was observed within the den area (a room adjoining the garage). The floor tiles may be located in other areas and beneath cabinetry, fixed furniture, shelving units, partition walls etc. The asbestos wall caulk was observed along wall seams at the fireplace in the den. The asbestos containing white sink undercoat was only observed in the kitchen.

The drywall/ceiling boards were observed in various areas where additions or renovations appear to have occurred. The northeast section of the house appears to be an addition for both the main and upper floor levels. Although the drywall joint compound is listed as a Category II non-friable material, when disturbed this material will become friable and should be handled as a friable material.

The roofing system over the northwest bedroom was observed to have an asphalt sheet roll shingle-like material. The seam sealant on this material is reported to contain asbestos. The black cement on the roof vents is also reported to contain asbestos.

The structure is sided with asbestos cement board panels. The felt paper associated with these panels is assumed to be contaminated with asbestos since the installation of the panels most likely utilized nails that penetrated the felt paper. The laundry room at the north side of the structure appears to have been an addition as cement panels were observed in the ceiling cavity of the laundry room where the ceiling was collapsed and exposed the interior ceiling/wall cavities.



ECS recommends where a material type has been identified as asbestos containing that materials exhibiting similar color and/or texture (i.e. homogenous) throughout the building's interior and exterior be assumed to contain asbestos.

#### **4.1.1.1 Materials Assumed to Contain Asbestos**

Due to the inaccessibility or the destructive means that asbestos sampling requires, additional suspect ACMs may remain within the building hidden behind inaccessible areas that include, but are not limited to, sub-grade walls, exterior areas, sub-grade sealants, flooring located below underlayments, areas behind solid walls or above solid ceilings, pipe chases, vapor barriers, etc. These areas were deemed inaccessible and were not assessed.

If these materials are discovered during renovations they should be presumed to contain asbestos and be treated as asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) or, otherwise, sampled immediately upon discovery and prior to disturbance for asbestos content by a certified asbestos inspector in accordance with 29 CFR 1926.1101.

The following list of materials assumed to contain asbestos is not comprehensive, but does include materials typically present in similarly constructed buildings:

- Air Handler Components in the air handlers (interior components);
- Concrete Masonry Unit (Blocks/Walls) with Vermiculite filler;
- Electrical Panels Asbestos Cement Components in electrical systems;
- Light shield Insulation in light shields;
- Mastics or cement boards associated with Baseboard Heaters/Radiators Components/Wall Mounted Fan Coil Units in and/or behind radiators/baseboards;
- Mirror Mastics behind/under mirrors;
- Soffit and materials within exterior soffit cavity at exterior locations;
- Thermal System Insulation (TSI) on pipes within chases behind walls and above ceilings;
- Waterproofing Membrane/Mastics/vapor barriers within exterior wall cavities, behind interior finishes, exterior veneer and/or subgrade walls;
- Wood Panels and/or Paneling Mastic/Felt Paper behind panels and/or paneling;

#### **4.1.2 Lead-Based Paints and Glazes**

The lead-based paint (LBP) survey was performed by a Commonwealth of Virginia licensed lead risk assessor (VA License No. 3356000966). Painted and/or glazed surfaces were assessed for lead content using a Direct-Read X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) Spectrometer manufactured by Innov-X Systems.

The survey was conducted utilizing the VA and U.S. EPA definition of lead-based paint. Under this definition, painted surfaces which contain lead in concentrations equal to or greater than 1.0 milligrams per square centimeter ( $\geq 1.0 \text{ mg/cm}^2$ ) are classified as coated with LBP. Paints with concentrations of lead detectable by the XRF are considered lead-containing paints. Additionally, fixtures or components that are manufactured with a factory applied glazing (i.e., sinks, toilets, ceramic tiles, etc.) are tested as these factory-applied finishes often contain lead. Lead-containing glazes, while not lead-based paints by the EPA definition, are regulated by OSHA (29 CFR 1926.62).



The representative survey included taking readings from walls, windows, doors, and miscellaneous components. Walls are listed by letter with wall "A" being the entrance of the subject building, proceeding clockwise to "B, C, D", etc. The survey was not performed for compliance with HUD Chapter 7 requirements or lead clearance certifications purposes. A total of 184 readings were collected during the survey, including calibration and standardization readings.

Painted and glazed surfaces which contain lead in concentrations equal to or greater than 1.0 milligrams per square centimeter ( $\geq 1.0 \text{ mg/cm}^2$ ) are listed below.

**Table 2 - XRF Lead-Based Paint Summary**

Reading	Location	Substrate	Color	Component	Pb (mg/cm <sup>2</sup> )
10	1st Floor – Den	Wood	Natural	Door Jamb	3.41
18	1st Floor – Den	Wood	White	Wall	3.53
26	1st Floor – Dining Room	Wood	White	Chair Rail	2.48
27	1st Floor – Dining Room	Wood	White	Chair Rail	2.35
40	1st Floor – Dining Room	Plaster	Yellow	Wall	1.00
41	1st Floor – Dining Room	Plaster	Yellow	Wall	1.00
62	1st Floor - Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Wall	1.37
64	1st Floor - Bathroom	Ceramic	Blue	Wall	2.16
65	1st Floor - Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Sink	1.00
66	1st Floor - Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Toilet	1.00
67	1st Floor - Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Tub	5.00
97	Basement	Wood	Gray	Stair Riser	4.45
99	Basement	Concrete Block	White	Wall	1.18
100	Basement	Concrete Block	White	Wall	2.66
103	Basement	Brick	White	Wall	1.16
104	Basement	Plaster	White	Wall	1.54
109	2nd Floor - Hallway	Wood	White	Window Casing	2.28
113	2nd Floor – Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Wall	1.00
115	2nd Floor – Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Toilet	1.00
116	2nd Floor – Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Floor	5.00
117	2nd Floor – Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Floor	1.00

Reading	Location	Substrate	Color	Component	Pb (mg/cm <sup>2</sup> )
123	2nd Floor – Bathroom	Wood	White	Baseboard	1.00
132	2nd Floor – Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Sink	5.00
135	2nd Floor – Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Toilet	1.00
136	2nd Floor – Bathroom	Ceramic	White	Wall	1.00
148	2nd Floor - Bedroom	Plaster	White	Wall	1.00
151	2nd Floor - Bedroom	Plaster	White	Wall	1.00
157	Exterior	Wood	Yellow	Wall	1.00
158	Exterior	Wood	Black	Shutter	2.67
159	Exterior	Wood	White	Window Casing	1.81
165	Garage	Wood	White	Door Jamb	1.02
166	Garage	Wood	White	Door	1.25
171	Exterior	Wood	Black	Shutter	1.72
175	Exterior	Wood	White	Door Casing	1.35
176	Exterior	Wood	Red	Door	1.79

*Note:* Pb – Lead in milligrams per square centimeter (mg/cm<sup>2</sup>)

Various components painted or coated with glazings were reported as lead-based paint. Painted and glazed surfaces which contain lead in concentrations less than 1.0 milligrams per square centimeter (< 1.0 mg/cm<sup>2</sup>) are considered “lead-containing paints”. Several components were reported as lead containing with concentrations ranging from 0.01 to 0.91 mg/cm<sup>2</sup>. OSHA has no specific action level for lead in paint or glazings and they consider any amount of lead in a material as a potential concern with respect to occupational exposure. Work activities disturbing painted or glazed surfaces with measurable concentrations of lead should be performed in accordance with 29 CFR 1926.62. Please refer to the attached Table 8 for the complete listing of readings and results. Disturbance of LBP is also regulated under US EPA Renovation, Repair, and Paint Regulations under 40 CFR 745.

Peeling paint and degraded wall and ceiling surfaces were observed in several areas of the structure. Dust and paint chips on the floor surfaces are assumed to contain lead from the identified lead-based/containing paints.

#### 4.1.2.1 Lead in Soils

ECS collected two representative soil samples from the drip line/foundation of the front and rear sides of the structure. Sampling was performed in general accordance with EPA/HUD guidelines. One composite of sub samples was collected each the front and rear sides of the structure. The samples were submitted to Scientific Analytical Institute, Inc. (SAI) labs in Greensboro, North Carolina per





chain of custody protocol per EPA methodology: Flame Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy EPA SW-846 3050B/6010C/7000B.

Based on the analytical results of the collected samples, Sample S-1 collected from the front side of the structure was reported to have a lead concentration of 660 ppm. Sample S-2 collected from the rear side of the structure was reported to have a lead concentration of 160 ppm. These levels are reported to be below the EPA/HUD compliance level of 1,200 ppm for lead in bare soil along the drip line/foundation.

#### **4.1.3 Universal Waste**

ECS assessed the building for various selected materials which may require special handling or disposal as universal or hazardous waste if removed from the building. Materials which may require sampling or characterization prior to disposal are summarized below.

##### **4.1.3.1 Suspect Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)**

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are toxic coolants or lubricating oils used in some electrical transformers and capacitors, hydraulically-operated equipment, light ballasts, and other similar equipment.

Observations were made for potential liquid PCB containing materials and equipment. At the time of the survey, several of the fluorescent light ballasts were observed throughout the structure in an attempt to identify labeling indicating the presence/absence of PCB containing fluids.

Several light ballasts were observed within the building. Labeling was not observed on the ballasts that were accessible. At this time, it is recommended that all ballasts be assumed to be suspect PCB containing until they are removed during construction and can be segregated. At the time of our investigation, no evidence of damage or leaking was observed on or in the vicinity of the inspected fixtures.

ECS collected two representative window caulk and glazing samples for analysis of PCBs. Interior and exterior window caulk and glazing were included in the sampling event. Two samples of each glazing and caulks were collected as composite samples. The samples were submitted to Environmental Hazard Services, LLC (EHS) in Richmond, Virginia per chain of custody protocol per EPA Method SW846 8082A.

Based on the results, two collected samples were not reported to contain PCBs above the laboratory reporting limit. A copy of the analytical results and chain of custody are attached to this report.

##### **4.1.3.2 Mercury Containing Components**

The EPA classifies mercury as both hazardous and toxic. The survey included observations for building components, equipment or other apparatus, which could contain mercury, such as thermostats, fluorescent lamps, and switch-containing devices.

As previously discussed, fluorescent lamps were observed throughout the building. The fluorescent lamps may contain small quantities of mercury and are regulated for disposal.



#### 4.1.3.3 Other Potential Hazardous/Regulated Substances and Building Condition Concerns

Lead-acid batteries located in emergency lamps, exit signs, alarm panels and associated with electrical components, etc. were observed. The following materials were also observed which may require special handling and disposal during renovation activities:

- Fluorescent Lamps and Light Ballasts
- Mercury Thermostats
- Lead- Acid Batteries associated with Alarm Panels, Emergency Lights, etc.
- Roadway Salt Stockpile in the Garage

#### 4.1.4 Mold and Moisture Testing

Observations for evidence of mold and moisture conditions were made for readily accessible surfaces within the structure. Photographs of our observations are attached to this report.

Based on our observations, visible mold was observed on the walls, ceilings, and floors of each room of the structure. A roof leak was observed at the upper level with degraded wall, ceiling, and floor materials on each floor below. Various other leaks and evidence of water staining were observed in other areas. The structure appears to have been vacant and unconditioned for a period of time. Elevated seasonal humidity conditions appear to have contributed to mold on most all surfaces in the structure. Doors, ceilings, and walls were observed to have sporadic mold growth. Peeling paint and degraded plaster were observed in several areas. These surfaces where impacted may also contain lead based paints and asbestos.

##### 4.1.4.1 Spore-Trap Air Sampling

Spore-trap air sampling was performed at representative areas at each floor level. For air sample collection, a high volume sampling pump and Air-O-Cell™ cassettes were utilized in sampling for airborne fungal spores, hyphal fragments, insect fragments, and pollen. Analytical background levels on the slide of skin fragments, fibers, and other debris are also reported. Air samples were collected with an air flow of 15 liters/minute verified by a pre-calibrated rotameter for 5 minutes (75 liters). The collected samples were submitted to Scientific Analytical Institute, Inc. (SAI) located in Greensboro, North Carolina for analysis. SAI is an AIHA (American Industrial Hygiene Association) EMLAP (Environmental Microbiology Laboratory Accreditation Program) accredited laboratory. The samples were analyzed per Direct Microscopic Exam in accordance to the laboratory's quantification methods. The analytical results and chain of custody are attached in the Appendix of the report.

Airborne fungal spore counts can be used as an indicator of the possible presence of mold growth generated by sources of moisture within a building. However, lack of elevations in spore count levels does not necessarily indicate that moisture intrusion concerns do not exist. Please note, there are currently no accepted regulatory standards or guidelines with respect to acceptable fungal levels inside buildings.

Spore-trap air samples were collected from the main living room, second floor stairwell, kitchen, and basement. Representative exterior samples were also collected during each sampling event

for comparison purposes to interior results. The following table summarizes the reported total concentrations from the collected samples.

**Table 3 - Spore-Trap Air Sample Summary**

Sample Number	Sample Location	Total Fungal Spore Concentration (count/m <sup>3</sup> )
A1	Exterior	9,720
A2	Kitchen	17,000
A3	Basement	9,800
A4	Living Room	13,400
A5	2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Stairwell	10,300
A6	Exterior	10,800

*Key:* count/m<sup>3</sup> - spores counts per cubic meter of air

In reviewing the overall total spore concentrations, each of the interior collected samples was reported to be above at least one of the exterior samples results for total spore concentrations.

In reviewing the individual spore genera reported, levels of *Penicillium/Aspergillus*, *Cladosporium* sp., and *Chaetomium* sp. spores were reported to be above exterior levels generally throughout the interior sampled areas. Levels of hyphal fragments were also reported to be above the exterior levels at each interior sample location.

Trace levels of a few spore groups were noted in the interior collected samples, however, based on the results, the concentrations do not appear to be significant as some small variability is typical when comparing indoor and outdoor fungal spore concentrations.

Overall, elevations of fungal spore concentrations appear to be present within the interior areas of the structure as compared to the exterior. Please note, there are currently no accepted regulatory standards or guidelines with respect to acceptable fungal levels inside buildings.

#### 4.1.4.2 Swab/Bulk Surface Samples

One swab sample was collected using a pre-packaged sterile/pre-moistened swab to sample a suspect surface or material. One bulk sample of attic insulation was also collected and submitted to the laboratory for analysis. This is a semi-quantitative test and only indicative of the location sampled and primarily meant to identify the type of mold spores present and associated concentration from the sampled area only. The results may also present concentration ratings reported for hyphal fragments pollen, insect fragments, skin fragments, fibrous particulate, and background matter.

The collected sample was submitted to SAI. The samples were analyzed per Direct Microscopic Exam in accordance to the laboratory's quantification methods. The analytical results and chain of custody are provided in the Appendix of this report.

ECS collected a surface sample from the door within the kitchen that displayed obvious visible mold across the surface of the door. The results are summarized below.



**Table 4 - Swab/Bulk Surface Sample Summary**

Sample Number	Sample Location	Analytical Results	
		Type	Density Rating
S-1 (Swab)	Kitchen Interior Wood Door	<i>Cladosporium</i> sp. Fruiting Bodies Hyphal Fragments Debris	<b>Loaded</b> <b>Loaded</b> <b>Loaded</b> Trace
B-1 (Bulk)	Attic Brown Insulation	<i>Ascospores</i> sp. <i>Basidiospores</i> sp. <i>Cladosporium</i> sp. <i>Curvularia</i> sp. <i>Epicoccum</i> sp. Hyphal Fragments	<b>Abundant</b> Trace Light Trace Trace Trace

Key: Density Rating: Trace – 1-10 spore counts/area; Light – 11-100 spore counts/area; Abundant - 101-300 spore counts/area; Loaded - >300 spore counts/area

Elevated levels of *Cladosporium* sp. fungal spores, fruiting bodies, and hyphal fragments were detected in the sample from the door in the kitchen. The presence of fruiting bodies and hyphal fragments is often an indicator of mold growth.

Notable levels of spores were reported for the attic insulation. Some levels of spores within dust are expected to be associated with attic insulation since this material is located in an area not normally considered a conditioned and clean environment. Please note, this sample only represents the location of the material assessed. Due to the roof leaks, the attic insulation and associated ceiling boards (drywall/plaster) should be considered compromised.

It is important to note however that spore measurements can fluctuate rapidly and the readings reported should not be used as a definitive indication that mold and or health hazards related to mold are present or absent.

#### 4.1.4.3 Temperature and Relative Humidity

Environmental conditions, including temperature and relative humidity (RH), were recorded using a Fluke meter. The purpose of these measurements was to evaluate if interior temperature and RH were sufficient to support mold growth and also to measure general indoor comfort parameters related to temperature/relative humidity. The relative humidity is the ratio of the amount of moisture contained in the air to the maximum amount of moisture the air can contain at a specific temperature.

The key to controlling mold growth is moisture control. The EPA recommends maintaining the relative humidity (RH) below 60%, ideally 30 to 50%, to prevent mold growth. ASHRAE recommends general temperature a range of 68 to 76°F (comfort range) assuming relative humidity is between 30 to 65% RH.

**Table 5 - Temperature and Relative Humidity Summary**

Location	Relative Humidity (%)	Temperature (° F)
Exterior	54.2	68.9
Kitchen	61.0	68.4
Basement	64.7	66.5
Living Room	64.5	67.6
2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Hallway	62.4	68.9
Exterior	58.6	68.8

Key: ° F – Degree Fahrenheit; % - percent

The exterior conditions were sunny and warm during our site visit. Precipitation was not encountered during our survey. The interior relative humidity levels were slightly elevated. Interior temperature and relative humidity levels are generally influenced by exterior conditions since the structure is not conditioned and an opening in the roof is present.

#### 4.1.4.4 Delmhorst Moisture Meter

ECS measured the moisture content in various building materials in select locations within the surveyed areas utilizing a Delmhorst brand hand-held moisture probe (Model BD 2100). Based on the Delmhorst moisture meter scales for materials, moisture levels greater than 0.5% are considered elevated for drywall wallboard materials and are considered at risk for mold growth. Levels greater than 15% for wood materials and greater than 85% for plaster surfaces are considered elevated. This was not a comprehensive moisture mapping survey of all building materials within the areas surveyed but rather a non-invasive survey of moisture in select areas of specific building materials which may be impacted by moisture.

**Table 6 - Delmhorst Moisture Meter Probe Summary**

Location	Area	Substrate	Moisture Content (%)
Kitchen	Ceiling (Damaged)	Drywall	0.3 – 0.4
2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Stairwell	Wall (Damaged)	Plaster	40.8
2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Stairwell	Wall (Damaged)	Drywall	0.4
2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Stairwell	Baseboard	Wood	<b>20.6</b>
2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Stairwell	Floor	Wood	<b>40+</b>

Key: ° F – Degree Fahrenheit; % - percent

Moisture readings were collected from select areas where moisture intrusions appeared to be present. Not all water stained or impacted surfaces were tested. The baseboards and flooring in the second floor hallway where the roof is opened were noted to have elevated moisture levels. ECS also observed the subflooring materials in the main floor bathroom were saturated which was determined by physical contact.

Although moisture readings were not detected to be elevated in all areas tested, this does not mean that these areas have not been impacted by water intrusions in the past. It is possible that concealed areas of impact may be present within solid walls and/or above hard ceilings.





## 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Asbestos-Containing Materials

Federal, state and local regulations require asbestos-containing materials be removed prior to disturbance by either renovations or demolishing the building. ECS recommends the identified asbestos-containing materials and any assumed asbestos-containing materials found to be present within the building be removed by a certified/licensed asbestos abatement contractor prior to disturbance. Any assumed or newly discovered material(s) should be sampled by an accredited asbestos inspector prior to disturbance.

Prior to removal of Regulated Asbestos Containing Materials (RACMs) and selected non-friable materials, notification may be required by either by VA and/or the EPA. This notification, if appropriate, must be filed by a certified asbestos abatement contractor 20 calendar days before starting asbestos abatement activities.

If asbestos-containing materials are to be removed, it is generally required that a certified/licensed asbestos Project Monitor observe the project and collect final clearance samples. This involves collecting air samples from within and outside abatement work areas to review the abatement contractor's work practices over the course of the project. The Project Monitor should inform the building owner if the asbestos abatement contractor is not performing the work in accordance with project specifications, and federal and state regulations for asbestos.

The project monitor should assess each work area and monitor the removal of asbestos-containing materials. Only after the monitor has determined the identified ACMs have been removed should final clearance air samples be collected. ECS can provide these services for an additional fee if requested.

Suspect asbestos containing materials not observed due to inaccessibility or not sampled due to the destructive means that sampling requires during the survey may be encountered during renovation activities. At the time of the survey, destructive means were not used to locate or sample suspect ACMs; therefore, additional suspect ACMs may remain within the building hidden behind inaccessible areas that include, but are not limited to, sub-grade walls, exterior areas, sub-grade sealants, flooring located below underlayments, areas behind solid walls or above solid ceiling, pipe chases, vapor barriers, etc. were deemed inaccessible and were not assessed. If additional suspect asbestos-containing materials are uncovered during renovation activities which were not accessible during this survey, it is recommended that these materials be sampled immediately upon discovery for asbestos content by a certified asbestos inspector in accordance with 29 CFR 1926.1101.

Under OSHA regulations for asbestos (29 CR 1926.1101), ECS also recommends that the site develop an Operations and Maintenance (O&M) plan to manage any asbestos containing materials remaining within the building. The OSHA regulations call for development of maintenance procedures, proper training, and notification for employees working around asbestos materials. The purpose of these regulations is to protect employees and also outside contractors and the public from potential asbestos exposures.



Please note, that the drywall joint compound is reported as asbestos-containing. Several walls and ceilings were observed to be degraded from roof leaks and elevated humidity conditions. The dust on the floor surfaces are assumed to be contaminated with asbestos dust. Those who access the building should utilize proper PPE when accessing or performing work within the structure. ECS recommends the debris be immediately abated and the impacted materials that are impacted be abated or repaired.

## 5.2 Lead-Based Paints and Glazes

Lead-based paint/glaze and lead-containing paint/glaze is an environmental concern primarily when it becomes airborne or is ingested. Contractors performing work that could impact paint films or glazing (i.e. scrapped or flaked off, or made airborne in a dust media) that have detectable concentrations of lead should be informed of the testing results and should take appropriate actions to comply with OSHA Standard 29 CFR 1926.62. – Lead in Construction.

Painted surfaces containing lead in concentrations less than 1.0 milligrams per square centimeter (< 1.0 mg/cm<sup>2</sup>), may, during disturbance, generate lead dust greater than the Permissible Exposure Limit (PEL) of 50 micrograms per cubic millimeter (µg/m<sup>3</sup>) as an 8-hour Time Weighted Average (TWA) established by U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Standard 29 CFR 1926.62 – Lead in Construction.

The OSHA standard also gives no guidance on acceptable levels of lead in paint at which no exposure to airborne lead (above the action level) would be expected. Rather, OSHA defines airborne concentrations, and references specific types of work practices and operations from which a lead hazard may be generated (reference 29 CFR 1926.62, section d). Environmental and personnel monitoring should be conducted during any removal/demolition process (as appropriate) to verify that actual personal exposures are below the Permissible Exposure Limit (PEL). Under OSHA requirements, the contractor performing renovation work will be required to conduct this monitoring and follow applicable requirements under 29 CFR 1926.62 if disturbing lead-containing paint.

Please note, that several surfaces were noted as LBP or lead-containing paint. Several walls and ceilings were observed to be in a degraded condition with paint chips and debris on the floor. The dust on the floor surfaces are considered contaminated with lead dust. Those who access the building shall utilize proper PPE when accessing or performing work within the residence. ECS recommends the debris be immediately abated and the impacted materials that are damaged be abated or repaired.

It is important to note that the house may be classified as a child occupied facility under US EPA RRP regulations and is potentially subject to those regulations for any future renovation, re-painting activities, etc. Additional testing may be needed per HUD/EPA requirements for renovations prior to planned renovations. Lead safe work practices should be performed per EPA RRP regulations.

## 5.3 Universal Waste

Fluorescent lamp ballasts manufactured prior to 1979 may contain small quantities of PCBs. Additionally, regardless of "PCB labeling," ballasts produced between 1980 and 1991 may contain di-ethyl hexyl phthalate (DEHP) which is classified as a potential carcinogen by the EPA. Ballasts



removed as part of renovations to the building, should be treated as universal waste and disposed of accordingly.

Fluorescent lamps and lamp ballasts, if removed, should be recycled in accordance with EPA and Commonwealth of Virginia regulations and local regulations at other jurisdictions if disposed of outside of Virginia. Recycling is the most environmental friendly means of disposal for these materials. Fluorescent lamps may be disposed as universal waste if they remain unbroken during removal. If bulbs are crushed or broken prior to disposal, they are classified as hazardous waste by the EPA.

Lamp ballasts, mercury containing switches, lead-acid batteries and other hazardous and/or regulated waste materials must be segregated and disposed of properly as required by the EPA and Commonwealth of Virginia. If any of these materials are observed to be leaking or otherwise damaged prior to disposal they must be disposed of as hazardous waste in accordance with EPA and Commonwealth of Virginia regulations. Handling, packaging, labeling, and disposal of hazardous materials should be performed in accordance with EPA and Commonwealth of Virginia regulations. ECS recommends that under the project specifications prepared for this site that requirements are made within the base bid scope of work to mandate that the contractor assist with this process through use of a hazardous waste broker.

#### **5.4 Mold and Moisture**

Based on visual observations, evidence of mold and water intrusions are present throughout the structure in various areas. A large hole was observed in the roof at the second floor level where materials below this area were impacted. Visible mold was observed sporadically on the walls, ceilings, and floors in each room and likely associated with former leaks, roof leaks, and elevated humidity conditions. Since the residence has been in an unconditioned environment, interior wall, ceiling, and floor cavities are also assumed to have possible hidden mold present.

Based on the analytical results, elevations in fungal spore concentrations are present in the air and on horizontal and vertical surfaces. The HVAC system is also assumed to be compromised with elevated mold conditions due to its lack of maintenance and presence of elevated spores in the air of the structure. Consideration should be made in regards to the cost of remediating the HVAC system compared to replacement of a new system if the structure will be reoccupied.

ECS recommends consideration is made in regards to the cost of mold abatement to the value of the structure. Should mold abatement occur, this work will need to be performed by an abatement contractor who is licensed for asbestos and lead removal efforts.

Mold abatement efforts would be necessary for all walls, ceiling, floors, and interior cavities throughout the structure. This includes all materials that have been subjected to elevated moisture conditions for greater than 48 hours without proper drying efforts and materials within obvious visible mold present. ECS recommends removal of porous materials such as impacted wallboards, plaster, carpet, tack strips, paper, cardboard, etc. All associated insulation within the cavities and attic should be removed. As part of this effort professional drying efforts should also be performed to ensure that the wall cavity and masonry flooring are properly dried prior to installation of new materials.



Repairs will be needed for all water intrusions within this structure. Further evaluation by a building engineer to assess the building envelopes and routes of water entry is recommended.

ECS highly recommends that a qualified mold remediation contractor licensed for asbestos and lead abatement by the Commonwealth of Virginia be retained to properly remove mold/water impacted materials. Remediation activities should be performed in general accordance with the guidelines described in EPA's March 2001 document "Mold Remediation in Schools and Commercial Buildings" and under the OSHA 2010 Guidelines for mold removal. Additional remedial guidance documents are also referenced in Section at the end of this report. Workers performing this work should wear proper personal protective equipment (PPE) including HEPA filtered respirators and disposable clothing (per OSHA standards for PPE).

As good practice and in general accordance with the EPA and OSHA guidelines, ECS recommends full containment of the work areas using plastic barriers and tape to create negative pressure containment during removal of mold impacted materials. Pressure differential in the containment should be -0.02 inches of water gauge between the outside and inside of containment. A HEPA-filtered local exhaust ventilation (negative air machine) should be utilized directly adjacent to the area(s) being cleaned and should maintain negative pressure and HEPA filtration continuously inside the containment during remediation activities and prior to clearance sampling.

All impacted drywall wallboards, floor tiles, carpeting, etc. that has visible mold and/or water staining should be removed in excess of 2 feet beyond visible mold or water staining. Delineation of the wallboard system may be necessary during remedial efforts to determine if additional material will need to be removed. Where wallboard is removed, all associated insulation within the wall cavity should be removed and the cavity cleaned. All associated carpet insulation and tack strips should be discarded. All degraded wood materials should be discarded.

Following remediation/removal of mold-impacted materials, ECS recommends that the contained areas of the building undergo a thorough cleaning following guidelines described in EPA's March 2001 document "Mold Remediation in Schools and Commercial Buildings." Surface remediation should include HEPA vacuuming of all surfaces and a clean-wipe with a mild detergent. The surfaces should not be saturated and discard cleaning cloths. All areas (affected and unaffected) should be left dry, visibly free from contamination and debris prior to build back activities.

Post-remediation observations and sampling should be performed to verify that obvious visible impacted materials have been removed and a reduction in airborne and/or surface fungal spore levels. Prior to final clearance observations and testing, the industrial hygienist will require that the negative air machines be turned off for a period of 24 to 48 hours prior to sampling activities.

Because of the nature of this environment, complete remediation of all microbial organisms within a building cannot be guaranteed. It is important to note that the reported mold levels are only reflective of conditions at the time of this test and that mold populations can vary over time, depending upon a number of conditions, including environmental factors (i.e., temperature and relative humidity). If significant mold growth reappears, or if the occupants experience prolonged allergic-type health complaints, they should seek further investigation of the problem.





Note: The purpose of this environmental portion of the survey was to evaluate areas where visible or apparent mold growth and/or moisture intrusion has occurred and provide findings and recommendations for remedial work efforts. Identification and recommendation(s) for correction of all moisture intrusion concerns was outside of the scope of services for the environmental testing services. As good practice all moisture intrusion concerns should be identified and corrected by a qualified contractor/engineer.

## 5.5 General

ECS recommends a project specification be developed to delineate and quantify known and suspect hazardous materials in the building and to outline proper procedures for the abatement. This will help protect the owner's liability in better defining the scope of work and contractors' roles and responsibilities in the abatement process and holding the contractor accountable for the performance of the project. The specification typically defines the Contractor's scope of work and outline requirements and procedures that must be followed for this project. The intent of the specification is to give performance requirements for the Contractor so that the project can be completed safely and in compliance with applicable federal and state regulations. Typically, the specification document also serves as part of the site owner's contract with the contractor.

ECS recommends that during entry or use of the structure by visitors or contractors, proper Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) should be used due to the presence of lead, asbestos, and mold on materials that appear to be in a degraded condition throughout various areas of the structure. Surfaces are also considered to be contaminated with mold, lead dust, and asbestos due to degraded building materials. Since the structure has been vacant and unmaintained for a long period of time with active roof leaks, interior wall, floor, and ceiling cavities are likely compromised by hidden mold and water impacts as either a result of leaks or high humidity and unconditioned environment. Consideration should be made in regards to the cost for mold/asbestos/lead based paint abatement efforts and the value of the structure.

## 5.6 Limitations

Information contained herein is based on information available to and data gathered by ECS during the performance of this project. Conclusions and recommendations pertaining to environmental conditions at the subject site are limited to the conditions observed at the time this study was undertaken. This survey is not intended to represent an exhaustive research of every potential hazard or condition that may exist, nor does it claim to represent indoor conditions or events that arise after the survey. This report has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted environmental practices. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made. Our conclusions and findings are based, in part, upon information provided to us by others and our site observations. We have not verified the completeness or accuracy of the information provided by others. Our observations and findings are based upon conditions readily visible at the site at the time of our site visit, analytical tests, and upon current accepted industry standards. The scope of services performed was limited to those requested by the Client and does not constitute a full microbial assessment of the site or a comprehensive moisture survey of the site. The data provided in this study is only indicative of conditions sampled at the immediate time of the study. The work performed in conjunction with this assessment and the data developed is intended as a description of available information at the dates and locations given. This report does not warrant against future operations or conditions, nor does it warrant



against extant, or future, conditions of a type or at a location not investigated. Because of the nature of this type of work (microbial contamination reduction) and the difficulties involved in conducting remediation work, ECS cannot guarantee that the methods or recommendations described in this report will eliminate all potential indoor air quality issues. Since performance of the remediation work is also beyond ECS scope of services, ECS also cannot be held responsible for the execution of the remediation work.

ECS is not liable for the discovery and elimination of hazards that may potentially cause damage, accidents, injury, or disease. The conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are based on a reasonable level of evaluation within the normal bounds and standards of professional practice for an evaluation of this nature. The recommendations have no relationship to insurance coverage. This document is not a legal mandate and should be used as a guideline only. It is important to note that the reported microbial levels are only reflective of conditions at the time of this test and that microbial populations can vary over time, depending upon a number of conditions, including environmental factors (i.e., temperature and relative humidity). The work performed in conjunction with this assessment and the data developed is intended as a description of available information at the dates and locations given. This report does not warrant against future operations or conditions, nor does it warrant against extent, or future, conditions of a type or at a location not investigated.

ECS in providing the services described in this report, does not assume the responsibility of the person(s) in charge of the site, or otherwise undertake responsibility for reporting to any local, state, or federal public agencies any conditions at the site that may present a potential danger to public health, safety, or the environment. In areas that require notification of local, state, or federal agencies as required by law, it is the Client's responsibility to so notify. Under this scope of services, ECS assumes no responsibility regarding any response actions or additional studies, which may be required as a result of these findings. Response actions are the sole responsibility of the Client and should be conducted in accordance with local, state, and/or federal requirements, and should be performed by appropriate trained and qualified personnel, as warranted.

No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made with regard to the conclusions and recommendations presented within this report. This report is provided for the exclusive use of the Client or their agents. The scope of services performed in the execution of this evaluation may not be appropriate to satisfy the needs of other users. This report is not intended to be used or relied upon in connection with other projects or by other unidentified third parties. The use of this report or the findings, conclusions, or recommendations by any undesignated third party or parties will be at such party's sole risk and ECS disclaims liability for any such third party's use or reliance.

During this study, suspect asbestos samples were submitted for analysis at an NVLAP-accredited laboratory via polarized light microscopy. As with any similar survey of this nature, actual conditions exist only at the precise locations from which suspect asbestos samples were collected. Certain inferences are based on the results of this sampling and related testing to form a professional opinion of conditions in areas beyond those from which the samples were collected. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made.

The client agrees to notify the appropriate local, state, or federal public agencies as required by law, or otherwise to disclose, in a timely manner, information that may be necessary to prevent any danger to public health, safety, or the environment.



# **Appendix I: Environmental Results Summary Tables**

TABLE 7

BULK SAMPLING OF SUSPECT ASBESTOS-CONTAINING MATERIALS

<u>Sample #</u>	<u>Sample Location</u>	<u>Material/Description</u>	<u>Analytical Results</u>
<b>1 - A</b>	<b>Room Next to Garage</b>	<b>9" x 9" Black Floor Tile with Green Streaks</b>	<b>5% Chrysotile</b>
1 - B	Room Next to Garage	Black Mastic of 9" x 9" Black Floor Tile	NAD
2 - A	Room Next to Garage	9" x 9" Black Floor Tile with Green Streaks	N/A
2 - B	Room Next to Garage	Black Mastic of 9" x 9" Black Floor Tile	NAD
3	Room Next to Garage	Fiberboard Ceiling with White Coating	NAD
4	Room Next to Garage	Fiberboard Ceiling with White Coating	NAD
<b>5</b>	<b>Room Next to Garage</b>	<b>Light Gray Interior Wall Caulk</b>	<b>6% Chrysotile</b>
6	Room Next to Garage	Light Gray Interior Wall Caulk	N/A
7	Dining Room	Electrical Wire Cloth	NAD
8	Dining Room	Electrical Wire Cloth	NAD
9	Dining Room	Interior White Window Caulk	NAD
10	Bedroom 1	Interior White Window Caulk	NAD
11 - A	Dining Room	Wall Plaster- Finish	NAD
11 - B	Dining Room	Wall Plaster- Base	NAD
12 - A	Living Room 1	Wall Plaster- Finish	NAD
12 - B	Living Room 1	Wall Plaster- Base	NAD
13 - A	Bedroom 1	Wall Plaster- Finish	NAD
13 - B	Bedroom 1	Wall Plaster- Base	NAD
14 - A	Hall at Stairwell 2nd FL	Wall Plaster- Finish	NAD
14 - B	Hall at Stairwell 2nd FL	Wall Plaster- Base	NAD
15 - A	Bedroom 4	Wall Plaster- Finish	NAD
15 - B	Bedroom 4	Wall Plaster- Base	NAD
16 - A	Bedroom 3	Wall Plaster- Finish	NAD

Notes:

**Bold = Asbestos-Containing Material**

NAD = No Asbestos Detected

N/A = Sample Not Analyzed; Positive Stop



TABLE 7

BULK SAMPLING OF SUSPECT ASBESTOS-CONTAINING MATERIALS

<u>Sample #</u>	<u>Sample Location</u>	<u>Material/Description</u>	<u>Analytical Results</u>
16 - B	Bedroom 3	Wall Plaster- Base	NAD
17 - A	Dining Room	Wall Plaster- Finish	NAD
17 - B	Dining Room	Wall Plaster- Base	NAD
18 - A	Dining Room	Ceiling Plaster- Finish	NAD
18 - B	Dining Room	Ceiling Plaster- Base	NAD
19 - A	Living Room 1	Ceiling Plaster- Finish	NAD
19 - B	Living Room 1	Ceiling Plaster- Base	NAD
20 - A	Bedroom 1	Ceiling Plaster- Finish	NAD
20 - B	Bedroom 1	Ceiling Plaster- Base	NAD
21 - A	Hall at Stairwell 2nd FL	Ceiling Plaster- Finish	NAD
21 - B	Hall at Stairwell 2nd FL	Ceiling Plaster- Base	NAD
22 - A	Bedroom 4	Ceiling Plaster- Finish	NAD
22 - B	Bedroom 4	Ceiling Plaster- Base	NAD
23 - A	Bedroom 3	Ceiling Plaster- Finish	NAD
23 - B	Bedroom 3	Ceiling Plaster- Base	NAD
24 - A	Dining Room	Ceiling Plaster- Finish	NAD
24 - B	Dining Room	Ceiling Plaster- Base	NAD
25	Living Room 2	Drywall Board	NAD
26	Kitchen Ceiling	Drywall Board	NAD
27	Bedroom 2	Drywall Board	NAD
<b>28</b>	<b>Living Room 2</b>	<b>Drywall Joint Compound</b>	<b>3% Chrysotile</b>
29	Kitchen Ceiling	Drywall Joint Compound	N/A
30	Bedroom 2	Drywall Joint Compound	N/A

Notes:

**Bold = Asbestos-Containing Material**

NAD = No Asbestos Detected

N/A = Sample Not Analyzed; Positive Stop

TABLE 7

BULK SAMPLING OF SUSPECT ASBESTOS-CONTAINING MATERIALS

<u>Sample #</u>	<u>Sample Location</u>	<u>Material/Description</u>	<u>Analytical Results</u>
31	Bath off Liv Rm 2	Dark Yellow Ceramic Mastic	NAD
32	Bath off Liv Rm 2	Dark Yellow Ceramic Mastic	NAD
33	Kitchen	Ceiling Debris	Drywall - NAD Jt. Cmpd - NAD
34	Kitchen	Ceiling Debris	Drywall - NAD Jt. Cmpd - NAD
<b>35</b>	<b>Kitchen</b>	<b>White Sink Undercoat</b>	<b>5% Chrysotile</b>
36	Kitchen	White Sink Undercoat	N/A
37 - A	Laundry	Brick Pattern Sheet flooring	NAD
37 - B	Laundry	Yellow Mastic of Brick Pattern Sheet flooring	NAD
38 - A	Laundry	Brick Pattern Sheet flooring	NAD
38 - B	Laundry	Yellow Mastic of Brick Pattern Sheet flooring	NAD
39	Laundry	Black Felt of Siding	NAD
40	Laundry	Black Felt of Siding	NAD
41	Basement	Fiberboard Wall	NAD
42	Basement	Fiberboard Wall	NAD
43	Basement Plumbing	Black Pipe Wrap	NAD
44	Basement Plumbing	Black Pipe Wrap	NAD
45 - A	Basement Wall	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound- Texture	NAD
45 - B	Basement Wall	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound - Compound	NAD
46 - A	Basement Wall	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound- Texture	NAD
46 - B	Basement Wall	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound - Compound	NAD
47 - A	Basement Wall	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound- Texture	NAD
47 - B	Basement Wall	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound - Compound	NAD
48 - A	Bedroom 4	Ceiling Board- Drywall	NAD

Notes:

**Bold = Asbestos-Containing Material**

NAD = No Asbestos Detected

N/A = Sample Not Analyzed; Positive Stop

TABLE 7

BULK SAMPLING OF SUSPECT ASBESTOS-CONTAINING MATERIALS

<u>Sample #</u>	<u>Sample Location</u>	<u>Material/Description</u>	<u>Analytical Results</u>
48 - B	Bedroom 4	Ceiling Board- Plaster Finish	NAD
48 - C	Bedroom 4	Ceiling Board- Plaster Base	NAD
49	Bedroom 4	Exterior White Window Glazing	NAD
50	Lower Rear House	Exterior White Window Glazing	NAD
51	2nd FL Bathroom	Tan Ceramic Wall Tile Mastic	NAD
52	2nd FL Bathroom	Tan Ceramic Wall Tile Mastic	NAD
53	Attic	Brown Insulation	NAD
54	Attic	Brown Insulation	NAD
55	Garage Roof	White Flashing Caulk on Chimney	NAD
56	Garage Roof	White Flashing Caulk on Chimney	NAD
57	Garage Roof	Black with White Pebble Asphalt Sheet Roll - Top Layer	NAD
58	Garage Roof	Black with White Pebble Asphalt Sheet Roll - Top Layer	NAD
59 - A	Garage Roof	Black Membrane under Sheet Roll	NAD
59 - B	Garage Roof	Fiberboard under Sheet Roll	NAD
60 - A	Garage Roof	Black Membrane under Sheet Roll	NAD
60 - B	Garage Roof	Fiberboard under Sheet Roll	NAD
61 - A	Laundry Roof	Black Asphalt Roof Shingle - Shingle	NAD
61 - B	Laundry Roof	Black Felt of Black Asphalt Roof Shingle	NAD
62 - A	Laundry Roof	Black Asphalt Roof Shingle - Shingle	NAD
62 - B	Laundry Roof	Black Felt of Black Asphalt Roof Shingle	NAD
63 - A	Roof Bedroom 1	Black Asphalt Sheet Roll with Black Sealant- Sheet Rock	NAD
<b>63 - B</b>	<b>Roof Bedroom 1</b>	<b>Black Sealant of Black Asphalt Sheet Roll</b>	<b>5% Chrysotile</b>
64 - A	Roof Bedroom 1	Black Asphalt Sheet Roll with Black Sealant- Sheet Rock	NAD

Notes:

**Bold = Asbestos-Containing Material**

NAD = No Asbestos Detected

N/A = Sample Not Analyzed; Positive Stop

TABLE 7

BULK SAMPLING OF SUSPECT ASBESTOS-CONTAINING MATERIALS

<u>Sample #</u>	<u>Sample Location</u>	<u>Material/Description</u>	<u>Analytical Results</u>
64 - B	Roof Bedroom 1	Black Sealant of Black Asphalt Sheet Roll	N/A
65 - A	Main Roof	Black/Brown Asphalt Roof Shingle	NAD
65 - B	Main Roof	Tar/Felt of Black/Brown Asphalt Roof Shingle	NAD
66 - A	Main Roof	Black/Brown Asphalt Roof Shingle	NAD
66 - B	Main Roof	Tar/Felt of Black/Brown Asphalt Roof Shingle	NAD
<b>67</b>	<b>Roof Bedroom 1</b>	<b>Black Cement on Vent</b>	<b>8% Chrysotile</b>
68	Roof Bedroom 1	Black Cement on Vent	N/A
69	<b>Side Porch</b>	<b>Exterior Tan Caulk on Chimney</b>	<b>6% Chrysotile</b>
70	Side Porch	Exterior Tan Caulk on Chimney	N/A
71	Exterior Siding of Garage	Exterior Brown Siding Fiberboard Panels	NAD
72	Exterior Siding of Garage	Exterior Brown Siding Fiberboard Panels	NAD
<b>73</b>	<b>Exterior Siding</b>	<b>Exterior Gray Siding Cement Panels</b>	<b>15% Chrysotile</b>
74	Exterior Siding	Exterior Gray Siding Cement Panels	N/A
75	Exterior Windows	Exterior White Window Caulk (Layered)	NAD
76	Exterior Windows	Exterior White Window Caulk (Layered)	NAD
77	Living Room 2	Black Floor Felt	NAD
78	Living Room 2	Black Floor Felt	NAD

Notes:

**Bold = Asbestos-Containing Material**

NAD = No Asbestos Detected

N/A = Sample Not Analyzed; Positive Stop





**TABLE 8**  
**XRF READINGS: LEAD BASED-PAINT RESULTS**

10606 Cedar Avenue Property  
ECS Project No. 47:4166  
Site Visit 6-7-2017

Date	Reading	Floor Level	Area/Room	Side	Substrate	Color	Component	Pb	Pb +/-
6/7/2017	1	Standardization						-	-
6/7/2017	2	Calibration						1.01	0.06
6/7/2017	3	Calibration						1.03	0.05
6/7/2017	4	Calibration						1.01	0.06
6/7/2017	5	1st Floor	Den	D	Wood	Natural	Wall	0.01	0.01
6/7/2017	6	1st Floor	Den	D	Plaster	White	Wall	0.03	0.01
6/7/2017	7	1st Floor	Den	D	Wood	Natural	Chair Rail	0.02	0.02
6/7/2017	8	1st Floor	Den	C	Wood	Natural	Shelf	0.01	0.01
6/7/2017	9	1st Floor	Den	C	Wood	Natural	Door	0.01	0.02
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Den</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>Natural</b>	<b>Door Jamb</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>1.09</b>
6/7/2017	11	1st Floor	Den	B	Wood	Natural	Wall	0.03	0.03
6/7/2017	12	1st Floor	Den	B	Wood	White	Wall	0.02	0.01
6/7/2017	13	1st Floor	Den	B	Wood	Natural	Baseboard	0.02	0.02
6/7/2017	14	1st Floor	Den	B	Wood	Natural	Window Casing	0.11	0.10
6/7/2017	15	1st Floor	Den	B	Wood	Natural	Window Sill	0.01	0.02
6/7/2017	16	1st Floor	Den	A	Wood	Natural	Wall	0.04	0.04
6/7/2017	17	1st Floor	Den	A	Wood	White	Wall	0.01	0.01
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Den</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>0.37</b>
6/7/2017	19	1st Floor	Den	D	Wood	Natural	Door Jamb	0.05	0.04
6/7/2017	20	1st Floor	Den	D	Wood	Natural	Door	0.06	0.05
6/7/2017	21	1st Floor	Dining Room	B	Wood	White	Door	0.74	0.12
6/7/2017	22	1st Floor	Dining Room	B	Wood	Brown	Floor	0.04	0.06
6/7/2017	23	1st Floor	Dining Room	B	Wood	Brown	Floor	0.02	0.03
6/7/2017	24	1st Floor	Dining Room	B	Plaster	Green	Wall	0.01	0.01
6/7/2017	25	1st Floor	Dining Room	B	Plaster	White	Wall	0.08	0.04
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Dining Room</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Chair Rail</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>0.73</b>
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Dining Room</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Chair Rail</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>0.62</b>
6/7/2017	28	1st Floor	Dining Room	A	Plaster	White	Wall	0.03	0.02
6/7/2017	29	1st Floor	Dining Room	A	Plaster	Green	Wall	0.03	0.03
6/7/2017	30	1st Floor	Dining Room	A	Wood	White	Window Sill	0.44	0.15
6/7/2017	31	1st Floor	Dining Room	A	Wood	White	Window Casing	0.03	0.07

Notes:  
 Bold - Lead Based Paint  
 Pb - Lead in milligrams per square centimeter



**TABLE 8**  
**XRF READINGS: LEAD BASED-PAINT RESULTS**

10606 Cedar Avenue Property  
ECS Project No. 47:4166  
Site Visit 6-7-2017

<u>Date</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Floor Level</u>	<u>Area/Room</u>	<u>Side</u>	<u>Substrate</u>	<u>Color</u>	<u>Component</u>	<u>Pb</u>	<u>Pb +/-</u>
6/7/2017	32	1st Floor	Dining Room	A	Wood	White	Baseboard	0.35	0.08
6/7/2017	33	1st Floor	Dining Room	D	Plaster	White	Wall	0.06	0.05
6/7/2017	34	1st Floor	Dining Room	D	Plaster	Green	Wall	0.02	0.02
6/7/2017	35	1st Floor	Dining Room	D	Wood	White	Door Jamb	0.44	0.16
6/7/2017	36	1st Floor	Dining Room	D	Plaster	White	Ceiling	0.02	0.02
6/7/2017	37	1st Floor	Dining Room	D	Wood	White	Door	0.12	0.06
6/7/2017	38	1st Floor	Dining Room	A	Wood	Natural	Cabinet	0.03	0.06
6/7/2017	39	1st Floor	Dining Room	B	Wood	Natural	Cabinet Door	0.05	0.07
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Dining Room</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Plaster</b>	<b>Yellow</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Dining Room</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Plaster</b>	<b>Yellow</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.02</b>
6/7/2017	42	1st Floor	Dining Room	B	Wood	White	Door	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	43	1st Floor	Dining Room	B	Wood	White	Door Jamb	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	44	1st Floor	Kitchen	C	Wood	White	Breakfast Nook	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	45	1st Floor	Kitchen	C	Wood	White	Window Sill	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	46	1st Floor	Kitchen	C	Wood	White	Window	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	47	1st Floor	Laundry	A	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	48	1st Floor	Laundry	A	Wood	White	Door Jamb	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	49	1st Floor	Laundry	B	Wood	White	Door	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	50	1st Floor	Kitchen	A	Plaster	Yellow	Wall	0.01	0.02
6/7/2017	51	1st Floor	Kitchen	D	Wood	White	Door Casing	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	52	1st Floor	Kitchen	D	Wood	White	Door Jamb	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	53	1st Floor	Kitchen	D	Wood	White	Door	0.01	0.02
6/7/2017	54	1st Floor	Hallway	A	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	55	1st Floor	Living Room	A	Plaster	White	Wall	0.01	0.01
6/7/2017	56	1st Floor	Living Room	B	Wood	White	Baseboard	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	57	1st Floor	Living Room	B	Drywall	White	Wall	0.01	0.00
6/7/2017	58	1st Floor	Living Room	B	Wood	White	Window Sill	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	59	1st Floor	Living Room	C	Wood	White	Shelf	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	60	1st Floor	Living Room	D	Wood	Natural	Wall	0.01	0.01
6/7/2017	61	1st Floor	Living Room	D	Plaster	White	Ceiling	0.00	0.00
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>0.13</b>
6/7/2017	63	1st Floor	Bathroom	A	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.00

Notes:  
**Bold - Lead Based Paint**  
 Pb - Lead in milligrams per square centimeter



**TABLE 8  
XRF READINGS: LEAD BASED-PAINT RESULTS**

10606 Cedar Avenue Property  
ECS Project No. 47:4166  
Site Visit 6-7-2017

<u>Date</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Floor Level</u>	<u>Area/Room</u>	<u>Side</u>	<u>Substrate</u>	<u>Color</u>	<u>Component</u>	<u>Pb</u>	<u>Pb +/-</u>
6/7/2017	<b>64</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>Blue</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>2.16</b>	<b>0.28</b>
6/7/2017	<b>65</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Sink</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
6/7/2017	<b>66</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Toilet</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.01</b>
6/7/2017	<b>67</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Tub</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.65</b>
6/7/2017	68	1st Floor	Family Room	C	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.01
6/7/2017	69	1st Floor	Family Room	C	Wood	White	Door Jamb	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	70	1st Floor	Family Room	C	Wood	White	Door Casing	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	71	1st Floor	Family Room	C	Wood	White	Baseboard	0.46	0.18
6/7/2017	72	1st Floor	Family Room	C	Wood	Natural	Floor	0.02	0.03
6/7/2017	73	1st Floor	Family Room	B	Plaster	White	Wall	0.01	0.01
6/7/2017	74	1st Floor	Family Room	A	Plaster	White	Wall	0.01	0.01
6/7/2017	75	1st Floor	Family Room	A	Wood	White	Window Sill	0.37	0.14
6/7/2017	76	1st Floor	Family Room	A	Wood	White	Window	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	77	1st Floor	Family Room	A	Wood	White	Window Casing	0.16	0.05
6/7/2017	78	1st Floor	Family Room	D	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.01
6/7/2017	79	1st Floor	Family Room	A	Brick	Red	Fireplace	0.33	0.03
6/7/2017	80	1st Floor	Family Room	D	Wood	White	Mantle	0.04	0.02
6/7/2017	81	1st Floor	Family Room	D	Wood	White	Door	0.17	0.05
6/7/2017	82	1st Floor	Family Room	D	Wood	White	Door Casing	0.28	0.10
6/7/2017	83	1st Floor	Family Room	A	Wood	White	Door Casing	0.27	0.09
6/7/2017	84	1st Floor	Family Room	A	Wood	White	Door	0.48	0.18
6/7/2017	85	Stairwell	Stairwell	B	Wood	Natural	Railing	0.02	0.02
6/7/2017	86	Stairwell	Stairwell	B	Wood	White	Stair Stringer	0.44	0.10
6/7/2017	87	Stairwell	Stairwell	B	Wood	White	Stair Baluster	0.51	0.11
6/7/2017	88	Stairwell	Stairwell	B	Wood	Natural	Railing	0.01	0.01
6/7/2017	89	Stairwell	Stairwell	B	Wood	Natural	Stair Riser	0.01	0.02
6/7/2017	90	1st Floor	Family Room	A	Wood	White	Window Soffit	0.02	0.03
6/7/2017	91	Basement	Basement	B	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.01
6/7/2017	92	Basement	Basement	A	Plaster	White	Ceiling	0.01	0.01
6/7/2017	93	1st Floor	Kitchen	A	Plaster	White	Beam	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	94	Basement	Basement	B	Wood	Gray	Stair Railing	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	95	Basement	Basement	B	Wood	Gray	Stair Railing	0.00	0.00

Notes:  
**Bold - Lead Based Paint**  
 Pb - Lead in milligrams per square centimeter



**TABLE 8**  
**XRF READINGS: LEAD BASED-PAINT RESULTS**

10606 Cedar Avenue Property  
ECS Project No. 47:4166  
Site Visit 6-7-2017

<u>Date</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Floor Level</u>	<u>Area/Room</u>	<u>Side</u>	<u>Substrate</u>	<u>Color</u>	<u>Component</u>	<u>Pb</u>	<u>Pb +/-</u>
6/7/2017	96	Basement	Basement	B	Wood	Gray	Stairs	0.23	0.05
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>Basement</b>	<b>Basement</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>Gray</b>	<b>Stair Riser</b>	<b>4.45</b>	<b>0.44</b>
6/7/2017	98	Basement	Basement	A	Plaster	White	Wall	0.63	0.15
6/7/2017	99	Basement	Basement	B	Concrete Block	White	Wall	1.18	0.16
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Basement</b>	<b>Basement</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Concrete Block</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>0.40</b>
6/7/2017	101	Basement	Basement	C	Wood	Gray	Stair Baluster	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	102	Basement	Basement	C	Wood	Gray	Stair Stringer	0.24	0.04
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>Basement</b>	<b>Basement</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Brick</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>0.08</b>
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>Basement</b>	<b>Basement</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Plaster</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>0.26</b>
6/7/2017	105	1st Floor	Family Room	B	Wood	White	Crown Molding	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	106	2nd Floor	Hallway	A	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	107	2nd Floor	Hallway	A	Wood	White	Baseboard	0.07	0.01
6/7/2017	108	2nd Floor	Hallway	A	Wood	White	Window Sill	0.10	0.04
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Hallway</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Window Casing</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>0.53</b>
6/7/2017	110	2nd Floor	Hallway	B	Plaster	White	Wall	0.03	0.01
6/7/2017	111	2nd Floor	Hallway	D	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	112	2nd Floor	Hallway	D	Plaster	White	Ceiling	0.01	0.01
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
6/7/2017	114	2nd Floor	Bathroom	A	Ceramic	White	Sink	0.00	0.00
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Toilet</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.01</b>
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.63</b>
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Floor</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
6/7/2017	118	2nd Floor	Bathroom	B	Wood	White	Door	0.08	0.04
6/7/2017	119	2nd Floor	Bathroom	B	Wood	White	Door Jamb	0.13	0.04
6/7/2017	120	2nd Floor	Bedroom	B	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.01
6/7/2017	121	2nd Floor	Bedroom	B	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.01
6/7/2017	122	2nd Floor	Bedroom	B	Wood	White	Window Sill	0.08	0.04
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Bedroom</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Baseboard</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.09</b>
6/7/2017	124	2nd Floor	Bedroom	C	Wood	White	Shelf	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	125	2nd Floor	Bedroom	C	Wood	White	Door Jamb	0.08	0.04
6/7/2017	126	2nd Floor	Bedroom	C	Wood	White	Cabinet Door	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	127	2nd Floor	Hallway	C	Plaster	Violet	Wall	0.00	0.00

Notes:  
**Bold** - Lead Based Paint  
 Pb - Lead in milligrams per square centimeter





**TABLE 8  
XRF READINGS: LEAD BASED-PAIN RESULTS**

10606 Cedar Avenue Property  
ECS Project No. 47:4166  
Site Visit 6-7-2017

<u>Date</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Floor Level</u>	<u>Area/Room</u>	<u>Side</u>	<u>Substrate</u>	<u>Color</u>	<u>Component</u>	<u>Pb</u>	<u>Pb +/-</u>
6/7/2017	128	2nd Floor	Hallway	C	Wood	White	Door Jamb	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	129	2nd Floor	Hallway	B	Plaster	Violet	Wall	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	130	2nd Floor	Hallway	B	Wood	White	Baseboard	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	131	2nd Floor	Bedroom	A	Wood	White	Door Casing	0.00	0.00
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Sink</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.53</b>
6/7/2017	133	2nd Floor	Bathroom	B	Wood	Tan	Cabinet	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	134	2nd Floor	Bathroom	B	Wood	Tan	Cabinet	0.00	0.00
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Toilet</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.01</b>
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Bathroom</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Ceramic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
6/7/2017	137	2nd Floor	Closet	C	Plaster	White	Wall	0.00	0.01
6/7/2017	138	2nd Floor	Closet	B	Wood	White	Shelf	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	139	2nd Floor	Bedroom	C	Wood	White	Door	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	140	2nd Floor	Bedroom	C	Wood	White	Door Jamb	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	141	2nd Floor	Bedroom	C	Wood	White	Window Casing	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	142	2nd Floor	Bedroom	C	Wood	White	Window Sill	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	143	2nd Floor	Bedroom	D	Wood	White	Window Sill	0.04	0.05
6/7/2017	144	2nd Floor	Bedroom	D	Wood	White	Window	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	145	2nd Floor	Bedroom	D	Wood	White	Window Casing	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	146	2nd Floor	Bedroom	B	Wood	White	Door	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	147	2nd Floor	Bedroom	B	Wood	White	Door	0.00	0.00
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Bedroom</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Plaster</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.02</b>
6/7/2017	149	2nd Floor	Bedroom	D	Plaster	White	Wall	0.03	0.01
6/7/2017	150	2nd Floor	Bedroom	C	Wood	White	Baseboard	0.02	0.01
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>2nd Floor</b>	<b>Bedroom</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Plaster</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.02</b>
6/7/2017	152	2nd Floor	Bedroom	A	Plaster	Off White	Wall	0.00	0.00
6/7/2017	153	2nd Floor	Bedroom	D	Plaster	Off White	Wall	0.00	0.01
6/7/2017	154	2nd Floor	Bedroom	A	Wood	White	Window Casing	0.02	0.02
6/7/2017	155	2nd Floor	Bedroom	A	Wood	White	Window Sill	0.06	0.07
6/7/2017	156	2nd Floor	Bedroom	C	Wood	White	Baseboard	0.06	0.07
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>Yellow</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.01</b>
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Shutter</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>0.31</b>
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Window Casing</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>0.20</b>

Notes:  
 Bold - Lead Based Paint  
 Pb - Lead in milligrams per square centimeter



**TABLE 8  
XRF READINGS: LEAD BASED-PAINT RESULTS**

10606 Cedar Avenue Property  
ECS Project No. 47:4166  
Site Visit 6-7-2017

<u>Date</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Floor Level</u>	<u>Area/Room</u>	<u>Side</u>	<u>Substrate</u>	<u>Color</u>	<u>Component</u>	<u>Pb</u>	<u>Pb +/-</u>	
6/7/2017	160	Exterior	Exterior	D	Wood	White	Window Soffit	0.91	0.10	
6/7/2017	161	Exterior	Exterior	C	Wood	White	Railing	0.62	0.13	
6/7/2017	162	Exterior	Exterior	B	Wood	Yellow	Wall	0.00	0.00	
6/7/2017	163	1st Floor	Garage	A	Wood	White	Wall	0.00	0.00	
6/7/2017	164	1st Floor	Garage	D	Concrete Block	White	Wall	0.01	0.01	
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Garage</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Door Jamb</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>0.27</b>	
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>1st Floor</b>	<b>Garage</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Door</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>0.18</b>	
6/7/2017	167	1st Floor	Garage	B	Wood	White	Door	0.01	0.00	
6/7/2017	168	1st Floor	Garage	B	Wood	White	Wall	0.00	0.00	
6/7/2017	169	Exterior	Garage	A	Wood	White	Wall	0.01	0.03	
6/7/2017	170	Exterior	Exterior	A	Wood	Yellow	Wall	0.01	0.02	
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Shutter</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>0.18</b>	
6/7/2017	172	Exterior	Exterior	A	Wood	White	Window Casing	0.07	0.02	
6/7/2017	173	Exterior	Exterior	A	Wood	White	Window Casing	0.07	0.02	
6/7/2017	174	Exterior	Exterior	A	Wood	Yellow	Wall	0.05	0.07	
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Door Casing</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>0.21</b>	
<b>6/7/2017</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>Exterior</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Wood</b>	<b>Red</b>	<b>Door</b>	<b>1.79</b>	<b>0.40</b>	
6/7/2017	177	Exterior	Exterior	A	Wood	White	Column	0.00	0.00	
6/7/2017	178	Exterior	Exterior	B	Wood	White	Wall	0.59	0.11	
6/7/2017	179	Exterior	Exterior	B	Wood	White	Fence	0.00	0.00	
6/7/2017	180	Exterior	Exterior	C	Metal	White	Wall	0.01	0.00	
6/7/2017	181	Exterior	Exterior	C	Wood	White	Window Casing	0.00	0.00	
6/7/2017	182	Calibration							1.03	0.05
6/7/2017	183	Calibration							1.02	0.03
6/7/2017	184	Calibration							1.01	0.06

Notes:  
**Bold - Lead Based Paint**  
 Pb - Lead in milligrams per square centimeter

# **Appendix II: Environmental Photographs**



1. View of the den with 9" x 9" black floor tiles (ACM), Samples 1-2.



2. View of the 9" x 9" black floor tiles (ACM), Samples 1-2.



3. View of the light gray wall caulk, Samples 5-6.



4. View of peeling paint with mold in the basement stairwell.



5. View of water impacts and mold beneath the sheet flooring in the laundry hallway.




6. View of visible mold on kitchen cabinets.

10606 Cedar Avenue  
Fairfax, Virginia



Site Photographs  
ECS Project No. 47:4166  
Site Visit: June 7, 2017





7. View of the hole in the roof at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor stairwell hallway.



8. View of debris on the floor, partial hole in the floor from the roof leak.



9. View of visible mold on the ceiling/walls in the den.



10. View of visible mold on the ceiling in the dining room.



11. View of peeling paint in the dining room with mold on the ceiling.



12. View of visible mold on the doors in the living room area.


10606 Cedar Avenue  
Fairfax, Virginia



Site Photographs  
ECS Project No. 47:4166  
Site Visit: June 7, 2017



13. View of peeling paint on the walls and ceiling.



14. View of peeling paint on the floor surfaces.



15. View of water impacted walls and ceiling in the northeast living room.



16. View of ceiling debris (with asbestos) on the floor in the kitchen.



17. View of the ceiling damage from a roof leak in the laundry room/hall.



18. View of impacted materials from a roof leak in the laundry room/hall.

10606 Cedar Avenue  
Fairfax, Virginia



Site Photographs  
ECS Project No. 47:4166  
Site Visit: June 7, 2017





19. View of visible mold and peeling paint in the upstairs hallway.



20. View of the black seam sealant (ACM), Samples 63-64.



21. View of the cement (ACM) on the roof vent, Samples 67-68



22. View of the cement board siding (ACM), Samples 73-74, and paint chips in the drip line.



23. View of the tan caulk (ACM) on the chimney of the patio.



24. View of peeling paint (LBP) on the exterior of the house.

10606 Cedar Avenue  
Fairfax, Virginia



Site Photographs  
ECS Project No. 47:4166  
Site Visit: June 7, 2017

# **Appendix III: Environmental Laboratory Results**





<b>Direct Exam: Bulk Analysis</b>	
SAI Method B-SOP-005	
<b>Client:</b> ECS Chantilly 14026 Thunderbolt Place Suite 100 Chantilly, VA 20151	<b>Attn:</b> Beverly Sedon <b>Lab ID:</b> 1712077 <b>Received:</b> 6/8/2017 <b>Reported:</b> 6/13/2017
<b>Project ID:</b> 47:4166	



<b>Sample ID</b>	B-1						
<b>Sample Description</b>	Attic Insulation						
<b>IDENTIFICATION: 1=Trace (1-10 spores); 2=Light (11-100 spores); 3=Abundant (101-300 spores) 4=Loaded (&gt;300 spores)</b>							
<i>Alternaria</i>							
Ascospores	3						
<i>Aspergillus</i>							
<i>Aspergillus/Penicillium-like</i>							
Basidiospores	1						
<i>Chaetomium</i>							
<i>Cladosporium</i>	2						
<i>Curvularia</i>	1						
<i>Drechslera/Bipolaris</i>							
<i>Epicoccum</i>	1						
Myxomycete/Rust/Smut-like							
<i>Nigrospora</i>							
<i>Penicillium</i>							
<i>Pithomyces</i>							
<i>Scopulariopsis</i>							
<i>Spegazzinia</i>							
<i>Stachybotrys</i>							
<i>Stemphylium</i>							
<i>Tetraploa</i>							
<i>Torula</i>							
<i>Ulocladium</i>							
Unknown/Other							
Fruiting bodies							
Hyphal fragments	1						
Pollen							
Debris	N/A						

**COMMENT:**

Scientific Analytical Institute, Inc. 4604 Dundas Dr. Greensboro, NC 27407 (336) 292-3888

  
 Microbiology Technical Manager  
 B-F-013 EXP: 3/1/2020

Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed on analytical results. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the AIHA EMPAT program for fungi. EMPAT Laboratory ID: 173190. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAI. Reporting Limit equals the Analytical Sensitivity.



**Scientific Analytical Institute**  
4604 Dundas Dr. Greensboro, NC 27407  
Phone: 336.292.3888 Fax: 336.292.3313  
www.sailab.com lab@sailab.com

Lab Use Only  
Lab Order ID: 1712077  
Client Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Company Contact Information	
Company: ECS Mid-Atlantic, LLC	Contact: Beverly Sedon
Address: 14026 Thunderbolt Place, Suite 100 Chantilly, VA 20151	Phone <input type="checkbox"/> : 301-672-2096
bsedon@ecslimited.com	Fax <input type="checkbox"/> : Email <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> :

Microbiology Test Types	
Spore Trap - Slit Impact, ie, AOC/Allergenco (STA)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Spore Trap Other, ie. Micro-5 (STO)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Direct Exam Tape (DET)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Direct Exam Swab (DES)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Direct Exam Bulk (DEB)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fungal Culture Air (FCA)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fungal Culture Swab (FCS)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fungal Culture Bulk (FCB)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bacteria Culture Air (BCA)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bacteria Culture Bulk (BCB)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bacteria Culture Swab (BCS)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Biolog (BLG)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drinking Water (BCC) (Coliform/E.coli)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>

Billing/Invoice Information	Turn Around Times	
Company: Same	90 Min. <input type="checkbox"/>	48 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
Contact:	3 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	72 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
Address:	6 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	96 Hours <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	12 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	120 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
	24 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	144 <sup>+</sup> Hours <input type="checkbox"/>

PO Number: 47:4166
Project Name/Number: 47:4166

Sample ID #	Description/Location	Volume/Area	Serial #	Comments
A-1	Exterior	75 L	2433-5090	
A-2	Kitchen	75 L	2433-5089	
A-3	Basement	75 L	2433-5096	
A-4	Living Room	75 L	2433-5080	
A-5	2nd Floor Stairwell	75 L	2433-5462	
A-6	Exterior	75 L	2433-5435	
S-1	DOOR to Basement+	-	-	
B-1	Attic Insulation	-	-	

Accepted   
Rejected

Total # of Samples 8

Relinquished by	Date/Time	Received by	Date/Time
[Signature]	4/17/2017	[Signature]	4/18 9:30 AM



<b>Direct Exam: Swab Analysis</b>	
SAI Method B-SOP-005	
<b>Client:</b> ECS Chantilly 14026 Thunderbolt Place Suite 100 Chantilly, VA 20151	<b>Attn:</b> Beverly Sedon <b>Lab ID:</b> 1712078 <b>Received:</b> 6/8/2017 <b>Reported:</b> 6/13/2017
<b>Project ID:</b> 47:4166	



<b>Sample ID</b>	S-1						
<b>Sample Description</b>	Door to Bsmt						
<b>IDENTIFICATION: 1=Trace (1-10 spores); 2=Light (11-100 spores); 3=Abundant (101-300 spores) 4=Loaded (&gt;300 spores)</b>							
<i>Alternaria</i>							
Ascospores							
<i>Aspergillus</i>							
<i>Aspergillus/Penicillium-like</i>							
Basidiospores							
<i>Chaetomium</i>							
<i>Cladosporium</i>	4						
<i>Curvularia</i>							
<i>Drechslera/Bipolaris</i>							
<i>Epicoccum</i>							
Myxomycete/Rust/Smut-like							
<i>Nigrospora</i>							
<i>Penicillium</i>							
<i>Pithomyces</i>							
<i>Scopulariopsis</i>							
<i>Spegazzinia</i>							
<i>Stachybotrys</i>							
<i>Stemphylium</i>							
<i>Tetraploa</i>							
<i>Torula</i>							
<i>Ulocladium</i>							
Unknown/Other							
Fruiting bodies	4						
Hyphal fragments	4						
Pollen							
Debris	1						
<b>COMMENT:</b>							

*[Handwritten Signature]*

Scientific Analytical Institute, Inc. 4604 Dundas Dr. Greensboro, NC 27407 (336) 292-3888

Microbiology Technical Manager  
B-F-015 EXP: 3/1/2020

*Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed on analytical results. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the AIHA EMPAT program for fungi. EMPAT Laboratory ID: 173190. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAI. Reporting Limit equals the Analytical Sensitivity.*



**Scientific Analytical Institute**  
 4604 Dundas Dr. Greensboro, NC 27407  
 Phone: 336.292.3888 Fax: 336.292.3313  
 www.sailab.com lab@sailab.com

Lab Use Only  
 Lab Order ID: 1712078  
 Client Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Company Contact Information	
Company: ECS Mid-Atlantic, LLC	Contact: Beverly Sedon
Address: 14026 Thunderbolt Place, Suite 100	Phone <input type="checkbox"/> : 301-672-2096
Chantilly, VA 20151	Fax <input type="checkbox"/> :
bsedon@ecslimited.com	Email <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> :

Microbiology Test Types	
Spore Trap - Slit Impact, ie. AOC/Allergenco (STA)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Spore Trap Other, ie. Micro-5 (STO)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Direct Exam Tape (DET)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Direct Exam Swab (DES)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Direct Exam Bulk (DEB)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fungal Culture Air (FCA)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fungal Culture Swab (FCS)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fungal Culture Bulk (FCB)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bacteria Culture Air (BCA)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bacteria Culture Bulk (BCB)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bacteria Culture Swab (BCS)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Biolog (BLG)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drinking Water (BCC) (Coliform/E.coli)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>

Billing/Invoice Information	Turn Around Times	
Company: Same	90 Min. <input type="checkbox"/>	48 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
Contact:	3 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	72 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
Address:	6 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	96 Hours <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	12 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	120 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
	24 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	144+ Hours <input type="checkbox"/>

PO Number: 47:4166  
 Project Name/Number: 47:4166

Sample ID #	Description/Location	Volume/Area	Serial #	Comments
A-1	Exterior	75 L	2433-5090	
A-2	Kitchen	75 L	2433-5089	
A-3	Basement	75 L	2433-5096	
A-4	Living Room	75 L	2433-5080	
A-5	2nd Floor Stairwell	75 L	2433-5462	
A-6	Exterior	75 L	2433-5435	
S-1	Door to Basement	-	-	
B-1	Attic Insulation	-	-	
Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Rejected <input type="checkbox"/>				

Total # of Samples 8

Relinquished by	Date/Time	Received by	Date/Time
<i>[Signature]</i>	4/7/2017	<i>[Signature]</i>	4/8 9:30 AM





Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C.  
 7469 Whitepine Rd  
 Richmond, VA 23237  
 Telephone: 800.347.4010

## PCB Bulk Analysis Report

Report Number: 17-06-01044

Client: ECS Mid-Atlantic - Chantilly  
 14026 Thunderbolt PI  
 Suite 100  
 Chantilly, VA 20151

Received Date: 06/08/2017  
 Reported Date: 06/14/2017

Project/Test Address: 47:4166; Fairfax, VA

Client Number:  
 201119

Fax Number:

# Laboratory Results

Lab Sample Number: 17-06-01044-001  
 Client Sample Number: 1  
 Sample Matrix: Bulk  
 Reporting Limit (mg/kg): 0.95

Preparation Date: 06/13/2017  
 Analysis Date: 06/14/2017  
 Sample Weight (g): 1.060  
 Narrative ID:

Aroclor 1016 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1221 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1232 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1242 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1248 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1254 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1260 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1262 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1268 (mg/kg)
<0.95	<0.95	<0.95	<0.95	<0.95	<0.95	<0.95	<0.95	<0.95

Lab Sample Number: 17-06-01044-002  
 Client Sample Number: 2  
 Sample Matrix: Caulk  
 Reporting Limit (mg/kg): 10

Preparation Date: 06/13/2017  
 Analysis Date: 06/14/2017  
 Sample Weight (g): 1.010  
 Narrative ID:

Aroclor 1016 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1221 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1232 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1242 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1248 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1254 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1260 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1262 (mg/kg)	Aroclor 1268 (mg/kg)
<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

# Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C

Client Number: 201119

Report Number: 17-06-01044

Project/Test Address: 47:4166; Fairfax, VA

---

## Sample Narratives:

---

Preparation Method: EPA SW846 3550C

Analysis Method: EPA SW846 8082A

Reviewed By Authorized Signatory: Melissa Kanode

*Missy Kanode*

QA/QC Clerk

The condition of the samples analyzed was acceptable upon receipt per laboratory protocol unless otherwise noted on this report. All internal quality control requirements associated with the batch were met, unless otherwise noted. Results represent the analysis of samples submitted by the client. Unless otherwise noted, samples are reported without a dry weight correction. Sample location, description, area, volume, etc., was provided by the client. This report cannot be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any agency of the U.S. Government. This report shall not be reproduced except in full, without the written consent of the Environmental Hazards Service, L.L.C. Virginia Certification #460172 NY ELAP #11714.

---

Legend      g = gram      mg/kg = milligram per kilogram

---



EHS Laboratories

Environmental Hazards Services, LLC

# PCB Chain-of-Custody Form

SHIP TO: 7469 Whitepine Rd. Richmond, VA 23237  
Phone: (800) 347-4010 FAX: (804) 275-4907  
ONLINE CLIENT PORTAL AVAILABLE FOR ANALYSIS RESULTS AT:  
www.leadlab.com

17-06-01044



Due Date:  
06/15/2017  
(Thursday)  
E

Company Name: ECS Mid Atlantic LLC Account Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: 14026 Thunderbolt Pl Ste 100 City/State/Zip: Chantilly VA 20151

Phone: 703 471 8400 Email: psedon@ecslimited.com Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name / Testing Address: 47.4166 P.O. #: 47.4166 City/State (Required): Fairfax, VA

LAB USE: Cooler Receipt Info: Sufficient Ice: Yes/No Temp: \_\_\_\_\_ Containers Preserved: Yes/No If no, explain Custody seal present/Intact: Yes/No Initials: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**TURN AROUND TIMES: IF NO TAT IS SPECIFIED, SAMPLE(S) WILL BE PROCESSED AND CHARGED AS 5 - DAY TAT.**

No.	Client Sample ID	Collection		Extraction Method		Matrix						Area Sampled (cm <sup>2</sup> or Air Volume (l))	Grab or Composite	Comments	
		Date	Time	Ultrasonic	Soxhlet	Caulk	Air	Wipe	Oil	Soil	Paint				Other
1	1	6/7/17	12:00 AM/PM												
2	2	6/7/17	12:00 AM/PM										Grab Composite	Glaze Caulk	
3															
4															
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															

Released by: [Signature] Signature: [Signature] Date/Time: 6/7/2017 3:33pm

Permitted by: [Signature] Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date/Time: 6/8/17 10:44



# Analysis for Lead Concentration in Soil Samples



**by Flame Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy  
EPA SW-846 3050B/6010C/7000B**

**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712080  
**Analysis ID:** 1712080\_PBS  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/13/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Mass (g)	Concentration (ppm)	Concentration (% by weight)
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes			
S-1	Front of house	1.1747	660	0.066%
1712080PBS_1				
S-2	Rear of house	1.4123	160	0.016%
1712080PBS_2				

Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed on analytical results. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the AIHA ELPAT program. ELPAT Laboratory ID: 173190. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAI. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. The quality control samples run with the samples in this report have passed all EPA required specifications unless otherwise noted. RL: (Report Limit for an undiluted 50ml sample is 4µg Total Pb).

Daniel Olson (2)

**Analyst**

Scientific Analytical Institute, Inc. 4604 Dundas Dr. Greensboro, NC 27407 (336) 292-3888

**Laboratory Director**





**Scientific Analytical Institute**  
 4604 Dundas Dr. Greensboro, NC 27407  
 Phone: 336.292.3888 Fax: 336.292.3313  
 www.sailab.com lab@sailab.com

Lab Use Only  
 Lab Order ID: 1712080  
 Client Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Information
Company Name: ECS Mid-Atlantic, LLC
Address: 14026 Thunderbolt Pl, Ste 100 Chantilly, VA 20151
Contact: Beverly Sedon
Phone <input type="checkbox"/> : 301-672-2096
Fax <input type="checkbox"/> :
Email <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> : bsedon@ecslimited.com
PO Number: 47:4166
Project Name/Number: 47:4166

Billing/Invoice Information
Company: Same
Address:
Contact:
Phone <input type="checkbox"/> :
Fax <input type="checkbox"/> :
Email <input type="checkbox"/> :

Lead Test Types		
Paint Chips by Flame AA (PBP) <input type="checkbox"/>	Soil by Flame AA (PBS) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>
Wipe by Flame AA (PBW) <input type="checkbox"/>	Air by Flame AA (PBA) <input type="checkbox"/>	

Turn Around Times	
3 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	72 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
6 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	96 Hours <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	120 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
24 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	144+ Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
48 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	

Sample ID #	Description/Location	Volume/Area	Comments
S-1	Front of House	—	
S-2	Rear of House	—	


Total Number of Samples 2

Relinquished by <i>[Signature]</i>	Date/Time 6/7/2017	Received by <i>[Signature]</i>	Date/Time 6/8 9:30 PM
---------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
1 - A	9" x 9" Black Floor Tile with Green Streaks with Black Mastic	5% Chrysotile		95% Other	Black Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_1	tile				Dissolved
1 - B	9" x 9" Black Floor Tile with Green Streaks with Black Mastic	None Detected		100% Other	Black Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_79	mastic				Dissolved
2 - A	9" x 9" Black Floor Tile with Green Streaks with Black Mastic	Not Analyzed			
1712056PLM_2	tile				
2 - B	9" x 9" Black Floor Tile with Green Streaks with Black Mastic	None Detected		100% Other	Black Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_80	mastic				Dissolved
3	Fiberboard Ceiling with White Coating	None Detected	85% Cellulose	15% Other	Tan, White Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_3					Teased
4	Fiberboard Ceiling with White Coating	None Detected	85% Cellulose	15% Other	Tan, White Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_4					Teased
5	Light Gray Interior Wall Caulk	6% Chrysotile		94% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_5					Dissolved
6	Light Gray Interior Wall Caulk	Not Analyzed			
1712056PLM_6					

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)


Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
7	Electrical Wire Cloth	None Detected	90% Cellulose	10% Other	Brown Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_7					Teased
8	Electrical Wire Cloth	None Detected	90% Cellulose	10% Other	Brown Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_8					Teased
9	Interior White Window Caulk	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_9					Ashed
10	Interior White Window Caulk	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_10					Ashed
11 - A	Wall Plaster	None Detected	10% Cellulose	90% Other	White, Yellow Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_11	finish				Crushed
11 - B	Wall Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_81	base				Crushed
12 - A	Wall Plaster	None Detected	10% Cellulose	90% Other	Brown, White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_12	finish				Crushed
12 - B	Wall Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_82	base				Crushed

Disclaimer: Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)


Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
13 - A	Wall Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	White, Yellow Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_13	finish				Crushed
13 - B	Wall Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_83	base				Crushed
14 - A	Wall Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_14	finish				Crushed
14 - B	Wall Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_84	base				Crushed
15 - A	Wall Plaster	None Detected	10% Cellulose	90% Other	Brown, White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_15	finish				Crushed
15 - B	Wall Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_85	base				Crushed
16 - A	Wall Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_16	finish				Crushed
16 - B	Wall Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_86	base				Crushed

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)

Analyst


Approved Signatory





# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
17 - A	Wall Plaster	None Detected	10% Cellulose	90% Other	White, Yellow Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_17	finish				Crushed
17 - B	Wall Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_87	base				Crushed
18 - A	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_18	finish				Crushed
18 - B	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_88	base				Crushed
19 - A	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_19	finish				Crushed
19 - B	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_89	base				Crushed
20 - A	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_20	finish				Crushed
20 - B	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_90	base				Crushed

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)

Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
21 - A	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_21	finish				Crushed
21 - B	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_91	base				Crushed
22 - A	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_22	finish				Crushed
22 - B	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_92	base				Crushed
23 - A	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_23	finish				Crushed
23 - B	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected	5% Cellulose	95% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_93	base				Crushed
24 - A	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_24	finish				Crushed
24 - B	Ceiling Plaster	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_94	base				Crushed

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)


Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
25	Drywall Board	None Detected	15% Cellulose	70% Gypsum 15% Other	Brown, White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_25					Teased
26	Drywall Board	None Detected	15% Cellulose	70% Gypsum 15% Other	Brown, White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_26					Teased
27	Drywall Board	None Detected	15% Cellulose	70% Gypsum 15% Other	Brown, White, Blue Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_27					Teased
28	Drywall Joint Compound	3% Chrysotile		97% Other	Cream Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_28					Crushed
29	Drywall Joint Compound	Not Analyzed			
1712056PLM_29					
30	Drywall Joint Compound	Not Analyzed			
1712056PLM_30					
31	Dark Yellow Ceramic Mastic	None Detected		100% Other	Tan Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_31	mastic only				Dissolved
32	Dark Yellow Ceramic Mastic	None Detected		100% Other	Tan Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_32	mastic only				Dissolved

Disclaimer: Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)


Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
33	Ceiling Debris	<b>None Detected</b>	10% Cellulose	60% Gypsum 30% Other	Gray, White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_33	<i>drywall: none detect; joint compnd: none detect</i>				Teased
34	Ceiling Debris	<b>None Detected</b>	10% Cellulose	60% Gypsum 30% Other	Gray, White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_34	<i>drywall: none detect; joint compnd: none detect</i>				Teased
35	White Sink Undercoat	5% Chrysotile		95% Other	Pink Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_35					Dissolved
36	White Sink Undercoat	<b>Not Analyzed</b>			
1712056PLM_36					
37 - A	Brick Pattern Sheetflooring	<b>None Detected</b>	15% Cellulose 15% Synthetic Fibers	70% Other	Gray, Red Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_37	<i>sheet flooring</i>				Teased
37 - B	Brick Pattern Sheetflooring	<b>None Detected</b>		100% Other	Yellow Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_95	<i>mastic</i>				Dissolved
38 - A	Brick Pattern Sheetflooring	<b>None Detected</b>	15% Cellulose 15% Synthetic Fibers	70% Other	Gray, Red Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_38	<i>sheet flooring</i>				Teased
38 - B	Brick Pattern Sheetflooring	<b>None Detected</b>		100% Other	Yellow Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_96	<i>mastic</i>				Dissolved

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)

Analyst

Approved Signatory





# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
39	Black Felt of Siding	None Detected	80% Cellulose	20% Other	Black Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_39					Teased
40	Black Felt of Siding	None Detected	80% Cellulose	20% Other	Black Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_40					Teased
41	Fiberboard Wall	None Detected	90% Cellulose	10% Other	Brown, White Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_41					Teased
42	Fiberboard Wall	None Detected	90% Cellulose	10% Other	Brown, White Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_42					Teased
43	Black Pipe Wrap	None Detected	10% Cellulose	90% Other	Black Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_43					Dissolved
44	Black Pipe Wrap	None Detected	10% Cellulose	90% Other	Black Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_44					Dissolved
45 - A	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_45	texture				Crushed
45 - B	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_97	compound				Crushed

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)


Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
46 - A	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_46	texture				Crushed
46 - B	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_98	compound				Crushed
47 - A	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_47	texture				Crushed
47 - B	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_99	compound				Crushed
48 - A	Drywall Board	None Detected	15% Cellulose	85% Gypsum	Gray, White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_48	drywall				Teased
48 - B	Drywall Board	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_100	finish				Crushed
48 - C	Drywall Board	None Detected		100% Other	Gray Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_101	base				Crushed
49	Exterior White Window Glazing	None Detected		100% Other	Gray, White Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_49					Crushed

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)

Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
50	Exterior White Window Glazing	None Detected		100% Other	Gray, White Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_50					Crushed
51	Tan Ceramic Mastic	None Detected		100% Other	Tan Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_51	mastic only				Dissolved
52	Tan Ceramic Mastic	None Detected		100% Other	Tan Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_52	mastic only				Dissolved
53	Brown Insulation	None Detected	95% Mineral Wool	5% Other	Brown Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_53					Teased
54	Brown Insulation	None Detected	95% Mineral Wool	5% Other	Brown Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_54					Teased
55	White Flashing Caulk on Chimney	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_55					Ashed
56	White Flashing Caulk on Chimney	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_56					Ashed
57	Black with White Pebble Asphalt Sheet Roll	None Detected	10% Synthetic Fibers	90% Other	Gray, Black Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_57					Dissolved

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)


Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
58	Black with White Pebble Asphalt Sheet Roll	None Detected	10% Synthetic Fibers	90% Other	Gray, Black Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_58					Dissolved
59 - A	Black Membrane with Fiberboard under Sheet Roll	None Detected	10% Cellulose	90% Other	Black Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_59	membrane				Dissolved
59 - B	Black Membrane with Fiberboard under Sheet Roll	None Detected	95% Cellulose	5% Other	Tan Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_102	fiberboard				Teased
60 - A	Black Membrane with Fiberboard under Sheet Roll	None Detected	10% Cellulose	90% Other	Black Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_60	membrane				Dissolved
60 - B	Black Membrane with Fiberboard under Sheet Roll	None Detected	95% Cellulose	5% Other	Tan Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_103	fiberboard				Teased
61 - A	Black Asphalt Roof Shingle with Felt	None Detected	15% Fiber Glass	85% Other	Black Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_61	shingle				Dissolved
61 - B	Black Asphalt Roof Shingle with Felt	None Detected	80% Cellulose	20% Other	Black Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_104	felt				Teased
62 - A	Black Asphalt Roof Shingle with Felt	None Detected	15% Fiber Glass	85% Other	Black Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_62	shingle				Dissolved

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)

Analyst

Approved Signatory





# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
62 - B	Black Asphalt Roof Shingle with Felt	None Detected	80% Cellulose	20% Other	Black Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_105	felt				Teased, Dissolved
63 - A	Black Asphalt Sheet Roll with Black Sealant	None Detected	10% Fiber Glass	90% Other	Black Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_63	sheet rock				Dissolved
63 - B	Black Asphalt Sheet Roll with Black Sealant	5% Chrysotile		95% Other	Black Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_106	sealant				Dissolved
64 - A	Black Asphalt Sheet Roll with Black Sealant	None Detected	10% Fiber Glass	90% Other	Black Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_64	sheet rock				Dissolved
64 - B	Black Asphalt Sheet Roll with Black Sealant	Not Analyzed			
1712056PLM_107	sealant				
65 - A	Black/Brown Asphalt Roof Shingle	None Detected	15% Fiber Glass	85% Other	White, Black Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_65	shingle				Dissolved
65 - B	Black/Brown Asphalt Roof Shingle	None Detected	60% Cellulose	40% Other	Black Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_108	tar / felt				Teased
66 - A	Black/Brown Asphalt Roof Shingle	None Detected	15% Fiber Glass	85% Other	White, Black Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_66	shingle				Dissolved

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)

Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
66 - B	Black/Brown Asphalt Roof Shingle	None Detected	60% Cellulose	40% Other	Black Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_109	tar / felt				Teased, Dissolved
67	Black Cement on Vent	8% Chrysotile		92% Other	Black Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_67					Dissolved
68	Black Cement on Vent	Not Analyzed			
1712056PLM_68					
69	Exterior Tan Caulk on Chimney	6% Chrysotile		94% Other	Tan, White Non Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_69					Ashed
70	Exterior Tan Caulk on Chimney	Not Analyzed			
1712056PLM_70					
71	Exterior Brown Siding Fiberboard Panels	None Detected	90% Cellulose	10% Other	Brown Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_71					Teased
72	Exterior Brown Siding Fiberboard Panels	None Detected	90% Cellulose	10% Other	Brown Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_72					Teased
73	Exterior Gray Siding Cement Panels	15% Chrysotile		85% Other	Gray Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_73					Teased

**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)


Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Bulk Asbestos Analysis

By Polarized Light Microscopy  
EPA Method: 600/R-93/116 and 600/M4-82-020



**Customer:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712056  
**Analysis ID:** 1712056\_PLM  
**Date Received:** 6/8/2017  
**Date Reported:** 6/12/2017

**Project:** 47:4166

Sample ID	Description	Asbestos	Fibrous Components	Non-Fibrous Components	Attributes
Lab Sample ID	Lab Notes				Treatment
74	Exterior Gray Siding Cement Panels	Not Analyzed			
1712056PLM_74					
75	Exterior White Window Caulk (Layered)	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_75	unable to distinguish layers				Ashed
76	Exterior White Window Caulk (Layered)	None Detected		100% Other	White Non Fibrous Homogeneous
1712056PLM_76	unable to distinguish layers				Ashed
77	Black Floor Felt	None Detected	70% Cellulose	30% Other	Black Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_77					Teased, Dissolved
78	Black Floor Felt	None Detected	70% Cellulose	30% Other	Black Fibrous Heterogeneous
1712056PLM_78					Teased, Dissolved


**Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of the EPA 600 method, asbestos may not be detected in samples containing low levels of asbestos. We strongly recommend that analysis of floor tiles, vermiculite, and/or heterogeneous soil samples be conducted by TEM for confirmation of "None Detected" by PLM. This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAL. This report may not be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other agency of the U.S. government. Analytical uncertainty available upon request. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the NVLAP Proficiency Testing program. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed. Estimated MDL is 0.1%.

Sharon Donald (109)

Analyst

Approved Signatory

1712056

<b>Client:</b>	ECS Mid-Atlantic, LLC	<b>*Instructions:</b> Use Column "B" for your contact info	
<b>Contact:</b>	Beverly Sedon		
<b>Address:</b>	14026 Thunderbolt Place, Suite	To See an Example Click the bottom Example Tab.	<b>4604 Dundas Drive</b> <b>Greensboro, NC 27407</b> <b>Phone: 336.292.3888</b> <b>Fax: 336.292.3313</b> <b>Email: lab@sailab.com</b>
<b>Phone:</b>	301-672-2096 (cell)		
<b>Fax:</b>		<b>Enter samples between "&lt;&lt;" and "&gt;&gt;"</b> <b>Begin Samples with a "&lt;&lt;" above the first sample</b> <b>and end with a "&gt;&gt;" below the last sample.</b> Only Enter your data on the first sheet "Sheet1"	
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:bsedon@ecslimited.com">bsedon@ecslimited.com</a>		
<b>Project:</b>	47:4166	<i>Note: Data 1 and Data 2 are optional fields that do not show up on the official report, however they will be included in the electronic data returned to you to facilitate your reintegration of the report data.</i>	
<b>Client Notes:</b>	<b>Positive Stop</b>		
<b>P.O. #:</b>	47:4166		
<b>Date Submitted:</b>	6/7/2017 0:00		
<b>Analysis:</b>	PLM EPA 600/R-93/116		
<b>TurnAroundTime:</b>	3 Day TAT		

Sample Number	Data 1	Sample Description	Data 2
<<			
1	HA1	9" x 9" Black Floor Tile with Green Streaks with Black M	Room Next to Garage
2	HA1	9" x 9" Black Floor Tile with Green Streaks with Black M	Room Next to Garage
3	HA2	Fiberboard Ceiling with White Coating	Room Next to Garage
4	HA2	Fiberboard Ceiling with White Coating	Room Next to Garage
5	HA3	Light Gray Interior Wall Caulk	Room Next to Garage
6	HA3	Light Gray Interior Wall Caulk	Room Next to Garage
7	HA4	Electrical Wire Cloth	Dining Room
8	HA4	Electrical Wire Cloth	Dining Room
9	HA5	Interior White Window Caulk	Dining Room
10	HA5	Interior White Window Caulk	Bedroom 1
11	HA6	Wall Plaster	Dining Room
12	HA6	Wall Plaster	Living Room 1
13	HA6	Wall Plaster	Bedroom 1
14	HA6	Wall Plaster	Hall at Stairwell 2nd FL
15	HA6	Wall Plaster	Bedroom 4
16	HA6	Wall Plaster	Bedroom 3
17	HA6	Wall Plaster	Dining Room
18	HA7	Ceiling Plaster	Dining Room

Accepted

Rejected

*Handwritten signature*  
6/8 9:30AM



17/2056

19 HA7	Ceiling Plaster	Living Room 1
20 HA7	Ceiling Plaster	Bedroom 1
21 HA7	Ceiling Plaster	Hall at Stairwell 2nd FL
22 HA7	Ceiling Plaster	Bedroom 4
23 HA7	Ceiling Plaster	Bedroom 3
24 HA7	Ceiling Plaster	Dining Room
25 HA8	Drywall Board	Living Room 2
26 HA8	Drywall Board	Kitchen Ceiling
27 HA8	Drywall Board	Bedroom 2
28 HA9	Drywall Joint Compound	Living Room 2
29 HA9	Drywall Joint Compound	Kitchen Ceiling
30 HA9	Drywall Joint Compound	Bedroom 2
31 HA10	Dark Yellow Ceramic Mastic	Bath off Liv Rm 2
32 HA10	Dark Yellow Ceramic Mastic	Bath off Liv Rm 2
33 HA11	Ceiling Debris	Kitchen
34 HA11	Ceiling Debris	Kitchen
35 HA12	White Sink Undercoat	Kitchen
36 HA12	White Sink Undercoat	Kitchen
37 HA13	Brick Pattern Sheetflooring	Laundry
38 HA13	Brick Pattern Sheetflooring	Laundry
39 HA14	Black Felt of Siding	Laundry
40 HA14	Black Felt of Siding	Laundry
41 HA15	Fiberboard Wall	Basement
42 HA15	Fiberboard Wall	Basement
43 HA16	Black Pipe Wrap	Basement Plumbing
44 HA16	Black Pipe Wrap	Basement Plumbing
45 HA17	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound	Basement Wall
46 HA17	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound	Basement Wall
47 HA17	White Texture Wall Coating with Gray Compound	Basement Wall
48 HA8	Drywall Board	Bedroom 4
49 HA18	Exterior White Window Glazing	Bedroom 4
50 HA18	Exterior White Window Glazing	Lower Rear House
51 HA19	Tan Ceramic Mastic	2nd FL Bathroom
52 HA19	Tan Ceramic Mastic	2nd FL Bathroom
53 HA20	Brown Insulation	Attic
54 HA20	Brown Insulation	Attic
55 HA21	White Flashing Caulk on Chimney	Garage Roof

17/2056

56 HA21	White Flashing Caulk on Chimney	Garage Roof
57 HA22	Black with White Pebble Asphalt Sheet Roll	Garage Roof
58 HA22	Black with White Pebble Asphalt Sheet Roll	Garage Roof
59 HA23	Black Membrane with Fiberboard under Sheet Roll	Garage Roof
60 HA23	Black Membrane with Fiberboard under Sheet Roll	Garage Roof
61 HA24	Black Asphalt Roof Shingle with Felt	Laundry Roof
62 HA24	Black Asphalt Roof Shingle with Felt	Laundry Roof
63 HA25	Black Asphalt Sheet Roll with Black Sealant	Roof Bedroom 1
64 HA25	Black Asphalt Sheet Roll with Black Sealant	Roof Bedroom 1
65 HA26	Black/Brown Asphalt Roof Shingle	Main Roof
66 HA26	Black/Brown Asphalt Roof Shingle	Main Roof
67 HA27	Black Cement on Vent	Roof Bedroom 1
68 HA27	Black Cement on Vent	Roof Bedroom 1
69 HA28	Exteiror Tan Caulk on Chimney	Side Porch
70 HA28	Exteiror Tan Caulk on Chimney	Side Porch
71 HA29	Exterior Brown Siding Fiberboard Panels	Exterior Siding of Garage
72 HA29	Exterior Brown Siding Fiberboard Panels	Exterior Siding of Garage
73 HA30	Exterior Gray Siding Cement Panels	Exterior Siding
74 HA30	Exterior Gray Siding Cement Panels	Exterior Siding
75 HA31	Exterior White Window Caulk (Layered)	Exterior Windows
76 HA31	Exterior White Window Caulk (Layered)	Exterior Windows
77 HA32	Black Floor Felt	Living Room 2
78 HA32	Black Floor Felt	Living Room 2

>>



# Direct Exam: Spore Trap Analysis



SAI Method B-SOP-003

**Client:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151  
**Project:** 47:4166

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712076  
**Analysis ID:** 1712076\_STA  
**Date Received:** 06/08/2017  
**Date Reported:** 06/12/2017

Sample ID	A-1			A-2			A-3			EXTERIOR AVERAGE		
Lab Sample ID	1712076_STA_001			1712076_STA_002			1712076_STA_003			N/A		
Description	Exterior			Kitchen			Basement			N/A		
Lab Notes										N/A		
Volume(L)	75			75			75			N/A		
Analytical Sensitivity (counts/m <sup>3</sup> )	78			78			78			N/A		
IDENTIFICATION	Raw Count	Concentration (counts/m <sup>3</sup> )	% Of Total	Raw Count	Concentration (counts/m <sup>3</sup> )	% Of Total	Raw Count	Concentration (counts/m <sup>3</sup> )	% Of Total	Raw Count	Concentration (counts/m <sup>3</sup> )	% Of Total
<i>Alternaria</i>	3	235	2.42%	10	784	4.61%	5	392	4.00%	4	274	3.00%
Ascospores	74	5800	59.7%	42	3290	19.4%	24	1880	19.2%	70	5450	53.0%
<i>Aspergillus/ Penicillium-like</i>				51	4000	23.5%	36	2820	28.8%			
Basidiospores	29	2270	23.4%	14	1100	6.45%	23	1800	18.4%	30	2310	22.7%
<i>Chaetomium</i>				1	78.0	0.461%	1	78.0	0.800%			
<i>Cladosporium</i>	14	1100	11.3%	89	6980	41.0%	29	2270	23.2%	20	1570	15.2%
<i>Curvularia</i>												
<i>Epicoccum</i>	1	78.0	0.806%	5	392	2.30%	2	157	1.60%	4	314	3.00%
Myxomycete/ Rust/ Smut-like	1	78.0	0.806%	2	157	0.922%	3	235	2.40%	1	78.0	0.800%
<i>Nigrospora</i>	1	78.0	0.806%							<1	39.0	N/A
<i>Pithomyces</i>	1	78.0	0.806%	1	78.0	0.461%	2	157	1.60%	1	78.0	0.800%
<i>Polythrincium</i>				1	78.0	0.461%				<1	39.0	N/A
<i>Stachybotrys</i>				1	78.0	0.461%						
Unknown/Other										2	118	1.50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>9720</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>17000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>9800</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>10300</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Non-Cellulosic Fibers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hyphal Fragments	5	392	-	11	862	-	8	627	-	4	275	-
Insect Parts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pollen	1	78.0	-	9	705	-	14	1100	-	2	118	-
Skin Cell % of Total Debris		0-20%			40-60%			40-60%			N/A	
Total Debris in Background		40-60%			80-100%			80-100%			N/A	

Disclaimer: This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAI. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed on analytical results. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the AIHA EMPAT program for fungi. EMPAT Laboratory ID: 173190. Reporting Limit equals Analytical Sensitivity.

Darrin Parrick (6)

Analyst

Approved Signatory



# Direct Exam: Spore Trap Analysis



SAI Method B-SOP-003

**Client:** ECS Chantilly  
14026 Thunderbolt Place  
Suite 100  
Chantilly, VA 20151  
**Project:** 47:4166

**Attn:** Beverly Sedon

**Lab Order ID:** 1712076  
**Analysis ID:** 1712076\_STA  
**Date Received:** 06/08/2017  
**Date Reported:** 06/12/2017

Sample ID	A-4			A-5			A-6			EXTERIOR		
Lab Sample ID	1712076_STA_004			1712076_STA_005			1712076_STA_006			AVERAGE		
Description	Living Room			2nd Floor Stairwell			Exterior			N/A		
Lab Notes										N/A		
Volume(L)	75			75			75			N/A		
Analytical Sensitivity (counts/m <sup>3</sup> )	78			78			78			N/A		
IDENTIFICATION	Raw Count	Concentration (counts/m <sup>3</sup> )	% Of Total	Raw Count	Concentration (counts/m <sup>3</sup> )	% Of Total	Raw Count	Concentration (counts/m <sup>3</sup> )	% Of Total	Raw Count	Concentration (counts/m <sup>3</sup> )	% Of Total
<i>Alternaria</i>	2	157	1.17%	3	235	2.27%	4	313	2.90%	4	274	3.00%
Ascospores	22	1720	12.9%	21	1650	15.9%	65	5090	47.1%	70	5450	53.0%
<i>Aspergillus/ Penicillium-like</i>	82	6430	48.0%	59	4620	44.7%						
Basidiospores	13	1020	7.60%	12	940	9.09%	30	2350	21.7%	30	2310	22.7%
<i>Chaetomium</i>	5	392	2.92%	5	392	3.79%						
<i>Cladosporium</i>	38	2980	22.2%	28	2190	21.2%	26	2040	18.8%	20	1570	15.2%
<i>Curvularia</i>	1	78.0	0.585%									
<i>Epicoccum</i>	1	78.0	0.585%				7	549	5.07%	4	314	3.00%
Myxomycete/ Rust/ Smut-like	1	78.0	0.585%	1	78.0	0.758%	1	78.0	0.725%	1	78.0	0.800%
<i>Nigrospora</i>	2	157	1.17%	2	157	1.52%				<1	39.0	N/A
<i>Pithomyces</i>	1	78.0	0.585%				1	78.0	0.725%	1	78.0	0.800%
<i>Polythrincium</i>							1	78.0	0.725%	<1	39.0	N/A
<i>Stachybotrys</i>	3	235	1.75%	1	78.0	0.758%						
Unknown/Other							3	235	2.17%	2	118	1.50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>13400</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>10300</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>10800</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>10300</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Non-Cellulosic Fibers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hyphal Fragments	9	705	-	5	392	-	2	157	-	4	275	-
Insect Parts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pollen	8	627	-	3	235	-	2	157	-	2	118	-
Skin Cell % of Total Debris		0-20%			20-40%			0-20%			N/A	
Total Debris in Background		80-100%			60-80%			40-60%			N/A	

Disclaimer: This report relates only to the samples tested and may not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of SAI. Unless otherwise noted blank sample correction was not performed on analytical results. Scientific Analytical Institute participates in the AIHA EMPAT program for fungi. EMPAT Laboratory ID: 173190. Reporting Limit equals Analytical Sensitivity.

Darrin Parrick (6)

Analyst

Approved Signatory





**Scientific Analytical Institute**  
 4604 Dundas Dr. Greensboro, NC 27407  
 Phone: 336.292.3888 Fax: 336.292.3313  
 www.sailab.com lab@sailab.com

Lab Use Only  
 Lab Order ID: 172076  
 Client Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Company Contact Information	
Company: ECS Mid-Atlantic, LLC	Contact: Beverly Sedon
Address: 14026 Thunderbolt Place, Suite 100	Phone <input type="checkbox"/> : 301-672-2096
Chantilly, VA 20151	Fax <input type="checkbox"/> :
bsedon@ecslimited.com	Email <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> :

Microbiology Test Types	
Spore Trap - Slit Impact, ie, AOC/Allergenco (STA)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Spore Trap Other, ie. Micro-5 (STO)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Direct Exam Tape (DET)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Direct Exam Swab (DES)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Direct Exam Bulk (DEB)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fungal Culture Air (FCA)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fungal Culture Swab (FCS)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fungal Culture Bulk (FCB)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bacteria Culture Air (BCA)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bacteria Culture Bulk (BCB)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bacteria Culture Swab (BCS)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Biolog (BLG)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drinking Water (BCC) (Coliform/E.coli)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>

Billing/Invoice Information	Turn Around Times	
Company: Same	90 Min. <input type="checkbox"/>	48 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
Contact:	3 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	72 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
Address:	6 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	96 Hours <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	12 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	120 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>
	24 Hours <input type="checkbox"/>	144+ Hours <input type="checkbox"/>

PO Number: 47:4166  
 Project Name/Number: 47:4166

Sample ID #	Description/Location	Volume/Area	Serial # Comments
A-1	Exterior	75 L	2433-5090
A-2	Kitchen	75 L	2433-5089
A-3	Basement	75 L	2433-5096
A-4	Living Room	75 L	2433-5080
A-5	2nd Floor Stairwell	75 L	2433-5462
A-6	Exterior	75 L	2433-5435
S-1	DOOR to Basement+	-	-
B-1	Attic Insulation	-	-

Accepted   
 Rejected

Total # of Samples 8

Relinquished by	Date/Time	Received by	Date/Time
<i>[Signature]</i>	4/7/2017	<i>[Signature]</i>	4/8/17 9:39 AM