

**ITS REWORK DATA VERIFICATION SUMMARY REPORT
for explosives samples collected from
CAMP STANLEY STORAGE ACTIVITY
BOERNE, TEXAS**

Data Verifiers: Laura Kelley
Parsons

INTRODUCTION

The following data verification summary report covers environmental soil samples and associated field quality control (QC) samples collected from the Camp Stanley CSSA Site B29 (for ITS rework) on March 9, 2000. Samples from the following laboratory Sample Delivery Group (SDG) were analyzed for explosives:

00C-0042-01

Field quality control samples collected were one field duplicate. The duplicate sample was analyzed for the same parameters as the associated samples.

All samples were collected by Parsons and analyzed by DataChem Laboratories following procedures outlined in the AFCEE QAPP, version 3.0.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The data submitted by the laboratory has been reviewed and verified following the guidelines outlined in the AFCEE QAPP, version 3.0. Information reviewed in the data packages include sample results; the summary of laboratory quality control results; case narrative; raw data; and chain-of-custody forms. The analyses and findings presented in this report are based on the reviewed information and whether guidelines in the AFCEE QAPP were met.

EXPLOSIVES SDG 00C-0042-01

General

This SDG consisted of ten (10) samples, including nine (9) environmental soil samples and one soil field duplicate sample. There were two sets of matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate samples analyzed with these samples that were from different SDGs. The samples were collected on March 9, 2000 and analyzed for explosives.

The explosives analyses were performed using United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) SW846 Method 8330. All samples for this SDG were analyzed following the procedures in the AFCEE QAPP. All samples collected were prepared and analyzed within the holding time required by the method.

Accuracy Results

Accuracy was evaluated using the %R results for the MS/MSD samples, LCS sample, and surrogate spikes. Samples from another SDG were analyzed as the MS/MSD samples.

All MS/MSD, LCS, and surrogate spike %Rs were within acceptance criteria.

Precision Results

Precision was evaluated using the Relative Percent Difference (RPD) results obtained from MS/MSD values and the field duplicate values. Samples from another SDG were analyzed as the MS/MSD samples. There was one field duplicate pair analyzed in this SDG. Sample RW-B29-SB06(7.0) was collected and analyzed as a duplicate.

All MS/MSD and field duplicate RPDs were within acceptance criteria.

Completeness

Completeness has been evaluated by comparing the total number of samples collected with the total number of samples with valid analytical data.

All results were considered usable. The completeness for this SDG is 100% compared to the minimum acceptance limit of 90%.

Representativeness

Representativeness expresses the degree to which sample data accurately and precisely represents actual site conditions. Representativeness has been evaluated by:

- Comparing the chain-of-custody procedures to those described in the AFCEE QAPP;
- Comparing actual analytical procedures to those described in the AFCEE QAPP;
- Evaluating holding times; and
- Examining laboratory blanks for cross contamination of samples during analysis.

All samples in this SDG were analyzed following the chain-of-custody (COC) and analytical procedures described in the AFCEE QAPP. All samples were prepared and analyzed within the holding time required for the analysis.

- All initial and continuing calibration criteria were met.
- All second source calibration criteria were met.
- Second column confirmation was not required since all sample results were non-detect.
- All MDLs were less than one-half the reporting limit for all compounds.

There was one method blank associated with the explosive analyses in this SDG. The blank was free of any target compounds above the RL.