

PRATHER SPRINGS DATA REVIEW SUMMARY

Data Package Number: Chem Solutions URS-037

Sampling Event: August 29th, 2008

Sample-specific Parameter Review? **Yes**

Laboratory Performance Parameters? **No**

Data Reviewer: Liz Kraak

Date Completed: 09/02/08

Peer Reviewer: Geoff Webb

Date Completed: 09/02/08

The table below summarizes the results presented in this data package.

Field ID	Sample Type	Matrix	Analyses	
			VOCs (8260B)	GRO (8260B)
PSMW-3D	SA	Water	X ^m	X ^m
Ned Prather Spring	SA	Water	X	---
Spring 2	SA	Water	X	---

QC Type: SA - Sample m - Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate

--- Not analyzed for this parameter.

Note: Sample PSMW-3D is a "pre-development" sample.

The data review was conducted in accordance with the Data Validation SOP included in Attachment B to the Phase I Site Investigation Work Plan – Prather Spring Investigation dated July 31, 2008.

General Overall Assessment:

- Data are usable without qualification.
- Data are usable with qualification (noted below).
- Data are usable with qualification (noted below).

Case Narrative Summary: Except as noted below, any of the issues noted in the laboratory case narrative potentially affecting data quality are addressed in the appropriate sections in the table below.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
Sample-specific Parameters	Complete with "Yes", "No", or "Not Applicable (N/A)".	For each "No" response, list what was out, associated acceptance limits, all qualified data, and bias direction or reference associated table with pertinent details.
COC & Sample Receipt	Yes	Samples were received intact and the cooler temperature was within the $\leq 6^{\circ}\text{C}$ temperature criterion.
Holding Times	Yes	All samples were analyzed within the holding time requirements specified in the Work Plan.
Method Blanks	Yes	Target analytes were not reported as detected within the associated method blanks. Data qualification was not required.
Matrix QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MS/MSD PSMW-3D (VOCs, GRO) • LD N/A 	Yes	<p>The samples were analyzed at an on-site laboratory and the QA/QC analyses were completed using a limited target analyte list.</p> <p>The recoveries and RPDs for the matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses were within the laboratory-determined acceptance range. Data qualification was not required.</p>

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
Field QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field Blanks (Ambient, Rinsate, or Trip) None Field Duplicate None 	N/A	
Surrogates	Yes	All surrogate recoveries were within the laboratory acceptance limits. Data qualification was not required.
Laboratory Control Sample (LCS)	Yes	The samples were analyzed at an on-site laboratory and the QA/QC analyses were completed using a limited target analyte list. LCS recoveries were within the laboratory determined acceptance limits. Data qualification was not required.
Continuing Calibration Verification	No	With the exceptions summarized in Table 1, all of the applicable initial and continuing calibration verifications were within the acceptance ranges.
Non-detect Results w/ Elevated RLs?	Yes	
Package Completeness	Yes	
Other Parameters	N/A	

Table 1: Continuing Calibration Verification Outliers and Resultant Data Qualification

Associated Samples	Analyte	%RSD or %D (Limit)	Qualification
ICAL			
All Samples	Vinyl Acetate	+22.51 (15)	None. As the potential bias was considered high and all vinyl acetate results were reported as non-detect, data qualification was not required.
Alternate Source			
All Samples	Vinyl Chloride	-32.7 (25)	As the potential bias was considered to be low, the vinyl chloride results were reported as estimated (J/UJ CCAL-L).
	Methyl-t-butyl ether	+25.8 (25)	None. As the potential bias was considered high and all the listed analytical results were reported as non-detect.
	4-methyl-2-pentanone	+28.3 (25)	
	2-Hexanone	+35.8 (25)	
	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	+30.7 (25)	
	1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	+41.6 (25)	

UJ/J – Estimated

CCAL – Continuing calibration verification failure. L – Low Bias.

PRATHER SPRINGS DATA REVIEW SUMMARY

Data Package Number: Chem Solutions URS-038

Sampling Event: September 3rd, 2008Sample-specific Parameter Review? **Yes**Laboratory Performance Parameters? **No**

Data Reviewer: Liz Kraak

Date Completed: 09/08/08

Peer Reviewer: Geoff Webb

Date Completed: 09/09/08

The table below summarizes the results presented in this data package.

Field ID	Sample Type	Matrix	Sampling Date	Analyses		
				VOCs (8260B)	GRO (8015)	DRO (8015)
PSMW-6R	SA	Solid	09/03/08	X ^m	X ^m	X ^m
PSMW08S	SA	Solid	09/03/08	X	X	X
PSMW03S	SA	Water	09/03/08	X ^m	X	X
PSMW04	SA	Water	09/03/08	X	X	X
Rinsate Blank MW-6R	RB	Water	09/03/08	X	X	X
PSMW11S	SA	Water	09/03/08	X	X ^m	X ^m
PSMW11D	SA	Water	09/03/08	X	X	X
PSMW03D	SA	Water	09/03/08	X	X	X

QC Type: SA - Sample

RB - Rinsate Blank

m - Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate

The data review was conducted in accordance with the Data Validation SOP included in Attachment B to the Phase I Site Investigation Work Plan – Prather Spring Investigation dated July 31, 2008.

General Overall Assessment:

- _____ Data are usable without qualification.
 Data are usable with qualification (noted below).
 _____ Data are usable with qualification (noted below).

Case Narrative Summary: Except as noted below, any of the issues noted in the laboratory case narrative potentially affecting data quality are addressed in the appropriate sections in the table below.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
<i>Sample-specific Parameters</i>	Complete with "Yes", "No", or "Not Applicable (N/A)".	For each "No" response, list what was out, associated acceptance limits, all qualified data, and bias direction or reference associated table with pertinent details.
COC & Sample Receipt	Yes	As the samples were delivered to an on-site laboratory, data qualification based on sample receipt was not required.
Holding Times	Yes	All samples were analyzed within the holding time requirements specified in the Work Plan.
Method Blanks	Yes	Target analytes were not reported as detected within the associated method blanks. Data qualification was not required.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
Matrix QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MS/MSD PSMW-6R (VOCs, GRO, DRO) PSMW03S (VOCs) PSMW11S (GRO, DRO) • LD N/A 	Yes	<p>The samples were analyzed at an on-site laboratory and the QA/QC analyses were completed using a limited target analyte list.</p> <p>The recoveries and RPDs for the matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses were within the laboratory-determined acceptance range. Data qualification was not required.</p>
Field QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field Blanks (Ambient, Rinsate, or Trip) Rinsate Blank MW-6R • Field Duplicate None 	Yes	<p>No target analytes were reported as detected in the rinsate blank. Data qualification was not necessary.</p>
Surrogates	No	<p>With the exceptions summarized in Table 1, all surrogate recoveries were within the laboratory acceptance limits.</p>
Laboratory Control Sample (LCS)	Yes	<p>The samples were analyzed at an on-site laboratory and the QA/QC analyses were completed using a limited target analyte list.</p> <p>With the exceptions summarized below in Table 1, LCS recoveries were within the laboratory determined acceptance limits. There were no historical GRO and DRO surrogate recovery acceptance limits for aqueous samples. Therefore, the GRO and DRO method acceptance limits of 70-130% were used to assign qualification.</p>
Continuing Calibration Verification	No	<p>With the exceptions summarized in Table 2, all of the applicable initial and continuing calibration verifications were within the acceptance ranges.</p>
Non-detect Results without Elevated Reporting Limits?	Yes	
Package Completeness	Yes	
Other Parameters	Yes	<p>Detected analytes with concentrations between the Instrument Detection Limit (IDL) and the Reporting Limit (RL) were qualified as estimated (J). A qualifier code of "SQL-I" (Sample Quantitation Limit) was assigned to reflect the greater uncertainty in quantitative values below the RL.</p>

Table 1: Surrogate Recovery Failures and Resultant Data Qualification

Sample	Surrogate	%R (Limits)	Qualification
PSMW03S	1-Chlorooctane	68.4 (70-130)	As the potential bias was considered to be low, the GRO results for the listed samples were qualified as estimated (J SUR-L).
Rinsate MW-6R		63.6 (70-130)	
PSMW11S		50.8 (70-130)	
PSMW03D		66.3(70-130)	
Method Blank (Associated with all aqueous samples.)		50.8 (70-130)	As this is a quality control sample, data qualification is not required on the basis of surrogate recovery failures.
PSMW03S	1-Chlorooctadecane	47.0 (70-130)	As the potential bias was considered to be low, the DRO results for the listed samples were qualified as estimated (J SUR-L).
PSMW04		52.8 (70-130)	
Rinsate MW-6R		66.8 (70-130)	
PSMW11S		61.0 (70-130)	
PSMW03D		66.6 (70-130)	

%R –Percent Recovery

J – Estimated

SUR- Surrogate recovery failure.

L – Low Bias

Table 2: Continuing Calibration Verification Outliers and Resultant Data Qualification

Associated Samples	Analyte	%RSD or %D (Limit)	Qualification
ICAL			
All Samples	Vinyl Chloride	+28.94 (15)	None. As the potential bias was considered high and all the listed analytical results were reported as non-detect data qualification was not required.
	Methylene Chloride	+31.17 (15)	
	Vinyl Acetate	+17.82 (15)	
Alternate Source			
All Samples	Chloroethane	+35.2 (25)	As the potential bias was considered to high and all chloroethane results were reported as non-detect, data qualification was not required.

UJ/J – Estimated

CCAL – Continuing calibration verification failure.

L – Low Bias.

PRATHER SPRINGS DATA REVIEW SUMMARY

Data Package Number: Chem Solutions URS-039

Sampling Event: September 4th, 2008Sample-specific Parameter Review? **Yes**Laboratory Performance Parameters? **No**

Data Reviewer: Liz Kraak

Date Completed: 09/08/08

Peer Reviewer: Geoff Webb

Date Completed: 09/09/08

The table below summarizes the results presented in this data package.

Field ID	Sample Type	Matrix	Sampling Date	Analyses		
				VOCs (8260B)	GRO (8015)	DRO (8015)
PSMW-07S	SA	Solid	09/04/08	X	X	X
PSMW03S	SA	Water	09/04/08	X	X	X
Rinsate	RB	Water	09/04/08	X	X	X
Ned Prather Spring	SA	Water	09/04/08	X	X	X
Ned Prather Spring DS-440	SA	Water	09/04/08	X	X	X
Spring 2	SA	Water	09/04/08	X	X	X
Spring 2 DS-100	SA	Water	09/04/08	X	X	X

QC Type: SA - Sample

RB – Rinsate Blank

m – Matrix spike and/or matrix spike duplicate.

The data review was conducted in accordance with the Data Validation SOP included in Attachment B to the Phase I Site Investigation Work Plan – Prather Spring Investigation dated July 31, 2008.

General Overall Assessment:

- _____ Data are usable without qualification.
 Data are usable with qualification (noted below).
 _____ Some data are unusable for any purpose (noted below).

Case Narrative Summary: Except as noted below, any of the issues noted in the laboratory case narrative potentially affecting data quality are addressed in the appropriate sections in the table below.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
<i>Sample-specific Parameters</i>	Complete with "Yes", "No", or "Not Applicable (N/A)".	For each "No" response, list what was out, associated acceptance limits, all qualified data, and bias direction or reference associated table with pertinent details.
COC & Sample Receipt	Yes	As the samples were delivered to an on-site laboratory, data qualification based on sample receipt was not required.
Holding Times	Yes	All samples were analyzed within the holding time requirements specified in the Work Plan.
Method Blanks	Yes	Target analytes were not reported as detected within the associated method blanks. Data qualification was not required.
Matrix QC • MS/MSD N/A • LD N/A	Yes	The MS/MSD recoveries and RPDs were within laboratory acceptance limits and reported in package Chem Solutions URS-038.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
Field QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field Blanks (Ambient, Rinsate, or Trip) Rinsate Field Duplicate None 	Yes	No target analytes were reported as detected in the rinsate blank. Data qualification was not required.
Surrogates	No	With the exceptions summarized in Table 1, all surrogate recoveries were within the laboratory acceptance limits. There were no historical GRO and DRO surrogate recovery acceptance limits for aqueous samples. Therefore, the GRO and DRO method acceptance limits of 70-130% were used to assign qualification.
Laboratory Control Sample (LCS)	Yes	The samples were analyzed at an on-site laboratory and the QA/QC analyses were completed using a limited target analyte list. LCS recoveries were within the laboratory determined acceptance limits. Data qualification was not required.
Continuing Calibration Verification	Yes	All of the applicable initial and continuing calibration verifications were within the acceptance ranges. Data qualification was not required.
Non-detect Results without Elevated Reporting Limits?	Yes	
Package Completeness	Yes	
Other Parameters	N/A	

Table 1: Surrogate Recovery Failures and Resultant Data Qualification

Sample	Surrogate	%R (Limits)	Qualification
PSMW03S	1-Chlorooctane	51.1 (70-130)	As the potential bias was considered to be low, the GRO results for the listed samples were qualified as estimated (J SUR-L).
Rinsate		47.9 (70-130)	
Ned Prather Spring		66.0 (70-130)	
Ned Prather Spring DS-440		49.4 (70-130)	
Spring 2		68.2 (70-130)	
Spring 2 DS-100		48.4 (70-130)	
Method Blank (Associated with all aqueous samples.)		44.8 (70-130)	As this is a quality control sample, data qualification is not required on the basis of surrogate recovery failures.
PSMW03S	1-Chlorooctadecane	47.0 (70-130)	As the potential bias was considered to be low, the DRO results for the listed samples were qualified as estimated (J SUR-L).
Rinsate		52.8 (70-130)	
Ned Prather Spring		66.8 (70-130)	
Ned Prather Spring DS-440		61.0 (70-130)	
Spring 2 DS-100		41.1 (70-130)	
Blank		50.7 (70-130)	As this is a quality control sample, data qualification is not required on the basis of surrogate recovery failures.

%R –Percent Recovery

J – Estimated

SUR- Surrogate recovery failure.

L – Low Bias

PRATHER SPRINGS DATA REVIEW SUMMARY

Data Package Number: Chem Solutions URS-040

Sampling Event: September 5th, 2008Sample-specific Parameter Review? **Yes**Laboratory Performance Parameters? **No**

Data Reviewer: Liz Kraak

Date Completed: 09/08/08

Peer Reviewer: Geoff Webb

Date Completed: 09/09/08

The table below summarizes the results presented in this data package.

Field ID	Sample Type	Matrix	Sampling Date	Analyses		
				VOCs (8260B)	GRO	DRO
PSMW-05D	SA	Water	09/05/08	X	---	---
PSMW07S	SA	Water	09/05/08	X	X	X
PSMW07D	SA	Water	09/05/08	X	---	---
PSMW08S	SA	Water	09/05/08	X	X	X
PSMW08D	SA	Water	09/05/08	X	---	---
PSMW04D	SA	Water	09/05/08	X	---	---
PSMW07S Dup	FD	Water	09/05/08	X	---	---

QC Type: SA - Sample FD – Field Duplicate

Note: Sample PSMW-05D is a “pre-development” sample.

--- Not analyzed for this parameter.

The data review was conducted in accordance with the Data Validation SOP included in Attachment B to the Phase I Site Investigation Work Plan – Prather Spring Investigation dated July 31, 2008.

General Overall Assessment:

- _____ Data are usable without qualification.
 Data are usable with qualification (noted below).
 _____ Data are usable with qualification (noted below).

Case Narrative Summary: Except as noted below, any of the issues noted in the laboratory case narrative potentially affecting data quality are addressed in the appropriate sections in the table below.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
<i>Sample-specific Parameters</i>	Complete with “Yes”, “No”, or “Not Applicable (N/A)”.	For each “No” response, list what was out, associated acceptance limits, all qualified data, and bias direction or reference associated table with pertinent details.
COC & Sample Receipt	Yes	As the samples were delivered to an on-site laboratory, data qualification based on sample receipt was not required. Inadequate sample volume remained to perform GRO and DRO analyses on samples PSMW-05D, PSMW07D, PSMW08D, PSMW04D, and PSMW07S Dup. Further action was not necessary.
Holding Times	Yes	All samples were analyzed within the holding time requirements specified in the Work Plan.
Method Blanks	Yes	Target analytes were not reported as detected within the associated method blanks. Data qualification was not required.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
Matrix QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MS/MSD N/A LD N/A 	NA	The MS/MSD recoveries and RPDs were within laboratory acceptance limits and reported in package Chem Solutions URS-038.
Field QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field Blanks (Ambient, Rinsate, or Trip) None Field Duplicate PSMW07S Dup 	Yes	The field duplicate pair PSMW07S/ PSMW07S Dup met the applicable criteria. Data qualification was not required.
Surrogates	No	With the exceptions summarized in Table 1, all surrogate recoveries were within the laboratory acceptance limits. There were no historical GRO and DRO surrogate recovery acceptance limits for aqueous samples. Therefore, the GRO and DRO method acceptance limits of 70-130% were used to assign qualification.
Laboratory Control Sample (LCS)	Yes	The samples were analyzed at an on-site laboratory and the QA/QC analyses were completed using a limited target analyte list. LCS recoveries were within the laboratory determined acceptance limits. Data qualification was not required.
Continuing Calibration Verification	Yes	All of the applicable initial and continuing calibration verifications were within the acceptance ranges. Data qualification was not required.
Non-detect Results without Elevated Reporting Limits?	Yes	
Package Completeness	Yes	
Other Parameters	Yes	Detected analytes with concentrations between the Instrument Detection Limit (IDL) and the Reporting Limit (RL) were qualified as estimated (J). A qualifier code of "SQL-I" (Sample Quantitation Limit) was assigned to reflect the greater uncertainty in quantitative values below the RL.

Table 1: Surrogate Recovery Failures and Resultant Data Qualification

Sample	Surrogate	Recovery	Qualification
PSMW07S	1-Chlorooctane	56.1 (70-130)	As the potential bias was considered to be low, the GRO results for the listed samples were qualified as estimated (J SUR-L).
PSMW08S		64.4 (70-130)	
Method Blank		48.9 (70-130)	As this is a quality control sample, data qualification is not required on the basis of surrogate recovery failures.
PSMW07S	1-Chlorooctadecane	52.2 (70-130)	As the potential bias was considered to be low, the DRO results for the listed samples were qualified as estimated (J SUR-L).
Method Blank		43.0 (70-130)	As this is a quality control sample, data qualification is not required on the basis of surrogate recovery failures.

J – Estimated SUR – Surrogate Recovery Failure L – Low Bias

PRATHER SPRINGS DATA REVIEW SUMMARY

Data Package Number: Chem Solutions URS-041

Sampling Event: October 15th – 17th, 2008

Sample-specific Parameter Review? **Yes**

Laboratory Performance Parameters? **No**

Data Reviewer: Liz Kraak

Date Completed: 10/27/08

Peer Reviewer: Geoff Webb

Date Completed: 10/28/08

The table below summarizes the results presented in this data package.

Field ID	Sample Type	Matrix	Sampling Date	Analyses	
				VOCs (8260B)	GRO
SGCT-05	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGCT-04	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGCT-03	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGCT-02	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGCT-01	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGFB-01	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGCT-06	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGCT-07	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGCT-08	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGCT-09	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGCT-10	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
AB3	SA	Soil Vapor	10/17/08	X	X
SGNS-1	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-2	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-3	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-4	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-5	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-6	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-7	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-8	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-9	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-10	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-11	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGNS-12	SA	Soil Vapor	10/15/08	X	X
SGST-1	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGST02	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGST03	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGST04	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGST-13	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
SGST-14	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
AB-3 (10-16-08)	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
AB2	SA	Soil Vapor	10/16/08	X	X
Sampling Blank	TB	Soil Vapor	10/15/08	X	X

QC Type: SA - Sample

The data review was conducted in accordance with the Data Validation SOP included in Attachment B to the Phase I Site Investigation Work Plan – Prather Spring Investigation dated July 31, 2008.

General Overall Assessment:

- Data are usable without qualification.
 Data are usable with qualification (noted below).
 Data are usable with qualification (noted below).

Case Narrative Summary: Except as noted below, any of the issues noted in the laboratory case narrative potentially affecting data quality are addressed in the appropriate sections in the table below.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
Sample-specific Parameters	Complete with "Yes", "No", or "Not Applicable (N/A)".	For each "No" response, list what was out, associated acceptance limits, all qualified data, and bias direction or reference associated table with pertinent details.
COC & Sample Receipt	Yes	As the samples were delivered to an on-site laboratory, data qualification based on sample receipt was not required.
Holding Times	Yes	All samples were analyzed within the holding time requirements specified in the Work Plan.
Method Blanks	Yes	Target analytes were not reported as detected within the associated method blanks. Data qualification was not required.
Matrix QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MS/MSD N/A LD N/A 	NA	The MS/MSD recoveries and RPDs were within laboratory acceptance limits and reported in another Chem Solutions package.
Field QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field Blanks (Ambient, Rinsate, or Trip) None Field Duplicate None 	N/A	
Surrogates	Yes	All surrogate recoveries were within the laboratory acceptance limits. There were no historical surrogate recovery acceptance limits for aqueous samples. Therefore, the method acceptance limits of 70-130% were used to assign qualification.
Laboratory Control Sample (LCS)	Yes	The samples were analyzed at an on-site laboratory and the QA/QC analyses were completed using a limited target analyte list. LCS recoveries were within the laboratory determined acceptance limits. Data qualification was not required.
Continuing Calibration Verification	Yes	All of the applicable initial and continuing calibration verifications were within the acceptance ranges. Data qualification was not required. Due to time constraints the method required 5 point initial calibration was completed using only 3 points. The 2 highest calibration points were not used for the calibration curve. As the analytes for the samples were reported as non-detect or at very low levels, data qualification was not considered necessary.
Non-detect Results without Elevated Reporting Limits?	Yes	
Package Completeness	Yes	
Other Parameters	Yes	Detected analytes with concentrations between the Instrument Detection Limit (IDL) and the Reporting Limit (RL) were qualified as estimated (J). A qualifier code of "SQL-I" (Sample Quantitation Limit) was assigned to reflect the greater uncertainty in quantitative values below the RL.

PRATHER SPRINGS DATA REVIEW SUMMARY

Data Package Number: Chem Solutions URS-042

Sampling Event: October 23rd, 2008Sample-specific Parameter Review? **Yes**Laboratory Performance Parameters? **No**

Data Reviewer: Liz Kraak

Date Completed: 10/27/08

Peer Reviewer: Geoff Webb

Date Completed: 10/28/08

The table below summarizes the results presented in this data package.

Field ID	Sample Type	Matrix	Sampling Date	Analyses	
				VOCs (8260B)	GRO
Cistern Side Wall	SA	Water	10/21/08	X	X
PSMW18	SA	Water	10/21/08	X	X
PSMW17	SA	Water	10/21/08	X ^m	X ^m
PSMW26	SA	Water	10/21/08	X	X
PSMW25	SA	Water	10/21/08	X	X
PSMW24	SA	Water	10/21/08	X	X
PSMW23	SA	Water	10/21/08	X	X
PSMW20	SA	Water	10/22/08	X	X
PSMW19	SA	Water	10/22/08	X ^m	X ^m
PSMW16	SA	Water	10/22/08	X	X
PSMW14	SA	Water	10/22/08	X	X
PSMW15	SA	Water	10/22/08	X	X
PSMW21	SA	Water	10/22/08	X	X
PSMW27	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW22	SA	Water	10/22/08	X	X
PSMW28	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW29	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW32	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW30	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW34	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X

QC Type: SA - Sample X^m - Matrix spike and/or matrix spike duplicate.

The data review was conducted in accordance with the Data Validation SOP included in Attachment B to the Phase I Site Investigation Work Plan – Prather Spring Investigation dated July 31, 2008.

General Overall Assessment:

- Data are usable without qualification.
 Data are usable with qualification (noted below).
 Data are usable with qualification (noted below).

Case Narrative Summary: Except as noted below, any of the issues noted in the laboratory case narrative potentially affecting data quality are addressed in the appropriate sections in the table below.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
<i>Sample-specific Parameters</i>	Complete with "Yes", "No", or "Not Applicable (N/A)".	For each "No" response, list what was out, associated acceptance limits, all qualified data, and bias direction or reference associated table with pertinent details.
COC & Sample Receipt	Yes	As the samples were delivered to an on-site laboratory, data qualification based on sample receipt was not required.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
Holding Times	Yes	All samples were analyzed within the holding time requirements specified in the Work Plan.
Method Blanks	Yes	Target analytes were not reported as detected within the associated method blanks. Data qualification was not required.
Matrix QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MS/MSD PSMW17 (VOCs, GRO) PSMW19 (VOCs, GRO) • LD N/A 	Yes	The MS/MSD recoveries and RPDs were within laboratory acceptance limit. Data qualification was not required.
Field QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field Blanks (Ambient, Rinsate, or Trip) None • Field Duplicate None 	N/A	
Surrogates	Yes	All surrogate recoveries were within the laboratory acceptance limits. There were no historical surrogate recovery acceptance limits for aqueous samples. Therefore, the method acceptance limits of 70-130% were used to assign qualification.
Laboratory Control Sample (LCS)	Yes	The samples were analyzed at an on-site laboratory and the QA/QC analyses were completed using a limited target analyte list. LCS recoveries were within the laboratory determined acceptance limits. Data qualification was not required.
Continuing Calibration Verification	Yes	All of the applicable initial and continuing calibration verifications were within the acceptance ranges. Data qualification was not required.
Non-detect Results without Elevated Reporting Limits?	Yes	
Package Completeness	Yes	
Other Parameters	Yes	Detected analytes with concentrations between the Instrument Detection Limit (IDL) and the Reporting Limit (RL) were qualified as estimated (J). A qualifier code of "SQL-I" (Sample Quantitation Limit) was assigned to reflect the greater uncertainty in quantitative values below the RL.

PRATHER SPRINGS DATA REVIEW SUMMARY

Data Package Number: Chem Solutions URS-043

Sampling Event: October 23rd, 2008

Sample-specific Parameter Review? **Yes**

Laboratory Performance Parameters? **No**

Data Reviewer: Liz Kraak

Date Completed: 10/29/08

Peer Reviewer: Geoff Webb

Date Completed: 10/29/08

The table below summarizes the results presented in this data package.

Field ID	Sample Type	Matrix	Sampling Date	Analyses	
				VOCs (8260B)	GRO
PSMW34	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW33	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW32	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW29	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW28	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW31	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW30	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X
PSMW27	SA	Water	10/23/08	X	X

QC Type: SA - Sample

The data review was conducted in accordance with the Data Validation SOP included in Attachment B to the Phase I Site Investigation Work Plan – Prather Spring Investigation dated July 31, 2008.

General Overall Assessment:

- Data are usable without qualification.
- Data are usable with qualification (noted below).
- Data are usable with qualification (noted below).

Case Narrative Summary: Except as noted below, any of the issues noted in the laboratory case narrative potentially affecting data quality are addressed in the appropriate sections in the table below.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
<i>Sample-specific Parameters</i>	Complete with "Yes", "No", or "Not Applicable (N/A)".	For each "No" response, list what was out, associated acceptance limits, all qualified data, and bias direction or reference associated table with pertinent details.
COC & Sample Receipt	Yes	As the samples were delivered to an on-site laboratory, data qualification based on sample receipt was not required.
Holding Times	Yes	All samples were analyzed within the holding time requirements specified in the Work Plan.
Method Blanks	Yes	Target analytes were not reported as detected within the associated method blanks. Data qualification was not required.
Matrix QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MS/MSD N/A • LD N/A 	N/A	The MS/MSD recoveries and RPDs were within laboratory acceptance limits and were presented in data package URS042.

Review Parameter	Criteria Met?	Comments
Field QC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field Blanks (Ambient, Rinsate, or Trip) None • Field Duplicate None 	N/A	
Surrogates	Yes	All surrogate recoveries were within the laboratory acceptance limits. There were no historical surrogate recovery acceptance limits for aqueous samples. Therefore, the method acceptance limits of 70-130% were used to assign qualification.
Laboratory Control Sample (LCS)	Yes	The samples were analyzed at an on-site laboratory and the QA/QC analyses were completed using a limited target analyte list. LCS recoveries were within the laboratory determined acceptance limits. Data qualification was not required.
Continuing Calibration Verification	Yes	All of the applicable initial and continuing calibration verifications were within the acceptance ranges. Data qualification was not required.
Non-detect Results without Elevated Reporting Limits?	Yes	
Package Completeness	Yes	
Other Parameters	Yes	Detected analytes with concentrations between the Instrument Detection Limit (IDL) and the Reporting Limit (RL) were qualified as estimated (J). A qualifier code of "SQL-I" (Sample Quantitation Limit) was assigned to reflect the greater uncertainty in quantitative values below the RL.