



LABORATORY DATA CONSULTANTS, INC.

7750 El Camino Real, Suite 2L Carlsbad, CA 92009 Phone: 760/634-0437 Fax: 760/634-0439

Northgate Environmental Management, Inc.
1100 Quail Street Ste. 102
Newport Beach, CA 92660
ATTN: Ms. Cindy Arnold

August 19, 2010

SUBJECT: Tronox LLC Facility, PCS, Henderson, Nevada,
Data Validation

Dear Ms. Arnold,

Enclosed are the final validation reports for the fraction listed below. These SDGs were received on August 5, 2010. Attachment 1 is a summary of the samples that were reviewed for each analysis.

LDC Project # 23733:

<u>SDG #</u>	<u>Fraction</u>
280-4960-2, 280-5189-1	Semivolatiles

The data validation was performed under Stage 2B/4 guidelines. The analyses were validated using the following documents, as applicable to each method:

- Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) 40, Data Review/Validation, BRC 2009
- Quality Assurance Project Plan Tronox LLC Facility, Henderson Nevada, June 2009
- NDEP Guidance, May 2006
- USEPA, Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Superfund Organic Methods Data Review, June 2008

Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Erlinda T. Rauto
Operations Manager/Senior Chemist

**Tronox LLC Facility, PCS, Henderson, Nevada
Data Validation Reports
LDC #23733**

Semivolatiles

LDC

**Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report**

Project/Site Name: Tronox LLC Facility, PCS, Henderson, Nevada

Collection Date: June 29, 2010

LDC Report Date: August 18, 2010

Matrix: Soil

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B & 4

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 280-4960-2

Sample Identification

SSAK6-05-2BPC

SSAO5-05-10BPC**

**Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 review

Introduction

This data review covers 2 soil samples listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA SW 846 Method 8270C for Semivolatiles.

This review follows the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) 40, Data Review/Validation (BRC 2009), the Quality Assurance Project Plan Tronox LLC Facility, Henderson, Nevada (June 2009), NDEP guidance (May 2006), and a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Superfund Organic Methods Data Review (June 2008).

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

Blank results are summarized in Section V.

Field duplicates are summarized in Section XVI.

Samples indicated by a double asterisk on the front cover underwent a Stage 4 review. A Stage 2B review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Stage 2B criteria since this review is based on QC data.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers:

- J+ Data are qualified as estimated, with a high bias likely to occur. False positives or false negatives are unlikely to have been reported.
- J- Data are qualified as estimated, with a low bias likely to occur. False positives or false negatives are unlikely to have been reported.
- J Data are qualified as estimated; it is not possible to assess the direction of the potential bias. False positives or false negatives are unlikely to have been reported.
- U Indicates the compound or analyte was analyzed for but not detected at or above the stated limit.
- R Data are qualified as rejected. There is a significant potential for the reporting of false negatives or false positives.
- UJ Indicates the compound or analyte was analyzed for but not detected. The sample detection limit is an estimated value.
- B The analytical result may be a false positive totally attributable to blank contamination. This qualifier is applicable to radiochemistry analysis only.
- JB The analytical result may be biased high and partially attributable to blank contamination. This qualifier is applicable to radiochemistry analysis only.
- JK The analytical result is an estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC).
- X The analytical result is not used for reporting because a more accurate and precise result is reported in its place.
- J-TDS The analytical result is estimated based on failure of the Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) correctness check performed in accordance with the Standard Method 1030E.
- J-CAB The analytical result is estimated based on failure of the cation-anion balance correctness check performed in accordance with Standard Method 1030E.
- J-TDS & CAB The analytical result is unreliable based on the failure of the cation-anion balance and TDS correctness check performed in accordance with standard Method 1030E.
- A Indicates the finding is based upon technical validation criteria.
- P Indicates the finding is related to a protocol/contractual deviation.
- None Indicates the data was not significantly impacted by the finding, therefore qualification was not required.

I. Technical Holding Times

All technical holding time requirements were met.

The chain-of-custodies were reviewed for documentation of cooler temperatures. All cooler temperatures met validation criteria.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration

Initial calibration was performed using required standard concentrations.

Percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

In the case where the laboratory used a calibration curve to evaluate the compounds, all coefficients of determination (r^2) were greater than or equal to 0.990 .

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within method and validation criteria.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

Percent differences (%D) between the initial calibration RRF and the continuing calibration RRF were within the method criteria of less than or equal to 20.0% for calibration check compounds (CCCs) and 25.0% for all other compounds.

The percent differences (%D) of the second source calibration standard were less than or equal to 25.0% for all compounds.

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within method and validation criteria.

V. Blanks

Method blanks were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. No semivolatile contaminants were found in the method blanks.

Samples FB-04072010-RZC (from SDG 280-2280-2) and FB-04072010-RZD (from SDG 280-2216-2) were identified as field blanks. No semivolatile contaminants were found in these blanks with the following exceptions:

Field Blank ID	Sampling Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
FB-04072010-RZD	4/7/10	Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	2.2 ug/L	SSAK6-05-2BPC

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the field blanks as required by the QAPP. No sample data was qualified.

VI. Surrogate Spikes

Surrogates were added to all samples and blanks as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

Laboratory control samples were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control

Not applicable.

X. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XI. Target Compound Identifications

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria for samples on which a Stage 4 review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Stage 2B criteria.

XII. Project Quantitation Limit

All compound quantitation and CRQLs were within validation criteria for samples on which a Stage 4 review was performed.

All compounds reported below the PQL were qualified as follows:

Sample	Finding	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 280-4960-2	All compounds reported below the PQL.	J (all detects)	A

Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Stage 2B criteria.

XIII. Tentatively Identified Compounds (TICs)

Tentatively identified compounds were not reported by the laboratory.

XIV. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable for samples on which a Stage 4 review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Stage 2B criteria.

XV. Overall Assessment

Data flags are summarized at the end of this report if data has been qualified.

XVI. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

**Tronox LLC Facility, PCS, Henderson, Nevada
Semivolatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 280-4960-2**

SDG	Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason (Code)
280-4960-2	SSAK6-05-2BPC SSAO5-05-10BPC**	All compounds reported below the PQL.	J (all detects)	A	Project Quantitation Limit (sp)

**Tronox LLC Facility, PCS, Henderson, Nevada
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 280-4960-2**

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG.

**Tronox LLC Facility, PCS, Henderson, Nevada
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 280-4960-2**

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG.

Tronox Northgate Henderson

LDC #: 23733A2a
 SDG #: 280-4960-2
 Laboratory: Test America

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
 Stage 2B/4

Date: 8/16/10
 Page: 1 of 1
 Reviewer: SV6
 2nd Reviewer: LV

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Technical holding times	A	Sampling dates: 6/29/10
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration	A	2 RSD ✓
IV.	Continuing calibration/ICV	A	CV/W ≤ 25%
V.	Blanks	A	
VI.	Surrogate spikes	SW	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	Client spec
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	A	ICS
IX.	Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control	N	
X.	Internal standards	A	
XI.	Target compound identification	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XII.	Compound quantitation/CRQLs	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XIII.	Tentatively identified compounds (TICs)	N	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XIV.	System performance	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	
XVI.	Field duplicates	N	
XVII.	Field blanks	SW	FB = * FB-0407 2010 - R2C (from 280-2280-2) ↓ = FB-0407 2010 - R2D (from 280-2216-2)

Note: A = Acceptable
 N = Not provided/applicable
 SW = See worksheet
 * ND = No compounds detected
 R = Rinsate
 FB = Field blank
 D = Duplicate
 TB = Trip blank
 EB = Equipment blank

Validated Samples: ** Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 validation

Soil

+	1	SSAK6-05-2BPC	11	21	31
+	2	SSAO5-05-10BPC**	12	22	32
-	3	MB 280-22068/A	13	23	33
	4		14	24	34
	5		15	25	35
	6		16	26	36
	7		17	27	37
	8		18	28	38
	9		19	29	39
	10		20	30	40

LDC #: 23733 A2a
 SDG #: See Cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Page: 1 of 2
 Reviewer: JV6
 2nd Reviewer: [Signature]

Method: Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
All technical holding times were met.	/			
Cooler temperature criteria was met.	/			
II. GC/MS Instrument performance check				
Were the DFTPP performance results reviewed and found to be within the specified criteria?	/			
Were all samples analyzed within the 12 hour clock criteria?	/			
III. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	/			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria for all CCCs and SPCCs?	/			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation?	/			
Did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of > 0.990?	/			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 30% and relative response factors (RRF) > 0.05?	/			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?	/			
Were all percent differences (%D) and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria for all CCCs and SPCCs?	/			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 25% and relative response factors (RRF) ≥ 0.05?	/			
V. Blanks				
Was a method blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	/			
Was a method blank analyzed for each matrix and concentration?	/			
Was there contamination in the method blanks? If yes, please see the Blanks validation completeness worksheet.		/		
VI. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate %R within QC limits?		/		
If 2 or more base neutral or acid surrogates were outside QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?		/		
If any %R was less than 10 percent, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?			/	
VII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were a matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG? If no, indicate which matrix does not have an associated MS/MSD. Soil / Water.		/		
Was a MS/MSD analyzed every 20 samples of each matrix?		/		
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?			/	
VIII. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed for this SDG?	/			

LDC #: 237 83 A 2a
 SDG #: See Cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Page: 2 of 2
 Reviewer: JTB
 2nd Reviewer: [Signature]

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control				
Were performance evaluation (PE) samples performed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were the performance evaluation (PE) samples within the acceptance limits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
X. Internal standards				
Were internal standard area counts within -50% or +100% of the associated calibration standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were retention times within + 30 seconds from the associated calibration standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XI. Target compound identification				
Were relative retention times (RRT's) within ± 0.06 RRT units of the standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Did compound spectra meet specified EPA "Functional Guidelines" criteria?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were chromatogram peaks verified and accounted for?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XII. Compound quantitation/CRQLs				
Were the correct internal standard (IS), quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were compound quantitation and CRQLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XIII. Tentatively identified compounds (TICs)				
Were the major ions (> 10 percent relative intensity) in the reference spectrum evaluated in sample spectrum?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Were relative intensities of the major ions within $\pm 20\%$ between the sample and the reference spectra?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Did the raw data indicate that the laboratory performed a library search for all required peaks in the chromatograms (samples and blanks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
XIV. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XV. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XVI. Field duplicates				
Field duplicate pairs were identified in this SDG.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Target compounds were detected in the field duplicates.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
XVII. Field blanks				
Field blanks were identified in this SDG.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Target compounds were detected in the field blanks.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270)

A. Phenol**	P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	TT. Pentachlorophenol**	III. Benzo(a)pyrene**
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol**	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	UU. Phenanthrene	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene
C. 2-Chlorophenol	R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	GG. Acenaphthene**	VV. Anthracene	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	S. Naphthalene	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol*	WW. Carbazole	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene**	T. 4-Chloroaniline	II. 4-Nitrophenol*	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	U. Hexachlorobutadiene**	JJ. Dibenzofuran	YY. Fluoranthene**	NNN. Aniline
G. 2-Methylphenol	V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol**	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	ZZ. Pyrene	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine
H. 2,2-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	LL. Diethylphthalate	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	PPP. Benzoic Acid
I. 4-Methylphenol	X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene*	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine*	Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol**	NN. Fluorene	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	RRR. Pyridine
K. Hexachloroethane	Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	DDD. Chrysene	SSS. Benzidine
L. Nitrobenzene	AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	TTT.
M. Isophorone	BB. 2-Nitroaniline	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine (1)**	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate**	UUU
N. 2-Nitrophenol**	CC. Dimethylphthalate	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	VVV.
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	DD. Acenaphthylene	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	WWW.

Notes: * = System performance check compound (SPCC) for RRF; ** = Calibration check compound (CCC) for %RSD.

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The Relative Response Factor (RRF), average RRF, and percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculations:

$$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is}) / (A_{is})(C_x)$$

$$\text{average RRF} = \text{sum of the RRFs} / \text{number of standards}$$

$$\%RSD = 100 * (S/X)$$

$$A_x = \text{Area of Compound}$$

$$C_x = \text{Concentration of compound,}$$

$$S = \text{Standard deviation of the RRFs,}$$

$$A_{is} = \text{Area of associated internal standard}$$

$$C_{is} = \text{Concentration of internal standard}$$

$$X = \text{Mean of the RRFs}$$

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Internal Standard)	Reported RRF (50 std)	Recalculated RRF (50 std)	Reported Average RRF (Initial)	Recalculated Average RRF (Initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	7/3/2010	1,4-Dioxane (IS1)	0.6102	0.6102	0.6008	0.6008	5.1	5.07
	MSS K		Naphthalene (IS2)	1.0418	1.0418	0.9914	0.9914	12.0	11.97
			Dimethyl phthalate (IS3)	1.2443	1.2443	1.2017	1.2017	7.9	7.86
			Hexachlorobenzene (IS4)	0.2373	0.2373	0.2237	0.2237	7.1	7.08
			Chrysene (IS5)	1.0879	1.0879	1.0549	1.0549	8.8	8.79
			Benzo(a)pyrene (IS6)	1.1315	1.1315	1.0538	1.0538	5.1	5.09

Inc IS/Cpd	Area cpd	Area IS
40/50	161271	211425
40/50	1052210	807956
40/50	720125	462977
40/50	226817	764720
40/50	1110735	816792
40/50	1134417	802029

Conc	1,4-Dioxane	Naphthalene	Dimethyl phtha	Hexachloro	Chrysene	Benzo(a)py
4.00	0.6711	1.1335	1.2809		1.1689	0.9886
10.00	0.5864	1.1043	1.3010	0.2427	1.1376	1.0534
20.00	0.5921	1.0824	1.2857	0.2373	1.1410	1.1022
50.00	0.6102	1.0418	1.2443	0.2373	1.0879	1.1315
80.00	0.6003	0.9839	1.2100	0.2228	1.0410	1.0984
120.00	0.5907	0.9067	1.1502	0.2160	0.9807	1.0480
160.00	0.5774	0.8649	1.0871	0.2081	0.9513	1.0196
200.00	0.5780	0.8135	1.0545	0.2020	0.9308	0.9884
X =	0.6008	0.9914	1.2017	0.2237	1.0549	1.0538
S =	0.0304	0.1187	0.0945	0.0158	0.0927	0.0536

Comments: Refer to Initial Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The percent difference (%D) of the initial calibration average Relative Response Factors (RRFs) and the continuing calibration RRFs were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Difference = $100 * (\text{ave. RRF} - \text{RRF}) / \text{ave. RRF}$
 $\text{RRF} = (\text{Ax})(\text{Cis}) / (\text{Ais})(\text{Cx})$

Where:

ave. RRF = initial calibration average RRF
 RRF = continuing calibration RRF
 Ax = Area of compound Ais = Area of associated internal standard
 Cx = Concentration of compound Cis = Concentration of internal standard

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference IS)	Average RRF (Initial RRF)	Reported (CC RRF)	Recalculated (CC RRF)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	K4961	07/09/10	1,4-Dioxane (IS1)	0.6008	0.5608	0.5608	6.7	6.7
			Naphthalene (IS2)	0.9914	0.9786	0.9786	1.3	1.3
			Dimethyl phthalate (IS3)	1.2017	1.1736	1.1736	2.3	2.3
			Hexachlorobenzene (IS4)	0.2237	0.2241	0.2241	0.2	0.2
			Chrysene (IS5)	1.0549	1.0580	1.0580	0.3	0.3
			Benzo(a)pyrene (IS6)	1.0538	1.0854	1.0854	3.0	3.0
2								

Compound (Reference IS)	CCV1			CCV2		
	Concentration (IS/Cpd)	Area Cpd	Area IS	Concentration (IS/Cpd)	Area Cpd	Area IS
1,4-Dioxane (IS1)	40/80	258207	230209	40/80	258207	230209
Naphthalene (IS2)	40/80	1731395	884668	40/80	1731395	884668
Dimethyl phthalate (IS3)	40/80	1184987	504835	40/80	1184987	504835
Hexachlorobenzene (IS4)	40/80	364529	813302	40/80	364529	813302
Chrysene (IS5)	40/80	1796085	848806	40/80	1796085	848806
Benzo(a)pyrene (IS6)	40/80	1857934	856895	40/80	1857934	856895

LDC #: 23793 A 2a
 SDG #: Src Cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
 Reviewer: JM
 2nd reviewer: W

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The percent recoveries (%R) of surrogates were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery: $SF/SS * 100$

Where: SF = Surrogate Found
 SS = Surrogate Spiked

Sample ID: # 2

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5	100	73.72	74	74	0
2-Fluorobiphenyl	↓	72.14	72	72	↓
Terphenyl-d14	↓	77.1	77	77	↓
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol					
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

Sample ID: _____

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14					
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol					
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

Sample ID: _____

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14					
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol					
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent Difference (RPD) of the laboratory control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = $100 * (SC/SA)$ Where: SSC = Spike concentration
SA = Spike added

RPD = $100 * LCSC - LCSDC / 2 * (LCSC + LCSDC)$ LCSC = Laboratory control sample concentration LCSDC = Laboratory control sample duplicate concentration

LCS/LCSD samples: LCS 280 - 22-068

Compound	Spike Added (ug)		Spike Concentration (ug/L)		LCS		LCSD		Percent Recovery		RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalculated
Phenol												
N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine												
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol												
Acenaphthene	2630	NA	2220	NA	84	84						
Pentachlorophenol												
Pyrene	2630		2300		87	87						

Comments: Refer to Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

**Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report**

Project/Site Name: Tronox LLC Facility, PCS, Henderson, Nevada
Collection Date: July 7, 2010
LDC Report Date: August 18, 2010
Matrix: Soil
Parameters: Semivolatiles
Validation Level: Stage 2B & 4
Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.
Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 280-5189-1

Sample Identification

SA148-2BPC
SA148-3BPC**
SA148-3BPCMS
SA148-3BPCMSD

**Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 review

Introduction

This data review covers 4 soil samples listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA SW 846 Method 8270C for Semivolatiles.

This review follows the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) 40, Data Review/Validation (BRC 2009), the Quality Assurance Project Plan Tronox LLC Facility, Henderson, Nevada (June 2009), NDEP guidance (May 2006), and a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Superfund Organic Methods Data Review (June 2008).

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

Blank results are summarized in Section V.

Field duplicates are summarized in Section XVI.

Samples indicated by a double asterisk on the front cover underwent a Stage 4 review. A Stage 2B review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Stage 2B criteria since this review is based on QC data.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers:

- J+ Data are qualified as estimated, with a high bias likely to occur. False positives or false negatives are unlikely to have been reported.
- J- Data are qualified as estimated, with a low bias likely to occur. False positives or false negatives are unlikely to have been reported.
- J Data are qualified as estimated; it is not possible to assess the direction of the potential bias. False positives or false negatives are unlikely to have been reported.
- U Indicates the compound or analyte was analyzed for but not detected at or above the stated limit.
- R Data are qualified as rejected. There is a significant potential for the reporting of false negatives or false positives.
- UJ Indicates the compound or analyte was analyzed for but not detected. The sample detection limit is an estimated value.
- B The analytical result may be a false positive totally attributable to blank contamination. This qualifier is applicable to radiochemistry analysis only.
- JB The analytical result may be biased high and partially attributable to blank contamination. This qualifier is applicable to radiochemistry analysis only.
- JK The analytical result is an estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC).
- X The analytical result is not used for reporting because a more accurate and precise result is reported in its place.
- J-TDS The analytical result is estimated based on failure of the Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) correctness check performed in accordance with the Standard Method 1030E.
- J-CAB The analytical result is estimated based on failure of the cation-anion balance correctness check performed in accordance with Standard Method 1030E.
- J-TDS & CAB The analytical result is unreliable based on the failure of the cation-anion balance and TDS correctness check performed in accordance with standard Method 1030E.
- A Indicates the finding is based upon technical validation criteria.
- P Indicates the finding is related to a protocol/contractual deviation.
- None Indicates the data was not significantly impacted by the finding, therefore qualification was not required.

I. Technical Holding Times

All technical holding time requirements were met.

The chain-of-custodies were reviewed for documentation of cooler temperatures. All cooler temperatures met validation criteria.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration

Initial calibration was performed using required standard concentrations.

Percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

In the case where the laboratory used a calibration curve to evaluate the compounds, all coefficients of determination (r^2) were greater than or equal to 0.990 .

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within method and validation criteria.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

Percent differences (%D) between the initial calibration RRF and the continuing calibration RRF were within the method criteria of less than or equal to 20.0% for calibration check compounds (CCCs) and 25.0% for all other compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
7/26/10	Pyridine	31.2	SA148-3BPCMS SA148-3BPCMSD	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

The percent differences (%D) of the second source calibration standard were less than or equal to 25.0% for all compounds.

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within method and validation criteria.

V. Blanks

Method blanks were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. No semivolatile contaminants were found in the method blanks with the following exceptions:

Method Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound TIC (RT in minutes)	Concentration	Associated Samples
MB 280-22481/1-A	7/10/10	Dimethylphthalate Di-n-octylphthalate	26.4 ug/Kg 66.4 ug/Kg	All samples in SDG 280-5189-1

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the method blanks as required by the QAPP. No sample data was qualified with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound TIC (RT in minutes)	Reported Concentration	Modified Final Concentration
SA148-2BPC	Dimethylphthalate Di-n-octylphthalate	75 ug/Kg 83 ug/Kg	75U ug/Kg 83U ug/Kg
SA148-3BPC**	Dimethylphthalate	50 ug/Kg	50U ug/Kg

Sample FB04062010-RZB (from SDG 280-2131-2) was identified as a field blank. No semivolatile contaminants were found in this blank with the following exceptions:

Field Blank ID	Sampling Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
FB04062010-RZB	4/6/10	Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	2.7 ug/L	All samples in SDG 280-5189-1

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the field blanks as required by the QAPP. No sample data was qualified.

VI. Surrogate Spikes

Surrogates were added to all samples and blanks as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) samples were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. Percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

Laboratory control samples were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

LCS ID	Compound	%R (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
LCS 280-22481/2-A	Pyridine	16 (23-120)	All samples in SDG 280-5189-1	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P

IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control

Not applicable.

X. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XI. Target Compound Identifications

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria for samples on which a Stage 4 review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Stage 2B criteria.

XII. Project Quantitation Limit

All compound quantitation and CRQLs were within validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Finding	Flag	A or P
SA148-2BPC SA148-3BPC**	Benzo(b)fluoranthene Benzo(k)fluoranthene	Due to lack of resolution between these compounds in the samples, the laboratory performed the quantitation using the total peak area.	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects) J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P

All compounds reported below the PQL were qualified as follows:

Sample	Finding	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 280-5189-1	All compounds reported below the PQL.	J (all detects)	A

Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Stage 2B criteria.

XIII. Tentatively Identified Compounds (TICs)

Tentatively identified compounds were not reported by the laboratory.

XIV. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable for samples on which a Stage 4 review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Stage 2B criteria.

XV. Overall Assessment

Data flags are summarized at the end of this report if data has been qualified.

XVI. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

**Tronox LLC Facility, PCS, Henderson, Nevada
Semivolatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 280-5189-1**

SDG	Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason (Code)
280-5189-1	SA148-2BPC SA148-3BPC**	Pyridine	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P	Laboratory control samples (%R) (l)
280-5189-1	SA148-2BPC SA148-3BPC**	Benzo(b)fluoranthene Benzo(k)fluoranthene	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects) J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P	Compound quantitation and CRQLs (q)
280-5189-1	SA148-2BPC SA148-3BPC**	All compounds reported below the PQL.	J (all detects)	A	Project Quantitation Limit (sp)

**Tronox LLC Facility, PCS, Henderson, Nevada
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 280-5189-1**

SDG	Sample	Compound TIC (RT in minutes)	Modified Final Concentration	A or P	Code
280-5189-1	SA148-2BPC	Dimethylphthalate Di-n-octylphthalate	75U ug/Kg 83U ug/Kg	A	bl
280-5189-1	SA148-3BPC**	Dimethylphthalate	50U ug/Kg	A	bl

**Tronox LLC Facility, PCS, Henderson, Nevada
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 280-5189-1**

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Tronox Northgate Henderson

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

LDC #: 23733B2a
 SDG #: 280-5189-1
 Laboratory: Test America

Stage 2B/4

Date: 8/16/10
 Page: 1 of 1
 Reviewer: JVG
 2nd Reviewer: [Signature]

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Technical holding times	A	Sampling dates: 7/07/10
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration	A	2 RSD r✓
IV.	Continuing calibration/ICV	SW	COV/W ≤ 25%
V.	Blanks	SW	
VI.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	SW	LCS
IX.	Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control	N	
X.	Internal standards	A	
XI.	Target compound identification	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XII.	Compound quantitation/CRQLs	SW	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XIII.	Tentatively identified compounds (TICs)	N	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XIV.	System performance	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	
XVI.	Field duplicates	N	
XVII.	Field blanks	SW	FB = FB04062010 - RZB (from 280-2131-2)

Note: A = Acceptable ND = No compounds detected D = Duplicate
 N = Not provided/applicable R = Rinsate TB = Trip blank
 SW = See worksheet FB = Field blank EB = Equipment blank

Validated Samples: ** Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 validation

1	SA148-2BPC	11		21		31	
2	SA148-3BPC**	12		22		32	
3	SA148-3BPCMS	13		23		33	
4	SA148-3BPCMSD	14		24		34	
5		15		25		35	
6		16		26		36	
7		17		27		37	
8		18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

LDC #: 23733 B2C
 SDG #: See Cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Page: 1 of 2
 Reviewer: JFB
 2nd Reviewer: W

Method: Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
All technical holding times were met.	/			
Cooler temperature criteria was met.	/			
II. GC/MS Instrument performance check				
Were the DFTPP performance results reviewed and found to be within the specified criteria?	/			
Were all samples analyzed within the 12 hour clock criteria?	/			
III. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	/			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria for all CCCs and SPCCs?	/			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation?	/			
Did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of > 0.990?	/			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 30% and relative response factors (RRF) > 0.05?	/			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?	/			
Were all percent differences (%D) and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria for all CCCs and SPCCs?	/			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 25% and relative response factors (RRF) ≥ 0.05?	/			
V. Blanks				
Was a method blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	/			
Was a method blank analyzed for each matrix and concentration?	/			
Was there contamination in the method blanks? If yes, please see the Blanks validation completeness worksheet.	/	X		
VI. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate %R within QC limits?	/			
If 2 or more base neutral or acid surrogates were outside QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?			/	
If any %R was less than 10 percent, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?			/	
VII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were a matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG? If no, indicate which matrix does not have an associated MS/MSD. Soil / Water.	/			
Was a MS/MSD analyzed every 20 samples of each matrix?	/			
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?	/			
VIII. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed for this SDG?	/			

LDC #: 23737 BVA
 SDG #: See Cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Page: 2 of 2
 Reviewer: Ng
 2nd Reviewer: [Signature]

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control				
Were performance evaluation (PE) samples performed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Were the performance evaluation (PE) samples within the acceptance limits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
X. Internal standards				
Were internal standard area counts within -50% or +100% of the associated calibration standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were retention times within + 30 seconds from the associated calibration standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XI. Target compound identification				
Were relative retention times (RRT's) within + 0.06 RRT units of the standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Did compound spectra meet specified EPA "Functional Guidelines" criteria?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were chromatogram peaks verified and accounted for?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XII. Compound quantitation/CRQLs				
Were the correct internal standard (IS), quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were compound quantitation and CRQLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XIII. Tentatively identified compounds (TICs)				
Were the major ions (> 10 percent relative intensity) in the reference spectrum evaluated in sample spectrum?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Were relative intensities of the major ions within ± 20% between the sample and the reference spectra?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Did the raw data indicate that the laboratory performed a library search for all required peaks in the chromatograms (samples and blanks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XIV. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XV. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XVI. Field duplicates				
Field duplicate pairs were identified in this SDG.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Target compounds were detected in the field duplicates.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
XVII. Field blanks				
Field blanks were identified in this SDG.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Target compounds were detected in the field blanks.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270)

A. Phenol**	P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	TT. Pentachlorophenol**	III. Benzo(a)pyrene**
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol**	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	UU. Phenanthrene	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene
C. 2-Chlorophenol	R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	GG. Acenaphthene**	VV. Anthracene	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	S. Naphthalene	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol*	WW. Carbazole	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene**	T. 4-Chloroaniline	II. 4-Nitrophenol*	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	U. Hexachlorobutadiene**	JJ. Dibenzofuran	YY. Fluoranthene**	NNN. Aniline
G. 2-Methylphenol	V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol**	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	ZZ. Pyrene	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	LL. Diethylphthalate	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	PPP. Benzoic Acid
I. 4-Methylphenol	X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene*	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine*	Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol**	NN. Fluorene	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	RRR. Pyridine
K. Hexachloroethane	Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	DDD. Chrysene	SSS. Benzidine
L. Nitrobenzene	AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	TTT.
M. Isophorone	BB. 2-Nitroaniline	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine (1)**	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate**	UUU
N. 2-Nitrophenol**	CC. Dimethylphthalate	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	VVV.
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	DD. Acenaphthylene	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	WWW.

Notes: * = System performance check compound (SPCC) for RRF; ** = Calibration check compound (CCC) for %RSD.

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The Relative Response Factor (RRF), average RRF, and percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculations:

$$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is}) / (A_{is})(C_x)$$

average RRF = sum of the RRFs/number of standards

$$\%RSD = 100 * (S/X)$$

A_x = Area of Compound

C_x = Concentration of compound,

S = Standard deviation of the RRFs,

A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard

C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard

X = Mean of the RRFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Internal Standard)	Reported RRF (50 std)	Recalculated RRF (50 std)	Reported Average RRF (Initial)	Recalculated Average RRF (Initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	7/21/2010	1,4-Dioxane (IS1)	0.5607	0.5607	0.5706	0.5707	4.1	4.13
	MSS K		Naphthalene (IS2)	1.0611	1.0611	1.0093	1.0093	5.7	5.70
			Fluorene (IS3)	1.3101	1.3101	1.2473	1.2473	5.3	5.25
			Hexachlorobenzene (IS4)	0.2418	0.2418	0.2300	0.2300	3.8	3.81
			Chrysene (IS5)	1.1089	1.1089	1.0581	1.0581	6.7	6.75
			Benzo(a)pyrene (IS6)	1.1425	1.1425	1.0793	1.0794	8.5	8.53

Inc IS/Cpd	Area cpd	Area IS
40/50	112429	160417
40/50	817090	616036
40/50	587234	358588
40/50	161541	534527
40/50	784054	565669
40/50	774079	542046

Conc	1,4-Dioxane	Naphthalene	Fluorene	Hexachloro	Chrysene	Benzo(a)py
4.00	0.6209	1.0632	1.2493		1.1443	0.8934
10.00	0.5673	1.0390	1.2573	0.2339	1.1045	0.9948
20.00	0.5842	1.0490	1.3209	0.2330	1.1007	1.0754
50.00	0.5607	1.0611	1.3101	0.2418	1.1089	1.1425
80.00	0.5523	1.0236	1.2953	0.2310	1.0810	1.1683
120.00	0.5455	0.9799	1.2298	0.2266	0.9887	1.1297
160.00	0.5731	0.9540	1.1898	0.2305	0.9795	1.1318
200.00	0.5612	0.9045	1.1261	0.2131	0.9573	1.0989
X =	0.5707	1.0093	1.2473	0.2300	1.0581	1.0794
S =	0.0236	0.0575	0.0655	0.0088	0.0714	0.0920

Comments: Refer to Initial Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The percent difference (%D) of the initial calibration average Relative Response Factors (RRFs) and the continuing calibration RRFs were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

Where:
 % Difference = $100 * (\text{ave. RRF} - \text{RRF}) / \text{ave. RRF}$
 RRF = $(Ax)(Cis) / (Ais)(Cx)$
 Ax = Area of compound
 Ais = Area of associated internal standard
 Cx = Concentration of compound
 Cis = Concentration of internal standard

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference IS)	Average RRF (Initial RRF)	Reported (CC RRF)	Recalculated (CC RRF)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	K5486	07/26/10	1,4-Dioxane (IS1)	0.5706	0.5421	0.5421	5.0	5.0
			Naphthalene (IS2)	1.0093	1.0474	1.0474	3.8	3.8
			Fluorene (IS3)	1.2473	1.3218	1.3218	6.0	6.0
			Hexachlorobenzene (IS4)	0.2300	0.2439	0.2439	6.0	6.0
			Chrysene (IS5)	1.0581	1.0708	1.0708	1.2	1.2
			Benzo(a)pyrene (IS6)	1.0793	1.1855	1.1855	9.8	9.8
2	K5532	07/27/10	1,4-Dioxane (IS1)	0.5706	0.5443	0.5443	4.6	4.6
			Naphthalene (IS2)	1.0093	1.0689	1.0689	5.9	5.9
			Fluorene (IS3)	1.2473	1.3191	1.3191	5.8	5.8
			Hexachlorobenzene (IS4)	0.2300	0.2438	0.2438	6.0	6.0
			Chrysene (IS5)	1.0581	1.1145	1.1145	5.3	5.3
			Benzo(a)pyrene (IS6)	1.0793	1.1724	1.1724	8.6	8.6

Compound (Reference IS)	CCV1			CCV2		
	Concentration (IS/Cpd)	Area Cpd	Area IS	Area Cpd	Area IS	Area IS
1,4-Dioxane (IS1)	40/80	228201	210491	202149	185703	185703
Naphthalene (IS2)	40/80	1687974	805819	1517262	709711	709711
Fluorene (IS3)	40/80	1267589	479482	1084580	411103	411103
Hexachlorobenzene (IS4)	40/80	383230	785735	317955	652027	652027
Chrysene (IS5)	40/80	1868368	872394	1544610	692941	692941
Benzo(a)pyrene (IS6)	40/80	1802120	760039	1522934	649517	649517

LDC #: 23733 B26
 SDG #: See Cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
 Reviewer: JV
 2nd reviewer: W

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The percent recoveries (%R) of surrogates were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery: $SF/SS * 100$

Where: SF = Surrogate Found
 SS = Surrogate Spiked

Sample ID: # 2

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5	100	74.8	75	75	0
2-Fluorobiphenyl	↓	81.4	81	81	↓
Terphenyl-d14	↓	95.5	96	96	↓
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol					
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

Sample ID: _____

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14					
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol					
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

Sample ID: _____

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14					
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol					
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent Difference (RPD) of the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = $100 * (SSC - SC) / SA$ Where: SSC = Spiked sample concentration SC = Sample concentration
 SA = Spike added
 RPD = $100 * MSC / (MSC + MSDC)$ MSC = Matrix spike concentration MSDC = Matrix spike duplicate concentration

MS/MSD samples: 3/4

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Sample Concentration (ug/kg)	Spiked Sample Concentration (ug/kg)		Matrix Spike Percent Recovery		Matrix Spike Duplicate Percent Recovery		MS/MSD RPD	
	MS	MSD		MS	MSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalculated
Phenol											
N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine											
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	2730	2750	0	2080	2070	76	76	75	75	0	0.5
Acenaphthene											
Pentachlorophenol											
Pyrene	2730	2750	190	2230	2420	74	75	81	81	8	8

Comments: Refer to Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates Results Verification

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent Difference (RPD) of the laboratory control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

$$\% \text{ Recovery} = 100 * (\text{SC}/\text{SA}) \quad \text{Where: SSC} = \text{Spike concentration}$$

$$\text{SA} = \text{Spike added}$$

$$\text{RPD} = | \text{LCSC} - \text{LCSDC} | * 2 / (\text{LCSC} + \text{LCSDC}) \quad \text{LCSC} = \text{Laboratory control sample concentration} \quad \text{LCSDC} = \text{Laboratory control sample duplicate concentration}$$

LCS/LCSD samples: LCS 280-22481 / 2-A

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Spike Concentration (ug/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalculated
Phenol										
N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine										
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol										
Acenaphthene	2610	NA	1960	NA	75	75				
Pentachlorophenol	2610	J	1946	J	74	74				
Pyrene										

Comments: Refer to Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

