

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT



Tier III Data Validation Report Summary

Client: Chevron Environmental Management Company	Laboratory: Air Toxics Limited (LTD)
Project Name: Risk Assessment/Hooven Vapor Investigation	Sample Matrix: Vapor
Project Number: 500-016-012	Sample Start Date: October 2, 2009
Date Validated: October 23, 2009	Sample End Date: October 2, 2009
Parameters: Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) by Modified Method TO-15, and Fixed Gases with Helium by Modified American Society for Testing of Materials (ASTM) D-1946	
Laboratory Project IDs: 0910198A and 0910198B	
Data Validator: Justin Hildenbrand, Environmental Chemist	

DATA EVALUATION CRITERIA SUMMARY

A Tier III Data Validation was performed by Trihydro Corporation's Chemical Data Evaluation Services group on the analytical data report package generated by Air Toxics LTD evaluating samples from the Chevron Site located in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Precision, accuracy, method compliance, and completeness of this data package were assessed during this data review. Precision was determined by evaluating the calculated relative percent difference (RPD) values of samples from field duplicate pairs and laboratory duplicate pairs. Laboratory accuracy was established by reviewing the demonstrated percent recovery of laboratory control samples (LCS) to verify that none of the data were biased. Additionally, field accuracy was established by collecting trip blanks to monitor for possible ambient or cross contamination during sampling. Method compliance was established by reviewing holding times, detection limits, surrogate recoveries, method blanks, and LCS percent recoveries against method specific requirements. Completeness was evaluated by determining the overall ratio of the number of samples planned versus the number of samples with valid analyses. Determination of completeness included a review of the chain-of-custody, laboratory analytical methods, and all other necessary documents associated with this analytical data set.

Data were evaluated in general accordance with validation criteria set forth in the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) National Functional Guidelines for Superfund Organic Methods Data Review, document number USEPA-540-R-08-01, June 2008, with additional reference to USEPA CLP National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review, document number EPA 540/R-99-008 of October 1999 and the USEPA CLP National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Data Review, document number EPA 540R-04-004, October 2004. Review of duplicates is conducted in accordance with USEPA Region 1 Laboratory Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluation of Organic Analysis, December 1996 or as specified by the method. In addition to the above mentioned guidance documents, the USEPA Hazardous Waste Support Branch Validating Air Samples Volatile Organic Analysis of Ambient Air in Canister by Method TO-15, SOP # HW-31, October 2006, document and the applicable methods were used for verification of the data.

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT





Tier III Data Validation Report Summary

SAMPLE NUMBERS TABLE

Client Sample ID	Sample Number Method TO-15	Sample Number Method ASTM D-1946
VW99(5A)100209	0910198A-01A	0910198B-01A
VW99(5A)100209 Lab Duplicate	0910198A-01AA	Not Applicable
VW99(10)100209	0910198A-02A	0910198B-02A
VW99(10)100209 Lab Duplicate	0910198A-02AA	0910198B-02AA
VW99(15)100209	0910198A-03A	0910198B-03A
VW99(20)100209	0910198A-04A	0910198B-04A
VW99(25)100209	0910198A-05A	0910198B-05A
VW99(30)100209	0910198A-06A	0910198B-06A
VW99(35)100209	0910198A-07A	0910198B-07A
VW99(40)100209	0910198A-08A	0910198B-08A
VW99(45)100209	0910198A-09A	0910198B-09A
BD1100209	0910198A-10A	0910198B-10A
VW96(50)100209	0910198A-11A	0910198B-11A
VW96(55)100209	0910198A-12A	0910198B-12A
VW96(60)100209	0910198A-13A	0910198B-13A
VW99(50)100209	0910198A-14A	0910198B-14A
VW99(55)100209	0910198A-15A	0910198B-15A
VW99(55)100209 Lab Duplicate	Not Applicable	0910198B-15AA
VW99(60)100209	0910198A-16A	0910198B-16A
TB-1, 100209	0910198A-17A	0910198B-17A

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT





Tier III Data Validation Report Summary

The samples were analyzed for client-specified analytes. The samples were shipped to Air Toxics LTD under chain-of-custody (COC) documents included for work order 0910198. The laboratory data were reviewed to evaluate compliance with the required methods and the quality of the reported data. A leading check mark (✓) indicates that the referenced data was deemed acceptable. A preceding crossed circle (⊗) signifies problems with the referenced data that may have warranted attaching qualifiers to the data.

- ✓ Data Completeness
- ✓ COC Documentation
- ✓ Holding Times and Preservation
- ✓ Laboratory Blanks
- ⊗ Initial and Continued Calibrations
- ✓ Instrument Calibrations
- ✓ System Monitoring Compounds (i.e. Surrogates)
- ⊗ Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)
- ✓ Field Duplicates
- ✓ Laboratory Duplicate
- ✓ Trip Blank

OVERALL DATA PACKAGE ASSESSMENT

Based on a data validation review, the data are acceptable as delivered. Air Toxics LTD qualified some data with UJ data qualifiers in data set 0910198A. The laboratory assigned data qualifier was reviewed and found to be valid and correct. The purpose of validating data and assigning qualifiers is to assist in proper data interpretation. Data which are not qualified meet the site data quality objectives. If values are assigned qualifiers other than an "R", the data may be used for site evaluation, with the reasons for qualification being given consideration when interpreting sample concentrations. Data points which are assigned an "R" qualifier should not be used for any site evaluation purposes. A total of 84 data points were qualified with UJ data flags as a result of this data validation review. Some of the qualified data points are useful only for qualitative purposes with the professional judgment of the project manager and associated technical staff. Data were qualified due to TO-15 calibration data outside of acceptable limits and low LCS recoveries in the TO-15 analyses.

Data qualifiers used during this validation included:

- UJ – Estimated reporting limit

Data Completeness

All analyses were performed as requested on the chain-of-custody records. All samples were received by the laboratory and analyzed properly. Excluding the trip blank sample, the complete data package consisted of 1216 data points, total. No data points were rejected. The data completeness measure for this data package is 100% and is acceptable.

TABLE 1. GENERAL VALIDATION CRITERIA CHECKLIST

1. Was the report free of non-conformances related to the analytical data identified by the laboratory? No

Comments: The laboratory listed the following non-conformances related to the analytical data.

Modified Method TO-15

The reported CCV for each daily batch may be derived from more than one analytical file due to the client's request for non-standard compounds.

Non-standard compounds may have different acceptance criteria than the standard TO-14A/TO-15 compound list as per contract or verbal agreement.

The laboratory noted the following for the initial calibrations.

A seven-point initial calibration was analyzed on 08/30/2009 on MSD-B.

Benzene used 3.0 ppbv as the lowest calibration concentration

Top of the curve for Ethyl Acetate is 200ppbv.

Top of the curve for Naphthalene is 2500ppbv.

Top of the curve for all other compounds is 1000ppbv.

On 09/04/09, [a] three point calibration of Methanol was included in the calibration curve. The resulting response factors are updated in calibration b0950830b.m.

On 09/15/09, [a] three point calibrations Acetonitrile, Acrylonitrile, and Ethyl Acetate and seven point calibration of Naphthalene were included in the calibration curve. The resulting response factors are updated in calibration b0950830c.m.

On 10/1/09, [a] three point calibration of Isobutylene was included in the calibration curve. The resulting response factors are updated in calibration b0950830c.m.

A 7 point initial calibration was analyzed on MSD-X on 8/21/2009

The following compounds used 0.3ppbv as the lowest calibration concentration:

1. 1,3-Butadiene
2. Chloroform
3. 1,2-Dibromoethane
4. Styrene
5. Cumene
6. 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene
7. 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene
8. Benzene

A 3pt [three point calibration] curve for Methanol was performed at 45, 600, and 1200 ppbv on 8/24/2009.

A 3pt [three point calibration] curve for Aerojet was performed at 2, 50, and 200ppbv on 9/17/2009 (no Butyl benzene).

A 3pt [three point calibration] curve for 2-Methylnaphthalene was performed at 10, 25, and 50ppbv on 9/18/2009.

A 5pt [five point calibration] curve for Butyl benzene was performed at 2, 25, 50, 100, and 200 ppbv on 9/18/2009.

A 3pt [three point calibration] curve for Methanol was performed at 45, 187.5, and 600ppbv on 10/5/2009.

A 3pt [three point calibration] curve for Ethyl Acetate was performed at 2, 50, and 200ppbv on 10/14/2009.

A 3pt [three point calibration] curve for Octane was performed at 2, 50, and 200ppbv on 10/15/2009.

A 4pt [four point calibration] curve for Acrolein was performed at 2, 10, 25, and 50ppbv on 10/15/2009.

A 4pt [four point calibration] curve for AT Special was performed at 2, 5, 50, and 200ppbv on 10/15/2009.

Modified Method ASTM D-1946

On the analytical column employed for this analysis, Oxygen coelutes with Argon. The corresponding peak is quantitated as Oxygen.

Since Nitrogen is used to pressurize samples, the reported Nitrogen values are calculated by adding all the sample components and subtracting from 100%.

The trip blank sample TB-1, 100209 has a reportable level of Oxygen present. Reanalysis confirmed the initial result.

The laboratory noted the following for the initial calibration performed from April 29, 2009, to May 12, 2009.

A 7 point initial calibration was analyzed on GC-9 on 04/29/2009. As noted on the accompanying analytical run log, calibration level 6 was reanalyzed due to an unacceptable linearity for compound Butane.

TABLE 1. GENERAL VALIDATION CRITERIA CHECKLIST

2. Were data qualification flags used by the laboratory? If yes, define.	Yes
<p>Comments: The following data qualifier flag was used by the laboratory. UJ - Non-detected compound associated with low bias in the CCV. Q - Exceeds quality control limits</p>	
3. Were sample COC forms complete?	Yes
<p>Comments: The COC records from field to laboratory were complete, and custody was maintained as evidenced by field and laboratory personnel signatures, dates, and times of receipt.</p>	
4. Were detection limits in accordance with the quality assurance project plan (QAPP), permit, or method, or indicated as acceptable by the Tier I validator?	Yes
<p>Comments: Detection limits were reviewed and determined to be acceptable. For Method TO-15, the laboratory reported required dilutions between 11.2 and 763 times. For Method ASTM D-1946, the laboratory reported required dilutions between 2.24 to 2.52 times.</p>	
5. Were the requested analytical methods in compliance with the QAPP, permit, or COC?	Yes
<p>Comments: The requested analytical methods were performed in accordance with the chain-of-custody forms.</p>	
6. Were samples received in good condition within method specified requirements?	Yes
<p>Comments: Samples were received intact and in good condition. The final vacuums from the field and receipt vacuums measured by the laboratory were compared and the vacuums appeared to be acceptable, with pressure/vacuum changes from the field to the laboratory less than five inches of mercury for each sample.</p> <p>The canisters used for sampling were 100% certified by the laboratory. The canister certification results were reviewed and found to be acceptable.</p> <p>The laboratory and field helium results were compared to evaluate the possible intrusion of ambient air into the sample canisters. The differences between the results were determined to be within acceptable limits. In addition, oxygen results were evaluated to determine acceptability of the data. For each sample, oxygen results were below 21% and were acceptable.</p>	
7. Were samples analyzed within method specified or technical holding times?	Yes
<p>Comments: The samples were analyzed within method specified holding times for analysis of Summa canisters and the respective methods.</p>	
8. Were reported units appropriate for the associated sample matrix/matrices and method(s) of analyses?	Yes
<p>Comments: The results for Method TO-15 were reported in units of part per billion by volume (ppbv) and micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The results for Method ASTM D-1946 for fixed gases were reported as percentages (%). These units are appropriate for the air matrix and for the methods used.</p>	
9. Do the laboratory reports include all constituents requested to be reported as indicated by the Tier I validator?	Yes
<p>Comments: The requested constituents were reported as requested.</p>	
10. Were the field duplicates collected equal to at least 10% of the total number of samples, or as required by the project guidelines, QAPP, SAP, or permit, or as indicated by the Tier I validator?	Yes
<p>Comments: One field duplicate was collected for this sampling event, resulting in a collection frequency of 10% of the total number of samples. The samples reported for these data sets were collected as part of a larger sampling event. Acceptability of the data with respect to blind duplicate collection will be made by the project team. Sample BD1100209 was collected as a duplicate of sample VW-99(30), 100209.</p>	



TABLE 1. GENERAL VALIDATION CRITERIA CHECKLIST

<p>11. Were field duplicate RPD values within data validation QC limits (soil 0-50%, water 0-30%, or air 0-25%)?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Comments: Precision based on field duplicate RPD results was determined to be acceptable. Field duplicate RPD values are reported in the Field Duplicate Summary table at the end of this data validation review. Analytes where both the parent and duplicate samples were non-detect are omitted from the Field Duplicate Summary table since precision could not be assessed for these data. If an analyte was detected in one sample but not in the other sample for the duplicate pair, a valid RPD could not be calculated and the RPD was reported as DL. For analytes where both the parent and duplicate results were detected at less than two times the reporting limit, a valid RPD could not be calculated and the result was reported as +/- RL.</p>	
<p>12. Was the number of equipment, trip, or field blanks collected equal to at least 10% of the total number of samples, or as required by the project guidelines, QAPP, SAP, or permit, or as indicated by the Tier I validator?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Comments: One trip blank, TB-1, 100209, was collected and submitted with the samples reported in these laboratory reports, resulting in a collection frequency of less than 10% of the total number of samples. Equipment and field blanks were not collected with the reported samples.</p>	
<p>13. Were the trip blank, field blank, and/or equipment blank samples free of analyte contamination?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Comments: Oxygen was reported in the trip blank at 0.17%. The laboratory noted that reanalysis confirmed the initial result. The presence of oxygen in the trip blank indicates that the trip blank canister may have not sealed completely between preparation at the laboratory before sampling and analysis. Similar oxygen results were reported for other trip blank canisters analyzed for this sampling effort. Based on professional judgment, the severity of any potential leakage appeared insufficient to adversely affect the sample data, and no data were qualified based on this occurrence. Since other reported analytes were not detected in the trip blank sample, no further action was necessary.</p>	



TABLE 2. VALIDATION CRITERIA CHECKLIST FOR VOC ANALYSES (TO-15 MODIFIED)

1. Were instrument calibrations within method or data validation quality control (QC) limits? No

Comments: Initial and continuing calibrations results were within acceptable limits, with the following exception.
In the initial calibration performed on August 30, 2009, through October 1, 2009, and associated with each reported sample except TB-1, 100209, the percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) for 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene and hexachlorobutadiene were outside of the method limits of 0% to 30% at 38.925% and 37.517%. As a result, associated data were qualified J for detections and UJ for non-detections.
In the initial calibration performed on August 21, 2009, through October 15, 2009, the %RSD for sec-butylbenzene was above the data validation limit of 30% at 31.760%. Data reported for sec-butylbenzene in the associated sample, TB-1, 100209, were non-detect and therefore associated results were qualified UJ.
In the continuing calibration verification (CCV) associated only with sample TB-1, 100209, and performed on October 17, 2009, at 8:46 AM, the analyte naphthalene had percent difference values above the method limit of 30% at 33.97%. Associated data were qualified J for detections and UJ for non-detections.
In the CCV performed on October 24, 2009, at 7:46 PM, and associated with each reported sample except TB-1, 100209, the analyte methyl tert-butyl ether had a percent difference value above the method limit of 30% at 30.3%. Associated data were qualified J for detections and UJ for non-detections.

2. Were the instrument tunes within method control limits? Yes

Comments: Instrument tunes were within method control limits.

3. Were the internal standards within method control limits? Yes

Comments: Internal standard areas and retention times were within method control limits.

4. Was the total number of laboratory blank samples prepared equal to at least 5% of the total number of samples, or analyzed as required by the method? Yes

Comments: Laboratory blank samples were prepared at a frequency equal to at least 5% of the total number of samples.

5. Were laboratory blank samples free of target analyte contamination? Yes

Comments: Detections were not reported in the laboratory blanks. For the method blank analyzed on October 17, 2009, the laboratory qualified the non-detected result for naphthalene UJ as estimated since it was associated with low bias in the CCV.

6. Was the total number of LCSs analyzed equal to at least 5% of the total number of samples, or analyzed as required by the method? Yes

Comments: The LCS samples were analyzed at a frequency equal to at least 5% of the total number of samples.

7. Were LCS/LCSD percent recoveries and LCS/LCSD RPDs within laboratory limits? No

Comments: The LCS recoveries were within acceptable limits, with the following exceptions.

The LCS percent recoveries (%R) for several reported analytes were outside of the laboratory limits as noted in the table below.

LCS Analysis Date	Analyte	Percent Recovery	Laboratory Limits
10/24/09	Hexachlorobutadiene	59.76%	70-130%
10/24/09	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	62.13%	70-130%
10/17/09	Freon 12	67.46%	70-130%
10/17/09	Ethanol	50.65%	60-140%
10/17/09	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	68.34%	70-130%
10/17/09	Hexachlorobutadiene	68.43%	70-130%

Associated sample data, as determined from the analytical run log and by analysis dates, were qualified J for detections and UJ for non-detections due to a possible low bias.



TABLE 2. VALIDATION CRITERIA CHECKLIST FOR VOC ANALYSES (TO-15 MODIFIED)

8. Was the total number of MS samples prepared equal to at least 5% of the total number of samples, or analyzed as required by the method?	No
Comments: Matrix spike samples were not prepared and are not required for analysis by Method TO-15 Modified.	
9. Were MS/MSD percent recoveries and MS/MSD RPDs within data validations or laboratory QC limits?	N/A
Comments: Matrix spike samples were not prepared and are not required for analysis by Method TO-15 Modified.	
10. Were surrogate recoveries within laboratory QC limits?	Yes
Comments: Surrogate recoveries were within laboratory QC limits.	
11. Were laboratory duplicate RPD values acceptable?	Yes
Comments: Laboratory duplicates were prepared from samples VW99(5A)100209 and VW99(10)100209. Laboratory duplicate RPD values were within acceptable QC limits, were not calculated since one or both results were non-detect, or were not valid since the results for one or both samples were within five times the reporting limit.	



TABLE 3. VALIDATION CRITERIA CHECKLIST FOR HELIUM AND FIXED GAS ANALYSES (ASTM D-1946 MODIFIED)	
1. Were instrument calibrations within method or data validation QC limits? Comments: The initial and continuing calibration verifications were within acceptable limits.	Yes
2. Were the instrument tunes within method QC limits? Comments: Instrument tunes are not required by Method ASTM D-1946 Modified.	N/A
3. Were the internal standards within method QC limits? Comments: Internal standards are not required by Method ASTM D-1946 Modified.	N/A
4. Was the total number of laboratory blank samples prepared equal to at least 5% of the total number of samples, or analyzed as required by the method? Comments: Laboratory blank samples were prepared at a frequency equal to at least 5% of the total number of samples.	Yes
5. Were laboratory blank samples free of analyte contamination? Comments: Detections were not reported in the laboratory blanks.	Yes
6. Was the total number of LCSs analyzed equal to at least 5% of the total number of samples, or analyzed as required by the method? Comments: The LCS samples were analyzed at a frequency equal to at least 5% of the total number of samples.	Yes
7. Were LCS/LCSD percent recoveries and LCS/LCSD RPDs within laboratory QC limits? Comments: The LCS percent recoveries were within laboratory QC limits.	Yes
8. Was the total number of MS samples prepared equal to at least 5% of the total number of samples, or analyzed as required by the method? Comments: Matrix spike samples were not prepared and are not required for analysis by Method ASTM D-1946 Modified.	N/A
9. Were MS/MSD percent recoveries and MS/MSD RPDs within data validation or laboratory QC limits? Comments: Matrix spike samples were not prepared and are not required for analysis by Method ASTM D-1946 Modified.	N/A
10. Were surrogate recoveries within laboratory QC limits? Comments: Surrogates are not required for analysis by Method ASTM D-1946 Modified.	N/A
12. Were laboratory duplicate RPD values acceptable? Comments: Two laboratory duplicates were prepared from samples VW99(10)100209 and VW99(55)100209. Laboratory duplicate RPD values were within acceptable QC limits.	Yes

TABLE 4. DATA QUALIFICATION, CHEVRON SITE, CINCINNATI, OHIO (0910198A/B)

Analyte	Client Sample ID	Laboratory Assigned ID	Laboratory Result	Reviewer Qualifier	Reason for Qualification
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	BD1100209	0910198A-10A	ND(38000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	TB-1, 100209	0910198A-17A	ND(15 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW96(50)100209	0910198A-11A	ND(110000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW96(55)100209	0910198A-12A	ND(110000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW96(60)100209	0910198A-13A	ND(110000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(10)100209	0910198A-02A	ND(1700 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(15)100209	0910198A-03A	ND(34000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(20)100209	0910198A-04A	ND(58000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(25)100209	0910198A-05A	ND(24000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(30)100209	0910198A-06A	ND(36000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(35)100209	0910198A-07A	ND(55000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(40)100209	0910198A-08A	ND(59000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(45)100209	0910198A-09A	ND(58000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(50)100209	0910198A-14A	ND(83000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(55)100209	0910198A-15A	ND(100000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(5A)100209	0910198A-01A	ND(13000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	VW99(60)100209	0910198A-16A	ND(25000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	BD1100209	0910198A-10A	ND(6200 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.



Analyte	Client Sample ID	Laboratory Assigned ID	Laboratory Result	Reviewer Qualifier	Reason for Qualification
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW96(50)100209	0910198A-11A	ND(19000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW96(55)100209	0910198A-12A	ND(19000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW96(60)100209	0910198A-13A	ND(19000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(10)100209	0910198A-02A	ND(280 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(15)100209	0910198A-03A	ND(5800 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(20)100209	0910198A-04A	ND(9600 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(25)100209	0910198A-05A	ND(4000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(30)100209	0910198A-06A	ND(6000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(35)100209	0910198A-07A	ND(9200 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(40)100209	0910198A-08A	ND(9800 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(45)100209	0910198A-09A	ND(9600 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(50)100209	0910198A-14A	ND(14000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.



Analyte	Client Sample ID	Laboratory Assigned ID	Laboratory Result	Reviewer Qualifier	Reason for Qualification
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(55)100209	0910198A-15A	ND(17000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(5A)100209	0910198A-01A	ND(2200 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Dichlorodifluoromethane	VW99(60)100209	0910198A-16A	ND(4100 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	BD1100209	0910198A-10A	ND(9500 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW96(50)100209	0910198A-11A	ND(29000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW96(55)100209	0910198A-12A	ND(29000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW96(60)100209	0910198A-13A	ND(29000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(10)100209	0910198A-02A	ND(420 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(15)100209	0910198A-03A	ND(8800 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(20)100209	0910198A-04A	ND(15000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(25)100209	0910198A-05A	ND(6200 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(30)100209	0910198A-06A	ND(9100 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.



Analyte	Client Sample ID	Laboratory Assigned ID	Laboratory Result	Reviewer Qualifier	Reason for Qualification
Ethanol	VW99(35)100209	0910198A-07A	ND(14000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(40)100209	0910198A-08A	ND(15000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(45)100209	0910198A-09A	ND(15000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(50)100209	0910198A-14A	ND(21000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(55)100209	0910198A-15A	ND(25000 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(5A)100209	0910198A-01A	ND(3400 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Ethanol	VW99(60)100209	0910198A-16A	ND(6200 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Hexachlorobutadiene	BD1100209	0910198A-10A	ND(54000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	TB-1, 100209	0910198A-17A	ND(21 ug/m3)	UJ	The LCS and/or LCSD recovery(ies) were below the acceptable limits indicating a possible low bias.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW96(50)100209	0910198A-11A	ND(160000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW96(55)100209	0910198A-12A	ND(160000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW96(60)100209	0910198A-13A	ND(160000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(10)100209	0910198A-02A	ND(2400 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(15)100209	0910198A-03A	ND(50000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.



Analyte	Client Sample ID	Laboratory Assigned ID	Laboratory Result	Reviewer Qualifier	Reason for Qualification
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(20)100209	0910198A-04A	ND(83000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(25)100209	0910198A-05A	ND(35000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(30)100209	0910198A-06A	ND(52000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(35)100209	0910198A-07A	ND(80000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(40)100209	0910198A-08A	ND(85000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(45)100209	0910198A-09A	ND(83000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(50)100209	0910198A-14A	ND(120000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(55)100209	0910198A-15A	ND(140000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(5A)100209	0910198A-01A	ND(19000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Hexachlorobutadiene	VW99(60)100209	0910198A-16A	ND(35000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	BD1100209	0910198A-10A	ND(4600 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW96(50)100209	0910198A-11A	ND(14000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW96(55)100209	0910198A-12A	ND(14000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW96(60)100209	0910198A-13A	ND(14000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(10)100209	0910198A-02A	ND(200 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(15)100209	0910198A-03A	ND(4200 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(20)100209	0910198A-04A	ND(7000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(25)100209	0910198A-05A	ND(3000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(30)100209	0910198A-06A	ND(4400 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(35)100209	0910198A-07A	ND(6700 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.



Analyte	Client Sample ID	Laboratory Assigned ID	Laboratory Result	Reviewer Qualifier	Reason for Qualification
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(40)100209	0910198A-08A	ND(7200 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(45)100209	0910198A-09A	ND(7000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(50)100209	0910198A-14A	ND(10000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(55)100209	0910198A-15A	ND(12000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(5A)100209	0910198A-01A	ND(1600 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)	VW99(60)100209	0910198A-16A	ND(3000 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
Naphthalene	TB-1, 100209	0910198A-17A	ND(10 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF value for the CCV was below the acceptable lower limit.
sec-Butylbenzene	TB-1, 100209	0910198A-17A	ND(11 ug/m3)	UJ	The RRF values for the ICV were below the acceptable lower limit.



TABLE 5. FIELD DUPLICATE SUMMARY, CHEVRON SITE, CINCINNATI, OHIO (0910198B/D)

Client Sample ID: VW-99(30), 100209 Field Duplicate Sample ID: BD1100209			
Analyte	Laboratory Result	Duplicate Result	Relative Percent Difference (RPD)
Hexane	31000 µg/m3	30000 µg/m3	1.2%
Cyclohexane	120000 µg/m3	120000 µg/m3	0.0%
2,2,4-Trimethylpentane	1000000 µg/m3	1100000 µg/m3	4.4%
Isopentane	600000 µg/m3	610000 µg/m3	0.0%
Butane	30000 µg/m3	31000 µg/m3	0.0%
Methylcyclohexane	230000 µg/m3	240000 µg/m3	3.4%
Oxygen	2.1%	1.8%	15.4%
Nitrogen	78%	77%	1.3%
Methane	8.8%	9.2%	4.4%
Carbon Dioxide	11%	12%	8.7%
Ethane	0.0026%	0.0027%	3.8%

Field duplicate RPD control limits should not exceed 30% for water, 50% for soil, or 25% for air or vapor as established by USEPA Region 1 Laboratory Data Validation Function Guidelines for Evaluation of Organic Analysis, December 1996.

