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

ERM
2525 Natomas Park Drive, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95833
ATTN: Ms. Maria Barajas-Albalawi

August 6, 2008

SUBJECT: BRC Tronox Parcel F, Data Validation

Dear Ms. Barajas-Albalawi

Enclosed are the final validation reports for the fractions listed below. This SDG was received on July 11, 2008. Attachment 1 is a summary of the samples that were reviewed for each analysis.

LDC Project # 19091:

SDG #	Fraction
F8F110177	Volatiles, Semivolatiles, Chlorinated Pesticides, Polychlorinated Biphenyls, Metals, Wet Chemistry, Gasoline Range Organics, Diesel Range Organics, Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons, Dioxins/Dibenzofurans

The data validation was performed under EPA Level III and Level IV guidelines. The analyses were validated using the following documents, as applicable to each method:

- USEPA, Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review, October 1999
- USEPA, Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Data Review, October 2004
- EPA SW 846, Third Edition, Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, update 1, July 1992; update IIA, August 1993; update II, September 1994; update IIB, January 1995; update III, December 1996; update IIIA, April 1998; IIIB, November 2004; Update IV, February 2007

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

Sincerely,

Erlinda T. Rauto
Operations Manager/Senior Chemist

5,203 Pages-CD R2

Attachment 1

80/20

LDC #19091 (ERM-Sacramento / BRC Tronox Parcel F)

LDC	SDG#	DATE REC'D	(3) DATE DUE	VOA (8260B)		SVOA (8270C)		Pest. (8081A)		PCBs (8082)		Metals (SW846)		GRO (8015)		DRO (8015)		PAHs (8310)		Dioxins (8290)		Bromide Bromine Chlorate		Chloride Chlorine Fluoride		NO_3 NO_2 O-OP_4		SO_4 (300.0)		O&G (9071B 1664A)							
Matrix:	Water/Soil			W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S
A	F8F110177	07/11/08	08/01/08	1	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2						
A	F8F110177	07/11/08	08/01/08	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3						
Total	T/LR			1	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	71

Shaded cells indicate Level IV validation (all other cells are Level IIII validation). These sample counts do not include MS/MSD, and DUPs

19091ST.wpd

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: BRC Tronox Parcel F

Collection Date: June 10, 2008

LDC Report Date: August 6, 2008

Matrix: Soil/Water

Parameters: Volatiles

Validation Level: EPA Level III & IV

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): F8F110177

TSB-FR-02-02-20'
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'
TB-2 6/10/08
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'MS
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'MSD

**Indicates sample underwent EPA Level IV review

Introduction

This data review covers 7 soil samples and one water sample listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA SW 846 Method 8260B for Volatiles.

This review follows a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (October 1999) as there are no current guidelines for the method stated above.

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 EPA Level IV review. A EPA Level III review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III 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.

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.

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 15.0% for each individual compound and less than or equal to 30.0% for calibration check compounds (CCCs).

In the case where %RSD was greater than 15.0%, the laboratory used a calibration curve to evaluate the compound. All coefficients of determination (r^2) were greater than or equal to 0.990 .

For the purposes of technical evaluation, all compounds were evaluated against the 30.0% (%RSD) National Functional Guideline criteria. Unless noted above, all compounds were within the validation criteria.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all volatile target compounds and system performance check compounds (SPCCs) were within method and validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	RRF (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
6/12/08	Ethanol	0.00148 (≥0.05)	All soil samples in SDG F8F110177	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

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).

For the purposes of technical evaluation, all compounds were evaluated against the 25.0% (%D) National Functional Guideline criteria. Unless noted above, all compounds were within the validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
6/19/08 (LCAL0317)	Iodomethane	67.71684	TB-2 6/10/08 F8F200000-125	J+ (all detects)	A

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

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
5/28/08 (LICV9881)	Iodomethane	31.67513	All water samples in SDG F8F110177	J+ (all detects)	A
5/28/08 (LICV9881)	2-Hexanone	25.04476	All water samples in SDG F8F110177	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A
6/9/08 (XICV2280)	Methylene chloride	29.90220	All soil samples in SDG F8F110177	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

All of the continuing calibration RRF values were within method and validation criteria.

V. Blanks

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

Method Blank ID	Analysis Date	Compound TIC (RT in minutes)	Concentration	Associated Samples
F8F120000-446	6/12/08	Tetrachloroethene	1.5 ug/Kg	All soil samples in SDG F8F110177

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the method blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater (>10X for common contaminants, >5X for other contaminants) than the concentrations found in the associated method blanks with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound TIC (RT in minutes)	Reported Concentration	Modified Final Concentration
TSB-FR-02-02-20'	Tetrachloroethene	1.4 ug/Kg	5.6U ug/Kg

Sample	Compound TIC (RT in minutes)	Reported Concentration	Modified Final Concentration
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	Tetrachloroethene	1.3 ug/Kg	7.2U ug/Kg
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	Tetrachloroethene	1.6 ug/Kg	6.6U ug/Kg
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	Tetrachloroethene	1.3 ug/Kg	6.1U ug/Kg
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	Tetrachloroethene	1.2 ug/Kg	6.5U ug/Kg

Sample TB-2 6/10/08 was identified as a trip blank. No volatile contaminants were found in this blank with the following exceptions:

Trip Blank ID	Sampling Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
TB-2 6/10/08	6/10/08	Acetone Chloroform	2.9 ug/L 0.14 ug/L	TSB-FR-02-02-20' TSB-FR-02-02-30'** TSB-FJ-02-02-10'** TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the field blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater (>10X for common contaminants, >5X for other contaminants) than the concentrations found in the associated field blanks.

VI. Surrogate Spikes

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

Sample	Surrogate	%R (Limits)	Compound	Flag	A or P
F8F200000-125	Bromofluorobenzene	117 (79-115)	All TCL compounds	J+ (all detects)	P

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) samples were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. Although the MS/MSD percent recovery (%R) and relative percent differences (RPD) were not within QC limits for some compounds, the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits and no data were qualified.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

Laboratory control samples were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. Although the relative percent differences (RPD) for one compound and the percent recoveries for some compounds in the LCS/LCSD were not within QC limits, the LCS and MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits and no data were qualified.

IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control

Not applicable.

X. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Sample	Internal Standards	Area (Limits)	Compound	Flag	A or P
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	1,4-Dichlorobenzene-d4	172980 (187131-748522)	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethene 1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene 1,2,3-Trichloropropane 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzne 1,2-Dichlorobenzene 1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene 1,3-Dichlorobenzene 1,4-Dichlorobenzene 2-Chlorotoluene 4-Chlorotoluene Bromobenzene Isopropylbenzene n-Butylbenzene n-Propylbenzene p-Cymene sec-Butylbenzene tert-Butylbenzene 1,3,5-Trichlorobenzene Nonanal Bromoform	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P

Sample	Internal Standards	Area (Limits)	Compound	Flag	A or P
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	1,4-Dichlorobenzene-d4	180609 (187131-748522)	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethene 1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene 1,2,3-Trichloropropane 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzne 1,2-Dichlorobenzene 1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene 1,3-Dichlorobenzene 1,4-Dichlorobenzene 2-Chlorotoluene 4-Chlorotoluene Bromobenzene Isopropylbenzene n-Butylbenzene n-Propylbenzene p-Cymene sec-Butylbenzene tert-Butylbenzene 1,3,5-Trichlorobenzene Nonanal Bromoform	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	1,4-Dichlorobenzene-d4	171259 (187131-748522)	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethene 1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene 1,2,3-Trichloropropane 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene 1,2-Dichlorobenzene 1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene 1,3-Dichlorobenzene 1,4-Dichlorobenzene 2-Chlorotoluene 4-Chlorotoluene Bromobenzene Isopropylbenzene n-Butylbenzene n-Propylbenzene p-Cymene sec-Butylbenzene tert-Butylbenzene 1,3,5-Trichlorobenzene Nonanal Bromoform	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P

Sample	Internal Standards	Area (Limits)	Compound	Flag	A or P
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	1,4-Dichlorobenzene-d4	168365 (187131-748522)	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethene 1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene 1,2,3-Trichloropropane 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene 1,2-Dichlorobenzene 1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene 1,3-Dichlorobenzene 1,4-Dichlorobenzene 2-Chlorotoluene 4-Chlorotoluene Bromobenzene Isopropylbenzene n-Butylbenzene n-Propylbenzene p-Cymene sec-Butylbenzene tert-Butylbenzene 1,3,5-Trichlorobenzene Nonanal Bromoform	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P

XI. Target Compound Identifications

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XII. Compound Quantitation and CRQLs

All compound quantitation and CRQLs were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XIII. Tentatively Identified Compounds (TICs)

All tentatively identified compounds were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XIV. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

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

XVI. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Volatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

SDG	Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
F8F110177	TSB-FR-02-02-20' TSB-FR-02-02-30'** TSB-FJ-02-02-10'** TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	Ethanol	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Initial calibration (RRF)
F8F110177	TB-2 6/10/08	Iodomethane	J+ (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
F8F110177	TB-2 6/10/08	Iodomethane	J+ (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (ICV %D)
F8F110177	TB-2 6/10/08	2-Hexanone	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Continuing calibration (ICV %D)
F8F110177	TSB-FR-02-02-20' TSB-FR-02-02-30'** TSB-FJ-02-02-10'** TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	Methylene chloride	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Continuing calibration (ICV %D)
F8F110177	TSB-FR-02-02-30'** TSB-FJ-02-02-10'** TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethene 1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene 1,2,3-Trichloropropane 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene 1,2-Dichlorobenzene 1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene 1,3-Dichlorobenzene 1,4-Dichlorobenzene 2-Chlorotoluene 4-Chlorotoluene Bromobenzene Isopropylbenzene n-Butylbenzene n-Propylbenzene p-Cymene sec-Butylbenzene tert-Butylbenzene 1,3,5-Trichlorobenzene Nonanal Bromoform	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P	Internal standards (area)

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Volatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

SDG	Sample	Compound TIC (RT in minutes)	Modified Final Concentration	A or P
F8F110177	TSB-FR-02-02-20'	Tetrachloroethene	5.6U ug/Kg	A
F8F110177	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	Tetrachloroethene	7.2U ug/Kg	A
F8F110177	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	Tetrachloroethene	6.6U ug/Kg	A
F8F110177	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	Tetrachloroethene	6.1U ug/Kg	A
F8F110177	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	Tetrachloroethene	6.5U ug/Kg	A

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Volatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 19091A1 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 7/19/08
SDG #: F8F110177 Level III/IV Page: 1 of 1
Laboratory: Test America Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS Volatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

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: 6/10/08
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration	A	%RSD, r^2 ≥0.990
IV.	Continuing calibration/ICV	SW	ICV ≤ 25
V.	Blanks	SW	
VI.	Surrogate spikes	SW	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	SW	Rinsate - 2
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	SW	
IX.	Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control	N	
X.	Internal standards	SW	
XI.	Target compound identification	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XII.	Compound quantitation/CRQLs	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XIII.	Tentatively identified compounds (TICs)	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XIV.	System performance	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	
XVI.	Field duplicates	N	
XVII.	Field blanks	SW	TB = 6

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 Level IV validation

soil + water

1	TSB-FR-02-02-20'	11	F8F120000-446	21	8164446	31	
2	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	12	F8F200000-125	22	8172125	32	
3	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	13	F8F200000-361	23	8172361 Nonane	33	
4	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	14		24		34	
5	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	15		25		35	
6	TB-2 6/10/08 3: Nonane W	16		26		36	
7	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'MS	17		27		37	
8	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'MSD	18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: pw cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Page: 1 of 2
Reviewer: FT
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Method: Volatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

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 BFB 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 at least once every 12 hours 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 the percent recovery (%R) for one or more surrogates was out of QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm samples with %R outside of criteria?		✓		
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 #: 19091A1
SDG #: all cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: EJ
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

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

TARGET COMPOUND WORKSHEET

METHOD: VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

A. Chloromethane*	U. 1,1,2-Trichloroethane	OO. 2,2-Dichloropropane	III. n-Butylbenzene	CCCC.1-Chlorohexane
B. Bromomethane	V. Benzene	PP. Bromochloromethane	JJJ. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	DDDD. Isopropyl alcohol
C. Vinyl choride**	W. trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	QQ. 1,1-Dichloropropene	KKK. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	EEEE. Acetonitrile
D. Chloroethane	X. Bromoform*	RR. Dibromomethane	LLL. Hexachlorobutadiene	FFFF. Acrolein
E. Methylene chloride	Y. 4-Methyl-2-pentanone	SS. 1,3-Dichloropropane	MMM. Naphthalene	GGGG. Acrylonitrile
F. Acetone	Z. 2-Hexanone	TT. 1,2-Dibromoethane	NNN. 1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	HHHH. 1,4-Dioxane
G. Carbon disulfide	AA. Tetrachloroethene	UU. 1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	OOO. 1,3,5-Trichlorobenzene	IIII. Isobutyl alcohol
H. 1,1-Dichloroethene**	BB. 1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane*	VV. Isopropylbenzene	PPP. trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	JJJJ. Methacrylonitrile
I. 1,1-Dichloroethane*	CC. Toluene**	WW. Bromobenzene	QQQ. cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	KKKK. Propionitrile
J. 1,2-Dichloroethene, total	DD. Chlorobenzene*	XX. 1,2,3-Trichloropropane	RRR. m,p-Xylenes	LLLL. Ethyl ether
K. Chloroform**	EE. Ethylbenzene**	YY. n-Propylbenzene	SSS. o-Xylene	MMMM. Benzyl chloride
L. 1,2-Dichloroethane	FF. Styrene	ZZ. 2-Chlorotoluene	TTT. 1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	NNNN.
M. 2-Butanone	GG. Xylenes, total	AAA. 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	UUU. 1,2-Dichlorotetrafluoroethane	OOOO.
N. 1,1,1-Trichloroethane	HH. Vinyl acetate	BBB. 4-Chlorotoluene	VVV. 4-Ethyltoluene	PPPP.
O. Carbon tetrachloride	II. 2-Chloroethylvinyl ether	CCC. tert-Butylbenzene	WWW. Ethanol	QQQQ.
P. Bromodichloromethane	JJ. Dichlorodifluoromethane	DDD. 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	XXX. Di-isopropyl ether	RRRR.
Q. 1,2-Dichloropropane**	KK. Trichlorofluoromethane	EEE. sec-Butylbenzene	YYY. tert-Butanol	SSSS.
R. cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	LL. Methyl-tert-butyl ether	FFF. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ZZZ. tert-Butyl alcohol	TTTT.
S. Trichloroethene	MM. 1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane	GGG. p-Isopropyltoluene	AAAA. Ethyl tert-butyl ether	UUUU.
T. Dibromochloromethane	NN. Methyl ethyl ketone	HHH. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	BBBB. tert-Amyl methyl ether	VVVV.

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

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: per cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?
Y N N/A Were percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria for all CCC's and SPCC's?
Y N N/A Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, what was the acceptance criteria used for evaluation?_____
Y N N/A Did the initial calibration meet the acceptance criteria?
Y N N/A Were all %RSDs and RRFs within the validation criteria of ≤30 %RSD and ≥0.05 RRF ?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %RSD (Limit: <30.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit: >0.05)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	6/12/08	X ICAL-1					
	6/12/08	ICALX-BRC	www		0.00148	F8F120000-446 All soil	J/UJ/A

INICAL.1SB

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: FT
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?
Y N N/A Were percent differences (%D) and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria for all CCC's and SPCC's ?
Y N N/A Were all %D and RRFs within the validation criteria of ≤25 %D and ≥0.05 RRF ?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %D (Limit: <25.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit: >0.05)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
+	5/28/08	LICV9881	Iodomethane	31.67513		F8F200000-125,	J+/A det
-			Z	25.04476		All water	J-/UJ/A
-	6/9/08	XICV2280	E	29.90220		F8F120000-446	J-/UJ/A
						All soil	
+	6/9/08	LCAL0317	Iodomethane	67.71684		F8F200000-125,	J+/Adet
						6	

CONCAL.1SB

LDC #: 19091A-1
SDG #: pu cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: FT
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a method blank associated with every sample in this SDG?
Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each matrix and concentration?
Y N N/A Was there contamination in the method blanks? If yes, please see the qualifications below.

Blank analysis date: 6/12/08
Conc. units: ug/kg
Associated Samples: All soils

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
	FBF120008-446	1	2	3	4	5				
~~Methylene chloride~~ AA	1.5	1.4/5.6U	1.3/5.2U	1.6/6.6U	1.3/6.1U	1.2/6.5U				
~~Acetone~~										
CRQL										

Blank analysis date:
Conc. units:
Associated Samples:

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
Methylene chloride										
Acetone										
CRQL										

All results were qualified using the criteria stated below except those circled.

Note: Common contaminants such as Methylene chloride, Acetone, 2-Butanone, Carbon disulfide and TICs that were detected in samples within ten times the associated method blank concentration were qualified as not detected, "U". Other contaminants within five times the method blank concentration were also qualified as not detected, "U".

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: per cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Field Blanks

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Y N /N/A Were field blanks identified in this SDG?
Y N N/A Were target compounds detected in the field blanks?

Blank units: ug/L **Associated sample units:** ug/Kg
Field blank type: (circle one) Field Blank / Rinsate / Trip Blank / Other: TB Associated Samples: 1-5 (ND)

Compound	Blank ID 6	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
Sample date	6/10/08										
~~Methylene chloride~~											
Acetone	2.9										
Chloroform	0.14										
CRQL											

Blank units: _____ **Associated sample units:** _____
Field blank type: (circle one) Field Blank / Rinsate / Trip Blank / Other: _____ Associated Samples: _____

Compound	Blank ID	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
Sample date											
Methylene chloride											
Acetone											
Chloroform											
CRQL											

CIRCLED RESULTS WERE NOT QUALIFIED. ALL RESULTS NOT CIRCLED WERE QUALIFIED BY THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:
Common contaminants such as Methylene chloride, Acetone, 2-Butanone and Carbon disulfide that were detected in samples within ten times the associated field blank concentration were qualified as not detected, "U". Other contaminants within five times the field blank concentration were also qualified as not detected, "U".

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: FW cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Spikes

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: FT
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Were all surrogate %R within QC limits?
Y N N/A If the percent recovery (%R) for one or more surrogates was out of QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm samples with %R out of outside of criteria?

#	Date	Sample ID	Surrogate	%Recovery (Limits)	Qualifications
		FB F2100000-125	BFB	117 (79-115)	J+/Pdet
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	

	QC Limits (Soil)	QC Limits (Water)
SMC1 (TOL) = Toluene-d8	81-117	88-110
SMC2 (BFB) = Bromofluorobenzene	74-121	86-115
SMC3 (DCE) = 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	80-120	80-120
SMC4 (DFM) = Dibromofluoromethane	80-120	86-118

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: pre cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD : GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A 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.

Y N N/A Was a MS/MSD analyzed every 20 samples of each matrix?

Y N N/A Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

#	Date	MS/MSD ID	Compound	MS %R (Limits)	MSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		7+8	L	124 (79-123)	( )	( )	5	no qual MSDin
			Iodomethane	( )	( )	39 (20)	↓	↓ MS/MSDin
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
		Rinsate 2 MS/D	Iodomethane	( )	( )	22 (20)	none	no qual
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		

	Compound	QC Limits (Soil)	RPD (Soil)	QC Limits (Water)	RPD (Water)
H.	1,1-Dichloroethene	59-172%	≤ 22%	61-145%	≤ 14%
S.	Trichloroethene	62-137%	≤ 24%	71-120%	≤ 14%
V.	Benzene	66-142%	≤ 21%	76-127%	≤ 11%
CC.	Toluene	59-139%	≤ 21%	76-125%	≤ 13%
DD.	Chlorobenzene	60-133%	≤ 21%	75-130%	≤ 13%

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: pre cover

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [initials]
2nd Reviewer: [initials]

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A Was a LCS required?
Y (N) N/A Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?

#	Date	LCS/LCSD ID	Compound	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		8172125-LCS	Y	293 (42-140)	( )	112 (20)	All water +	No qual LCSD in
			Iodomethane	166 (45-140)	181 (45-140)	( )	F8F200000-125	↓ MS/8 in
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: pre cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Internal Standards

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Were all internal standard area counts within -50 to +100% of the associated calibration standard?
Y N N/A Were the retention times of the internal standards within +/- 30 seconds of the retention times of the associated calibration standard?

#	Date	Sample ID	Internal Standard	Area (Limits)	RT (Limits)	Qualifications
		2	4BCB	172980 (187131-748522)		J/UJ/P
		3	↓	180609 (↓)		↓
		4	↓	171259 (↓)		↓
		5	↓	168365 (↓)		↓
						See list next page

(BCM) = Bromochloromethane
(DFB) = 1,4-Difluorobenzene
(CBZ) = Chlorobenzene-d5
(PFB) = Pentafluorobenzene
(4DCB) = 1,4-Dichlorobenzene-d4
(2DCB) = 1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4
(FBZ) = Fluorobenzene

Test America ERM/BRC

Volatile Internal Standards

Fluorobenzene	Chlorobenzene-d5	1,4-Dichlorobenzene-d4
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane
~~1,1,2-Trichloroethane~~	1,2-~~Dibromoethane~~	1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene
1,1-Dichloroethane	1,3-Dichloropropane	1,2,3-Trichloropropane
1,1-Dichloroethene	1-~~Chlorohexane~~	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene
1,1-Dichloropropene	~~Bromoform~~	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene
1,2-Dichloroethane	Chlorobenzene	1,2-Dichlorobenzene
1,2-Dichloropropane	Dibromochloromethane	1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane
2,2-Dichloropropane	Ethylbenzene	1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene
Acetone	m,p-Xylene	1,3-Dichlorobenzene
Benzene	o-Xylene	1,4-Dichlorobenzene
Bromochloromethane	Styrene	2-Chlorotoluene
Bromodichloromethane	Tetrachloroethene	4-Chlorotoluene
Bromomethane	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	Bromobenzene
Carbon tetrachloride	Toluene	~~Hexachlorobutadiene~~
Chloroethane	trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	Isopropylbenzene
Chloroform	2-Nitropropane	~~Methyl isobutyl ketone~~
Chloromethane	4-Methyl-2-pentanone	n-Butylbenzene
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	2-Hexanone	n-Propylbenzene
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	Dimethyl disulfide	Naphthalene
Dibromomethane	Xylenes (total)	~~p-Isopropyltoluene~~, p-cymene
Dichlorodifluoromethane		sec-Butylbenzene
Methylene chloride		tert-Butylbenzene
Methyl-tert-butyl ether		1,3,5-Trichlorobenzene
2-Butanone		Nonanal
Trichloroethene		Bromoform
~~Toluene~~		
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene		
~~trans-1,3-Dichloropropene~~		
Trichlorofluoromethane		
Vinyl chloride		
Carbon Disulfide		

Iodomethane
Acetonitrile
Vinyl Acetate
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,1,2-Trifluoroethane
Ethanol
3,3-Dimethylpentane
2,3-
2,2-
2,4-
2,2,3-Trimethylbutane
3-Ethylpentane
2-Methylhexane
3- ↓
Heptane
1,2-Dichloroethene (total)

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Reviewer: FT
2nd Reviewer: JR

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

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
X = Mean of the RRFs

A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Reported RRF (50 std)	Recalculated RRF (50 std)	Reported Average RRF (initial)	Recalculated Average RRF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL-X	6/9/08	vinyl chloride (1st internal standard)	0.34552	0.34552	0.33747	0.33747	5.136	5.136
			Ethyl Benzene (2nd internal standard)	2.30191	2.30191	2.19908	2.19908	6.13989	6.139
			1,2-Dichlorobenzene (3rd internal standard)	1.29993	1.29993	1.28078	1.28078	5.32652	5.33
2	ICAL-X BFB	6/12/08	2,2-Dimethylpentane (1st internal standard)	0.52673	0.52673	0.53039	0.53039	4.99617	4.99617
			(2nd internal standard)						
			(3rd internal standard)						
3			(1st internal standard)						
			(2nd internal standard)						
			(3rd internal standard)						
4			(1st internal standard)						
			(2nd internal standard)						
			(3rd internal standard)						

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.

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

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 * (ave. RRF - RRF)/ave. RRF
$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$

Where: ave. RRF = initial calibration average RRF
RRF = continuing calibration RRF
A_x = Area of compound, A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_x = Concentration of compound, C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference internal Standard)	Average RRF (initial)	Reported RRF (CC)	Recalculated RRF (CC)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	XCAL23116	6/12/08	Vinyl Chloride (1st internal standard)	0.33747	0.30844	0.30844	8.6039	8.6039
			Ethyl Benzene (2nd internal standard)	2.19908	2.37076	2.37076	7.80675	7.80675
			1,2-DCB (3rd internal standard)	1.28078	1.38777	1.38777	8.35372	8.35373
2			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
3			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
4			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					

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

LDC #: 1909(A)
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

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
Toluene-d8	50.0	53.0191	106	106	0
Bromofluorobenzene	↓	55.9784	112	112	↓
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	↓	59.4200	119	119	↓
Dibromofluoromethane	↓	55.0604	110	110	↓

Sample ID:

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Toluene-d8					
Bromofluorobenzene					
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4					
Dibromofluoromethane					

Sample ID:

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Toluene-d8					
Bromofluorobenzene					
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4					
Dibromofluoromethane					

Sample ID:

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Toluene-d8					
Bromofluorobenzene					
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4					
Dibromofluoromethane					

Sample ID:

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Toluene-d8					
Bromofluorobenzene					
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4					
Dibromofluoromethane					

LDC #: 19091 A 1
SDG #: per cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: FT
2nd Reviewer: [signature]

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

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; SA = Spike added; SC = Sample concentration

RPD = I MSC - MSDC I * 2/(MSC + MSDC) MSC = Matrix spike percent recovery MSDC = Matrix spike duplicate percent recovery

MS/MSD sample: 7 & 8

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
1,1-Dichloroethene	65.0	64.9	ND	69.3	71.4	106	106	110	110	3.0	3.0
Trichloroethene	↓	↓	↓	73.4	72.0	113	113	111	111	2.0	2.0
Benzene				66.2	65.2	102	102	100	100	1.6	1.6
Toluene				68.7	67.7	106	106	104	104	1.6	1.6
Chlorobenzene	↓	↓	↓	66.0	65.4	101	101	101	101	0.83	0.83

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.

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Sample Results Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

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

% Recovery = 100 * SSC/SA Where: SSC = Spiked sample concentration
SA = Spike added

RPD = | LCS - LCSD | * 2/(LCS + LCSD) LCS = Laboraotry control sample percent recovery LCSD = Laboratory control sample duplicate percent recovery

LCS ID: 816446-LCS

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Spiked Sample Concentration (ug/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalculated
1,1-Dichloroethene	50.0	NA	48.0	NA	96	96				
Trichloroethene	↓	↓	53.0	↓	106	106				
Benzene			51.2		102	102				
Toluene			52.2		104	104				
Chlorobenzene			50.5		101	101	NA			

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

LDC #: 19091A1
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: PJ
2nd reviewer: PJ

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the reported results?

M = 31 %

Concentration = $\frac{(A_x)(I_s)(DF)}{(A_{is})(RRF)(V_o)(\%S)}$

A_x	=	Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the compound to be measured
A_{is}	=	Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the specific internal standard
I_s	=	Amount of internal standard added in nanograms (ng)
RRF	=	Relative response factor of the calibration standard.
V_o	=	Volume or weight of sample pruged in milliliters (ml) or grams (g).
Df	=	Dilution factor.
%S	=	Percent solids, applicable to soils and solid matrices only.

Example:

Sample I.D. #2 , chloroform

Conc. = (58801)(50)( )( )
(542188)(0.58039)(0.31)
=

12 ug/kg

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration ( )	Calculated Concentration ( )	Qualification

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: BRC Tronox Parcel F

Collection Date: June 10, 2008

LDC Report Date: July 23, 2008

Matrix: Soil

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: EPA Level III & IV

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): F8F110177

Sample Identification

TSB-FR-02-02-20'
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

**Indicates sample underwent EPA Level IV review

Introduction

This data review covers 5 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 a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (October 1999) as there are no current guidelines for the method stated above.

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 EPA Level IV review. A EPA Level III review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III 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.

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 15.0% for each individual compound and less than or equal to 30.0% for calibration check compounds (CCCs).

In the case where %RSD was greater than 15.0%, the laboratory used a calibration curve to evaluate the compound. All coefficients of determination (r^2) were greater than or equal to 0.990 .

For the purposes of technical evaluation, all compounds were evaluated against the 30.0% (%RSD) National Functional Guideline criteria. Unless noted above, all compounds were within the validation criteria.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all semivolatile target compounds and system performance check compounds (SPCCs) were greater than or equal to 0.05 as required with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	RRF (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
6/18/08	Phthalic acid n-(Hydroxymethyl)phthalimide	0.01422 (≥0.05) 0.04408 (≥0.05)	All samples in SDG F8F110177	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects) J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

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).

For the purposes of technical evaluation, all compounds were evaluated against the 25.0% (%D) National Functional Guideline criteria. Unless noted above, all compounds were within the validation criteria.

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

All of the continuing calibration RRF values were within method and validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	RRF (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
6/18/08	Phthalic acid	0.01330 (≥0.05)	All samples in SDG F8F110177	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A
	n-(Hydroxymethyl)phthalimide	0.04331 (≥0.05)		J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	

V. Blanks

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

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

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. Although the LCS percent recovery (%R) was not within QC limits for one compound, the MS/MSD percent recovery (%R) was within QC limits and no data were qualified.

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 EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XII. Compound Quantitation and CRQLs

All compound quantitation and CRQLs were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XIII. Tentatively Identified Compounds (TICs)

All tentatively identified compounds were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XIV. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

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

XVI. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Semivolatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

SDG	Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
F8F110177	TSB-FR-02-02-20' TSB-FR-02-02-30'** TSB-FJ-02-02-10'** TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	Phthalic acid n-(Hydroxymethyl)phthalimide	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects) J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Initial calibration (RRF)
F8F110177	TSB-FR-02-02-20' TSB-FR-02-02-30'** TSB-FJ-02-02-10'** TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	Phthalic acid n-(Hydroxymethyl)phthalimide	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects) J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Continuing calibration (RRF)

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: F8F110177
Laboratory: Test America

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Level III/IV

Date: 7/19/08
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: R
2nd Reviewer: R

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: 6/10/08
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration	SW	%RSD, r^2 ≥0.990
IV.	Continuing calibration/ICV	SW	ICV ≤ 25
V.	Blanks	A	
VI.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	TSB-GJ-08-10
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 Level III validation.
XII.	Compound quantitation/CRQLs	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XIII.	Tentatively identified compounds (TICs)	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XIV.	System performance	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	
XVI.	Field duplicates	N	
XVII.	Field blanks	N	

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 Level IV validation

1	TSB-FR-02-02-20'	11	~~8168439~~	21		31	
2	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	12		22		32	
3	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	13		23		33	
4	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	14		24		34	
5	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	15		25		35	
6	F8F160000-439	16	8168439	26		36	
7		17		27		37	
8		18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: pre cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: EV
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

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 #: 19091A2
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: BJ
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

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

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

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

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.

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: [illegible]

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

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

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Did the laboratory conduct an acceptable 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?
Y N N/A Were percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria for all CCC's and SPCC's?
Y N N/A Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, what was the acceptance criteria used for evaluation?_____
Y N N/A Did the initial calibration meet the acceptance criteria?
Y N N/A Were all %RSDs and RRFs within the validation criteria of ≤30 %RSD and ≥0.05 RRF ?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %RSD (Limit: ≤30.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit: ≥0.05)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
					0.01422		
	6/18/08	JICAL SPEC	Phthalic Acid		~~0.01256~~	All + B/F	J/UJ/A
			N-(hydroxymethyl) phthalimide		~~0.04161~~ 0.04408	↓	↓

INICAL.2S

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: fee cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9
2nd Reviewer: 8

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

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours of sample analysis for each instrument?
Y N N/A Were percent differences (%D) and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria for all CCC's and SPCC's ?
Y N N/A Were all %D and RRFs within the validation criteria of ≤25 %D and ≥0.05 RRF ?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %D (Limit: <25.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit: >0.05)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	6/18/08	JCAL5197SPEC	Phthalic Acid		0.01330	All + B/K	J/UJ/A
			N-(Hydroxmethyl) phthalimide		0.04331	↓	↓

CONCAL.2S

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

Reviewer: [signature]
2nd Reviewer: [signature]

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

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A Was a LCS required?
Y (N) N/A Were the LCS/LCSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

#	Date	LCS/LCSD ID	Compound	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		8168439-LCS	HH	19 (54-90)	( )	( )	All+BlK	NO QUAL W/D[illegible]
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )	— — —	—
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: per cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Reviewer: F7
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (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, A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_x = Concentration of compound, C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard
S = Standard deviation of the RRFs, X = Mean of the RRFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Reported RRF (50 std)	Recalculated RRF (50 std)	Reported Average RRF (initial)	Recalculated Average RRF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL-J	6/2/08	Phenol (1st internal standard)	1.87853	1.87853	1.85537	1.85537	1.070	1.070
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)	1.09438	1.09438	1.10901	1.10901	1.329	1.329
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)	1.41778	1.41778	1.41229	1.41229	0.573	0.573
			Pentachlorophenol (4th internal standard)	0.20260	0.20260	0.19634	0.19634	10.255	10.255
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)	0.90763	0.90763	0.86343	0.86343	9.524	9.524
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)	1.13808	1.13808	1.11182	1.11182	6.486	6.486
2	ICAL ASIX	J 6/18	~~Phenol~~ Acetophenone (1st internal standard)	0.51976	0.51976	0.51274	0.51274	0.71511	0.71511
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)						
	ICAL SPEC	J 6/18	~~Fluorene~~ N-(hydroxymethyl) phthalimide (3rd internal standard)	0.04162	0.04162	0.04408	0.04408	8.41339	8.41339
			Pentachlorophenol (4th internal standard)						
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)						
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)						
3			Phenol (1st internal standard)						
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)						
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)						
			Pentachlorophenol (4th internal standard)						
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)						
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)						

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.

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: RJ
2nd Reviewer: S

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (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 * (ave. RRF - RRF)/ave. RRF
$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$

Where: ave. RRF = initial calibration average RRF
RRF = continuing calibration RRF
A_x = Area of compound, A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_x = Concentration of compound, C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Average RRF (initial)	Reported RRF (CC)	Recalculated RRF (CC)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	JCAL5195	6/18/08	Phenol (1st internal standard)	1.85537	1.87174	1.87174	0.88210	0.88210
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)	1.10901	1.10135	1.10135	0.69070	0.69070
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)	1.41229	1.39801	1.39801	1.01058	+1.01058
			Pentachlorophenol (4th internal standard)	0.19634	0.20370	0.20370	3.74980	3.74980
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)	0.86343	0.87088	0.87088	0.86222	0.86222
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)	1.11182	1.11507	1.11507	0.29280	0.29280
2	JCAL5196	6/18/08	~~Phenol~~ Acetophenone (1st internal standard)	0.51274	0.52185	0.52185	1.77632	1.77632
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)					
	JCAL5197	6/18/08	~~Fluorene~~ 4-nitrophenol (3rd internal standard) phthalimide	0.04408	0.04331	0.04331	1.73819	1.73819
			Pentachlorophenol (4th internal standard)					
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)					
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)					
3			Phenol (1st internal standard)					
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)					
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)					
			Pentachlorophenol (4th internal standard)					
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)					
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)					

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

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: B
2nd reviewer: [signature]

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	50	35.2132	70	70	0
2-Fluorobiphenyl	↓	37.0385	74	74	↓
Terphenyl-d14	↓	36.1641	72	72	↓
Phenol-d5	75	52.8544	70	70	↓
2-Fluorophenol	↓	52.0442	69	69	↓
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	↓	55.2829	74	74	↓
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					

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: per cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: A
2nd Reviewer: Q

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; SA = Spike added; SC = Sample concentation

RPD = | MS - MSD | * 2/(MS + MSD) MS = Matrix spike percent recovery MSD = Matrix spike duplicate percent recovery

MS/MSD samples: TSB-GJ-08-10

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	3570	3570	ND	2490	2450	70	70	69	69	1.7	1.7
N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	↓	↓	↓	2730	2670	77	77	75	75	2.2	2.2
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol				2760	2690	77	77	75	75	2.8	2.8
Acenaphthene				2640	2620	74	74	73	73	1.0	1.0
Pentachlorophenol				2300	2230	64	64	62	62	3.0	3.0
Pyrene				2460	2390	69	69	67	67	2.7	2.7

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.

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: see cover

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

Reviewer: A
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

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 = I LCS - LCSD I * 2/(LCS + LCSD) LCS = Laboratory control sample percent recovery LCSD = Laboratory control sample duplicate percent recovery

LCS/LCSD samples: 816 8439

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	3330	NA ~~2360~~	2360	NA	71	71				
N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine			2570		77	77				
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol			2560		77	77				
Acenaphthene			2510		75	75				
Pentachlorophenol			2240		67	67				
Pyrene			2350		70	70	NA			

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.

LDC #: 19091A2
SDG #: fee cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd reviewer: [illegible]

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

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the reported results?

Concentration = $\frac{(A_x)(I_s)(V_t)(DF)(2.0)}{(A_{is})(RRF)(V_o)(V_i)(\%S)}$

A_x = Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the compound to be measured

A_{is} = Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the specific internal standard

I_s = Amount of internal standard added in nanograms (ng)

V_o = Volume or weight of sample extract in milliliters (ml) or grams (g).

V_i = Volume of extract injected in microliters (ul)

V_t = Volume of the concentrated extract in microliters (ul)

Df = Dilution Factor.

%S = Percent solids, applicable to soil and solid matrices only.

2.0 = Factor of 2 to account for GPC cleanup

Example:

Sample I.D. _____, _____:

Conc. = $\frac{(\quad)(\quad)(\quad)(\quad)(\quad)(\quad)}{(\quad)(\quad)(\quad)(\quad)(\quad)(\quad)}$

= ND

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration ( )	Calculated Concentration ( )	Qualification

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: BRC Tronox Parcel F

Collection Date: June 10, 2008

LDC Report Date: July 22, 2008

Matrix: Soil

Parameters: Chlorinated Pesticides

Validation Level: EPA Level III & IV

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): F8F110177

Sample Identification

TSB-F-02-02-20'
TSB-F-02-02-30'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

**Indicates sample underwent EPA Level IV review

Introduction

This data review covers 5 soil samples listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA SW 846 Method 8081A for Chlorinated Pesticides.

This review follows a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (October 1999) as there are no current guidelines for the method stated above.

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 XIV.

Samples indicated by a double asterisk on the front cover underwent a EPA Level IV review. A EPA Level III review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III 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.

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/ECD Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was acceptable unless noted otherwise under initial calibration and continuing calibration sections.

III. Initial Calibration

Initial calibration of single and multicomponent compounds was performed for the primary (quantitation) column and confirmation column as required by this method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

Retention time windows were evaluated and considered technically acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples on which a Level III review was performed.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) of calibration factors in continuing standard mixtures were within the 15.0% QC limits with the following exceptions:

Date	Standard	Channel	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
6/18/08	KCAL081	A	2,4'-DDT	16.2	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

The percent differences (%D) of the second source calibration standard were less than or equal to 15.0% for all compounds.

The individual 4,4'-DDT and Endrin breakdowns (%BD) were less than or equal to 15.0%.

Retention times (RT) of all compounds in the calibration standards were within QC limits for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples on which a Level III review was performed.

V. Blanks

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

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

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.

IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control

Not applicable.

X. Pesticide Cleanup Checks

a. Florisil Cartridge Check

Florisil cleanup was not required and therefore not performed in this SDG.

b. GPC Calibration

GPC cleanup was not required and therefore not performed in this SDG.

XI. Target Compound Identification

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria for samples on which an EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XII. Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs

All compound quantitation and CRQLs were within validation criteria for samples on which an EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XIII. Overall Assessment of Data

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

XIV. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Chlorinated Pesticides - Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

SDG	Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
F8F110177	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	2,4'-DDT	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Chlorinated Pesticides - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Chlorinated Pesticides - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 19091A3a
SDG #: F8F110177
Laboratory: Test America

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Level III/IV

Date: 7/19/08
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC Chlorinated Pesticides (EPA SW 846 Method 8081A)

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: 6/10/08
II.	GC/ECD Instrument Performance Check	A	
III.	Initial calibration	A	
IV.	Continuing calibration/ICV	SW	ICV ≤ 15
V.	Blanks	A	
VI.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	TSB-GJ-08-10
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
IX.	Regional quality assurance and quality control	N	
Xa.	Florisil cartridge check	N	
Xb.	GPC Calibration	N	
XI.	Target compound identification	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XII.	Compound quantitation and reported CRQLs	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XIII.	Overall assessment of data	A	
XIV.	Field duplicates	N	
XV.	Field blanks	N	

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 Level IV validation

1	TSB-FR-02-02-20'	11	F8F160000-164	21	8168164	31	
2	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	12		22		32	
3	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	13		23		33	
4	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	14		24		34	
5	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	15		25		35	
6		16		26		36	
7		17		27		37	
8		18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

SOIL

LDC #: 1909/A3a
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: FR
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Method: Pesticides/PCBs (EPA SW 846 Method 8081/8082)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
All technical holding times were met.	✓			
Cooler temperature criteria was met.	✓			
II. GC/ECD Instrument performance check				
Was the instrument performance found to be acceptable?	✓			
III. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Was a linear fit used for evaluation? If yes, were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) $\leq$ 20%?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If Yes, what was the acceptance criteria used?		✓		
Did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria?			✓	
Were the RT windows properly established?	✓			
Were the required standard concentrations analyzed in the initial calibration?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
What type of continuing calibration calculation was performed? ____%D or ____%R	✓			
Were Evaluation mix standards analyzed prior to the initial calibration and sample analysis?	✓			
Were endrin and 4,4'-DDT breakdowns $\leq$ 15%.0 for individual breakdown in the Evaluation mix standards?	✓			
Was a continuing calibration analyzed daily?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) $\leq$ 15%.0 or percent recovieries 85-115%?	NA ✓			
Were all the retention times within the acceptance windows?	✓			
V. Blanks				
Was a method blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a method blank analyzed for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Were extract cleanup blanks analyzed with every batch requiring clean-up?			✓	
Was there contamination in the method blanks or clean-up blanks? If yes, please see the Blanks validation completeness worksheet.		✓		
VI. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate %R within the QC limits?	✓			
If the percent recovery (%R) of one or more surrogates was 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?			✓	

LDC #: 19091#36
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
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?	✓			
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			
IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control				
Were performance evaluation (PE) samples performed?			✓	
Were the performance evaluation (PE) samples within the acceptance limits?			✓	
X. Target compound identification				
Were the retention times of reported detects within the RT windows?			✓	
XI. Compound quantitation/CRQLs				
Were compound quantitation and CRQLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions, dry weight factors, and clean-up activities applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XII. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIII. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIV. Field duplicates				
Field duplicate pairs were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target compounds were detected in the field duplicates.			✓	
XV. Field blanks				
Field blanks were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target compounds were detected in the field blanks.			✓	

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: Pesticide/PCBs (EPASW 846 Method 8081/8082)

A. alpha-BHC	I. Dieldrin	Q. Endrin ketone	Y. Aroclor-1242	GG.
B. beta-BHC	J. 4,4'-DDE	R. Endrin aldehyde	Z. Aroclor-1248	HH.
C. delta-BHC	K. Endrin	S. alpha-Chlordane	AA. Aroclor-1254	II.
D. gamma-BHC	L. Endosulfan II	T. gamma-Chlordane	BB. Aroclor-1260	JJ.
E. Heptachlor	M. 4,4'-DDD	U. Toxaphene	CC. DB 608	KK.
F. Aldrin	N. Endosulfan sulfate	V. Aroclor-1016	DD. DB 1701	LL.
G. Heptachlor epoxide	O. 4,4'-DDT	W. Aroclor-1221	EE.	MM.
H. Endosulfan I	P. Methoxychlor	X. Aroclor-1232	FF.	NN.

Notes:_____

LDC #: 19091A3a
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: __GC__ HPLC

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".
What type of continuing calibration calculation was performed? __%D or __RPD
Y N N/A Were continuing calibration standards analyzed at the required frequencies?
Y N N/A Did the continuing calibration standards meet the %D / RPD validation criteria of ≤15.0%?
Level IV Only
Y N N/A Were the retention times for all calibrated compounds within their respective acceptance windows?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D / RPD (Limit ≤ 15.0)	RT (limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
-	6/18/08	KCAL081	ch A	2,4'-DDT	16.2	( )	4, 5	J/UJ/A
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		

LDC #: 19091A3a
SDG #: pu cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC ____ ~~HPLC~~ ____

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

CF = A/C
average CF = sum of the CF/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

A = Area of compound,
C = Concentration of compound,
S = Standard deviation of the CF
X = Mean of the CFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Reported CF (0.025 std)	Recalculated CF (0.025 std)	Reported Average CF (initial)	Recalculated Average CF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	6/16/08	endosulfan I chA	530216040	530216040	510995140	510995140	3.14887	3.14887
			methoxychlor ↓	161496680	161496680	152272620	152272620	6.25575	6.25575
2			↓ chB	285001720	285001720	273533412	273533412	2.96584	2.96584
			↓	44217640	44217640	42222360	42222360	6.01863	6.01863
3									
4									

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.

LDC #: 19091A3a
SDG #: per cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC ✓ HPLC ____

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

% Difference = 100 * (ave. CF - CF)/ave. CF
CF = A/C

Where: ave. CF = initial calibration average CF
CF = continuing calibration CF
A = Area of compound
C = Concentration of compound

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Average CF(Ical)/ CCV Conc.	Reported CF/Conc. CCV	Recalculated CF/Conc. CCV	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	KCAL064	6/18/08	endosulfan I chA	0.0250	0.0259	0.0259	3.7	3.7
			methoxychlor	↓	0.0252	0.0252	0.8	0.8
2	KCAL080	6/18/08	↓	↓	0.0252	0.0252	1.0	1.0
					0.0257	0.0257	2.7	2.7
3								
4								

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

LDC #: 19091A3a
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC Pesticides/PCBs (EPA SW 846 Method 8081/8082)

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	Column	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
Tetrachloro-m-xylene	ch A	0.02	0.01839	92	92	0
~~Tetrachloro-m-xylene~~ DCB	↓	↓	0.01682	84	84	0
Decachlorobiphenyl						
Decachlorobiphenyl						

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Decachlorobiphenyl						
Decachlorobiphenyl						

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Decachlorobiphenyl						
Decachlorobiphenyl						

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Decachlorobiphenyl						
Decachlorobiphenyl						

Notes:

LDC #: 19091 ABa
SDG #: per cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: 1
2nd Reviewer: 1

METHOD: GC Pesticides/PCBs (EPA SW 846 Method 8081/8082)

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
SA = Spike added
SC = Concentration

RPD = | MS - MSD | * 2/(MS + MSD)

MS = Matrix spike percent recovery
MSD = Matrix spike duplicate percent recovery

MS/MSD samples: TSB-GJ-08-10

Compound	Spike Added ( )		Sample Concentration ( )	Spiked Sample Concentration ( )		Matrix Spike Percent Recovery		Matrix Spike Duplicate Percent Recovery		MS/MSD RPD	
	MS	MSD	-	MS	MSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalculated
gamma-BHC	17.7	17.5		15.6	15.3	88	88	87	87	2.0	2.0
4,4'-DDT	↓	↓		15.6	16.3	88	88	93	93	4.4	4.4

Comments: Refer ot 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.

LDC #: 19091A3a
SDG #: all cover

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

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC Pesticides/PCBs (EPA SW 846 Method 8081/8082)

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* (SSC-SC)/SA

Where: SSC = Spiked sample concentration
SA = Spike added
SC = Concentration

RPD = I LCS - LCSD I * 2/(LCS + LCSD)

LCS = Laboratory control sample percent recovery
LCSD = Laboratory control sample duplicate percent recovery

LCS/LCSD samples: 8168164 LCS

Compound	Spike Added (ug/Kg)		Spiked Sample Concentration (ug/Kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
gamma-BHC	16.7	NA	15.0	NA	90	90				
4,4'-DDT	↓	↓	16.8	↓	101	101	NA			

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

LDC #: 19091A3a
SDG #: per cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC Pesticides/PCBs (EPA SW 846 Method 8081/8082)

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the reported results?

Example:

Sample I.D. _____ _____:

Conc. = (_____)
( )

=

ND

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration ( )	Calculated Concentration ( )	Qualification

Note: _____

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: BRC Tronox Parcel F

Collection Date: June 10, 2008

LDC Report Date: July 22, 2008

Matrix: Soil

Parameters: Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Validation Level: EPA Level III & IV

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): F8F110177

Sample Identification

TSB-FR-02-02-20'
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

**Indicates sample underwent EPA Level IV review

Introduction

This data review covers 5 soil samples listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA SW 846 Method 8082 for Polychlorinated Biphenyls.

This review follows a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (October 1999) as there are no current guidelines for the method stated above.

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 XIV.

Samples indicated by a double asterisk on the front cover underwent a EPA Level IV review. A EPA Level III review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III 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.

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/ECD Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was acceptable unless noted otherwise under initial calibration and continuing calibration sections.

III. Initial Calibration

Initial calibration of multicomponent compounds was performed for the primary (quantitation) column as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

Retention time windows were evaluated and considered technically acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples on which a Level III review was performed.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) of calibration factors in continuing standard mixtures were within the 15.0% QC limits.

The percent differences (%D) of the second source calibration standard were less than or equal to 15.0% for all compounds.

Retention times (RT) of all compounds in the calibration standards were within QC limits for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples on which a Level III review was performed.

V. Blanks

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

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

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.

IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control

Not applicable.

X. Pesticide Cleanup Checks

a. Florisil Cartridge Check

Florisil cleanup was not required and therefore not performed in this SDG.

b. GPC Calibration

GPC cleanup was not required and therefore not performed in this SDG.

XI. Target Compound Identification

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XII. Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs

All compound quantitation and CRQLs were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XIII. Overall Assessment of Data

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

XIV. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 19091A3b
SDG #: F8F110177
Laboratory: Test America

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Level III/IV

Date: 7/18/08
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW 846 Method 8082)

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: 6/10/08
II.	GC/ECD Instrument Performance Check	NA	
III.	Initial calibration	A	
IV.	Continuing calibration/ICV	A	ICV ≤ 15
V.	Blanks	A	
VI.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A N	~~Client specified~~ TSB-GJ-08-10
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
IX.	Regional quality assurance and quality control	N	
Xa.	Florisil cartridge check	N	
Xb.	GPC Calibration	N	
XI.	Target compound identification	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XII.	Compound quantitation and reported CRQLs	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XIII.	Overall assessment of data	A	
XIV.	Field duplicates	N	
XV.	Field blanks	N	

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 Level IV validation

1	TSB-FR-02-02-20' (Soil)	11	F8F160000-162	21	8168162	31	
2	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	12		22		32	
3	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	13		23		33	
4	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	14		24		34	
5	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	15		25		35	
6		16		26		36	
7		17		27		37	
8		18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

LDC #: 19091A3b
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: MZ
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Method: ✓ GC _____ HPLC

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
All technical holding times were met.	✓			
Cooler temperature criteria was met.	✓			
II. Initial calibrations				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Was a linear fit used for evaluation? If yes, were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 20%?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If Yes, what was the acceptance criteria used?		✓		
Did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria?			✓	
Were the RT windows properly established?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
What type of continuing calibration calculation was performed? ____%D or ____%R	✓			
Was a continuing calibration analyzed daily?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) < 15%.0 or percent recoveries 85-115%?	✓			
Were all the retention times within the acceptance windows?	✓			
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 the QC limits?	✓			
If the percent recovery (%R) of one or more surrogates was 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?	✓			
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			

LDC #: 19091A36
SDG #: pw cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control				
Were performance evaluation (PE) samples performed?			✓	
Were the performance evaluation (PE) samples within the acceptance limits?			✓	
X. Target compound identification				
Were the retention times of reported detects within the RT windows?	-		✓	
XI. Compound quantitation/CRQL				
Were compound quantitation and CRQLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XII. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIII. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIV. Field duplicates				
Field duplicate pairs were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target compounds were detected in the field duplicates.			✓	
XV. Field blanks				
Field blanks were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target compounds were detected in the field blanks.		✓		

LDC #: 19091A3b
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC ✓ HPLC ____

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

CF = A/C
average CF = sum of the CF/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

A = Area of compound,
C = Concentration of compound,
S = Standard deviation of the CF
X = Mean of the CFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Reported CF (1000std)	Recalculated CF (1000std)	Reported Average CF (initial)	Recalculated Average CF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	5/21/08	Aroclor 1260 chA	27377	27377	27977	27977	12.0	12.0
			↓ chB	38550	38550	39164	39164	9.582	9.582
2									
3									
4									

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.

INIC[illegible]SB

LDC #: 19091A3b
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC ✓ HPLC ____

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

% Difference = 100 * (ave. CF - CF)/ave. CF
CF = A/C

Where: ave. CF = initial calibration average CF
CF = continuing calibration CF
A = Area of compound
C = Concentration of compound

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Average CF(ical)/ CCV Conc.	Reported CF/Conc. CCV	Recalculated CF/Conc. CCV	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	PCAL089	6/18/08	Aroclor 1260 chA	1000	952.1902	952.1902	4.8	4.8
	13:04							
2	PCAL100	6/18/08	Aroclor 1260 chA	1000	937.3342	937.334	6.3	6.3
	16:03							
3								
4								

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

LDC #: 19091A3b
SDG #: see cover
METHOD: ✓ GC ___ HPLC

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Page: ___ of ___
Reviewer: ___
2nd reviewer: ___

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: #1

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
DCB	ch A	20	16.2550	81	81	0

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	

LDC #: 19041 A3b
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: ___ GC ___HPLC

The percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (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 =(((SSCMS - SSCMSD) * 2) / (SSCMS + SSCMSD))*100   MS = Matrix spike   MSD = Matrix spike duplicate

MS/MSD samples: TSB - GJ - 08-10

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Sample Conc. (ug/kg)	Spike 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	Recalc.
Gasoline (8015)											
Diesel (8015)											
Benzene (8021B)											
Methane (RSK-175)											
2,4-D (8151)											
Dinoseb (8151)											
Naphthalene (8310)											
Anthracene (8310)											
HMX (8330)											
2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (8330)											
Aroclor 1260	177	178	ND	181	194	102	102	109	109	7.4	7.4

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.

LDC #: 19091A3b
SDG #: pw cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC HPLC

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

%Recovery = 100 * (SSC - SC)/SA Where SSC = Spiked concentration, SA = Spike added, SC = Sample concentration

RPD =(({SSCLCS - SSCLCSD} * 2) / (SSCLCS + SSCLCSD))*100 LCS = Laboratory Control Sample percent recovery LCSD = Laboratory Control Sample duplicate percent recovery

LCS/LCSD samples: LCS

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Sample Conc. (ug/kg)	Spike Sample Concentration (ug/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	--	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
Gasoline (8015)											
Diesel (8015)											
Benzene (8021B)											
Methane (RSK-175)											
2,4-D (8151)											
Dinoseb (8151)											
Naphthalene (8310)											
Anthracene (8310)											
HMX (8330)											
2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (8330)											
Aroclor 1260	167	NA		171	NA	103	103	NA			

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

LDC #: 19091A3b
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: ___ GC ___ HPLC

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds within 10% of the reported results?

Concentration = $\frac{(A)(Fv)(Df)}{(RF)(Vs \text{ or } Ws)(\%S/100)}$

A= Area or height of the compound to be measured
Fv= Final Volume of extract
Df= Dilution Factor
RF= Average response factor of the compound in the initial calibration
Vs= Initial volume of the sample
Ws= Initial weight of the sample
%S= Percent Solid

Example:

Sample ID._____ Compound Name NP

Concentration = _____

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentrations ( )	Recalculated Results Concentrations ( )	Qualifications

Comments: _____

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: BRC Tronox Parcel F

Collection Date: June 10, 2008

LDC Report Date: July 23, 2008

Matrix: Soil

Parameters: Metals

Validation Level: EPA Level III & IV

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): F8F110177

Sample Identification

TSB-FR-02-02-20'
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

**Indicates sample underwent EPA Level IV review

Introduction

This data review covers 5 soil samples listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA SW 846 Methods 6010B, 6020, and 7000 for Metals. The metals analyzed were Aluminum, Antimony, Arsenic, Barium, Beryllium, Boron, Cadmium, Calcium, Chromium, Cobalt, Copper, Iron, Lead, Lithium, Magnesium, Manganese, Molybdenum, Mercury, Nickel, Niobium, Palladium, Phosphorus, Platinum, Potassium, Selenium, Silicon, Silver, Sodium, Strontium, Sulfur, Thallium, Tin, Titanium, Tungsten, Uranium, Vanadium, Zinc, and Zirconium.

This review follows a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Data Review (October 2004) as there are no current guidelines for the methods stated above.

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.

Blanks are summarized in Section III.

Field duplicates are summarized in Section XIII.

Samples indicated by a double asterisk on the front cover underwent a EPA Level IV review. A EPA Level III review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III 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.

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. Calibration

An initial calibration was performed.

The frequency and analysis criteria of the initial calibration verification (ICV) and continuing calibration verification (CCV) were met.

III. Blanks

Method blanks were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. No contaminant concentrations were found in the initial, continuing and preparation blanks with the following exceptions:

Method Blank ID	Analyte	Maximum Concentration	Associated Samples
PB (prep blank)	Iron	12.1 mg/Kg	All samples in SDG F8F110177
ICB/CCB	Antimony Thallium Tungsten Vanadium	1.3 ug/L 1.1 ug/L 1.4 ug/L 2.7 ug/L	All samples in SDG F8F110177

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

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

IV. ICP Interference Check Sample (ICS) Analysis

The frequency of analysis was met.

The criteria for analysis were met.

V. Matrix Spike Analysis

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 with the following exceptions:

Spike ID (Associated Samples)	Analyte	MS (%R) (Limits)	MSD (%R) (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Flag	A or P
TSB-FJ-06-02-101MS/MSD (All samples in SDG F8F110177)	Antimony	50.0 (75-125)	50.0 (75-125)	-	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A
	Barium	61.1 (75-125)	61.0 (75-125)	-		
	Copper	73.2 (75-125)	-	-		
	Magnesium	43.4 (75-125)	34.8 (75-125)	-		
	Niobium	38.8 (75-125)	39.3 (75-125)	-		
	Phosphorus	43.6 (75-125)	63.8 (75-125)	-		
	Tungsten	71.5 (75-125)	71.0 (75-125)	-		
	Zinc	-	74.8 (75-125)	-		

VI. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analyses were reviewed for each matrix as applicable.

VII. Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

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

VIII. Internal Standards (ICP-MS)

All internal standard percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed with the following exceptions:

Sample	Internal Standard	%R (Limits)	Analyte	Flag	A or P
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	Sc^{45}	132.5 (30-120)	Strontium	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

IX. Furnace Atomic Absorption QC

Graphite furnace atomic absorption was not utilized in this SDG.

X. ICP Serial Dilution

ICP serial dilution analysis was performed by the laboratory. The analysis criteria were met with the following exceptions:

Diluted Sample	Analyte	%D (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
TSB-FJ-06-02-10'L	Calcium	13.8 (≤10)	All samples in SDG F8F110177	J (all detects)	A
	Phosphorus	15.6 (≤10)		J (all detects)	
	Titanium	19.2 (≤10)		J (all detects)	

XI. Sample Result Verification

All sample result verifications were acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

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

XIII. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Metals - Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

SDG	Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason
F8F110177	TSB-FR-02-02-20' TSB-FR-02-02-30'** TSB-FJ-02-02-10'** TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	Antimony Barium Copper Magnesium Niobium Phosphorus Tungsten Zinc	J- (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates (%R)
F8F110177	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	Strontium	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Internal standards (%R)
F8F110177	TSB-FR-02-02-20' TSB-FR-02-02-30'** TSB-FJ-02-02-10'** TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	Calcium Phosphorus Titanium	J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	ICP serial dilution (%D)

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Metals - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Metals - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 19091A4
SDG #: F8F110177
Laboratory: Test America

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Level III/IV

Date: 7/22/08
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: W
2nd Reviewer: Q

METHOD: Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6020/6010B/7000)

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: 6/10/08
II.	Calibration	A	
III.	Blanks	SW	
IV.	ICP Interference Check Sample (ICS) Analysis	A	
V.	Matrix Spike Analysis	SW	3 MS/MSD TSB-FJ-06-2-101
VI.	Duplicate Sample Analysis	N	
VII.	Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)	A	LCS
VIII.	Internal Standard (ICP-MS)	SW	Not reviewed for Level 3
IX.	Furnace Atomic Absorption QC	N	Not utilized
X.	ICP Serial Dilution	SW	
XI.	Sample Result Verification	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XII.	Overall Assessment of Data	A	
XIII.	Field Duplicates	N	
XIV.	Field Blanks	N	

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: 5 or 1 ** Indicates sample underwent Level IV validation

1	TSB-FR-02-02-20'	11		21		31	
2	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	12		22		32	
3	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	13		23		33	
4	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	14		24		34	
5	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	15		25		35	
6	PB	16		26		36	
7		17		27		37	
8		18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

Notes: _____

LDC #: 190914A4
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: MH
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Method: Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6010/7000/6020)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
All technical holding times were met.	✓			
Cooler temperature criteria was met.	✓			
II. Calibration				
Were all instruments calibrated daily, each set-up time?	✓			
Were the proper number of standards used?	✓			
Were all initial and continuing calibration verification %Rs within the 90-110% (80-120% for mercury and 85-115% for cyanide) QC limits?	✓			
Were all initial calibration correlation coefficients ≥ 0.995? (Level IV only)	✓			
III. Blanks				
Was a method blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was there contamination in the method blanks? If yes, please see the Blanks validation completeness worksheet.		✓		
IV. ICP Interference Check Sample				
Were ICP interference check samples performed daily?	✓			
Were the AB solution percent recoveries (%R) with the 80-120% QC limits?	✓			
IV. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were a matrix spike (MS) and duplicate (DUP) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG? If no, indicate which matrix does not have an associated MS/MSD or MS/DUP. Soil / Water.	✓			
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the 75-125 QC limits? If the sample concentration exceeded the spike concentration by a factor of 4 or more, no action was taken.		✓		
Were the MS/MSD or duplicate relative percent differences (RPD) ≤ 20% for waters and ≤ 35% for soil samples? A control limit of +/- RL(+/-2X RL for soil) was used for samples that were ≤ 5X the RL, including when only one of the duplicate sample values were < 5X the RL.	✓			
V. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS anaylzed for this SDG?	✓			
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the 80-120% QC limits for water samples and laboratory established QC limits for soils?	✓			
VI. Furnace Atomic Absorption QC				
If MSA was performed, was the correlation coefficients > 0.995?			✓	
Do all applicable analysies have duplicate injections? (Level IV only)			✓	
For sample concentrations > RL, are applicable duplicate injection RSD values < 20%? (Level IV only)			✓	
Were analytical spike recoveries within the 85-115% QC limits?			✓	

LDC #: 19091A4
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: MM
2nd Reviewer: A

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
VII. ICP Serial Dilution				
Was an ICP serial dilution analyzed if analyte concentrations were > 50X the IDL?	✓			>(50X MDL for ICP/MS
Were all percent differences (%Ds) < 10%?		✓		
Was there evidence of negative interference? If yes, professional judgement will be used to qualify the data.		✓		
VIII. Internal Standards (EPA SW-846 Method 6020)				
Were all the percent recoveries (%R) within the 30-120% of the intensity of the internal standard in the associated initial calibration?	✗	✓		
If the %Rs were outside the criteria, was a reanalysis performed?	✗	✓		
IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control				
Were performance evaluation (PE) samples performed?			✓	
Were the performance evaluation (PE) samples within the acceptance limits?			✓	
X. Sample Result Verification				
Were RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XI. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XII. Field duplicates				
Field duplicate pairs were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target analytes were detected in the field duplicates.			✓	
XIII. Field blanks				
Field blanks were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target analytes were detected in the field blanks.			✓	

LDC #: 19091A4
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Specific Element Reference

Reviewer: MH
2nd reviewer: [illegible]

All circled elements are applicable to each sample.

Sample ID	Matrix	Target Analyte List (TAL)
1-5	Soil	(Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si,) ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, ___ ___
1-5	Soil	(Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr,) ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
		Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Li, S, Zr, ___ ___
Analysis Method		
ICP		(Li, S,) ___ ___
ICP-MS		(Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si,) ___ ___
ICP-MS		(Nb, Pd, P, Pt, Sn, Sr, Ti, W, U, Zr,) ___ ___
GFAA		Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Ni, K, Se, Ag, Na, Tl, V, Zn, Mo, B, Si, CN⁻

Comments: (Mercury by CVAA if performed)
Nb: Niobium, Pd: Palladium, P: Phosphorus, Pt: Platinum, S: Sulfur, W: Tungsten, U: Uranium, Zr: Zirconium

LDC #: 19091A4
SDG #: See Cover
METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6010/6020/7000)
Sample Concentration units, unless otherwise noted: mg/Kg

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
PB/ICB/CCB QUALIFIED SAMPLES
Soil preparation factor applied:
Associated Samples: All (ND or > RL)

					Sample Identification									
Analyte	Maximum PB[a] (mg/Kg)	Maximum PB[a] (ug/L)	Maximum ICB/CCB[a] (ug/L)	Blank Action Limit										
Sb			1.3											
Fe	12.1			121										
Tl			1.1	0.22										
W			1.4											
V			2.7											

Samples with analyte concentrations within five times the associated ICB, CCB or PB concentration are listed above with the identifications from the Validation Completeness Worksheet. These sample results were qualified as not detected, "U".
Note : a - The listed analyte concentration is the highest ICB, CCB, or PB detected in the analysis of each element.

LDC #: 19091A4
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Reviewer: KM
2nd Reviewer: R

METHOD: Trace metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6010/7000)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A Was a matrix spike analyzed for each matrix in this SDG?

Y (N) N/A Were matrix spike percent recoveries (%R) within the control limits of 75-125? If the sample concentration exceeded the spike concentration by a factor of 4 or more, no action was taken.

(Y) N N/A Were all duplicate sample relative percent differences (RPD) ≤ 20% for water samples and ≤35% for soil samples?

LEVEL IV ONLY:

(Y) N N/A Were recalculated results acceptable? See Level IV Recalculation Worksheet for recalculations.

#	MS/MSD ID	Matrix	Analyte	MS %Recovery	MSD %Recovery	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
1	TSB-FJ-06-02-101	Soil	Sb	50.0	50.0		All	J-/UJ/A
			Ba	61.1	61.0			
			Cu	73.2				
			Mg	43.4	34.8			
			Nb	38.8	39.3			
			P	43.6	63.8			
			W	71.5	71.0			
			Zn		74.8			

Comments: Al, Fe, Mn, Si, Sr, Ti, Ca >4X

LDC #: 1909A4
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Internal Standards (ICP-MS)

Reviewer: HH
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6020)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y (N) N/A Were all internal standard percent recoveries within 30-120% of the intensity of the internal standard in the initial calibration standard ?

Y (N) N/A If the response to either of the above questions is no, were the samples reanalyzed as required ?

#	Internal Standard	Associated Metals	%R (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
1	Sc 45	Sr	132.5	3	J/UJ/A

INTST.4S2

LDC #: 19091A4
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
ICP Serial Dilution

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: LW
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6010/6020/7000)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A If analyte concentrations were > 50X the MDL (ICP) ,or >100X the MDL (ICP/MS), was a serial dilution analyzed?

Y (N) N/A Were ICP serial dilution percent differences (%D) ≤10%?

Y (N) N/A Is there evidence of negative interference? If yes, professional judgement will be used to qualify the data.

LEVEL IV ONLY:

(Y) N N/A Were recalculated results acceptable? See Level IV Recalculation Worksheet for recalculations.

#	Date	Diluted Sample ID	Matrix	Analyte	%D (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
1		TSB-FJ-06-02-10	soil	Ca	13.8	All	J+/A
				P	15.6	J	J
				Ti	19.2		

Comments: Ni, V < 100 XMDL

SDILICPMS.wpd

LDC #: 19091A4
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial and Continuing Calibration Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: MM
2nd Reviewer: R

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6010/6020/7000)

An initial and continuing calibration verification percent recovery (%R) was recalculated for each type of analysis using the following formula:

%R = Found x 100 / True

Where, Found = concentration (in ug/L) of each analyte measured in the analysis of the ICV or CCV solution
True = concentration (in ug/L) of each analyte in the ICV or CCV source

Standard ID	Type of Analysis	Element	Found (ug/L)	True (ug/L)	Recalculated %R	Reported %R	Acceptable (Y/N)
ICV	ICP (Initial calibration)	Li	4037	4000	100.9	100.9	Y
	GFAA (Initial calibration)						
ICV	CVAA (Initial calibration)	Hg	2.51	2.5	100.4	100.4	Y
ICV	ICP (Continuing calibration)	S	52680	50000	105.4	105.4	↓
	GFAA (Continuing calibration)						
CCV	CVAA (Continuing calibration)	Hg	4.9	5.0	98.0	98.0	Y
ICV	ICP/MS (Initial calibration)	Pb	1019.4	1000	101.9	101.9	↓
CCV	ICP/MS (Continuing calibation)	P	3881.6	4000	97.0	97.0	↓

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

LDC #: 19091A4
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Level IV Recalculation Worksheet

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: MM
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6010/7000)

Percent recoveries (%R) for an ICP interference check sample, a laboratory control sample and a matrix spike sample were recalculated using the following formula:

$\%R = \frac{Found}{True} \times 100$ Where, Found = Concentration of each analyte measured in the analysis of the sample. For the matrix spike calculation, Found = SSR (spiked sample result) - SR (sample result).
True = Concentration of each analyte in the source.

A sample and duplicate relative percent difference (RPD) was recalculated using the following formula:

$RPD = \frac{|S-D|}{(S+D)/2} \times 100$ Where, S = Original sample concentration
D = Duplicate sample concentration

An ICP serial dilution percent difference (%D) was recalculated using the following formula:

$\%D = \frac{|I-SDR|}{I} \times 100$ Where, I = Initial Sample Result (mg/L)
SDR = Serial Dilution Result (mg/L) (Instrument Reading x 5)

Sample ID	Type of Analysis	Element	Found / S / I (units)	True / D / SDR (units)	Recalculated %R / RPD / %D	Reported %R / RPD / %D	Acceptable (Y/N)
ICSAB	ICP interference check	Zn	104.2	100	104	104	Y
LCS	Laboratory control sample	Cr	149	142	104.9	104.8	
TSB-FJ-06-0210'	Matrix spike	Be	(SSR-SR) 2.3723	2.6551	89.3	89.4	
	Duplicate	Al	9953	9110	6.8	6.8	
	ICP serial dilution	Ba	555.65 ~~548.87~~	561.42	1.0 ~~2.0~~	1.0	

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

LDC #: 19091A4
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Reviewer: MM
2nd reviewer: [signature]

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6010/7000)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Have results been reported and calculated correctly?
Y N N/A Are results within the calibrated range of the instruments and within the linear range of the ICP?
Y N N/A Are all detection limits below the CRDL?

Detected analyte results for 2 were recalculated and verified using the following equation:

Concentration = $\frac{(RD)(FV)(Dil)}{(In.\ Vol.)(\%S)}$

RD = Raw data concentration
FV = Final volume (ml)
In. Vol. = Initial volume (ml) or weight (G)
Dil = Dilution factor
%S = Decimal percent solids

Recalculation:

$$S = \frac{9.314\ mg/L \times 0.1\ L \times 2 \times 1000\ g/kg}{0.5\ g \times 0.6931} = 2688\ mg/kg$$

Sample ID	Analyte	Reported Concentration (mg/kg)	Calculated Concentration (mg/kg)	Acceptable (Y/N)
2	Li	133	133	Y
	S	2690	2690	
	Al	18200	18200	
	As	35.5	35.5	
	Ba	56.2	56.2	
	Be	0.97	0.97	
	B	27.8	27.8	
	Ca	23400	23400	
	Cr	26.4	26.4	
	Co	8.8	8.8	
	Cu	28.8	28.8	
	Fe	19900	19900	
	Pb	10.6	10.6	
	Mg	4500	4500	
	Mn	310	310	
	Mo	2.9	2.8	
	Ni	20.7	20.7	
	Pd	0.48	0.48	
	P	812	812	
	K	3780	3780	
	Si	1200	1200	
	Ag	0.19	0.19	Y

LDC #: 19091A4
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 9
Reviewer: MH
2nd reviewer: [signature]

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6010/7000)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A Have results been reported and calculated correctly?
(Y) N N/A Are results within the calibrated range of the instruments and within the linear range of the ICP?
(Y) N N/A Are all detection limits below the CRDL?

Detected analyte results for 2 were recalculated and verified using the following equation:

Concentration = $\frac{(RD)(FV)(Dil)}{(In.\ Vol.)(\%S)}$

RD = Raw data concentration
FV = Final volume (ml)
In. Vol. = Initial volume (ml) or weight (G)
Dil = Dilution factor
%S = Decimal percent solids

Recalculation:

$$Na = \frac{668.431\ ug/L \times 0.1L \times 5}{0.5g \times .693} = 964.4\ mg/kg$$

Sample ID	Analyte	Reported Concentration (mg/kg)	Calculated Concentration (mg/kg)	Acceptable (Y/N)
2	Na	964	964	Y
	Sr	21.9	21.9	
	Ti	866	866	
	U	6.7	6.7	
	V	60.9	60.9	
	Zn	650	650	
	Zr	44.4	44.4	↓

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: BRC Tronox Parcel F

Collection Date: June 10, 2008

LDC Report Date: July 23, 2008

Matrix: Soil

Parameters: Wet Chemistry

Validation Level: EPA Level III & IV

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): F8F110177

Sample Identification

TSB-FR-02-02-20'
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

**Indicates sample underwent EPA Level IV review

Introduction

This data review covers 5 soil samples listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA Method 300.0 for Bromide, Bromine, Chlorate, Chloride, Chorine, Fluoride, Nitrate as Nitrogen, Nitrite as Nitrogen, Orthophosphate as Phosphorus, and Sulfate and EPA SW 846 Method 9071B for Oil & Grease.

The review follows a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Data Review (October 2004) as there are no current guidelines for the method stated above.

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 III.

Field duplicates are summarized in Section IX.

Samples indicated by a double asterisk on the front cover underwent a EPA Level IV review. A EPA Level III review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III 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.

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. Calibration

a. Initial Calibration

All criteria for the initial calibration of each method were met.

b. Calibration Verification

Calibration verification frequency and analysis criteria were met for each method when applicable.

III. Blanks

Method blanks were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. No contaminant concentrations were found in the initial, continuing and preparation blanks with the following exceptions:

Method Blank ID	Analyte	Concentration	Associated Samples
MB	Orthophosphate as P	1.1 mg/L	All samples in SDG F8F110177
ICB/CCB	Orthophosphate as P	0.237 mg/L	All samples in SDG F8F110177

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

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

IV. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) samples were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

V. Duplicates

Duplicate (DUP) sample analyses were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. Results were within QC limits.

VI. Laboratory Control Samples

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

VII. Sample Result Verification

All sample result verifications were acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

VIII. Overall Assessment of Data

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

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Wet Chemistry - Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Wet Chemistry - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Wet Chemistry - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 19091A6
SDG #: F8F110177
Laboratory: Test America

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Level III/IV

Date: 7/22/08
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: MY
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: (Analyte) Bromide, Bromine, Chlorate, Chloride, Chorine, Fluoride, Nitrate, Nitrite, Orthophosphate-P, Sulfate (EPA Method 300.0), O & G (EPA SW846 Method 9071B)

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: 6/10/08
IIa.	Initial calibration	A	
IIb.	Calibration verification	A	
III.	Blanks	SW	
IV	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	A	3 MS/Dup TSB-FJ-06-02-10'
V	Duplicates	A	
VI.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
VII.	Sample result verification	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
VIII.	Overall assessment of data	A	
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X	Field blanks	N	

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 Level IV validation

	Soil						
1	TSB-FR-02-02-20'	11		21		31	
2	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	12		22		32	
3	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	13		23		33	
4	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	14		24		34	
5	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	15		25		35	
6	MB	16		26		36	
7		17		27		37	
8		18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

Notes:

LDC #: 19091Ab
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: MM
2nd Reviewer: A

Method: Inorganics (EPA Method See cover

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
All technical holding times were met.	✓			
Cooler temperature criteria was met.	✓			
II. Calibration				
Were all instruments calibrated daily, each set-up time?	✓			
Were the proper number of standards used?	✓			
Were all initial calibration correlation coefficients ≥ 0.995?	✓			
Were all initial and continuing calibration verification %Rs within the 90-110% QC limits?	✓			
Were titrant checks performed as required? (Level IV only)			✓	
Were balance checks performed as required? (Level IV only)	✓			
III. Blanks				
Was a method blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was there contamination in the method blanks? If yes, please see the Blanks validation completeness worksheet.	✓			
IV. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates and Duplicates				
Were a matrix spike (MS) and duplicate (DUP) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG? If no, indicate which matrix does not have an associated MS/MSD or MS/DUP. Soil / Water.	✓			
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the 75-125 QC limits? If the sample concentration exceeded the spike concentration by a factor of 4 or more, no action was taken.	✓			
Were the MS/MSD or duplicate relative percent differences (RPD) ≤ 20% for waters and ≤ 35% for soil samples? A control limit of ≤ CRDL(≤ 2X CRDL for soil) was used for samples that were < 5X the CRDL, including when only one of the duplicate sample values were < 5X the CRDL.	✓			
V. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS anaylzed for this SDG?	✓			
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the 80-120% (85-115% for Method 300.0) QC limits?	✓			
VI. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control				
Were performance evaluation (PE) samples performed?			✓	
Were the performance evaluation (PE) samples within the acceptance limits?			✓	

LDC #: 19091A6
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: MM
2nd Reviewer: A

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
VII. Sample Result Verification				
Were RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
Were detection limits < RL?	✓			
VIII. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			
IX. Field duplicates				
Field duplicate pairs were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target analytes were detected in the field duplicates.			✓	
X. Field blanks				
Field blanks were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target analytes were detected in the field blanks.			✓	

LDC #: 19091A6
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Specific Analysis Reference

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [initials]
2nd reviewer: [initials]

All circled methods are applicable to each sample.

Sample ID	Matrix	Parameter
1-5	Soil	Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH
		Br Bromine Cl Chlorine F NO_3 NO_2 SO_4 O-PO_4 Chlorate ClO_4 O+G/TPH

Comments:

LDC #: 19091A6
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: Inorganics, Method See cover

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".
Y N N/A Were all samples associated with a given method blank?
Y N N/A Were any inorganic contaminants detected above the reporting limit in the method blanks? If yes, please see qualifications below.

Conc. units: mg/kg **Associated Samples:** All (NO)

Analyte	Blank ID	Maximum ICB/CCB	Blank Action Limit	Sample Identification								
	MB	mg/L										
o-PO4-P	1-1	0.237										

CIRCLED RESULTS WERE NOT QUALIFIED. ALL RESULTS NOT CIRCLED WERE QUALIFIED BY THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:
All contaminants within five times the methoc blank concentration were qualified as not detected, "U".

LDC #: 19091A6
SDG #: See Cover

Validatin Findings Worksheet
Initial and Continuing Calibration Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Method: Inorganics, Method See cover

The correlation coefficient (r) for the calibration of cl was recalculated.Calibration date: 6/18/08

An initial or continuing calibration verification percent recovery (%R) was recalculated for each type of analysis using the following formula:

%R = Found X 100 / True

Where, Found = concentration of each analyte measured in the analysis of the ICV or CCV solution
True = concentration of each analyte in the ICV or CCV source

Type of analysis	Analyte	Standard	Conc. (ug/L)	Area	Recalculated r or r^2	Reported r or r^2	Acceptable (Y/N)
Initial calibration	Cl	s1	200	0.04	*0.99984*	0.99991	Y
		s2	500	0.091			
		s3	1000	0.191			
		s4	2500	0.474			
		s5	5000	0.989			
ccv Calibration verification	chloride	4000	4081		102	NR	Y
ccv Calibration verification	F	1000	1035.4		103.5	103.5	Y
ccv Calibration verification	Br	2000	2016.6		100.8	100.8	Y

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

LDC #: 19291A6
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Level IV Recalculation Worksheet

Reviewer: MM
2nd Reviewer: R

METHOD: Inorganics, Method See cover

Percent recoveries (%R) for a laboratory control sample and a matrix spike sample were recalculated using the following formula:

%R = Found / True x 100 Where, Found = concentration of each analyte measured in the analysis of the sample. For the matrix spike calculation, Found = SSR (spiked sample result) - SR (sample result).
True = concentration of each analyte in the source.

A sample and duplicate relative percent difference (RPD) was recalculated using the following formula:

RPD = |S-D| / (S+D)/2 x 100 Where, S = Original sample concentration
D = Duplicate sample concentration

Sample ID	Type of Analysis	Element	Found / S (units)	True / D (units)	Recalculated %R / RPD	Reported %R / RPD	Acceptable (Y/N)
LCS	Laboratory control sample	Ca+Mg	1173	1330	88	88	Y
TSB-FJ-06-021-1	Matrix spike sample	chloride	(SSR-SR) 43.6	42.5	103	103	↓
↓	Duplicate sample	SO4	242	245	1.2	1.2	↓

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

LDC #: 19091A6
SDG #: See cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: MH
2nd reviewer:

METHOD: Inorganics, Method See cover

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Have results been reported and calculated correctly?
Y N N/A Are results within the calibrated range of the instruments?
Y N N/A Are all detection limits below the CRQL?

Compound (analyte) results for 2 reported with a positive detect were recalculated and verified using the following equation:

Concentration = Recalculation:

$$C = \frac{0.215 \times 0.04\,\ell \times 10}{0.69 \times 4\,g \times 0.000196} = 158.97\ mg/kg$$

#	Sample ID	Analyte	Reported Concentration (mg/kg)	Calculated Concentration (mg/kg)	Acceptable (Y/N)
1	2	chloride	4.8	4.8	Y
		Cl	159	159	
		Cl_2	317	318	
		F	3.5	3.5	
		NO_3-N	3.4	3.4	
		SO4	524	525	

Note:

LDC Report# 19091A7

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: BRC Tronox Parcel F

Collection Date: June 10, 2008

LDC Report Date: July 22, 2008

Matrix: Soil

Parameters: Gasoline Range Organics

Validation Level: EPA Level III & IV

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): F8F110177

Sample Identification

TSB-FR-02-02-20'
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

**Indicates sample underwent EPA Level IV review

Introduction

This data review covers 5 soil samples listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA SW 846 Method 8015B for Gasoline Range Organics.

This review follows a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (October 1999) as there are no current guidelines for the method stated above.

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 III.

Field duplicates are summarized in Section IX.

Samples indicated by a double asterisk on the front cover underwent a EPA Level IV review. A EPA Level III review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III 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.

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.

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. Calibration

a. Initial Calibration

Initial calibration of compounds was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) of calibration factors for compounds were less than 20.0% .

b. Calibration Verification

Calibration verification was performed at required frequencies. The percent differences (%D) of amounts in continuing standard mixtures were within the 15.0% QC limits.

The percent differences (%D) of the second source calibration standard were less than or equal to 15.0% for all compounds.

III. Blanks

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

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

IV. Accuracy and Precision Data

a. Surrogate Recovery

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

b. 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.

c. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. Although the LCS percent recovery (%R) was not within QC limits for one compound, the LCSD percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits and no data were qualified.

V. Target Compound Identification

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

VI. Compound Quantitation and CRQLs

All compound quantitation and CRQLs were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

VII. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

VIII. Overall Assessment of Data

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

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Gasoline Range Organics - Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Gasoline Range Organics - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Gasoline Range Organics - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 19091A7
SDG #: F8F110177
Laboratory: Test America

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Level III/IV

Date: 7/19/08
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC Gasoline Range Organics (EPA SW846 Method 8015B)

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: 6/10/08
IIa.	Initial calibration	A	
IIb.	Calibration verification/ICV	A	ICV ≤ 15
III.	Blanks	A	
IVa.	Surrogate recovery	A	
IVb.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	TSB-FJ-06-02-10
IVc.	Laboratory control samples	SW	LCS ID
V.	Target compound identification	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
VI.	Compound Quantitation and CRQLs	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
VII.	System Performance	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
VIII.	Overall assessment of data	A	
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Field blanks	N	

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 Level IV validation SOIL

1	TSB-FR-02-02-20'	11	F8F130000-267	21	8165267	31	
2	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	12		22		32	
3	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	13		23		33	
4	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	14		24		34	
5	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	15		25		35	
6		16		26		36	
7		17		27		37	
8		18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

Notes: _____

LDC #: 19091A7
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Page: 1 of 2
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Method: ___/GC ___ HPLC

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
All technical holding times were met.	✓			
Cooler temperature criteria was met.	✓			
II. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Was a linear fit used for evaluation? If yes, were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) < 20%?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If Yes, what was the acceptance criteria used?	✓			
Did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria?	✓			
Were the RT windows properly established?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
What type of continuing calibration calculation was performed? ____%D or ____%R	✓			
Was a continuing calibration analyzed daily?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) < 15%.0 or percent recoveries 85-115%?	✓			
Were all the retention times within the acceptance windows?	✓			
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 the QC limits?	✓			
If the percent recovery (%R) of one or more surrogates was 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?	✓			
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?		✓		

LDC #: 19091A7
SDG #: All cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: MT
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control				
Were performance evaluation (PE) samples performed?			✓	
Were the performance evaluation (PE) samples within the acceptance limits?			✓	
X. Target compound identification				
Were the retention times of reported detects within the RT windows?			✓	
XI. Compound quantitation/CRQLs				
Were compound quantitation and CRQLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XII. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIII. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIV. Field duplicates				
Field duplicate pairs were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target compounds were detected in the field duplicates.			✓	
XV. Field blanks				
Field blanks were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target compounds were detected in the field blanks.			✓	

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

LDC #: 19091A7
SDG #: see cover

Reviewer: FT
2nd Reviewer: Q

METHOD: ___ GC ___ HPLC

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Were a laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control sample duplicate (LCSD) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG?

Y N N/A Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

Level IV/D Only

Y N N/A Was an LCS analyzed every 20 samples for each matrix or whenever a sample extraction was performed?

#	LCS/LCSD ID	Compound	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	8165267	GRO	120 (73-113)	( )	( )	All + BlK	No Qual LCSD in
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 19091 A7
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC / HPLC

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

CF = A/C
average CF = sum of the CF/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

A = Area of compound,
C = Concentration of compound,
S = Standard deviation of the CF
X = Mean of the CFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Reported CF (1.0 std)	Recalculated CF (1.0 std)	Reported Average CF (initial)	Recalculated Average CF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	5/27/08	GRO	17025649	17025649	17182732	17182732	3.915	3.915
2									
3									
4									

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.

INICIO ISB

LDC #: 19091A7
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC ✓ HPLC ____

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

% Difference = 100 * (ave. CF - CF)/ave. CF
CF = A/C

Where: ave. CF = initial calibration average CF
CF = continuing calibration CF
A = Area of compound
C = Concentration of compound

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Average CF(ical)/ CCV Conc.	Reported CF/Conc. CCV	Recalculated CF/Conc. CCV	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	LCAL377B	6/13/08	GRO	1.0	1.0195	1.0195	2.0	2.0
2	LCAL388B	6/13/08	GRO	1.0	0.9976	0.9976	0.2	0.2
3								
4								

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

LDC #: 19091A7
SDG #: all covered

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Reviewer:
2nd reviewer:

METHOD: GC ___ HPLC

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	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
TFT	not specified	0.04	~~83~~ 0.03339	83	83	0

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	

LDC #: 19091A7
SDG #: w cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: R
2nd Reviewer: R

METHOD: ~~GC~~ HPLC

The percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (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

RPD =(((SSCMS - SSCMSD) * 2) / (SSCMS + SSCMSD))*100

Where

SSC = Spiked sample concentration
SA = Spike added
MS = Matrix spike
SC = Sample concentration
MSD = Matrix spike duplicate

MS/MSD samples: TSB-FJ-06-02-10

Compound	Spike Added (mg/kg)		Sample Conc. (mg/kg)	Spike Sample Concentration (mg/kg)		Matrix spike Percent Recovery		Matrix Spike Duplicate Percent Recovery		MS/MSD RPD	
	MS	MSD	--	MS	MSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
Gasoline (8015)	1.06	1.06	ND	1.02	0.978	96	96	92	92	4.7	4.7
Diesel (8015)											
Benzene (8021B)											
Methane (RSK-175)											
2,4-D (8151)											
Dinoseb (8151)											
Naphthalene (8310)											
Anthracene (8310)											
HMX (8330)											
2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (8330)											

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.

LDC #: 19091A7
SDG #: pw cover

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

Reviewer: P
2nd Reviewer: R

METHOD: GC HPLC

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

%Recovery = 100 * (SSC - SC)/SA Where SSC = Spiked concentration, SA = Spike added, SC = Sample concentration

RPD =(({SSCLCS - SSCLCSD} * 2) / (SSCLCS + SSCLCSD))*100 LCS = Laboratory Control Sample percent recovery LCSD = Laboratory Control Sample duplicate percent recovery

LCS/LCSD samples: 8165267 - LCS

Compound	Spike Added (mg/kg)		Sample Conc (mg/kg)	Spike Sample Concentration (mg/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	---	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
Gasoline (8015)	1.0	1.0		1.20	0.986	120	120	99	99	19	19
Diesel (8015)											
Benzene (8021B)											
Methane (RSK-175)											
2,4-D (8151)											
Dinoseb (8151)											
Naphthalene (8310)											
Anthracene (8310)											
HMX (8330)											
2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (8330)											

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

LDC #: 19091A7
SDG #: all cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: ✓GC ___ HPLC

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds within 10% of the reported results?

Concentration= $\frac{(A)(Fv)(Df)}{(RF)(Vs \text{ or } Ws)(\%S/100)}$

A= Area or height of the compound to be measured
Fv= Final Volume of extract
Df= Dilution Factor
RF= Average response factor of the compound in the initial calibration
Vs= Initial volume of the sample
Ws= Initial weight of the sample
%S= Percent Solid

Example:

Sample ID._____ Compound Name _____

Concentration = _____

ND

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentrations ( )	Recalculated Results Concentrations ( )	Qualifications

Comments: _____

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: BRC Tronox Parcel F

Collection Date: June 10, 2008

LDC Report Date: July 22, 2008

Matrix: Soil

Parameters: Diesel Range Organics

Validation Level: EPA Level III & IV

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): F8F110177

Sample Identification

TSB-FR-02-02-20'
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

**Indicates sample underwent EPA Level IV review

Introduction

This data review covers 5 soil samples listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA SW 846 Method 8015B for Diesel Range Organics.

This review follows a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (October 1999) as there are no current guidelines for the method stated above.

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 III.

Field duplicates are summarized in Section IX.

Samples indicated by a double asterisk on the front cover underwent a EPA Level IV review. A EPA Level III review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III 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.

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.

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. Calibration

a. Initial Calibration

Initial calibration of compounds was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) of calibration factors for compounds were less than 20.0% .

b. Calibration Verification

Calibration verification was performed at required frequencies. The percent differences (%D) of amounts in continuing standard mixtures were within the 15.0% QC limits.

The percent differences (%D) of the second source calibration standard were less than or equal to 15.0% for all compounds.

III. Blanks

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

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

IV. Accuracy and Precision Data

a. Surrogate Recovery

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

b. 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.

c. Laboratory Control Samples

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

V. Target Compound Identification

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

VI. Compound Quantitation and CRQLs

All compound quantitation and CRQLs were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

VII. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

VIII. Overall Assessment of Data

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

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Diesel Range Organics - Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Diesel Range Organics - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Diesel Range Organics - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 19091A8
SDG #: F8F110177
Laboratory: Test America

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Level III/IV

Date: 7/19/08
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC Diesel Range Organics (EPA SW846 Method 8015B)

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: 6/10/08
IIa.	Initial calibration	A	
IIb.	Calibration verification/ICV	A	ICV ≤ 15
III.	Blanks	A	
IVa.	Surrogate recovery	A	
IVb.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	TSB-FJ-02-02-30' + TSB-CJ-09-0'
IVc.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
V.	Target compound identification	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
VI.	Compound Quantitation and CRQLs	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
VII.	System Performance	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
VIII.	Overall assessment of data	A	
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Field blanks	N	

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 Level IV validation

1	TSB-FR-02-02-20'	11	F8F130000-291	21	816529	31	
2	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	12	F8F180000-312	22	817031 2	32	
3	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	13		23		33	
4	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	14		24		34	
5	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	15		25		35	
6		16		26		36	
7		17		27		37	
8		18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

Notes: _____

LDC #: 19091A8
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: MT
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Method: ____GC ____HPLC

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
All technical holding times were met.	✓			
Cooler temperature criteria was met.	✓			
II. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Was a linear fit used for evaluation? If yes, were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) < 20%?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If Yes, what was the acceptance criteria used?		✓	✓	
Did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria?				
Were the RT windows properly established?	✓			
III. Continuing calibration				
What type of continuing calibration calculation was performed? ____%D or ____%R	✓			
Was a continuing calibration analyzed daily?				
Were all percent differences (%D) < 15%.0 or percent recoveries 85-115%?	✓			
Were all the retention times within the acceptance windows?	✓			
IV. 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.		✓		
V. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate %R within the QC limits?	✓			
If the percent recovery (%R) of one or more surrogates was 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?	✓		✓	
VI. 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?	✓			
VII. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed for this SDG?	✓			
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			

LDC #: 19091A8
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: MJ
2nd Reviewer: JL

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control				
Were performance evaluation (PE) samples performed?			✓	
Were the performance evaluation (PE) samples within the acceptance limits?			✓	
X. Target Compound Identification				
Were the retention times of reported detects within the RT windows?			✓	
XI. Compound quantitation/CRQLs				
Were compound quantitation and CRQLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XII. System Performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIII. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIV. Field duplicates				
Field duplicate pairs were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target compounds were detected in the field duplicates.			✓	
XV. Field Blanks				
Field blanks were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target compounds were detected in the field blanks.			✓	

LDC #: 19091 A8
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC ✓ HPLC ____

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

CF = A/C
average CF = sum of the CF/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

A = Area of compound,
C = Concentration of compound,
S = Standard deviation of the CF
X = Mean of the CFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Reported CF (100 std)	Recalculated CF (100 std)	Reported Average CF (initial)	Recalculated Average CF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	5/16/08	PRO	16236	16236	16023	16023	3.456	3.456
2									
3									
4									

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.

LDC #: 19091A8
SDG #: all covered

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC ✓ HPLC ____

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

% Difference = 100 * (ave. CF - CF)/ave. CF
CF = A/C

Where: ave. CF = initial calibration average CF
CF = continuing calibration CF
A = Area of compound
C = Concentration of compound

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Average CF(ical)/ CCV Conc.	Reported CF/Conc. CCV	Recalculated CF/Conc. CCV	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	ECAL525	6/17/08	Diesel	1000.00	996.5312	996.53	0.3	0.3
2	ECAL549	6/18/08	↓	↓	1039.4417	1039.4417	3.9	3.9
3	ECAL575	6/19/08	↓	1000	979.8723	979.8723	2.0	2.0
4								

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

LDC #: 19091A7 SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Page:____ of ____
Reviewer: ____
2nd reviewer: ____

METHOD: ~~GC~~ __ HPLC

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	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
o- Terphenyl	not specified	25	20.9889	84	84	0

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	

LDC #: 17071A8
SDG #: fw cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: M
2nd Reviewer: R

METHOD: ~~GC~~ HPLC

The percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (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; SA = Spike added; MS = Matrix spike; SC = Sample concentration; MSD = Matrix spike duplicate

RPD =(((SSCMS - SSCMSD) * 2) / (SSCMS + SSCMSD))*100

MS/MSD samples: TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

Compound	Spike Added (mg/Kg)		Sample Conc. (mg/Kg)	Spike Sample Concentration (mg/Kg)		Matrix spike Percent Recovery		Matrix Spike Duplicate Percent Recovery		MS/MSD RPD	
	MS	MSD	--	MS	MSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
Gasoline (8015)											
Diesel (8015)	87.2	88.6		74.5	78.5	85	85	89	89	5.2	5.2
Benzene (8021B)											
Methane (RSK-175)											
2,4-D (8151)											
Dinoseb (8151)											
Naphthalene (8310)											
Anthracene (8310)											
HMX (8330)											
2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (8330)											

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.

LDC #: 19091A8
SDG #: see cover

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

METHOD: ~~GC~~ HPLC

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

%Recovery = 100 * (SSC - SC)/SA Where SSC = Spiked concentration, SA = Spike added, SC = Sample concentration

RPD =(({SSCLCS - SSCLCSD} * 2) / (SSCLCS + SSCLCSD))*100 LCS = Laboratory Control Sample percent recovery LCSD = Laboratory Control Sample duplicate percent recovery

LCS/LCSD samples: 816529/- LCS

Compound	Spike Added (mg/kg)		Sample Conc. (mg/kg)	Spike Sample Concentration (mg/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	--	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
Gasoline (8015)											
Diesel (8015)	83.3	NA	0	68.9	NA	83	83	NA			
Benzene (8021B)											
Methane (RSK-175)											
2,4-D (8151)											
Dinoseb (8151)											
Naphthalene (8310)											
Anthracene (8310)											
HMX (8330)											
2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (8330)											

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

LDC #: 19091A8
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: ✓ GC __ HPLC

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds within 10% of the reported results?

Concentration = $\frac{(A)(Fv)(Df)}{(RF)(Vs \text{ or } Ws)(\%S/100)}$

A= Area or height of the compound to be measured
Fv= Final Volume of extract
Df= Dilution Factor
RF= Average response factor of the compound in the initial calibration
Vs= Initial volume of the sample
Ws= Initial weight of the sample
%S= Percent Solid

Example:

Sample ID._____ Compound Name _____

Concentration = _____

ND

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentrations ( )	Recalculated Results Concentrations ( )	Qualifications

Comments: _____

SAMPCALew.wpd

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: BRC Tronox Parcel F

Collection Date: June 10, 2008

LDC Report Date: July 22, 2008

Matrix: Soil

Parameters: Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons

Validation Level: EPA Level III & IV

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): F8F110177

Sample Identification

TSB-FR-02-02-20'
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

**Indicates sample underwent EPA Level IV review

Introduction

This data review covers 5 soil samples listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA SW 846 Method 8310 for Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons.

This review follows a modified outline of the USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (October 1999) as there are no current guidelines for the method stated above.

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 III.

Field duplicates are summarized in Section IX.

Samples indicated by a double asterisk on the front cover underwent a EPA Level IV review. A EPA Level III review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III 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.

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. Calibration

a. Initial Calibration

Initial calibration of compounds was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

Retention time windows were evaluated and considered technically acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples on which a Level III review was performed.

b. Calibration Verification

Calibration verification was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) of calibration factors in continuing standard mixtures were within the 15.0% QC limits with the following exceptions:

Date	Detector	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
6/16/08	Not specified	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	15.2	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	J+ (all detects)	A

The percent differences (%D) of the second source calibration standard were less than or equal to 15.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Detector	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
6/4/08	Not specified	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	16.69	All samples in SDG F8F110177	J+ (all detects)	A

Retention time windows were evaluated and considered technically acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples on which a Level III review was performed.

III. Blanks

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

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

IV. Accuracy and Precision Data

a. Surrogate Recovery

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

b. 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.

c. Laboratory Control Samples

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

V. Target Compound Identification

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

VI. Compound Quantitation and CRQLs

All compound quantitation and CRQLs were within validation criteria for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

VII. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable for samples on which a EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by Level III criteria.

VIII. Overall Assessment of Data

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

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons - Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

SDG	Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
F8F110177	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	J+ (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
F8F110177	TSB-FR-02-02-20' TSB-FR-02-02-30'** TSB-FJ-02-02-10'** TSB-FJ-02-02-20'** TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	J+ (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (ICV %D)

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 19091A9
SDG #: F8F110177
Laboratory: Test America

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Level III/IV

Date: 7/9/08
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (EPA SW 846 Method 8310)

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: 6/10/08
IIa.	Initial calibration	A	
IIb.	Calibration verification/ICV	SW	ICV ≤ 15
III.	Blanks	A	
IVa.	Surrogate recovery	A	
IVb.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	TSB-GJ-08-10
IVc.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
V.	Target compound identification	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
VI.	Compound Quantitation and CRQLs	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
VII.	System Performance	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
VIII.	Overall assessment of data	A	
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Field blanks	N	

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 Level IV validation

			SOIL				
1	TSB-FR-02-02-20'	11	FSF160000-158	21	8168158	31	
2	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	12		22		32	
3	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	13		23		33	
4	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	14		24		34	
5	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	15		25		35	
6		16		26		36	
7		17		27		37	
8		18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

Notes: _____

LDC #: 19091A9
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Page: 1 of 2
Reviewer: D
2nd Reviewer: A

Method: / GC _____ HPLC

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
All technical holding times were met.	/			
Cooler temperature criteria was met.	/			
II. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	/			
Was a linear fit used for evaluation? If yes, were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 20%?	/			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If Yes, what was the acceptance criteria used?		/		
Did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria?			/	
Were the RT windows properly established?	/			
IV. Continuing calibration				
What type of continuing calibration calculation was performed? ____%D or ____%R	/			
Was a continuing calibration analyzed daily?	/			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 15%.0 or percent recoveries 85-115%?	/			
Were all the retention times within the acceptance windows?	/			
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 the QC limits?	/			
If the percent recovery (%R) of one or more surrogates was 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?	/			
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	/			

LDC #: 19091A9
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: FT
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			
IX. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control				
Were performance evaluation (PE) samples performed?			✓	
Were the performance evaluation (PE) samples within the acceptance limits?			✓	
X. Target compound identification				
Were the retention times of reported detects within the RT windows?	✓		✓	
XI. Compound quantitation/CRQLs				
Were compound quantitation and CRQLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XII. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIII. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIV. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds idetected in the field duplicates?			✓	
XV. Field blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field blanks?			✓	

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: ____GC ____HPLC

8310	8330	8151	8141	8141(Con't)	8021B
A. Acenaphthene	A. HMX	A. 2,4-D	A. Dichlorvos	V. Fensulfothion	V. Benzene
B. Acenaphthylene	B. RDX	B. 2,4-DB	B. Mevinphos	W. Bolstar	CC. Toluene
C. Anthracene	C. 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene	C. 2,4,5-T	C. Demeton-O	X. EPN	EE. Ethyl Benzene
D. Benzo(a)anthracene	D. 1,3-Dinitrobenzene	D. 2,4,5-TP	D. Demeton-S	Y. Azinphos-methyl	SSS. O-Xylene
E. Benzo(a)pyrene	E. Tetryl	E. Dinoseb	E. Ethoprop	Z. Coumaphos	RRR. MP-Xylene
F. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	F. Nitrobenzene	F. Dichlorprop	F. Naled	AA. Parathion	GG. Total Xylene
G. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	G. 2.4.6-Trinitrotoluene	G. Dicamba	G. Sulfotep	BB. Trichloronate	
H. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	H. 4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene	H. Dalapon	H. Phorate	CC. Trichlorinate	
I. Chrysene	I. 2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene	I. MCPP	I. Dimethoate	DD. Trifluralin	
J. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	J. 2,4-Dinitrotolune	J. MCPA	J. Diazinon	EE. Def	
K. Fluoranthene	K. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	K. Pentachlorophenol	K. Disulfoton	FF. Prowl	
L. Fluorene	L. 2-Nitrotoluene	L.. 2,4,5-TP (silvex)	L. Parathion-methyl	GG. Ethion	
M. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	M. 3-Nitrotoluene	M. Silvex	M. Ronnel		
N. Naphthalene	N. 4-Nitrotoluene		N. Malathion		
O. Phenanthrene	O.		O. Chlorpyrifos		
P. Pyrene	P.		P. Fenthion		
Q.	Q		Q. Parathion-ethyl		
R.			R. Trichlornate		
S.			S. Merphos		
			T. Stirofos		
			U. Tokuthion		

Notes: _____

LDC #: 19081A9
SDG #: see cover
METHOD: ~~GC~~ HPLC

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9
2nd Reviewer: 2

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".
What type of continuing calibration calculation was performed? ___%D or ___RPD
Y N N/A Were continuing calibration standards analyzed at the required frequencies?
Y N N/A Did the continuing calibration standards meet the %D / RPD validation criteria of ≤15.0%?
Level IV Only
Y N N/A Were the retention times for all calibrated compounds within their respective acceptance windows?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D / RPD (Limit ≤ 15.0)	RT (limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
+	6/4/08	QKV768	not specified	H	16.6	( )	All but B/K	J+/A det
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
+	6/6/08	QCAL873	↓	G	15.2	( )	4, 5	J+/A det
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		

LDC #: 19091A9
SDG #: Pecore

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC ✓ HPLC ____

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

CF = A/C
average CF = sum of the CF/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

A = Area of compound,
C = Concentration of compound,
S = Standard deviation of the CF
X = Mean of the CFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Reported	Recalculated	Reported	Recalculated	Reported	Recalculated
				5/ CF (0.5 std)	5/ CF (0.5 std)	Average CF (initial)	Average CF (initial)	%RSD	%RSD
1	ICAL	6/4/08	Naphthalene	24206	24206	23507	23507	3.240	3.240
			Anthracene	815734	815734	806710	806710	1.821	1.821
2									
3									
4									

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.

LDC #: 19091A9
SDG #: fuel cores

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC ✓ HPLC ____

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

% Difference = 100 * (ave. CF - CF)/ave. CF
CF = A/C

Where: ave. CF = initial calibration average CF
CF = continuing calibration CF
A = Area of compound
C = Concentration of compound

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Average CF(Ical)/ CCV Conc.	Reported CF/Conc. CCV	Recalculated CF/Conc. CCV	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	QCAL862	6/16/08	Naphthalene	5.0	5.3624	5.3624	7.2	7.2
			Anthracene	0.50	0.5344	0.5344	6.9	6.9
2	QCAL873	6/16/08	↓	↓	5.3978	5.3978	8.0	8.0
					0.5307	0.5307	6.1	6.1
3								
4								

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

LDC #: 17091A7
SDG #: recovery

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: __ GC __ HPLC

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	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
p-Terphenyl	not specified	25	17.918	72	72	0

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	

LDC #: 19098A9
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: ~~GC~~ HPLC

The percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (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; SA = Spike added; SC = Sample concentration; MS = Matrix spike; MSD = Matrix spike duplicate

RPD =(({SSCMS - SSCMSD} * 2) / (SSCMS + SSCMSD))*100

MS/MSD samples: TSB-GJ-08-10

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Sample Conc. (ug/kg)	Spike 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	Recalc.
Gasoline (8015)											
Diesel (8015)											
Benzene (8021B)											
Methane (RSK-175)											
2,4-D (8151)											
Dinoseb (8151)											
Naphthalene (8310)	698	709		505	515	72	72	73	73	2.0	2.0
Anthracene (8310)	69.8	70.9		52.9	49.6	76	76	70	70	6.5	6.5
HMX (8330)											
2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (8330)											

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.

LDC #: 19091A9
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: e

METHOD: ~~GC~~ HPLC

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

%Recovery = 100 * (SSC - SC)/SA

RPD =(({SSCLCS - SSCLCSD} * 2) / (SSCLCS + SSCLCSD))*100

Where SSC = Spiked sample concentration
SA = Spike added
LCS = Laboratory Control Sample
SC = Sample concentration
LCSD = Laboratory Control Sample duplicate

LCS/LCSD samples: 8168158-LCS

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Sample Conc. (ug/kg)	Spike Sample Concentration (ug/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	---	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
Gasoline (8015)											
Diesel (8015)											
Benzene (8021B)											
Methane (RSK-175)											
2,4-D (8151)											
Dinoseb (8151)											
Naphthalene (8310)	667	na		484	na	73	73				
Anthracene (8310)	66.7	↓		51.2	↓	77	77				
HMX (8330)											
2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (8330)											

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

LDC #: 19091A9
SDG #: see cover

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Reviewer: RJ
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: __ GC __ HPLC

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds within 10% of the reported results?

Concentration= $\frac{(A)(Fv)(Df)}{(RF)(Vs \text{ or } Ws)(\%S/100)}$

A= Area or height of the compound to be measured
Fv= Final Volume of extract
Df= Dilution Factor
RF= Average response factor of the compound In the initial calibration
Vs= Initial volume of the sample
Ws= Initial weight of the sample
%S= Percent Solid

Example:

Sample ID._____ Compound Name _____

Concentration =_____

ND

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentrations ( )	Recalculated Results Concentrations ( )	Qualifications

Comments: _____

LDC Report# 19091A21

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: BRC Tronox Parcel F

Collection Date: June 10, 2008

LDC Report Date: July 23, 2008

Matrix: Soil

Parameters: Dioxins/Dibenzofurans

Validation Level: EPA Level III & IV

Laboratory: TestAmerica, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): F8F110177

Sample Identification

TSB-FR-02-02-20'
TSB-FR-02-02-30'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**
TSB-FJ-02-02-30'

**Indicates sample underwent EPA Level IV review

Introduction

This data review covers 5 soil samples listed on the cover sheet including dilutions and reanalysis as applicable. The analyses were per EPA SW 846 Method 8290 for Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans.

This review follows USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans Data Review (September 2005) as there are no current guidelines for the method stated above.

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 XIV.

Samples indicated by a double asterisk on the front cover underwent EPA Level IV review. EPA Level III review was performed on all of the other samples. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by EPA Level III 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.

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.

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. HRGC/HRMS Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at the required daily frequency.

Retention time windows were established for all homologues. The chromatographic resolution between 2,3,7,8-TCDD and peaks representing any other unlabeled TCDD isomer was less than or equal to 25% .

The exact mass of 380.9760 of PFK was verified. The static resolving power was at least 10,000 (10% valley definition) for samples on which EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by EPA Level III criteria.

III. Initial Calibration

A five point initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

Percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for unlabeled compounds and less than or equal to 30.0% for labeled compounds.

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

The minimum S/N ratio for each target compound was greater than or equal to 2.5 and and greater than or equal to 10 for each recovery and internal standard compound for samples on which EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by EPA Level III criteria.

IV. Routine Calibration (Continuing)

Routine calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

All of the routine calibration percent differences (%D) between the initial calibration RRF and the routine calibration RRF were less than or equal to 20.0% for unlabeled compounds and less than or equal to 30.0% for labeled compounds.

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

V. Blanks

Method blanks were reviewed for each matrix as applicable. No polychlorinated dioxin/dibenzofuran contaminants were found in the method blanks.

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. 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.

VII. Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

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

VIII. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control

Not applicable.

IX. Internal Standards

All internal standard recoveries were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Sample	Internal Standards	%R (Limits)	Compound	Flag	A or P
8169351MB	^{13}C-1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	38 (40-135)	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF 2,3,4,6,7,8-HxCDF 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P

X. Target Compound Identifications

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria for samples on which EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by EPA Level III criteria.

XI. Compound Quantitation and CRQLs

All compound quantitation and CRQLs were within validation criteria for samples on which EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by EPA Level III criteria.

XII. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable for samples on which EPA Level IV review was performed. Raw data were not evaluated for the samples reviewed by EPA Level III criteria.

XIII. Overall Assessment of Data

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

XIV. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

BRC Tronox Parcel F
Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG F8F110177

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 19091A21 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 7/19/08
SDG #: F8F110177 Level III/IV Page: 1 of 1
Laboratory: Test America Reviewer: M
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA SW 846 Method 8290)

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: 6/10/08
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration	A	
IV.	Routine calibration/~~ICV~~ CCV	A	
V.	Blanks	A	
VI.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	client specified
VII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
VIII.	Regional quality assurance and quality control	N	
IX.	Internal standards	SW	
X.	Target compound identifications	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XI.	Compound quantitation and CRQLs	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XII.	System performance	A	Not reviewed for Level III validation.
XIII.	Overall assessment of data	A	
XIV.	Field duplicates	N	
XV.	Field blanks	N	

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 Level IV validation

Soil

1	TSB-FR-02-02-20'	11	816935MB	21		31	
2	TSB-FR-02-02-30'**	12		22		32	
3	TSB-FJ-02-02-10'**	13		23		33	
4	TSB-FJ-02-02-20'**	14		24		34	
5	TSB-FJ-02-02-30'	15		25		35	
6		16		26		36	
7		17		27		37	
8		18		28		38	
9		19		29		39	
10		20		30		40	

Notes: _____

LDC #: 19091A21
SDG #: F8F110177

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: R
2nd Reviewer: A

Method: Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA SW 846 Method 8290)

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				
Was PFK exact mass 380.9760 verified?	✓			
Were the retention time windows established for all homologues?	✓			
Was the chromatographic resolution between 2,3,7,8-TCDD and peaks representing any other unlabeled TCDD isomers ≤ 25% ?	✓			
Is the static resolving power at least 10,000 (10% valley definition)?	✓			
Was the mass resolution adequately check with PFK?	✓			
Was the presence of 1,2,8,9-TCDD and 1,3,4,6,8-PeCDF verified?	✓			
III. Initial calibration				
Was the initial calibration performed at 5 concentration levels?	✓			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 20% for unlabeled standards and ≤ 30% for labeled standards?	✓			
Did all calibration standards meet the Ion Abundance Ratio criteria?	✓			
Was the signal to noise ratio for each target compound ≥ 2.5 and for each recovery and internal standard ≥ 10?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a routine calibration performed at the beginning and end of each 12 hour period?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20% for unlabeled standards and ≤ 30% for labeled standards?	✓			
Did all routine calibration standards meet the Ion Abundance Ratio criteria?	✓			
V. Blanks				
Was a method blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a method blank performed for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Was there contamination in the method blanks? If yes, please see the Blanks validation completeness worksheet?		✓		
VI. 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.		✓		
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?			✓	
VII. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed for this SDG?	✓			

LDC #: 19091A21
SDG #: F8F110177

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: JL
2nd Reviewer: JL

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			
VIII. Regional Quality Assurance and Quality Control				
Were performance evaluation (PE) samples performed?			✓	
Were the performance evaluation (PE) samples within the acceptance limits?			✓	
IX. Internal standards				
Were internal standard recoveries within the 40-135% criteria?		✓		
Was the minimum S/N ratio of all internal standard peaks $\geq$ 10?	✓			
X. Target compound identification				
For 2,3,7,8 substituted congeners with associated labeled standards, were the retention times of the two quantitation peaks within -1 to 3 sec. of the RT of the labeled standard?	✓		✓	
For 2,3,7,8 substituted congeners without associated labeled standards, were the relative retention times of the two quantitation peaks within 0.005 time units of the RRT measured in the routine calibration?	✓		✓	
For non-2,3,7,8 substituted congeners, were the retention times of the two quantitation peaks within RT established in the performance check solution?			✓	
Did compound spectra contain all characteristic ions listed in the table attached?			✓	
Was the Ion Abundance Ratio for the two quantitation ions within criteria?			✓	
Was the signal to noise ratio for each target compound and labeled standard $\geq$ 2.5?			✓	
Does the maximum intensity of each specified characteristic ion coincide within $\pm$ 2 seconds (includes labeled standards)?			✓	
For PCDF identification, was any signal (S/N $\geq$ 2.5, at $\pm$ seconds RT) detected in the corresponding PCDPE channel?			✓	
Was an acceptable lock mass recorded and monitored?			✓	
XI. Compound quantitation/CRQLs				
Were the correct internal standard (IS), quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?			✓	
Were compound quantitation and CRQLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XII. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIII. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XIV. Field duplicates				
Field duplicate pairs were identified in this SDG.		✓		

LDC #: 19091A21
SDG #: F8F110177

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: JL
2nd Reviewer: JL

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
Target compounds were detected in the field duplicates.			✓	
XV. Field blanks				
Field blanks were identified in this SDG.		✓		
Target compounds were detected in the field blanks.			✓	

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA SW 846 Method 8290)

A. 2,3,7,8-TCDD	F. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD	K. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	P. 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	U. Total HpCDD
B. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	G. OCDD	L. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF	Q. OCDF	V. Total TCDF
C. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	H. 2,3,7,8-TCDF	M. 2,3,4,6,7,8-HxCDF	R. Total TCDD	W. Total PeCDF
D. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD	I. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF	N. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF	S. Total PeCDD	X. Total HxCDF
E. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD	J. 2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF	O. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	T. Total HxCDD	Y. Total HpCDF

Notes: _____

LDC #: 19091A21
SDG #: F8F110177

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Internal Standards

Reviewer: a
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA SW 846 Method 8290)
Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y (N) N/A Are all internal standard recoveries were within the 40-135% criteria?
(Y) N N/A Was the S/N ratio all internal standard peaks ≥ 10?

#	Date	Lab ID/Reference	Internal Standard	% Recovery (Limit: 40-135%)	Qualifications
		8169351MB	E	38 (40-135)	J/UJ/P (K-N, ≠)
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	

	Internal Standards	Check Standard Used		Recovery Standards	Check Standard Used
A.	^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF		K.	^{13}C-1,2,3,4-TCDD	
B.	^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD		L.	^{13}C-1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD	
C.	^{13}C-1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF		M.		
D.	^{13}C-1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD		N.		
E.	^{13}C-1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF		O.		
F.	^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD		P.		
G.	^{13}C-1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF		Q.		
H.	^{13}C-1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD		R.		
I	^{13}C-OCDD		T		

LDC #: 19091A21
SDG #: F8F110177

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Reviewer: K
2nd Reviewer: K

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA SW 846 Method 8290)

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, A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_x = Concentration of compound, C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard
S = Standard deviation of the RRFs, X = Mean of the RRFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Reported Average RRF (initial)	Recalculated Average RRF (initial)	Reported RRF (CS3 std)	Recalculated RRF (CS3 std)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	6/16/09	2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)	0.798	0.798	0.82	0.82	12.5	12.7
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)	0.913	0.912	0.93	0.93	10.2	10.3
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)	0.821	0.820	0.87	0.87	13.9	14.1
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)	0.844	0.844	0.88	0.88	12.8	12.7
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDD)	1.721	1.722	1.86	1.86	16.2	16.3
2			2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)						
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)						
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)						
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)						
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDD)						
3			2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)						
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)						
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)						
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)						
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDD)						

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.

LDC #: 19091A21
SDG #: F8F110177

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Routine Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA SW 846 Method 8290)

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 * (ave. RRF - RRF)/ave. RRF
$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$

Where: ave. RRF = initial calibration average RRF
RRF = continuing calibration RRF
A_x = Area of compound, A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_x = Concentration of compound, C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Average RRF (initial)	Reported RRF (CC)	Recalculated RRF (CC)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	ST0627A	6/27/08	2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)	0.798	0.81	0.81	1.5	1.5
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)	0.913	0.78	0.78	14.4	14.4
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)	0.821	0.82	0.82	0.2	0.3
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)	0.844	0.82	0.82	2.4	2.5
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDD)	1.721	1.53	1.53	11.2	11.2
2	ST0630B	6/30/08	2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)	0.798	0.84	0.84	4.9	4.9
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)	0.913	0.80	0.80	12.8	12.8
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)	0.821	0.89	0.89	8.4	8.4
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)	0.844	0.91	0.91	7.3	7.3
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDD)	1.721	1.68	1.68	2.6	2.7
3			2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)					
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)					
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)					
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)					
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDD)					

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

LDC #: 19091A21
SDG #: F8F110177

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Sample Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA SW 846 Method 8290)

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

% Recovery = 100 * SSC/SA Where: SSC = Spiked sample concentration
SA = Spike added

RPD = I LCS - LCSD I * 2/(LCS + LCSD) LCS = Laboraotry control sample percent recovery LCSD = Laboratory control sample duplicate percent recovery

LCS ID: 816935/LCS

Compound	Spike Added (pg/g)		Spiked Sample Concentration (pg/g)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalculated
2,3,7,8-TCDD	20		16.7		83	84				
1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	100		106		106	106				
1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	↓		95.4		95	95				
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	↓		89.2		89	89				
OCDF	200		183		92	92				

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

Ions Monitored for HRGC/HRMS Analysis of PCDDs/PCDFs

Descriptor	Accurate mass[a]	Ion ID	Elemental Composition	Analyte	Descriptor	Accurate Mass[a]	Ion ID	Elemental Composition	Analyte
1	303.9016	M	$C_{12}H_4{}^{35}Cl_4O$	TCDF	4	407.7818	M+2	$C_{12}H^{35}Cl_6{}^{37}ClO$	HpCDF
	305.8987	M+2	$C_{12}H_4{}^{35}Cl_3{}^{37}C10$	TCDF		409.7788	M+4	$C_{12}H^{35}Cl_5{}^{37}Cl_2O$	HpCDF
	315.9419	M	$^{13}C_{12}H_4{}^{35}Cl_4O$	TCDF (S)		417.8250	M	$^{13}C_{12}H^{35}Cl_7O$	HpCDF (S)
	317.9389	M+2	$^{13}C_{12}H_4{}^{35}Cl_3{}^{37}ClO$	TCDF (S)		419.8220	M+2	$^{13}C_{12}H^{35}Cl_5{}^{37}ClO$	HpCDF
	319.8965	M	$C_{12}H_4{}^{35}Cl_4O_2$	TCDD		423.7767	M+2	$C_{12}H^{35}Cl_6{}^{37}ClO_2$	HpCDD
	321.8936	M+2	$C_{12}H_4{}^{35}Cl_3{}^{37}C10_2$	TCDD		425.7737	M+4	$C_{12}H^{35}Cl_5{}^{37}Cl_2O_2$	HpCDD
	331.9368	M	$^{13}C_{12}H_4{}^{35}Cl_4O_2$	TCDD (S)		435.8169	M+2	$^{13}C_{12}H^{35}Cl_6{}^{37}ClO_2$	HpCDD (S)
	333.9338	M+2	$^{13}C_{12}H_4{}^{35}Cl_3{}^{37}ClO_2$	TCDD (S)		437.8140	M+4	$^{13}C_{12}H^{35}Cl_5{}^{37}Cl_2O_2$	HpCDD (S)
	375.8364	M+2	$C_{12}H_4{}^{35}Cl_5{}^{37}ClO$	HxCDPE		479.7165	M+4	$C_{12}H^{35}Cl_7{}^{37}Cl_2O$	NCDPE
	[354.9792]	LOCK	C_9F_{13}	PFK		[430.9728]	LOCK	C_9F_{17}	PFK
2	339.8597	M+2	$C_{12}H_3{}^{35}Cl_4{}^{37}ClO$	PeCDF	5	441.7428	M+2	$C_{12}{}^{35}Cl_7{}^{37}ClO$	OCDF
	341.8567	M+4	$C_{12}H_3{}^{35}Cl_3{}^{37}Cl_2O$	PeCDF		443.7399	M+4	$C_{12}{}^{35}Cl_6{}^{37}Cl_2O$	OCDF
	351.9000	M+2	$^{13}C_{12}H_3{}^{35}Cl_4{}^{37}C10$	PeCDF (S)		457.7377	M+2	$C_{12}{}^{35}Cl_7{}^{37}ClO_2$	OCDD
	353.8970	M+4	$^{13}C_{12}H_3{}^{35}Cl_3{}^{37}Cl_2O$	PeCDF (S)		459.7348	M+4	$C_{12}{}^{35}Cl_6{}^{37}Cl_2O_2$	OCDD
	355.8546	M+2	$C_{12}H_3{}^{35}Cl_4{}^{37}ClO_2$	PeCDD		469.7780	M+2	$^{13}C_{12}{}^{35}Cl_7{}^{37}ClO_2$	OCDD (S)
	357.8516	M+4	$C_{12}H_3{}^{35}Cl_3{}^{37}Cl_2O_2$	PeCDD		471.7750	M+4	$^{13}C_{12}{}^{35}Cl_6{}^{37}Cl_2O_2$	OCDD (S)
	367.8949	M+2	$^{13}C_{12}H_3{}^{35}Cl_4{}^{37}ClO_2$	PeCDD (S)		513.6775	M+4	$C_{12}{}^{35}Cl_8{}^{37}Cl_2O$	DCDPE
	369.8919	M+4	$^{13}C_{12}H_3{}^{35}Cl_3{}^{37}Cl_2O_2$	PeCDD (S)		[422.9278]	LOCK	$C_{10}F_{17}$	PFK
	409.7974	M+2	$C_{12}H_3{}^{35}Cl_6{}^{37}ClO$	HpCDPE					
	[354.9792]	LOCK	C_9F_{13}	PFK					
3	373.8208	M+2	$C_{12}H_2{}^{35}Cl_5{}^{37}ClO$	HxCDF					
	375.8178	M+4	$C_{12}H_2{}^{35}Cl_4{}^{37}Cl_2O$	HxCDF					
	383.8639	M	$^{13}C_{12}H_2{}^{35}Cl_6O$	HxCDF (S)					
	385.8610	M+2	$^{13}C_{12}H_2{}^{35}Cl_5{}^{37}ClO$	HxCDF (S)					
	389.8156	M+2	$C_{12}H_2{}^{35}Cl_5{}^{37}ClO_2$	HxCDD					
	391.8127	M+4	$C_{12}H_2{}^{35}Cl_4{}^{37}Cl_2O_2$	HxCDD					
	401.8559	M+2	$^{13}C_{12}H_2{}^{35}Cl_5{}^{37}ClO_2$	HxCDD (S)					
	403.8529	M+4	$^{13}C_{12}H_2{}^{35}Cl_4{}^{37}Cl_2O_2$	HxCDD (S)					
	445.7555	M+4	$C_{12}H_2{}^{35}Cl_6{}^{37}Cl_2O$	OCDPE					
	[430.9728]	LOCK	C_9F_{17}	PFK					

(a) The following nuclidic masses were used:

H = 1.007825	O = 15.994915
C = 12.000000	^{35}Cl = 34.968853
^{13}C = 13.003355	^{37}Cl = 36.965903
F = 18.9984	

S = internal/recovery standard

LDC #: 19091A21
SDG #: F8F110177

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: AC
2nd reviewer: [signature]

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA SW 846 Method 8290)

(Y) N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N (N/A) Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the reported results?

Concentration = $\frac{(A_x)(I_s)(DF)}{(A_{is})(RRF)(V_o)(\%S)}$

A_x = Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the compound to be measured

A_{is} = Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the specific internal standard

I_s = Amount of internal standard added in nanograms (ng)

V_o = Volume or weight of sample extract in milliliters (ml) or grams (g).

RRF = Relative Response Factor (average) from the initial calibration

Df = Dilution Factor.

%S = Percent solids, applicable to soil and solid matrices only.

Example:

Sample I.D. 24 , NB :

Conc. = ( ) ( ) ( ) / ( ) ( ) ( )( )

=

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration ( )	Calculated Concentration ( )	Qualification