LABORATORY DATA CONSULTANTS, INC.
2701 Loker Ave. West, Suite 220, Carlsbad, CA 92010 Bus: 760-827-1100 Fax: 760-827-1099

AECOM
1001 Bishop Street Suite 1600
Honolulu, HI 96813
ATTN: Ms. Alethea Ramos
alethea.ramos@aecom.com

March 4, 2022

SUBJECT: Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126 - Data Validation

Dear Ms. Ramos,

Enclosed is the final validation report for the fraction listed below. This SDG was received on October 27, 2021. Attachment 1 is a summary of the samples that were reviewed for analysis.

LDC Project #52409:

SDG #	Fraction
97378 97642	Volatiles, Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons, Gasoline Range Organics, Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons As Extractables

The data validation was performed under Stage 2B & 4 validation guidelines. The analysis was validated using the following documents and variances, as applicable to method:

- Work Plan/Scope of Work, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor - Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 02, January 2017)
- Sampling and Analysis Plan, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor - Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 01, April 2017)
- Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 01, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, September 2017)
- Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 03, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, June 2018)
- U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Quality Systems Manual (QSM) for Environmental Laboratories, Version 5.3 (2019)
- DoD General Validation Guidelines (November 2019)
- U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Data Validation Guidelines Module 1: Data Validation Procedure for Organic Analysis by GC/MS (May 2020)
- U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Data Validation Guidelines Module 4: Data Validation Procedure for Organic Analysis by GC (March 2021)
- 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; update V, July 2014; update VI, July 2018

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

Sincerely,

Stella Cuenco
Operations Manager/Senior Chemist
scuenco@lab-data.com

188 pages-DL 1 WEEK TAT Attachment 1

90/10 2B/4 EDD **LDC# 52409 (AECOM - Honolulu, HI / Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126)**

LDC	SDG#	DATE REC'D	(2) DATE DUE	BTEX (8260B)		(3)PAHs (8270D -SIM)		GRO (8260B)		TPH-E (8015B)		SGCU TPH-E (8015B)																			
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
A	97378	10/27/21	11/03/21	9	0	5	0	9	0	5	0	5	0																		
B	97642	10/27/21	11/03/21	7	0	4	0	7	0	4	0	4	0																		
B	97642	10/27/21	11/03/21	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0																		
Total	T/SC			18	0	10	0	18	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

Shaded cells indicate Stage 4 validation (all other cells are Stage 2B validation). These sample counts do not include MS/MSD, and DUPs V:\LOGIN\AECOM\Red Hill\52409ST-18F0126-NOI.wpd

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2021

Parameters: Volatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 97378

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
ERH1639	BA39509	Water	09/01/21
ERH1640	BA39510	Water	09/01/21
ERH1641	BA39511	Water	09/01/21
ERH1642	BA39512	Water	09/01/21
ERH1643	BA39513	Water	09/01/21
ERH1644	BA39514	Water	09/01/21
ERH1645	BA39515	Water	09/01/21
ERH1646	BA39516	Water	09/01/21
ERH1647	BA39517	Water	09/01/21

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Work Plan/Scope of Work, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 02, January 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 01, April 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 01, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, September 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 03, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, June 2018), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Quality Systems Manual (QSM) for Environmental Laboratories, Version 5.3 (2019), the DoD General Validation Guidelines (November 2019), and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Data Validation Guidelines Module 1: Data Validation Procedure for Organic Analysis by GC/MS (May 2020). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) which are Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, and Xylenes (BTEX) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8260B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J+ (Estimated, High Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying high bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J- (Estimated, Low Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying low bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J (Estimated, Bias Indeterminate): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation. Bias is indeterminate.

U (Non-detected): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the analyte should be considered non-detected due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The analyte was not detected and the associated numerical value is approximate.

X (Exclusion of data recommended): The sample results (including non-detects) were affected by serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and to meet published method and project quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be substantiated by the data provided. Exclusion of the data is recommended.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

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.

Qualification Code Reference

a ICP Serial Dilution %D was not within control limits.

b Presumed contamination from preparation (method blank).

c Calibration %RSD, r, r^2, %D or %R was noncompliant.

d The analysis with this flag should not be used because another more technically sound analysis is available.

e MS/MSD or Duplicate RPD was high.

f Presumed contamination from FB or ER.

g ICP ICS results were unsatisfactory.

h Holding times were exceeded.

i Internal standard performance was unsatisfactory.

k Estimated Maximum Possible Concentration (HRGC/HRMS only)

l LCS/LCSD %R was not within control limits.

m Result exceeded the calibration range.

o Cooler temperature or temperature blank was noncompliant and/or sample custody problems.

p RPD between two columns was high (GC only).

q MS/MSD recovery was not within control limits.

s Surrogate recovery was not within control limits.

t Presumed contamination from trip blank.

v Unusual problems found with the data not defined elsewhere. Description of the problem can be found in the validation report.

w LCS/LCSD RPD was high.

y Chemical recovery was not within control limits (Radiochemistry only).

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A bromofluorobenzene (BFB) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 15.0% for all analytes.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all analytes were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

The percent differences (%D) of the ending continuing calibration verifications (CCVs) were less than or equal to 50.0% for all analytes.

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

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

Samples ERH1639, ERH1641, ERH1643, and ERH1645 were identified as trip blanks. No contaminants were found.

VII. Surrogates

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

Sample	Surrogate	%R (Limits)	Affected Analyte	Flag	A or P
ERH1639	1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	128 (81-118)	All analytes	NA	-
ERH1640	1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	130 (81-118)	All analytes	NA	-
ERH1641	1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	125 (81-118)	All analytes	NA	-
ERH1642	1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	124 (81-118)	All analytes	NA	-
ERH1643	1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	128 (81-118)	All analytes	NA	-
ERH1644	1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	127 (81-118)	All analytes	NA	-
ERH1645	1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	128 (81-118)	All analytes	NA	-
ERH1646	1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	129 (81-118)	All analytes	NA	-
ERH1647	1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	133 (81-118)	All analytes	NA	-

VIII. 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.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

Samples ERH1640 and ERH1647 were identified as field duplicates. No results were detected in any of the samples.

XI. Internal Standards

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

XII. Target Analyte Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Analyte Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected or recommended for exclusion in this SDG.

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Volatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Volatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Volatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 52409A1a

SDG #: 97378

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/8/21

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: [illegible]

2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS Volatiles (BTEX)(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.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A / A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	%RSD ≤15 ICV ≤20
IV.	Continuing calibration pending	A	CCV ≤20|50
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	ND	TB = 1, 3, 5, 7
VII.	Surrogate spikes	SW	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	es
IX.	Laboratory control samples	A	les 1D
X.	Field duplicates	ND	D = 2, 9
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Target analyte quantitation	N	
XIII.	Target analyte identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

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; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID		Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	ERH1639	TB	BA39509	Water	09/01/21
2	ERH1640	D	BA39510	Water	09/01/21
3	ERH1641	TB	BA39511	Water	09/01/21
4	ERH1642		BA39512	Water	09/01/21
5	ERH1643	TB	BA39513	Water	09/01/21
6	ERH1644		BA39514	Water	09/01/21
7	ERH1645	TB	BA39515	Water	09/01/21
8	ERH1646		BA39516	Water	09/01/21
9	ERH1647	D	BA39517	Water	09/01/21
10					

Notes:

	210904 BM						

LDC #: 52409A1a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Spikes

Reviewer: FT

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

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?

#	Sample ID	Surrogate	%Recovery (Limits)	Qualifications (5)
	1	DCE	128 (81-118)	J+ dil /P all ND
			( )	
	2	↓	130 (↓)	↓
			( )	
	3	↓	125 (↓)	↓
			( )	
	4	↓	124 (↓)	↓
			( )	
	5	↓	128 (↓)	↓
			( )	
	6	↓	127 (↓)	↓
			( )	
	7	↓	128 (↓)	↓
			( )	
	8	↓	129 (↓)	↓
			( )	
	9	↓	133 (↓)	↓
	210904BM	↓	126 (↓)	↓

SMC1 (TOL) = Toluene-d8
SMC2 (BFB) = Bromofluorobenzene
SMC3 (DCE) = 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4
SMC4 (DFM) = Dibromofluoromethane

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2021

Parameters: Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 97378

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
ERH1640	BA39510	Water	09/01/21
ERH1642	BA39512	Water	09/01/21
ERH1644	BA39514	Water	09/01/21
ERH1646	BA39516	Water	09/01/21
ERH1647	BA39517	Water	09/01/21

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Work Plan/Scope of Work, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 02, January 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 01, April 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 01, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, September 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 03, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, June 2018), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Quality Systems Manual (QSM) for Environmental Laboratories, Version 5.3 (2019), the DoD General Validation Guidelines (November 2019), and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Data Validation Guidelines Module 1: Data Validation Procedure for Organic Analysis by GC/MS (May 2020). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) which are 1-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylnaphthalene, and Naphthalene by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270D in Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM) mode

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J+ (Estimated, High Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying high bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J- (Estimated, Low Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying low bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J (Estimated, Bias Indeterminate): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation. Bias is indeterminate.

U (Non-detected): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the analyte should be considered non-detected due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The analyte was not detected and the associated numerical value is approximate.

X (Exclusion of data recommended): The sample results (including non-detects) were affected by serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and to meet published method and project quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be substantiated by the data provided. Exclusion of the data is recommended.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

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.

Qualification Code Reference

a ICP Serial Dilution %D was not within control limits.

b Presumed contamination from preparation (method blank).

c Calibration %RSD, r, r^2, %D or %R was noncompliant.

d The analysis with this flag should not be used because another more technically sound analysis is available.

e MS/MSD or Duplicate RPD was high.

f Presumed contamination from FB or ER.

g ICP ICS results were unsatisfactory.

h Holding times were exceeded.

i Internal standard performance was unsatisfactory.

k Estimated Maximum Possible Concentration (HRGC/HRMS only)

l LCS/LCSD %R was not within control limits.

m Result exceeded the calibration range.

o Cooler temperature or temperature blank was noncompliant and/or sample custody problems.

p RPD between two columns was high (GC only).

q MS/MSD recovery was not within control limits.

s Surrogate recovery was not within control limits.

t Presumed contamination from trip blank.

v Unusual problems found with the data not defined elsewhere. Description of the problem can be found in the validation report.

w LCS/LCSD RPD was high.

y Chemical recovery was not within control limits (Radiochemistry only).

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 15.0% for all analytes.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all analytes were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

The percent differences (%D) of the ending continuing calibration verifications (CCVs) were less than or equal to 50.0% for all analytes.

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

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

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

Sample	Surrogate	%R (Limits)	Affected Analyte	Flag	A or P
ERH1642	Fluoranthene-d10	24 (58-120)	All analytes	J- (all detects)	P

VIII. 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.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

Samples ERH1640 and ERH1647 were identified as field duplicates. No results were detected in any of the samples with the following exceptions:

Analyte	Concentration (ug/L)		RPD (Limits)
	ERH1640	ERH1647	
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.28	0.25	11 (≤50)
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.085	0.064	28 (≤50)

XI. Internal Standards

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

XII. Target Analyte Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Analyte Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected or recommended for exclusion in this SDG.

Due to surrogate %R, data were qualified as estimated in one sample.

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason (Code)
ERH1642	All analytes	J- (all detects)	P	Surrogates (%R) (s)

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 52409A2b
SDG #: 97378
Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/8/21
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: FT
2nd Reviewer: AC

METHOD: GC/MS Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (EPA SW846 Method 8270D-SIM)

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.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A/A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	%D RSD ≤ 15 ICV ≤ 20
IV.	Continuing calibration pending	A	CCV ≤ 20/50
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	SW	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	CS
IX.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS ID
X.	Field duplicates	SW	D = 1, 5
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Target analyte quantitation	N	
XIII.	Target analyte identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

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; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1+	ERH1640 D	BA39510	Water	09/01/21
2+	ERH1642	BA39512	Water	09/01/21
3-	ERH1644	BA39514	Water	09/01/21
4-	ERH1646	BA39516	Water	09/01/21
5+	ERH1647 D	BA39517	Water	09/01/21
6				
7				
8				
9				

Notes:

	210908A						

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	GGGG. C30-Hopane	I1. Methyl methanesulfonate
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	DD. Acenaphthylene	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	J1. Ethyl methanesulfonate
C. 2-Chlorophenol	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	K1. o,o',o''-Triethylphosphorothioate
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	L1. n-Phenylene diamine
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	GG. Acenaphthene	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	KKKK. Atrazine	M1. 1,4-Naphthoquinone
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	N1. N-Nitro-o-toluidine
G. 2-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	MMMM. Caprolactam	O1. 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	JJ. Dibenzofuran	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	P1. Pentachlorobenzene
I. 4-Methylphenol	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	Q1. 4-Aminobiphenyl
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	LL. Diethylphthalate	NNN. Aniline	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	R1. 2-Naphthylamine
K. Hexachloroethane	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	S1. Triphenylene
L. Nitrobenzene	NN. Fluorene	PPP. Benzoic Acid	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	T1. Octachlorostyrene
M. Isophorone	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	U1. Famphur
N. 2-Nitrophenol	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	RRR. Pyridine	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	V1. 1,4-phenylenediamine
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	SSS. Benzidine	UUUU.. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	W1. Methapyrilene
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	X1. Pentachloroethane
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	WWWW.. 2-Picoline	Y1. 3,3'-Dimethylbenzidine
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	TT. Pentachlorophenol	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	XXXX. 3-Methylcholanthrene	Z1. o-Toluidine
S. Naphthalene	UU. Phenanthrene	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	YYYY. a,a-Dimethylphenethylamine	A2. 1-Naphthylamine
T. 4-Chloroaniline	VV. Anthracene	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	ZZZZ. Hexachloropropene	B2. 4-Aminobiphenyl
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	WW. Carbazole	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	A1. N-Nitrosodiethylamine	C2. 4-Nitroquinoline-1-oxide
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	ZZZ. Perylene	B1. N-Nitrosodi-n-butylamine	D2. Hexachloropene
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	YY. Fluoranthene	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	C1. N-Nitrosomethylethylamine	E2. Bis (2-chloro-1-methylethyl) ether
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	ZZ. Pyrene	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	D1. N-Nitrosomorpholine	F2. Bifenthrin
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	E1. N-Nitrosopyrrolidine	G2. Cyfluthrin
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	F1. Phenacetin	H2. Cypermethrin
AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	EEEE. 1,1'-Biphenyl	G1. 2-Acetylaminofluorene	I2. Permethrin (cis/trans)
BB. 2-Nitroaniline	DDD. Chrysene	FFFF. Retene	H1. Pronamide	J2. 5-Nitro-o-toluidine

LDC #: 52409A2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

Surrogate Recovery

Reviewer: FT

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

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

Y (N) N/A Were percent recoveries (%R) for surrogates within QC limits?

Y (N) N/A If 2 or more base neutral or acid surrogates were outside QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?

Y N (N/A) If any %R was less than 10 percent, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?

#	Sample ID	Surrogate	%R (Limits)	Qualifications
	2	YY - d10	54 (58-120)	J-/UJ/P all Det
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	

(NBZ) = Nitrobenzene - d5
(FBP) = 2-Fluorobiphenyl
(TPH) = Terphenyl - d14
(2FP) = 2-Fluorophenol
(TBP) = 2,4,6 -Tribromophenol
(2CP) = 2-Chlorophenol - d4

LDC #: 52409A2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Field Duplicates

Reviewer: FT

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

Y N N/A Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?
Y N N/A Were target compounds identified in the field duplicate pairs?

Compound	Concentration (ug/L)		RPD (≤ 50%)	QUAL
	1	5		
TTT	0.28	0.25	11	
W	0.085 J	0.064 J	28	

Compound	Concentration ( )		RPD (≤ %)	QUAL

Compound	Concentration ( )		RPD (≤ %)	QUAL

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2021

Parameters: Gasoline Range Organics

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 97378

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
ERH1639	BA39509	Water	09/01/21
ERH1640	BA39510	Water	09/01/21
ERH1641	BA39511	Water	09/01/21
ERH1642	BA39512	Water	09/01/21
ERH1643	BA39513	Water	09/01/21
ERH1644	BA39514	Water	09/01/21
ERH1645	BA39515	Water	09/01/21
ERH1646	BA39516	Water	09/01/21
ERH1647	BA39517	Water	09/01/21

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Work Plan/Scope of Work, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 02, January 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 01, April 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 01, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, September 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 03, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, June 2018), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Quality Systems Manual (QSM) for Environmental Laboratories, Version 5.3 (2019), the DoD General Validation Guidelines (November 2019), and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Data Validation Guidelines Module 4: Data Validation Procedure for Organic Analysis by GC (March 2021). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Gasoline Range Organics by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8260B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J+ (Estimated, High Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying high bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J- (Estimated, Low Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying low bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J (Estimated, Bias Indeterminate): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation. Bias is indeterminate.

U (Non-detected): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the analyte should be considered non-detected due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The analyte was not detected and the associated numerical value is approximate.

X (Exclusion of data recommended): The sample results (including non-detects) were affected by serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and to meet published method and project quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be substantiated by the data provided. Exclusion of the data is recommended.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

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.

Qualification Code Reference

a ICP Serial Dilution %D was not within control limits.

b Presumed contamination from preparation (method blank).

c Calibration %RSD, r, r^2, %D or %R was noncompliant.

d The analysis with this flag should not be used because another more technically sound analysis is available.

e MS/MSD or Duplicate RPD was high.

f Presumed contamination from FB or ER.

g ICP ICS results were unsatisfactory.

h Holding times were exceeded.

i Internal standard performance was unsatisfactory.

k Estimated Maximum Possible Concentration (HRGC/HRMS only)

l LCS/LCSD %R was not within control limits.

m Result exceeded the calibration range.

o Cooler temperature or temperature blank was noncompliant and/or sample custody problems.

p RPD between two columns was high (GC only).

q MS/MSD recovery was not within control limits.

s Surrogate recovery was not within control limits.

t Presumed contamination from trip blank.

v Unusual problems found with the data not defined elsewhere. Description of the problem can be found in the validation report.

w LCS/LCSD RPD was high.

y Chemical recovery was not within control limits (Radiochemistry only).

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

A curve fit, based on the initial calibration, was established for quantitation. The coefficient of determination (r^2) was greater than or equal to 0.990.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0%.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

The percent differences (%D) of the ending continuing calibration verifications (CCVs) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

Samples ERH1639, ERH1641, ERH1643, and ERH1645 were identified as trip blanks. No contaminants were found.

VI. Surrogates

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

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

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

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

Samples ERH1640 and ERH1647 were identified as field duplicates. No results were detected in any of the samples.

X. Target Analyte Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Target Analyte Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected or recommended for exclusion in this SDG.

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Gasoline Range Organics - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Gasoline Range Organics - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Gasoline Range Organics - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 52409A7
SDG #: 97378
Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/8/21
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS Gasoline Range Organics (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.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	1st ICV ≤ 20
III.	Initial calibration/ICV beg.	A A	CCV ≤ 20/20
IV.	Continuing calibration / ending	A	↓
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	ND	TB = 1, 3, 5, 7
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	
IX.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS/D
X.	Field duplicates	ND	D = 2, 9
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Target analyte quantitation	N	
XIII.	Target analyte identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

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; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	ERH1639 TB	BA39509	Water	09/01/21
2	ERH1640 D	BA39510	Water	09/01/21
3	ERH1641 TB	BA39511	Water	09/01/21
4	ERH1642	BA39512	Water	09/01/21
5	ERH1643 TB	BA39513	Water	09/01/21
6	ERH1644	BA39514	Water	09/01/21
7	ERH1645 TB	BA39515	Water	09/01/21
8	ERH1646	BA39516	Water	09/01/21
9	ERH1647 D	BA39517	Water	09/01/21
10				

Notes:

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2021

Parameters: Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Extractables

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 97378

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
ERH1640	BA39510	Water	09/01/21
ERH1642	BA39512	Water	09/01/21
ERH1644	BA39514	Water	09/01/21
ERH1646	BA39516	Water	09/01/21
ERH1647	BA39517	Water	09/01/21
ERH1640(SGCU)	BA39510(SGCU)	Water	09/01/21
ERH1642(SGCU)	BA39512(SGCU)	Water	09/01/21
ERH1644(SGCU)	BA39514(SGCU)	Water	09/01/21
ERH1646(SGCU)	BA39516(SGCU)	Water	09/01/21
ERH1647(SGCU)	BA39517(SGCU)	Water	09/01/21

Samples appended with "SGCU" underwent Silica Gel cleanup

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Work Plan/Scope of Work, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 02, January 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 01, April 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 01, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, September 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 03, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, June 2018), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Quality Systems Manual (QSM) for Environmental Laboratories, Version 5.3 (2019), the DoD General Validation Guidelines (November 2019), and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Data Validation Guidelines Module 4: Data Validation Procedure for Organic Analysis by GC (March 2021). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) as Extractables by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8015B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J+ (Estimated, High Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying high bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J- (Estimated, Low Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying low bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J (Estimated, Bias Indeterminate): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation. Bias is indeterminate.

U (Non-detected): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the analyte should be considered non-detected due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The analyte was not detected and the associated numerical value is approximate.

X (Exclusion of data recommended): The sample results (including non-detects) were affected by serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and to meet published method and project quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be substantiated by the data provided. Exclusion of the data is recommended.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

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.

Qualification Code Reference

a ICP Serial Dilution %D was not within control limits.

b Presumed contamination from preparation (method blank).

c Calibration %RSD, r, r^2, %D or %R was noncompliant.

d The analysis with this flag should not be used because another more technically sound analysis is available.

e MS/MSD or Duplicate RPD was high.

f Presumed contamination from FB or ER.

g ICP ICS results were unsatisfactory.

h Holding times were exceeded.

i Internal standard performance was unsatisfactory.

k Estimated Maximum Possible Concentration (HRGC/HRMS only)

l LCS/LCSD %R was not within control limits.

m Result exceeded the calibration range.

o Cooler temperature or temperature blank was noncompliant and/or sample custody problems.

p RPD between two columns was high (GC only).

q MS/MSD recovery was not within control limits.

s Surrogate recovery was not within control limits.

t Presumed contamination from trip blank.

v Unusual problems found with the data not defined elsewhere. Description of the problem can be found in the validation report.

w LCS/LCSD RPD was high.

y Chemical recovery was not within control limits (Radiochemistry only).

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

For analytes where average calibration factors were utilized, percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

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

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

The percent differences (%D) of the ending continuing calibration verifications (CCVs) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Surrogates

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

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

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

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

LCS ID (Associated Samples)	Analyte	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	Flag	A or P
210908A-LCS/LCSD (ERH1640 ERH1642 ERH1644 ERH1646 ERH1647)	Oil (C24-C40)	-	118 (41-113)	J+ (all detects)	P
210908A1-LCS/LCSD (ERH1640(SGCU) ERH1647(SGCU))	Oil (C24-C40)	120 (41-113)	126 (41-113)	NA	-
210908A1-LCS/LCSD (ERH1642(SGCU) ERH1644(SGCU) ERH1646(SGCU))	Oil (C24-C40)	120 (41-113)	126 (41-113)	J+ (all detects)	P

Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

Samples ERH1640 and ERH1647and samples ERH1640(SGCU) and ERH1647(SGCU) were identified as field duplicates. No results were detected in any of the samples with the following exceptions:

Analyte	Concentration (ug/L)		RPD (Limits)	Flag	A or P
	ERH1640	ERH1647			
Diesel (C10-C24)	240	250	4 (≤50)	-	-
Oil (C24-C40)	160	220	32 (≤50)	-	-

X. Target Analyte Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Target Analyte Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected or recommended for exclusion in this SDG.

Due to LCS/LCSD %R, data were qualified as estimated in eight samples.

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Extractables - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason (Code)
ERH1640 ERH1642 ERH1644 ERH1646 ERH1647	Oil (C24-C40)	J+ (all detects)	P	Laboratory control samples (%R) (l)
ERH1642(SGCU) ERH1644(SGCU) ERH1646(SGCU)	Oil (C24-C40)	J+ (all detects)	P	Laboratory control samples (%R) (l)

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Extractables - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Extractables - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97378

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 52409A8
SDG #: 97378
Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/8/21
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: EJ
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC TPH as Extractables (EPA SW 846 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.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A / A	
II.	Initial calibration/ICV	A / A	0/0 RSD ≤ 20, r² ICV ≤ 20
III.	Continuing calibration	pending	A CCV ≤ 20/20
IV.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
V.	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	OS
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	SW	LCS/D
IX.	Field duplicates	SW	D = 1, 5 * 6, 10
X.	Target analyte quantitation	N	
XI.	Target analyte identification	N	
XII.	Overall assessment of data	A	

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; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID		Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	ERH1640	D	BA39510	Water	09/01/21
2	ERH1642		BA39512	Water	09/01/21
3	ERH1644		BA39514	Water	09/01/21
4	ERH1646		BA39516	Water	09/01/21
5	ERH1647	D	BA39517	Water	09/01/21
6	ERH1640(SGCU)	D1	BA39510(SGCU)	Water	09/01/21
7	ERH1642(SGCU)		BA39512(SGCU)	Water	09/01/21
8	ERH1644(SGCU)		BA39514(SGCU)	Water	09/01/21
9	ERH1646(SGCU)		BA39516(SGCU)	Water	09/01/21
10	ERH1647(SGCU)	D1	BA39517(SGCU)	Water	09/01/21
11					
12					
13					

Notes:

1	210908A-BLK						
2	210908A1-BLK2						

LDC #: 52409 A8

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

Reviewer: FT

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?

(1)

#	LCS/LCSD ID	Compound	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	210908A	Oil (C24-C40)	( )	118 (41-113)	( )	1 → 5	J+ dil lP
	LCSID		( )	( )	( )	210908A-BLK	All Det
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
	210908A1	↓	120 (41-113)	126 (41-113)	( )	6 → 10,	J+ dil lP
	LCSID		( )	( )	( )	210908A1-	7, 8, 9, (Det)
			( )	( )	( )	BLK	
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 52409AX

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Field Duplicates

Reviewer: FT

METHOD: GC (EPA Method 8015B

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

Compound	Concentration (ug/L)		RPD (≤ 50%)	QUAL
	1	5		
Diesel (C_{10}-C_{24})	240 J	250J	4	
Oil (C_{24}-C_{40})	160 J	220J	32	

Compound	Concentration ( )		RPD (≤ %)	QUAL

Compound	Concentration ( )		RPD (≤ %)	QUAL

Compound	Concentration ( )		RPD (≤ %)	QUAL

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2021

Parameters: Volatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B & 4

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 97642

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
ERH1670	BA41498	Water	09/22/21
ERH1671	BA41499	Water	09/22/21
ERH1672	BA41500	Water	09/22/21
ERH1673**	BA41501**	Water	09/22/21
ERH1674	BA41502	Water	09/22/21
ERH1675**	BA41503**	Water	09/22/21
ERH1676	BA41504	Water	09/22/21
ERH1677	BA41505	Water	09/22/21
ERH1678	BA41506	Water	09/22/21

**Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 validation

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Work Plan/Scope of Work, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 02, January 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 01, April 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 01, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, September 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 03, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, June 2018), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Quality Systems Manual (QSM) for Environmental Laboratories, Version 5.3 (2019), the DoD General Validation Guidelines (November 2019), and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Data Validation Guidelines Module 1: Data Validation Procedure for Organic Analysis by GC/MS (May 2020). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) which are Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylenes (BTEX) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8260B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results. Samples appended with a double asterisk on the cover page were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the QC summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J+ (Estimated, High Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying high bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J- (Estimated, Low Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying low bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J (Estimated, Bias Indeterminate): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation. Bias is indeterminate.

U (Non-detected): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the analyte should be considered non-detected due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The analyte was not detected and the associated numerical value is approximate.

X (Exclusion of data recommended): The sample results (including non-detects) were affected by serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and to meet published method and project quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be substantiated by the data provided. Exclusion of the data is recommended.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

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.

Qualification Code Reference

a ICP Serial Dilution %D was not within control limits.

b Presumed contamination from preparation (method blank).

c Calibration %RSD, r, r^2, %D or %R was noncompliant.

d The analysis with this flag should not be used because another more technically sound analysis is available.

e MS/MSD or Duplicate RPD was high.

f Presumed contamination from FB or ER.

g ICP ICS results were unsatisfactory.

h Holding times were exceeded.

i Internal standard performance was unsatisfactory.

k Estimated Maximum Possible Concentration (HRGC/HRMS only)

l LCS/LCSD %R was not within control limits.

m Result exceeded the calibration range.

o Cooler temperature or temperature blank was noncompliant and/or sample custody problems.

p RPD between two columns was high (GC only).

q MS/MSD recovery was not within control limits.

s Surrogate recovery was not within control limits.

t Presumed contamination from trip blank.

v Unusual problems found with the data not defined elsewhere. Description of the problem can be found in the validation report.

w LCS/LCSD RPD was high.

y Chemical recovery was not within control limits (Radiochemistry only).

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A bromofluorobenzene (BFB) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 15.0% for all analytes.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all analytes were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all other analytes.

The percent differences (%D) of the ending continuing calibration verifications (CCVs) were less than or equal to 50.0% for all analytes.

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

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

Samples ERH1670, ERH1672, ERH1674, and ERH1676 were identified as trip blanks. No contaminants were found.

VII. Surrogates

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

VIII. 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.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

Samples ERH1671 and ERH1678 were identified as field duplicates. No results were detected in any of the samples.

XI. Internal Standards

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

XII. Target Analyte Quantitation

All target analyte quantitations met validation criteria for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Analyte Identifications

All target analyte identifications met validation criteria for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected or recommended for exclusion in this SDG.

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Volatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Volatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Volatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 52409B1a

SDG #: 97642

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B/4

Date: 11/8/21

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer:

2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC/MS Volatiles (BTEX)(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.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A / A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	%D RSD ≤ 15 ICV ≤ 20
IV.	Continuing calibration	pending A	CCV ≤ 20|20
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	ND	TB = 1, 3, 5, 7
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	MS
IX.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS ID
X.	Field duplicates	ND	D = 2, 9
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Target analyte quantitation	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XIII.	Target analyte identification	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XIV.	System performance	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

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; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

** Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 validation

	Client ID		Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	ERH1670	TB	BA41498	Water	09/22/21
2	ERH1671	D	BA41499	Water	09/22/21
3	ERH1672	TB	BA41500	Water	09/22/21
4	ERH1673**		BA41501**	Water	09/22/21
5	ERH1674	TB	BA41502	Water	09/22/21
6	ERH1675**		BA41503**	Water	09/22/21
7	ERH1676	TB	BA41504	Water	09/22/21
8	ERH1677		BA41505	Water	09/22/21
9	ERH1678	D	BA41506	Water	09/22/21
10					

Notes: No traceability NP/AR

	210928BL						

LDC #: 52409B1a

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: FM

Method: Volatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8260 B)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?	✓			
Was cooler temperature criteria 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?	✓			
IIIa. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 15% and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of ≥ 0.990?			✓	
IIIb. Initial Calibration Verification				
Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each initial calibration for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20%?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20% and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria? Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 50% in the ending CCV?	✓			
V. Laboratory Blanks				
Was a laboratory blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a laboratory blank analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Was there contamination in the laboratory blanks?		✓		
VI. Field blanks				
Were field blanks were identified in this SDG?	✓			
Were target analytes detected in the field blanks?		✓		
VII. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate percent recovery (%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?			✓	
VIII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed in this SDG?			✓	
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?			✓	

IX. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed per analytical batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			
X. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?	✓			
Were target analytes detected in the field duplicates?		✓		
XI. Internal standards				
Were internal standard area counts within -50% to +100% of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
Were retention times within ± 30 seconds of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
XII. Target analyte quantitation				
Did the laboratory LOQs/RLs meet the QAPP LOQs/RLs?	✓			
Were the correct internal standard (IS), quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the target analyte?	✓			
Were target analyte quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
Were manual integrations reviewed and found acceptable?	✓			
Did the laboratory provide before and after integration printouts?			✓	
XIII. Target analyte identification				
Were relative retention times (RRT's) within ± 0.06 RRT units of the standard?	✓			
Did analyte spectra meet specified EPA "Functional Guidelines" criteria?	✓			
Were chromatogram peaks verified and accounted for?	✓			
XIV. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XV. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			

TARGET COMPOUND WORKSHEET

METHOD: VOA

A. Chloromethane	AA. Tetrachloroethene	AAA. 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	AAAA. Ethyl tert-butyl ether	A1. 1,3-Butadiene
B. Bromomethane	BB. 1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	BBB. 4-Chlorotoluene	BBBB. tert-Amyl methyl ether	B1. Hexane
C. Vinyl choride	CC. Toluene	CCC. tert-Butylbenzene	CCCC. 1-Chlorohexane	C1. Heptane
D. Chloroethane	DD. Chlorobenzene	DDD. 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	DDDD. Isopropyl alcohol	D1. Propylene
E. Methylene chloride	EE. Ethylbenzene	EEE. sec-Butylbenzene	EEEE. Acetonitrile	E1. Freon 11
F. Acetone	FF. Styrene	FFF. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	FFFF. Acrolein	F1. Freon 12
G. Carbon disulfide	GG. Xylenes, total	GGG. p-Isopropyltoluene	GGGG. Acrylonitrile	G1. Freon 113
H. 1,1-Dichloroethene	HH. Vinyl acetate	HHH. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	HHHH. 1,4-Dioxane	H1. Freon 114
I. 1,1-Dichloroethane	II. 2-Chloroethylvinyl ether	III. n-Butylbenzene	IIII. Isobutyl alcohol	I1. 2-Nitropropane
J. 1,2-Dichloroethene, total	JJ. Dichlorodifluoromethane	JJJ. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	JJJJ. Methacrylonitrile	J1. Dimethyl disulfide
K. Chloroform	KK. Trichlorofluoromethane	KKK. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	KKKK. Propionitrile	K1. 2,3-Dimethyl pentane
L. 1,2-Dichloroethane	LL. Methyl-tert-butyl ether	LLL. Hexachlorobutadiene	LLLL. Ethyl ether	L1. 2,4-Dimethyl pentane
M. 2-Butanone	MM. 1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane	MMM. Naphthalene	MMMM. Benzyl chloride	M1. 3,3-Dimethyl pentane
N. 1,1,1-Trichloroethane	NN. Methyl ethyl ketone	NNN. 1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	NNNN. Iodomethane	N1. 2-Methylpentane
O. Carbon tetrachloride	OO. 2,2-Dichloropropane	OOO. 1,3,5-Trichlorobenzene	OOOO.1,1-Difluoroethane	O1. 3-Methylpentane
P. Bromodichloromethane	PP. Bromochloromethane	PPP. trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	PPPP. Tetrahydrofuran	P1. 3-Ethylpentane
Q. 1,2-Dichloropropane	QQ. 1,1-Dichloropropene	QQQ. cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	QQQQ. Methyl acetate	Q1. 2,2-Dimethylpentane
R. cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	RR. Dibromomethane	RRR. m,p-Xylenes	RRRR. Ethyl acetate	R1. 2,2,3- Trimethylbutane
S. Trichloroethene	SS. 1,3-Dichloropropane	SSS. o-Xylene	SSSS. Cyclohexane	S1. 2,2,4-Trimethylpentane
T. Dibromochloromethane	TT. 1,2-Dibromoethane	TTT. 1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	TTTT. Methyl cyclohexane	T1. 2-Methylhexane
U. 1,1,2-Trichloroethane	UU. 1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	UUU. 1,2-Dichlorotetrafluoroethane	UUUU. Allyl chloride	U1. Nonanal
V. Benzene	VV. Isopropylbenzene	VVV. 4-Ethyltoluene	VVVV. Methyl methacrylate	V1. 2-Methylnaphthalene
W. trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	WW. Bromobenzene	WWW. Ethanol	WWWW. Ethyl methacrylate	W1. Methanol
X. Bromoform	XX. 1,2,3-Trichloropropane	XXX. Di-isopropyl ether	XXXX. cis-1,4-Dichloro-2-butene	X1. 1,2,3-Trimethylbenzene
Y. 4-Methyl-2-pentanone	YY. n-Propylbenzene	YYY. tert-Butanol	YYYY. trans-1,4-Dichloro-2-butene	Y1. 2-Propanol
Z. 2-Hexanone	ZZ. 2-Chlorotoluene	ZZZ. tert-Butyl alcohol	ZZZZ. Pentachloroethane	Z1.

LDC #: 52409B1a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

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

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 16

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

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Reported RRF (5.0 std)	Recalc RRF (5.0 std)	Reported Average RRF (initial)	Recalc Average RRF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalc %RSD
1	ICAL Loki	9/24/21	V (1st internal standard)	0.4313	0.4313	0.4275	0.4275	3.6	3.6
			EE (2nd internal standard)	0.3828	0.3828	0.3733	0.3733	5.6	5.6
			(3rd internal standard)						
			(4th internal standard)						
2			(1st internal standard)						
			(2nd internal standard)						
			(3rd internal standard)						
			(4th internal standard)						
3			(1st internal standard)						
			(2nd internal standard)						
			(3rd internal standard)						
			(4th internal standard)						
4			(1st internal standard)						
			(2nd internal standard)						
			(3rd internal standard)						
			(4th internal standard)						

LDC #: 52409B1a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

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

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	ccv 0928L30 L46	9/29/2 3:02	V (1st internal standard)	0.4275	0.4268	0.4268	0.16	0.16
			EE (2nd internal standard)	0.3733	0.3713	0.3713	0.53	0.53
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
2			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
3			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
4			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th 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 #: 52409B1a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: FT

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

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: 4

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Dibromofluoromethane	25.0	26.16	105	105	0
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	↓	24.60	98.4	98.4	↓
Toluene-d8	↓	25.41	102	102	↓
Bromofluorobenzene	↓	24.45	97.8	97.8	↓

Sample ID:

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

Sample ID:

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

Sample ID:

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

Sample ID:

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

LDC #: 52409B1a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Sample Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

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

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 LCSC - LCSDC I * 2/(LCSC + LCSDC) LCSC = Laboraotry control sample concentration LCSDC = Laboratory control sample duplicate concentration

LCS ID: 210928BL LCSID

Compound	Spike Added (ug/L)		Spiked Sample Concentration (ug/L)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalculated
1,1-Dichloroethene										
Trichloroethene										
Benzene	10.0	10.0	10.4	10.4	104	104	104	104	0.0	0
Toluene	↓	↓	11.0	11.0	111	111	110	110	0.90	.9V
Chlorobenzene										

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 #: 52409B1a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

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

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)
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. #4, EE:

Conc. = $\frac{(1745)(25)}{(428049)(0.3733)}$

= 0.2730 ug/L

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration (ug/L)	Calculated Concentration (ug/L)	Qualification
	#4	EE	0.27	0.2730	

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2021

Parameters: Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons

Validation Level: Stage 2B & 4

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 97642

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
ERH1671	BA41499	Water	09/22/21
ERH1673**	BA41501**	Water	09/22/21
ERH1675	BA41503	Water	09/22/21
ERH1677	BA41505	Water	09/22/21
ERH1678	BA41506	Water	09/22/21

**Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 validation

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Work Plan/Scope of Work, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 02, January 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 01, April 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 01, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, September 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 03, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, June 2018), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Quality Systems Manual (QSM) for Environmental Laboratories, Version 5.3 (2019), the DoD General Validation Guidelines (November 2019), and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Data Validation Guidelines Module 1: Data Validation Procedure for Organic Analysis by GC/MS (May 2020). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) which are 1-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylnaphthalene, and Naphthalene by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270D in Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM) mode

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results. Samples appended with a double asterisk on the cover page were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the QC summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J+ (Estimated, High Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying high bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J- (Estimated, Low Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying low bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J (Estimated, Bias Indeterminate): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation. Bias is indeterminate.

U (Non-detected): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the analyte should be considered non-detected due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The analyte was not detected and the associated numerical value is approximate.

X (Exclusion of data recommended): The sample results (including non-detects) were affected by serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and to meet published method and project quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be substantiated by the data provided. Exclusion of the data is recommended.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

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.

Qualification Code Reference

a ICP Serial Dilution %D was not within control limits.

b Presumed contamination from preparation (method blank).

c Calibration %RSD, r, r^2, %D or %R was noncompliant.

d The analysis with this flag should not be used because another more technically sound analysis is available.

e MS/MSD or Duplicate RPD was high.

f Presumed contamination from FB or ER.

g ICP ICS results were unsatisfactory.

h Holding times were exceeded.

i Internal standard performance was unsatisfactory.

k Estimated Maximum Possible Concentration (HRGC/HRMS only)

l LCS/LCSD %R was not within control limits.

m Result exceeded the calibration range.

o Cooler temperature or temperature blank was noncompliant and/or sample custody problems.

p RPD between two columns was high (GC only).

q MS/MSD recovery was not within control limits.

s Surrogate recovery was not within control limits.

t Presumed contamination from trip blank.

v Unusual problems found with the data not defined elsewhere. Description of the problem can be found in the validation report.

w LCS/LCSD RPD was high.

y Chemical recovery was not within control limits (Radiochemistry only).

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 15.0% for all analytes.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all analytes were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

The percent differences (%D) of the ending continuing calibration verifications (CCVs) were less than or equal to 50.0% for all analytes.

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

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

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

Sample	Surrogate	%R (Limits)	Affected Analyte	Flag	A or P
ERH1673**	Fluoranthene	53.1 (58-120)	All analytes	J- (all detects)	P

VIII. 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.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

Samples ERH1671 and ERH1678 were identified as field duplicates. No results were detected in any of the samples with the following exceptions:

Analyte	Concentration (ug/L)		RPD (Limits)
	ERH1671	ERH1678	
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.10U	0.10	0 (≤50)

XI. Internal Standards

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

XII. Target Analyte Quantitation

All target analyte quantitations met validation criteria for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Analyte Identification

All target analyte identifications met validation criteria for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected or recommended for exclusion in this SDG.

Due to surrogate %R, data were qualified as estimated in one sample.

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason
ERH1673**	All analytes	J- (all detects)	P	Surrogates (%R) (s)

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 52409B2b

SDG #: 97642

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B/4

Date: 11/8/21

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: EM

2nd Reviewer: MC

METHOD: GC/MS Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D-SIM)

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.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A /A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A /A	%D RSD ≤ 15 ICV ≤ 20
IV.	Continuing calibration pending	A	CCV ≤ 20/20
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	SW	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	CS
IX.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS ID
X.	Field duplicates SW	~~ND~~	D = 1,5
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Target analyte quantitation	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XIII.	Target analyte identification	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XIV.	System performance	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

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; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

** Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 validation

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	ERH1671 N	BA41499	Water	09/22/21
2	ERH1673**	BA41501**	Water	09/22/21
3	ERH1675	BA41503	Water	09/22/21
4	ERH1677	BA41505	Water	09/22/21
5	ERH1678 D	BA41506	Water	09/22/21
6				
7				
8				
9				

Notes:

	210927A						

LDC #: 52409B26 **VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST** Page: 1 of 2
Reviewer: FT

Method: Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270 D) SIM

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?	✓			
Was cooler temperature criteria met?	✓			
II. GC/MS Instrument performance check (Not required)				
Were the DFTPP performance results reviewed and found to be within the specified criteria?	✓			
Were all samples analyzed within the 12 hour clock criteria?	✓			
IIIa. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 15% and relative response factors (RRF) > 0.05?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of ≥ 0.990?			✓	
IIIb. Initial Calibration Verification				
Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each initial calibration for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤20%?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20% and relative response factors (RRF) ≥ 0.05?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 50% for closing calibration verifications?	✓			
V. Laboratory Blanks				
Was a laboratory blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a laboratory blank analyzed for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Was there contamination in the laboratory blanks?		✓		
VI. Field blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field blanks?			✓	
VII. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate percent differences (%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 percent recoveries (%R) was less than 10 percent, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?			✓	
VIII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed in this SDG?			✓	

Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?			✓	
IX. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			
X. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?	✓			
Were target compounds detected in the field duplicates?	✓			
XI. Internal standards				
Were internal standard area counts within -50% or +100% of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
Were retention times within ± 10 seconds of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
XII. Compound quantitation				
Did the laboratory LOQs/RLs meet the QAPP LOQs/RLs?	✓			
Were the correct internal standard (IS), quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?	✓			
Were compound quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
Did compound quantitation limits meet QAPP limits?	✓			
XIII. 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?	✓			
XIV. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XV. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			

No Manual Integration

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	GGGG. C30-Hopane	I1. Methyl methanesulfonate
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	DD. Acenaphthylene	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	J1. Ethyl methanesulfonate
C. 2-Chlorophenol	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	K1. o,o',o''-Triethylphosphorothioate
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	L1. n-Phenylene diamine
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	GG. Acenaphthene	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	KKKK. Atrazine	M1. 1,4-Naphthoquinone
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	N1. N-Nitro-o-toluidine
G. 2-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	MMMM. Caprolactam	O1. 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	JJ. Dibenzofuran	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	P1. Pentachlorobenzene
I. 4-Methylphenol	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	Q1. 4-Aminobiphenyl
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	LL. Diethylphthalate	NNN. Aniline	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	R1. 2-Naphthylamine
K. Hexachloroethane	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	S1. Triphenylene
L. Nitrobenzene	NN. Fluorene	PPP. Benzoic Acid	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	T1. Octachlorostyrene
M. Isophorone	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	U1. Famphur
N. 2-Nitrophenol	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	RRR. Pyridine	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	V1. 1,4-phenylenediamine
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	SSS. Benzidine	UUUU.. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	W1. Methapyrilene
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	X1. Pentachloroethane
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	WWWW.. 2-Picoline	Y1. 3,3'-Dimethylbenzidine
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	TT. Pentachlorophenol	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	XXXX. 3-Methylcholanthrene	Z1. o-Toluidine
S. Naphthalene	UU. Phenanthrene	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	YYYY. a,a-Dimethylphenethylamine	A2. 1-Naphthylamine
T. 4-Chloroaniline	VV. Anthracene	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	ZZZZ. Hexachloropropene	B2. 4-Aminobiphenyl
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	WW. Carbazole	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	A1. N-Nitrosodiethylamine	C2. 4-Nitroquinoline-1-oxide
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	ZZZ. Perylene	B1. N-Nitrosodi-n-butylamine	D2. Hexachloropene
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	YY. Fluoranthene	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	C1. N-Nitrosomethylethylamine	E2. Bis (2-chloro-1-methylethyl) ether
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	ZZ. Pyrene	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	D1. N-Nitrosomorpholine	F2. Bifenthrin
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	E1. N-Nitrosopyrrolidine	G2. Cyfluthrin
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	F1. Phenacetin	H2. Cypermethrin
AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	EEEE. 1,1'-Biphenyl	G1. 2-Acetylaminofluorene	I2. Permethrin (cis/trans)
BB. 2-Nitroaniline	DDD. Chrysene	FFFF. Retene	H1. Pronamide	J2. 5-Nitro-o-toluidine

LDC #: 52409B2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Recovery

Reviewer: FT

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

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

Y (N) N/A Were percent recoveries (%R) for surrogates within QC limits?

Y (N) N/A If 2 or more base neutral or acid surrogates were outside QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?

Y N (N/A) If any %R was less than 10 percent, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?

(S)

#	Sample ID	Surrogate	%R (Limits)	Qualifications
	2	YY	53.1 (58-120)	J-/UJ/P all Det
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	
			( )	

(NBZ) = Nitrobenzene - d5
(FBP) = 2-Fluorobiphenyl
(TPH) = Terphenyl - d14
(2FP) = 2-Fluorophenol
(TBP) = 2,4,6 -Tribromophenol
(2CP) = 2-Chlorophenol - d4

LDC #: 52409B26

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Field Duplicates

Reviewer: FT

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

Y N N/A Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?
Y N N/A Were target compounds identified in the field duplicate pairs?

Compound	Concentration (ug/L)		RPD (≤ 50 %)	QUAL
	1	5		
TTT	0.104	0.108	200	

Compound	Concentration ( )		RPD (≤ %)	QUAL

Compound	Concentration ( )		RPD (≤ %)	QUAL

LDC #: 52409B2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270 D)
The Relative Response Factor (RRF), average RRF, and percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculations:

RRF = $(A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$
average RRF = sum of the RRFs/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

A_x = Area of compound,
C_x = Concentration of compound,
S = Standard deviation of the RRFs,

A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard
X = Mean of the RRFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Internal Standard)	Reported RRF (1.0 std)	Recalculated RRF (1.0 std)	Reported Average RRF (initial)	Recalculated Average RRF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL Linus	9/14/21	S (1st IS)	1.297	1.297	1.279	1.279	6.5	6.5
			(2nd IS)						
			(3rd IS)						
			(4th IS)						
			(5th IS)						
			(6th IS)						
2			(1st IS)						
			(2nd IS)						
			(3rd IS)						
			(4th IS)						
			(5th IS)						
			(6th IS)						
3			(1st IS)						
			(2nd IS)						
			(3rd IS)						
			(4th IS)						
			(5th IS)						
			(6th IS)						

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 #: 52409 B2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270 P)
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 (Internal Standard)	Average RRF (Initial)	Reported RRF (CC)	Recalculated RRF (CC)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	CCV 0914L278	10/1/21	S (1st IS)	1.279	1.309	1.309	2.3	2.3
			(2nd IS)					
			(3rd IS)					
			(4th IS)					
			(5th IS)					
			(6th IS)					
2			(1st IS)					
			(2nd IS)					
			(3rd IS)					
			(4th IS)					
			(5th IS)					
			(6th IS)					
3			(1st IS)					
			(2nd IS)					
			(3rd IS)					
			(4th IS)					
			(5th IS)					
			(6th IS)					

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 #: 52409 B2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

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

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 W-d10	4.854	4.03407	83.1	83.1	0
2-Fluorobiphenyl Y4-d10	↓	2.57609	53.1	53.1	0
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					

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 #: 52409B2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

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

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 = | LCSC - LCSDC | * 2/(LCSC + LCSDC) LCSC = Laboratory control sample concentration LCSDC = Laboratory control sample duplicate concentration

LCS/LCSD samples: 210927A LCS ID

Compound	Spike Added (ug/L)		Spike Concentration (ug/L)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalculated
Phenol										
N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine										
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol										
Acenaphthene										
Pentachlorophenol										
Pyrene										
S	5.0	5.0	3.33	3.66	66.6	66.6	73.2	73.2	9.4	9.4

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 #: 52409B2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Reviewer: FT

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

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. #2 , S

Conc. = $\frac{815204\ (2.5)\ (1)\ (1000)}{31262\ (1.279)\ (1030)}$

= 49.48 ug/L

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration (ug/L)	Calculated Concentration (ug/L)	Qualification
	#2	S	49	49.48	

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2021

Parameters: Gasoline Range Organics

Validation Level: Stage 2B & 4

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 97642

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
ERH1670	BA41498	Water	09/22/21
ERH1671	BA41499	Water	09/22/21
ERH1672	BA41500	Water	09/22/21
ERH1673**	BA41501**	Water	09/22/21
ERH1674	BA41502	Water	09/22/21
ERH1675**	BA41503**	Water	09/22/21
ERH1676	BA41504	Water	09/22/21
ERH1677	BA41505	Water	09/22/21
ERH1678	BA41506	Water	09/22/21

**Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 validation

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Work Plan/Scope of Work, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 02, January 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 01, April 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 01, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, September 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 03, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, June 2018), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Quality Systems Manual (QSM) for Environmental Laboratories, Version 5.3 (2019), the DoD General Validation Guidelines (November 2019), and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Data Validation Guidelines Module 4: Data Validation Procedure for Organic Analysis by GC (March 2021). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Gasoline Range Organics by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8260B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results. Samples appended with a double asterisk on the cover page were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the QC summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J+ (Estimated, High Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying high bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J- (Estimated, Low Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying low bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J (Estimated, Bias Indeterminate): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation. Bias is indeterminate.

U (Non-detected): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the analyte should be considered non-detected due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The analyte was not detected and the associated numerical value is approximate.

X (Exclusion of data recommended): The sample results (including non-detects) were affected by serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and to meet published method and project quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be substantiated by the data provided. Exclusion of the data is recommended.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

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.

Qualification Code Reference

a ICP Serial Dilution %D was not within control limits.

b Presumed contamination from preparation (method blank).

c Calibration %RSD, r, r^2, %D or %R was noncompliant.

d The analysis with this flag should not be used because another more technically sound analysis is available.

e MS/MSD or Duplicate RPD was high.

f Presumed contamination from FB or ER.

g ICP ICS results were unsatisfactory.

h Holding times were exceeded.

i Internal standard performance was unsatisfactory.

k Estimated Maximum Possible Concentration (HRGC/HRMS only)

l LCS/LCSD %R was not within control limits.

m Result exceeded the calibration range.

o Cooler temperature or temperature blank was noncompliant and/or sample custody problems.

p RPD between two columns was high (GC only).

q MS/MSD recovery was not within control limits.

s Surrogate recovery was not within control limits.

t Presumed contamination from trip blank.

v Unusual problems found with the data not defined elsewhere. Description of the problem can be found in the validation report.

w LCS/LCSD RPD was high.

y Chemical recovery was not within control limits (Radiochemistry only).

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

A curve fit, based on the initial calibration, was established for quantitation. The coefficient of determination (r^2) was greater than or equal to 0.990.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0%.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

The percent differences (%D) of the ending continuing calibration verifications (CCVs) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

Samples ERH1670, ERH1672, ERH1674, and ERH1676 were identified as trip blanks. No contaminants were found.

VI. Surrogates

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

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

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

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

Samples ERH1671 and ERH1678 were identified as field duplicates. No results were detected in any of the samples.

X. Target Analyte Quantitation

All target analyte quantitations met validation criteria for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Target Analyte Identification

All target analyte identifications met validation criteria for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected or recommended for exclusion in this SDG.

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Gasoline Range Organics - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Gasoline Range Organics - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Gasoline Range Organics - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 52409B7

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B/4

Date: 11/28/21

SDG #: 97642

Page: 1 of 1

Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

Reviewer: EJ

2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS Gasoline Range Organics (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.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A/A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	r² ICV ≤20
IV.	Continuing calibration pending	A	CCV ≤ 20/20
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	ND	TB = 1, 3, 5, 7
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	OS
IX.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS/D
X.	Field duplicates	ND	D = 2, 9
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Target analyte quantitation	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XIII.	Target analyte identification	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XIV.	System performance	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

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; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

** Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 validation

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	ERH1670 TB	BA41498	Water	09/22/21
2	ERH1671 D	BA41499	Water	09/22/21
3	ERH1672 TB	BA41500	Water	09/22/21
4	ERH1673**	BA41501**	Water	09/22/21
5	ERH1674 TB	BA41502	Water	09/22/21
6	ERH1675**	BA41503**	Water	09/22/21
7	ERH1676 TB	BA41504	Water	09/22/21
8	ERH1677	BA41505	Water	09/22/21
9	ERH1678 D	BA41506	Water	09/22/21
10				

Notes:

210928 BL- B1/4

LDC #: 52409B7 **VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST** Page: 1 of 2
Reviewer: FT

Method: Volatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?	✓			
Was cooler temperature criteria 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?	✓			
IIIa. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ~~≤ 15%~~ 20 and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria?			✓	
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of ≥ 0.990?	✓			
IIIb. Initial Calibration Verification				
Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each initial calibration for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20%?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20% and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria? Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ ~~50%~~ 20 in the ending CCV?	✓			
V. Laboratory Blanks				
Was a laboratory blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a laboratory blank analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Was there contamination in the laboratory blanks?		✓		
VI. Field blanks				
Were field blanks were identified in this SDG?	✓			
Were target analytes detected in the field blanks?		✓		
VII. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate percent recovery (%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?			✓	
VIII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed in this SDG?			✓	
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?			✓	

IX. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed per analytical batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			
X. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?	✓			
Were target analytes detected in the field duplicates?	✓			
XI. Internal standards				
Were internal standard area counts within -50% to +100% of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
Were retention times within ± 30 seconds of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
XII. Target analyte quantitation				
Did the laboratory LOQs/RLs meet the QAPP LOQs/RLs?	✓			
Were the correct internal standard (IS), quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the target analyte?	✓			
Were target analyte quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
Were manual integrations reviewed and found acceptable?	✓			
Did the laboratory provide before and after integration printouts?			✓	
XIII. Target analyte identification				
Were relative retention times (RRT's) within ± 0.06 RRT units of the standard?	✓			
Did analyte spectra meet specified EPA "Functional Guidelines" criteria?	✓			
Were chromatogram peaks verified and accounted for?	✓			
XIV. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XV. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			

LDC#: 52409B7

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Method: Gasoline (EPA SW 846 Method 8260B)

Calibration Date	System	Compound	Standard	(Y) Response	(X) Concentration
9/24/21	GCMS Loki	Gasoline C6-C10	1	6.284	0.8
			2	6.626	2.0
			3	7.012	4.0
			4	8.986	12.0
			5	11.986	24.0
			6	14.298	32.0
			7	15.904	40.0

Regression Output		***Reported***
Constant	*6.066833*	*NR*
Std Err of Y Est		
R Squared	*0.998933*	*NR*
Degrees of Freedom		
X Coefficient(s)	*0.249364*	*NR*
Std Err of Coef.		
Correlation Coefficient	*0.999466*	
Coefficient of Determination (r^2)	*0.998933*	*NR*

LDC #: 52409B7

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

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

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

449

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference internal Standard)	Average RRF (initial)	Reported RRF (CC)	Recalculated RRF (CC)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	ccv 0928L33	9/29/21	gasoline C_6-C_{10} (1st internal standard)	300	305.77	305.77	1.9	1.9
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
2			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
3			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
4			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th 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 #: 52409B7

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

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

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: 6

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Dibromofluoromethane					
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4					
Toluene-d8					
Bromofluorobenzene	25.0	24.49	97.9	97.9	0

Sample ID:

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

Sample ID:

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

Sample ID:

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

Sample ID:

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

LDC #: 52409B7

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Sample Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

METHOD: GC/MS VOA (EPA Method 8260)

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 LCSC - LCSDC I * 2/(LCSC + LCSDC) LCSC = Laboraotry control sample concentration LCSDC = Laboratory control sample duplicate concentration

LCS ID: 210928BL

Compound	Spike Added (ug/L)		Spiked Sample Concentration (ug/L)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalculated
GRO 1,1-Dichloroethene	300	300	299	304	99.7	99.7	101	101	1.7	1.7
Trichloroethene										
Benzene										
Toluene										
Chlorobenzene										

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 #: 52409B7

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Reviewer: FT

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

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)

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. #4 , GRO

Conc. = $\frac{\left(\frac{6378537}{964909} - 6.066833\right)(25)}{0.249364}$

= 54.5

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration (ug/L)	Calculated Concentration (ug/L)	Qualification
	#4	GRO	55	54.5	

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2021

Parameters: Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Extractables

Validation Level: Stage 2B & 4

Laboratory: APPL, Inc, Clovis, CA

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 97642

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
ERH1671	BA41499	Water	09/22/21
ERH1673**	BA41501**	Water	09/22/21
ERH1675	BA41503	Water	09/22/21
ERH1677	BA41505	Water	09/22/21
ERH1678	BA41506	Water	09/22/21
ERH1671(SGCU)	BA41499(SGCU)	Water	09/22/21
ERH1673(SGCU)**	BA41501(SGCU)**	Water	09/22/21
ERH1675(SGCU)	BA41503(SGCU)	Water	09/22/21
ERH1677(SGCU)	BA41505(SGCU)	Water	09/22/21
ERH1678(SGCU)	BA41506(SGCU)	Water	09/22/21

Samples appended with "SGCU" underwent Silica Gel cleanup
**Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 validation

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Work Plan/Scope of Work, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 02, January 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 01, April 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 01, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, September 2017), the Sampling and Analysis Plan, Addendum 03, Investigation and Remediation of Releases and Groundwater Protection and Evaluation, Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Revision 00, June 2018), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Quality Systems Manual (QSM) for Environmental Laboratories, Version 5.3 (2019), the DoD General Validation Guidelines (November 2019), and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Data Validation Guidelines Module 4: Data Validation Procedure for Organic Analysis by GC (March 2021). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Extractables by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8015B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results. Samples appended with a double asterisk on the cover page were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the QC summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J+ (Estimated, High Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying high bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J- (Estimated, Low Bias): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated, displaying low bias, due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

J (Estimated, Bias Indeterminate): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation. Bias is indeterminate.

U (Non-detected): The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the analyte should be considered non-detected due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The analyte was not detected and the associated numerical value is approximate.

X (Exclusion of data recommended): The sample results (including non-detects) were affected by serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and to meet published method and project quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be substantiated by the data provided. Exclusion of the data is recommended.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

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.

Qualification Code Reference

a ICP Serial Dilution %D was not within control limits.

b Presumed contamination from preparation (method blank).

c Calibration %RSD, r, r^2, %D or %R was noncompliant.

d The analysis with this flag should not be used because another more technically sound analysis is available.

e MS/MSD or Duplicate RPD was high.

f Presumed contamination from FB or ER.

g ICP ICS results were unsatisfactory.

h Holding times were exceeded.

i Internal standard performance was unsatisfactory.

k Estimated Maximum Possible Concentration (HRGC/HRMS only)

l LCS/LCSD %R was not within control limits.

m Result exceeded the calibration range.

o Cooler temperature or temperature blank was noncompliant and/or sample custody problems.

p RPD between two columns was high (GC only).

q MS/MSD recovery was not within control limits.

s Surrogate recovery was not within control limits.

t Presumed contamination from trip blank.

v Unusual problems found with the data not defined elsewhere. Description of the problem can be found in the validation report.

w LCS/LCSD RPD was high.

y Chemical recovery was not within control limits (Radiochemistry only).

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

For analytes where average calibration factors were utilized, percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

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

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all analytes.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Analyte	Concentration	Limit of Quantitation	Associated Samples
210928A-BLK	09/28/21	Oil (C24-C40)	290 ug/L	320 ug/L	ERH1671 ERH1673** ERH1675 ERH1677 ERH1678
210928A1-BLK	09/28/21	Oil (C24-C40)	170 ug/L	320 ug/L	ERH1671(SGCU) ERH1673(SGCU)** ERH1675(SGCU) ERH1677(SGCU) ERH1678(SGCU)

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater (>5X blank contaminants) than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Sample	Analyte	Reported Concentration	Modified Final Concentration
ERH1671	Oil (C24-C40)	170 ug/L	300U ug/L
ERH1673**	Oil (C24-C40)	470 ug/L	470U ug/L
ERH1675	Oil (C24-C40)	530 ug/L	530U ug/L
ERH1677	Oil (C24-C40)	490 ug/L	490U ug/L
ERH1678	Oil (C24-C40)	200 ug/L	300U ug/L
ERH1673(SGCU)**	Oil (C24-C40)	250 ug/L	300U ug/L
ERH1675(SGCU)	Oil (C24-C40)	200 ug/L	300U ug/L
ERH1677(SGCU)	Oil (C24-C40)	280 ug/L	300U ug/L
ERH1678(SGCU)	Oil (C24-C40)	180 ug/L	300U ug/L

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Surrogates

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

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

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

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

LCS ID (Associated Samples)	Analyte	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	Flag	A or P
210928A LCS/LCSD (ERH1671 ERH1673** ERH1675 ERH1677 ERH1678)	Oil (C24-C40)	119 (41-113)	-	J+ (all detects)	P

Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

Samples ERH1671 and ERH1678 and samples ERH1671(SGCU) and ERH1678(SGCU) were identified as field duplicates. No results were detected in any of the samples with the following exceptions:

Analyte	Concentration (ug/L)		RPD (Limits)	Flag	A or P
	ERH1671	ERH1678			
Diesel (C10-C24)	270	220	20 (≤50)	-	-
Oil (C24-C40)	170	200	16 (≤50)	-	-

Analyte	Concentration (ug/L)		RPD (Limits)	Flag	A or P
	ERH1671(SGCU)	ERH1678(SGCU)			
Oil (C24-C40)	190	150	24 (≤50)	-	-

X. Target Analyte Quantitation

All target analyte quantitations met validation criteria for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Target Analyte Identification

All target analyte identifications met validation criteria for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected or recommended for exclusion in this SDG.

Due to LCS/LCSD %R, data were qualified as estimated in five samples.

Due to laboratory blank contamination, data were qualified as not detected in nine samples.

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Extractables - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason (Code)
ERH1671 ERH1673** ERH1675 ERH1677 ERH1678	Oil (C24-C40)	J+ (all detects)	P	Laboratory control samples (%R) (l)

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Extractables - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

Sample	Analyte	Modified Final Concentration	A or P	Code
ERH1671	Oil (C24-C40)	300U ug/L	A	b
ERH1673**	Oil (C24-C40)	470U ug/L	A	b
ERH1675	Oil (C24-C40)	530U ug/L	A	b
ERH1677	Oil (C24-C40)	490U ug/L	A	b
ERH1678	Oil (C24-C40)	300U ug/L	A	b
ERH1673(SGCU)**	Oil (C24-C40)	300U ug/L	A	b
ERH1675(SGCU)	Oil (C24-C40)	300U ug/L	A	b
ERH1677(SGCU)	Oil (C24-C40)	300U ug/L	A	b
ERH1678(SGCU)	Oil (C24-C40)	300U ug/L	A	b

Red Hill Bulk Storage Facility, CTO 18F0126
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Extractables - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 97642

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 52409B8
SDG #: 97642
Laboratory: APPL, Inc., Clovis, CA

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B/4

Date: 11/8/21
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: EJ
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC TPH as Extractables (EPA SW 846 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.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A/A	
II.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	%D RSD ≤ 20, r² ICV ≤ 20
III.	Continuing calibration ending	A	CCV ≤ 20/20
IV.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
V.	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	MS
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	SW	LCS/D
IX.	Field duplicates	SW	D = 1,5 6,10
X.	Target analyte quantitation	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XI.	Target analyte identification	A	Not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.
XII	Overall assessment of data	A	

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; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

** Indicates sample underwent Stage 4 validation

	Client ID		Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	ERH1671	D	BA41499	Water	09/22/21
2	ERH1673**		BA41501**	Water	09/22/21
3	ERH1675		BA41503	Water	09/22/21
4	ERH1677		BA41505	Water	09/22/21
5	ERH1678	D	BA41506	Water	09/22/21
6	ERH1671(SGCU)	D1	BA41499(SGCU)	Water	09/22/21
7	ERH1673(SGCU)**		BA41501(SGCU)**	Water	09/22/21
8	ERH1675(SGCU)		BA41503(SGCU)	Water	09/22/21
9	ERH1677(SGCU)		BA41505(SGCU)	Water	09/22/21
10	ERH1678(SGCU)	D1	BA41506(SGCU)	Water	09/22/21
11					
12					
13					

Notes:

1	210928A-BLK						
2	210928A1-BLK						

LDC #: 52409B8

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: FM

Method: ✓ GC __ HPLC

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?	✓			
Was cooler temperature criteria met?	✓			
IIa. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 20%?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of ≥0.990?	✓		NA	FM
Were the RT windows properly established?	✓			
IIb. Initial calibration verification				
Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each initial calibration for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20%?	✓			
III. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration analyzed daily?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20%?	✓			
Were all the retention times within the acceptance windows?	✓			
IV. Laboratory Blanks				
Was a laboratory blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a laboratory blank analyzed for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Was there contamination in the laboratory blanks?	-	✓		
V. Field Blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target analytes detected in the field blanks?			✓	
VI. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate percent recovery (%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 matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed in this SDG?			✓	
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 per analytical or extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?		✓		

IX. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?	✓			
Were target analytes detected in the field duplicates?	✓			
X. Target analyte quantitation				
Did the laboratory LOQs/RLs meet the QAPP LOQs/RLs?	✓			
Were analyte quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
Were manual integrations reviewed and found acceptable?	✓		✓	
Did the laboratory provide before and after integration printouts?			✓	
XI. Target analyte identification				
Were the retention times of reported detects within the RT windows?	✓			
XIII. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			

LDC #: 52409B8

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Reviewer: FT

METHOD: ✓ GC ___ HPLC

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

Y N N/A Were all samples associated with a given method blank?
Y N N/A Was a method blank performed for each matrix and whenever a sample extraction procedure was performed?
Y N N/A Was a method blank performed with each extraction batch?
Y N N/A Were any contaminants found in the method blanks? If yes, please see findings below.

Level IV/D Only

Y N N/A (Gasoline and aromatics only)Was a method blank analyzed with each 24 hour batch?
Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each analytical / extraction batch of ≤20 samples?

(b)

Blank extraction date: 9/28/21 **Blank analysis date:** 10/1/21 **Associated samples:** 1 → 5

Conc. units: ug/L

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification					
	210928A-BLK	1	2	3	4	5	
Oil (C24-C40)	290	170/300.0U	470U	530U	490U	200/300.0U	
	320	320	320	320	320	320	

Blank extraction date: 9/28/21 **Blank analysis date:** 10/8/21 **Associated samples:** 6 → 10

Conc. units: ug/L

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification					
	210928A1-BLK	7	8	9	10		
Oil (C24-C40)	170	250/300.0U	200/300.0U	280/300.0U	180/300.0U		
	320	320	320	320	320		

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

LDC #: 52409B8

Reviewer: FT

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

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?

(8)

#	LCS/LCSD ID	Compound	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	210928A	Oil (C24-C40)	119 (41-113)	( )	( )	1→5,	J+det/P all Det
	LCS ID		( )	( )	( )	210928A-BlK	
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 52409B8 ✓

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Field Duplicates

METHOD: GC (EPA Method 8015B)

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

Compound	Concentration (ug/L)		RPD (≤ 50 %)	QUAL
	1	5		
Diesel (C10-C24)	270 J	~~28~~ 220 J	20	
Oil (C24-C40)	170 J	200 J	16	

Compound	Concentration (ug/L)		RPD (≤ 50 %)	QUAL
	6	10		
Oil (C24-C40)	300.0	180	J ~~200~~	

Compound	Concentration ( )		RPD (≤ %)	QUAL

Compound	Concentration ( )		RPD (≤ %)	QUAL

LDC #: 52409B8

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

METHOD: GC X HPLC _____

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

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

Where:
A = Area of compound
C = Concentration of compound
S = Standard deviation of calibration factors
X = Mean of calibration factors

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Reported (std=250ppb)	Recalculated (std=250ppb)	Reported Average CF (Initial)	Recalculated Average CF (Initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	8/30/2021	Diesel C10-C24)	1954573	1954573	2019597	2019597	2.7	2.7
	Apollo								

LDC #: 52409B8

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

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

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	ccv 100510	10/7/21	Diesel C10-C24	2019600	2099130	2099130	3.9	3.9
2	ccv 100943	10/8/21	↓	↓	1903820	1903820	5.7	5.7
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 #: 52409B8

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

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: #7

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
octacosane				97.6		
o-Terphenyl				84.3		

Sample ID: _____

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

	Surrogate Compound		Surrogate Compound		Surrogate Compound		Surrogate Compound		Surrogate Compound
A	Chlorobenzene (CBZ)	G	Octacosane	M	Benzo(e)Pyrene	S	1-Chloro-3-Nitrobenzene	Y	Tetrachloro-m- xylene
B	4-Bromofluorobenzene (BFB)	H	Ortho-Terphenyl	N	Terphenyl-D14	T	3,4-Dinitrotoluene	Z	2-Bromonaphthalene
C`	a,a,a-Trifluorotoluene	I	Fluorobenzene (FBZ)	O	Decachlorobiphenyl (DCB)	U	Tripentyltin	AA	Chloro-octadecane
D	Bromochlorobenene	J	n-Triacontane	P	1-methylnaphthalene	V	Tri-n-propyltin	BB	2,4-Dichlorophenylacetic acid
E	1,4-Dichlorobutane	K	Hexacosane	Q	Dichlorophenyl Acetic Acid (DCAA)	W	Tributyl Phosphate	CC	2,5-Dibromotoluene
F	1,4-Difluorobenzene (DFB)	L	Bromobenzene	R	4-Nitrophenol	X	Triphenyl Phosphate		

LDC #: 52409B8

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: FT

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

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

LCS/LCSD samples: 210928A LCS/D

Compound	Spike Added (ug/L)		Spike Sample Concentration (ug/L)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
Diesel (C10-C24)	2000	2000	~~2080~~ F7	2080	117	117	104	104	11.8	11.8
			2340							

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 #: 52409B8

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Reviewer: FT

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. #2 Compound Name Diesel (c10-c24)

Concentration = $\frac{26896833830\ (5)\ (1000)}{20195497\ (1020)\ (2)}$ =

= 3264.2 ug/L

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentrations (ug/L)	Recalculated Results Concentrations (ug/L)	Qualifications
	#2	Diesel (c10-c24)	3300	3264.2	

Comments: _____