

PRATHER SPRINGS DATA REVIEW SUMMARY

Data Package Number: Chem Solutions URS-037

Sampling Event: August 29th, 2008Sample-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.
_____ **X** 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.
 _____ **X** 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 | No target analytes were reported as detected in the rinsate blank. Data qualification was not necessary. |
| Surrogates | No | With the exceptions summarized in Table 1, all surrogate recoveries were within the laboratory acceptance limits. |
| 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 | With the exceptions summarized in Table 2, all of the applicable initial and continuing calibration verifications were within the acceptance ranges. |
| 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 | %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.
- X 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 |
|--|---|---|
| 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 | 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) 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.
 _____ **X** 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, 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 |
| 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 |
|--|---|---|
| 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 | 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. |