DATA VALIDATION REPORT

October 2016 Groundwater Sampling Event
Four Corners Power Plant, Arizona Public Service
Farmington, New Mexico

Prepared by:

Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.
4600 East Washington Street, Suite 600
Phoenix, Arizona 85034-1917
(602) 733-6000

February 2017

Project No. 1420162024.1.2

Copyright © 2017 by Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.
All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACRONYMS iii

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

2.0 DATA VALIDATION METHODOLOGY 1

3.0 EXPLANATION OF DATA QUALITY INDICATORS 2
- 3.1 Laboratory Control Sample Recoveries 2
- 3.2 Matrix Spike Recoveries 2
- 3.3 Blank Concentrations 3
- 3.4 Laboratory Duplicates 3

4.0 DEFINITIONS OF QUALIFIERS THAT MAY BE ADDED DURING DATA VALIDATION 3

5.0 QUALIFICATION REASON CODES 4

6.0 CHAIN OF CUSTODY AND SAMPLE RECEIPT CONDITION DOCUMENTATION 4

7.0 SPECIFIC DATA VALIDATION FINDINGS 4
- 7.1 Metals By EPA Methods 200.7, 200.8, and 245.1 4
  - 7.1.1 Holding Times 4
  - 7.1.2 Laboratory Blanks 5
  - 7.1.3 Laboratory Control Sample Accuracy and Precision 5
  - 7.1.4 Matrix Spikes/Matrix Spike Duplicates 5
  - 7.1.5 Analytical Sensitivity 5
  - 7.1.6 Data Reporting and Analytical Procedures 5
- 7.2 Anions by EPA Method 300.0 5
  - 7.2.1 Holding Times 5
  - 7.2.2 Laboratory Blanks 6
  - 7.2.3 Laboratory Control Sample Accuracy and Precision 6
  - 7.2.4 Matrix Spikes/Matrix Spike Duplicates 6
  - 7.2.5 Laboratory Duplicates 6
  - 7.2.6 Analytical Sensitivity 6
  - 7.2.7 Data Reporting and Analytical Procedures 6
- 7.3 Total Dissolved Solids by SM 2540C 7
  - 7.3.1 Holding Times 7
  - 7.3.2 Laboratory Blanks 7
  - 7.3.3 Laboratory Control Sample Accuracy and Precision 7
  - 7.3.4 Laboratory Duplicates 7
  - 7.3.5 Data Reporting and Analytical Procedures 7
- 7.4 pH by SM 4500B 7
  - 7.4.1 Holding Times 7
  - 7.4.2 Laboratory Control Sample Accuracy 7
  - 7.4.3 Laboratory Duplicates 8
  - 7.4.4 Data Reporting and Analytical Procedures 8
- 7.5 Radiochemical Analyses 8
  - 7.5.1 Analytical Sensitivity 8

8.0 FIELD DUPLICATES 8

9.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 8

REFERENCES..... 10
LIMITATIONS..... 11

TABLES

Table 1 Field Samples Submitted to TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc.

Table 2A Redundant Laboratory Results

Table 2B Field Duplicate Detections

Table 3 Qualifiers Added During Data Validation

ACRONYMS

%	percent
Amec Foster Wheeler	Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.
APS	Arizona Public Service
CCR	coal combustion residual
CLP	Contract Laboratory Program
COC	chain of custody
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ID	identification
LCS	laboratory control sample
LCSD	laboratory control sample
MCL	maximum contaminant level
mg/L	milligrams per liter
MS	matrix spike
MSD	matrix spike duplicate
QC	quality control
RL	reporting limit
RPD	relative percent difference
SAP	sampling and analysis plan
SM	Standard Method
TestAmerica	TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc.
TDS	total dissolved solids

DATA VALIDATION REPORT
Four Corners Power Plant, Arizona Public Service
Farmington, New Mexico

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Arizona Public Service (APS) collected 17 water samples October 19 and 20, 2016, from the Four Corners Power Plant, located in Farmington, New Mexico. APS submitted the samples to TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc. (TestAmerica), located in Phoenix, Arizona, where they were assigned to sample delivery groups J71659-1, J71660-1, and J71661-1. TestAmerica analyzed the samples for total metals and mercury by United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Methods 200.7, 200.8, and 245.1; anions by EPA Method 300.0; total dissolved solids (TDS) by Standard Method (SM) 2540C; and pH by SM 4500B. TestAmerica subcontracted the samples to Radiation Safety Engineering, Inc., where they were analyzed for radium 226/228 using EPA Method 903.1/904. A list of these samples by field sample identification (ID), sample collection date, and the laboratory sample IDs is presented in Table 1.

2.0 DATA VALIDATION METHODOLOGY

Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. (Amec Foster Wheeler) performed an EPA Stage 2A validation on these samples, which is equivalent to a Level I data evaluation as defined in the project sampling and analysis plan (SAP). The Stage 2A validation includes review of the quality control (QC) results in the laboratory's analytical report and does not include review or validation of the raw analytical data. This data validation report also does not include review or validation of the data from Radiation Safety Engineering, Inc. due to the lack of QC data. This data validation has been performed in general accordance with:

- AECOM, Inc., 2015. Final Sampling and Analysis Plan Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Groundwater Monitoring, Four Corners Power Plant, Arizona Public Service, Farmington, New Mexico, December 2015.
- EPA, 2004. SW 846 Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Wastes, Update IIIB.
- EPA, 2014. EPA Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Superfund Data Review, EPA-540 R 013 001.

The CLP guidelines were written specifically for the CLP, and have been modified for the purposes of this data review where they differ from method-specific QC requirements.

The laboratory's certified analytical report and supporting documentation were reviewed to assess the following:

- Data package and electronic data deliverable completeness;
- Chain of custody (COC) compliance;
- Holding time compliance;
- Presence or absence of laboratory contamination as demonstrated by laboratory blanks;
- Accuracy and bias as demonstrated by recovery of laboratory control sample (LCS) and matrix spike (MS) samples;
- Analytical precision as relative percent difference (RPD) of analyte concentration between laboratory duplicates, LCS/LCS duplicates (LCSDs), or MSs/MS duplicates (MSDs);
- Insofar as possible, the degree of conformance to method requirements and good laboratory practices.

In general, it is important to recognize that no analytical data are guaranteed to be correct, even if all QC audits are passed. Strict QC serves to increase confidence in data, but any reported value may potentially contain error.

3.0 EXPLANATION OF DATA QUALITY INDICATORS

Summary explanations of the specific data quality indicators reviewed during data validation are presented below.

3.1 LABORATORY CONTROL SAMPLE RECOVERIES

LCSs are aliquots of analyte free matrices that are spiked with the analytes of interest for an analytical method, or a representative subset of those analytes. The spiked matrix is then processed through the same analytical procedures as the samples they accompany. LCS recovery is an indication of a laboratory’s ability to successfully perform an analytical method in an interference free matrix.

3.2 MATRIX SPIKE RECOVERIES

MSs and MSDs are prepared by adding known amounts of the analytes of interest for an analytical method, or a representative subset of those analytes, to an aliquot of sample. The spiked sample is then processed through the same extraction, concentration, cleanup, and analytical procedures as the unspiked samples in an analytical batch.

MS recovery and precision are an indication of a laboratory's ability to successfully recover an analyte in the matrix of a specific sample or closely related sample matrices. It is important not to apply MS results for any specific sample to other samples without understanding how the sample matrices are related.

3.3 BLANK CONCENTRATIONS

Blank samples are aliquots of analyte free matrix that are used as negative controls to verify that the sample collection, storage, preparation, and analysis system does not produce false positive results.

Laboratory blanks are processed by the laboratory using exactly the same procedures as the field samples. Target analytes should not be found in laboratory blanks.

When target analytes are detected in blanks, analyte concentrations in associated samples less than five times the concentration detected in the blank will be U qualified as being not detected.

3.4 LABORATORY DUPLICATES

Laboratory duplicate analysis verifies acceptable method precision by the laboratory at the time of preparation and analysis and/or sampling precision at the time of collection.

4.0 DEFINITIONS OF QUALIFIERS THAT MAY BE ADDED DURING DATA VALIDATION

J The analyte was positively identified; the associated numerical value is the approximate concentration of the analyte in the sample.

R The sample result is rejected due to serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and meet quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be verified.

U The analyte was analyzed for, but was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit.

UJ The analyte was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit. However, the reported quantitation limit is approximate and may or may not represent the actual limit of quantitation necessary to accurately and precisely measure the analyte in the sample.

5.0 QUALIFICATION REASON CODES

The following reason codes were applied to the data during data validation:

FD Field duplicate RPD exceeded established criteria. Potential sampling or analytical imprecision.

HT Holding time exceeded.

SE Excessive RPD between redundant analytical results. Potential analytical imprecision.

6.0 CHAIN OF CUSTODY AND SAMPLE RECEIPT CONDITION DOCUMENTATION

The samples were received at the laboratories under proper COC, intact, properly preserved, and at temperatures less than the SAP-specified maximum of 6 degrees Celsius.

According to the COC, field duplicate FC-CCR-MW100-1016 was collected on October 20, 2016 at 9:07 a.m., concurrent with parent sample FC-CCR-MW61-1016; and field duplicate FC-CCR-MW101-1016 was collected on October 19, 2016 at 12:29 p.m., concurrent with parent sample FC-CCR-MW63-1016. However, according to the Groundwater Sampling Record field forms, sample FC-CCR-MW100-1016 is a field duplicate of sample FC-CCR-MW63-1016, and sample FC-CCR-MW101-1016 is a field duplicate of sample FC-CCR-MW61-1016. Amec Foster Wheeler evaluated the field duplicate pairs as indicated in the Groundwater Sampling Record field forms.

7.0 SPECIFIC DATA VALIDATION FINDINGS

Results from these samples may be considered usable with the limitations and exceptions described in Sections 7.1 through 8.0.

7.1 METALS BY EPA METHODS 200.7, 200.8, AND 245.1

Total metals and mercury results generated by TestAmerica may be considered usable without exception.

7.1.1 Holding Times

All samples were analyzed for metals within the SAP-specified holding time of 28 days for mercury and 180 days for the additional metals.

7.1.2 Laboratory Blanks

Target analytes were not detected in the laboratory blanks associated with the analysis of these samples.

7.1.3 Laboratory Control Sample Accuracy and Precision

LCS and LCSD recoveries were within the SAP-specified 80 to 120 percent (%) limits and RPDs between the LCS and LCSD results were less than the laboratory-specified maximum of 20%.

7.1.4 Matrix Spikes/Matrix Spike Duplicates

TestAmerica performed MS and MSD analyses on project samples FC-CCR-MW7-1016 and FC-CCR-MW69-1016 for total metals by EPA method 200.8. MS/MSD recoveries were within laboratory-specified limits, and RPDs between MS and MSD results were less than the laboratory-specified maximum of 20%.

MS and MSD analyses for other metals were performed on batch samples not related to this project. It is not possible to evaluate data usability based on the MS/MSD performance of unrelated samples.

7.1.5 Analytical Sensitivity

Amec Foster Wheeler compared reporting limits (RL)s for antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, selenium, thallium, and mercury against applicable National Primary Drinking Water Regulation Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) to confirm that the RLs were sufficiently low to meet the MCLs. Non-detect results were reported to RLs less than the applicable MCLs.

Boron, calcium, cobalt, lithium, and molybdenum are not EPA-regulated analytes in groundwater and it is not possible to evaluate the RLs for these analytes against the National Primary Drinking Water Regulation MCLs.

7.1.6 Data Reporting and Analytical Procedures

There were no data anomalies associated with the metals analyses of these samples.

7.2 ANIONS BY EPA METHOD 300.0

Fluoride, chloride, and sulfate results generated by TestAmerica may be considered usable with the limitations described in Sections 7.2.1 through 7.2.7.

7.2.1 Holding Times

Samples were analyzed for anions within the SAP-specified holding time of 28 days.

7.2.2 Laboratory Blanks

Fluoride, chloride, and sulfate were not detected in the laboratory blanks associated with the analysis of these samples.

7.2.3 Laboratory Control Sample Accuracy and Precision

LCS LCSD recoveries were within the laboratory-specified 90 to 110% limits and RPDs between the LCS and LCSD results were less than the laboratory-specified maximum values.

7.2.4 Matrix Spikes/Matrix Spike Duplicates

TestAmerica performed MS and MSD analyses on sample FC-CCR-MW63-1016 for fluoride. Recoveries were within the laboratory-specified 80 to 120% limits, and RPDs between MS and MSD results were less than 20%.

7.2.5 Laboratory Duplicates

TestAmerica did not perform duplicate analyses of any of the samples covered in this report.

7.2.6 Analytical Sensitivity

Amec Foster Wheeler compared RLs for fluoride against the MCL to confirm that the RLs were sufficiently low to meet the MCL. Non-detect results were reported at RLs less than the applicable MCL.

Chloride and sulfate are not EPA-regulated analytes in groundwater and it is not possible to evaluate the RLs for these analytes against the Primary Drinking Water Regulation MCLs.

7.2.7 Data Reporting and Analytical Procedures

Reports J71659-1 and J71660-1 each contain fluoride results for all samples (i.e., the sample was analyzed twice because it was on two chains of custody). When multiple results are reported for the same analyte/sample, they are shown in Table 2A, along with a calculation of the RPD between the results. Precision values were less than 20%, or the differences between the detected concentrations were less than the RLs, indicating general agreement between results. Exceptions are noted below.

- The RPD between fluoride results reported in J71659-1 and J1660-1 was high at 21% in the analysis of sample FC-CCR-MW68-1016. Amec Foster Wheeler J qualified the detected fluoride results from this sample because of the high RPDs between analytical results. (J-SE)

- Fluoride was detected at a concentration of 2.8 mg/L in sample FC-CCR-MW60-1016, in report J71660-1, but was not detected in the sample when analyzed for report J1659-1. Amec Foster Wheeler J qualified the detected fluoride result and UJ qualified the non-detect fluoride result from this sample because of the high RPDs between analytical results. (J/UJ-SE)

7.3 TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS BY SM 2540C

TDS results generated by TestAmerica may be considered fully usable without qualification.

7.3.1 Holding Times

All samples were analyzed for TDS within the SAP-specified holding time of 7 days.

7.3.2 Laboratory Blanks

TDS was not detected in the laboratory blanks at concentrations above the reporting limit.

7.3.3 Laboratory Control Sample Accuracy and Precision

LCS and LCSD recoveries were within the laboratory-specified 90 to 110% limits and RPDs between the LCS and LCSD results were less than the laboratory-specified maximum of 10%.

7.3.4 Laboratory Duplicates

TestAmerica performed duplicate analyses on project sample FC-CCR-MW67-1016. The RPD between source and duplicate result was less than laboratory-specified maximum of 10%.

7.3.5 Data Reporting and Analytical Procedures

There were no data anomalies associated with the TDS analysis of these samples.

7.4 PH BY SM 4500B

pH results generated by TestAmerica may be considered usable with the limitations described in Sections 7.4.1 through 7.4.4.

7.4.1 Holding Times

All samples were analyzed for pH on October 24, 4 to 5 days after the method-specified 15 minute hold time had passed. Amec Foster Wheeler J qualified the pH results from these samples because of the missed hold time. (J-HT)

7.4.2 Laboratory Control Sample Accuracy

LCS recovery was within the laboratory-specified 98.5 to 101.5% limits.

7.4.3 Laboratory Duplicates

TestAmerica performed duplicate analyses on samples FC-CCR-MW7-1016 and FC-CCR-MW68-1016. RPDs between source and duplicate results were less than laboratory-specified maximum of 5%.

7.4.4 Data Reporting and Analytical Procedures

There were no data anomalies associated with the pH analysis of these samples.

7.5 RADIOCHEMICAL ANALYSES

It was not possible to evaluate data usability for the radiochemical analyses due to a lack of laboratory QC.

7.5.1 Analytical Sensitivity

Amec Foster Wheeler compared RLs for total radium analysis against the MCL to confirm that the RLs were sufficiently low to meet the MCL. Non-detect results were reported to RLs less than the applicable MCL.

8.0 FIELD DUPLICATES

APS collected sample FC-CCR-MW100-1016 as a field duplicate of sample FC-CCR-MW63-1016 and FC-CCR-MW101-1016 as a field duplicate of sample FC-CCR-MW61-1016. Target analyte detections are summarized in Table 2B. Precision values were less than the SAP-specified maximum of 20%, or the differences between the detected concentrations were less than the RLs, with the following exception:

- The RPD between lead results was high at 29% for sample FC-CCR-MW61-1016 and its field duplicate, FC-CCR-MW101-1016. Amec Foster Wheeler J qualified the lead results from these samples because of potential sampling or analytical imprecision. (J-FD)

9.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Amec Foster Wheeler reviewed 357 data records from field samples during this validation. All of the data generated are usable and of acceptable quality with the addition of qualifiers presented in Table 3. Qualifier definitions are summarized in Section 4.0, reason codes are summarized in Section 5.0, and qualified data are summarized below.

- Amec Foster Wheeler J or UJ qualified 23 records (6.4%) as being estimated concentrations because of high RPDs between duplicate results, hold time exceedances, and field duplicate imprecision.

No records were rejected and 100% of the data should be considered valid with the addition of the qualifiers presented in Table 3.

REFERENCES

AECOM, 2015. Sampling and Analysis Plan CCR Groundwater Monitoring Four Corners Power Plant Arizona Public Service, Farmington, New Mexico, December 2015.

EPA, 2014. EPA CLP National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Superfund Data Review, EPA-540 R 013 001.

EPA, 2004. SW 846 Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Wastes, Update IIIB.

LIMITATIONS

This report was prepared exclusively for Arizona Public Service by Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. The quality of information, conclusions, and estimates contained herein is consistent with the level of effort involved in Amec Foster Wheeler services and based on: i) information available at the time of preparation, ii) data supplied by outside sources, and iii) the assumptions, conditions, and qualifications set forth in this report. This data validation report is intended to be used by Arizona Public Service, Four Corners Power Plant site only, subject to the terms and conditions of its contract with Amec Foster Wheeler. Any other use of, or reliance on, this report by any third party is at that party's sole risk.

TABLES

TABLE 1
Field Samples Submitted to Test America Laboratories, Inc.
Four Corners Power Plant, Arizona Public Service
Farmington, New Mexico

Field Sample ID	Collection Date	Test America Sample ID	Notes
FC-CCR-MW7-1016	10/20/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-1	
FC-CCR-MW49A-1016	10/20/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-2	
FC-CCR-MW60-1016	10/20/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-3	
FC-CCR-MW61-1016	10/20/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-4	
FC-CCR-MW62-1016	10/19/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-5	
FC-CCR-MW63-1016	10/19/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-6	
FC-CCR-MW64-1016	10/19/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-7	
FC-CCR-MW65-1016	10/19/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-8	
FC-CCR-MW66-1016	10/19/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-9	
FC-CCR-MW67-1016	10/20/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-10	
FC-CCR-MW68-1016	10/20/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-11	
FC-CCR-MW69-1016	10/20/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-12	
FC-CCR-MW70-1016	10/19/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-13	
FC-CCR-MW71-1016	10/20/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-14	
FC-CCR-MW72-1016	10/20/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-15	
FC-CCR-MW100-1016	10/20/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-16	Field duplicate of FC-CCR-MW61-1016
FC-CCR-MW101-1016	10/19/2016	550-71659, 71660, and 71661-16	Field duplicate of FC-CCR-MW63-1016

Notes:
ID = identification

TABLE 2A
Redundant Laboratory Results
Four Corners Power Plant, Arizona Public Service
Farmington, New Mexico

Sample	Method	Analyte	Average RL	J71660-1 Result	J71661-1 Result	RPD	Notes
FC-CCR-MW7-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	0.40 U	0.40 U	NC	± RL
FC-CCR-MW49A-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	0.40 U	0.40 U	NC	± RL
FC-CCR-MW60-1016	**EPA 300.0**	**Fluoride**	**0.40 mg/L**	**0.40 U**	**2.8**	**NC**	**J/UJ-SE**
FC-CCR-MW61-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	1.1	0.95	15%	
FC-CCR-MW62-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	1.5	1.2	22%	± RL
FC-CCR-MW63-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	1.9	1.8	5%	
FC-CCR-MW64-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	1.5	1.5	0%	
FC-CCR-MW65-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	2.0	2.0	0%	
FC-CCR-MW66-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.80 mg/L	19	17	11%	
FC-CCR-MW67-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.60 mg/L	15	16	6%	
FC-CCR-MW68-1016	**EPA 300.0**	**Fluoride**	**0.60 mg/L**	**5.5**	**6.8**	**21%**	**J-SE**
FC-CCR-MW69-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.60 mg/L	9.6	9.0	6%	
FC-CCR-MW70-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	0.40 U	0.40 U	NC	± RL
FC-CCR-MW71-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	0.40 U	0.40 U	NC	± RL
FC-CCR-MW72-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	0.40 U	0.40 U	NC	± RL
FC-CCR-MW100-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	1.8	2.0	11%	
FC-CCR-MW101-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride	0.40 mg/L	1.0	0.84	17%	

Notes:
mg/L = milligrams per liter
NC = not calculable
RL = reporting limit
RPD = relative percent difference

Methods:
EPA 300.0 = Ions

Qualifier and Reason Code Definitions:
SE = Excessive RPD between redundant analytical results
J = The analyte was positively identified; the associated numerical value is approximate.
UJ = The analyte was not detected above the RL. However, the RL is approximate.

TABLE 2B
Field Duplicate Detections
Four Corners Power Plant, Arizona Public Service
Farmington, New Mexico

Method	Analyte	RL	Primary Sample Result	Field Duplicate Result	RPD	Notes
Samples FC-CCR-MW61-1016 and FC-CCR-MW101-1016						
EPA 300.0	Chloride	100 mg/L	300	310	3%	
	Fluoride, J71659-1	0.40 mg/L	1.1	1.0	10%	
	Fluoride, J71660-1	0.40 mg/L	1.0	0.8	12%	
	Sulfate	100 mg/L	3,500	3,700	6%	
EPA 200.7	Boron	0.050 mg/L	37	38	3%	
	Calcium	2.0 mg/L	420	440	5%	
	Lithium	0.20 mg/L	0.39	0.39	0%	
EPA 200.8	Arsenic	0.00020 mg/L	0.00042	0.00043	2%	
	Barium	0.00020 mg/L	0.014	0.014	0%	
	Cadmium	0.00010 mg/L	0.00094	0.00084	11%	
	Cobalt	0.00020 mg/L	0.012	0.012	0%	
	Lead	**0.00010 mg/L**	**0.00092**	**0.00069**	**29%**	**J-FD**
	Molybdenum	0.00020 mg/L	0.080	0.073	9%	
	Selenium	0.00060 mg/L	0.00076	0.00110	37%	± RL
	Thallium	0.00010 mg/L	0.00014	0.00013	7%	
SM2540C	Total Dissolved Solids	100 mg/L	5,600	5,700	2%	
SM4500	pH	1.7 SU	8.6	8.6	0%	
Samples FC-CCR-MW63-1016 and FC-CCR-MW100-1016						
EPA 300.0	Chloride	2.0 mg/L	100	98	2%	
	Fluoride, J71659-1	0.40 mg/L	1.9	1.8	5%	
	Fluoride, J71660-1	0.40 mg/L	1.8	2.0	11%	
	Sulfate	400 mg/L	2,700	2,600	4%	
EPA 200.7	Boron	0.050 mg/L	1.7	1.7	0%	
	Calcium	2.0 mg/L	470	480	2%	
EPA 200.8	Arsenic	0.00020 mg/L	0.00062	0.00061	2%	
	Barium	0.00020 mg/L	0.021	0.021	0%	
	Cobalt	0.00020 mg/L	0.0062	0.0056	10%	
	Molybdenum	0.00020 mg/L	0.0031	0.0029	7%	
SM2540C	Total Dissolved Solids	20 mg/L	4,500	4,400	2%	
SM4500	pH	1.7 SU	7.8	7.2	8%	

Notes:
mg/L = milligrams per liter
RL = reporting limit
RPD = relative percent difference
SU = standard units

Methods:
EPA 300.0 = Ions
EPA 200.7 = Metals
EPA 200.8 = Low Level Metals
SM2540C = Total Dissolved Solids
SM4500 = pH

Qualifier Definitions:
J = The analyte was positively identified; the associated numerical value is approximate.

Reason Codes:
FD = High field duplicate RPD. Potential analytical or sampling imprecision.
± RL = The difference between the detected resulst was less than the value of the reporting limit.

TABLE 3
Qualifiers Added During Data Validation
Four Corners Power Plant, Arizona Public Service
Farmington, New Mexico

Sample IDs	Methods	Analytes	Concentrations	Qualifiers and Reason Codes
FC-CCR-MW7-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.4 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW49A-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.5 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW60-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride, J71659-1	0.40 mg/L	UJ SE
		Fluoride, J71660-1	2.8 mg/L	J SE
	SM 4500B	pH	7.6 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW61-1016	EPA 200.8	Lead	0.0009 mg/L	J FD
	SM 4500B	pH	8.6 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW62-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.0 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW63-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.2 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW64-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.8 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW65-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.6 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW66-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.4 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW67-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.3 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW68-1016	EPA 300.0	Fluoride, J71659-1	5.5 mg/L	J SE
		Fluoride, J71660-1	6.8 mg/L	J SE
	SM 4500B	pH	7.1 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW69-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.4 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW70-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.1 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW71-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.3 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW100-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.2 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW72-1016	SM 4500B	pH	7.1 SU	J HT
FC-CCR-MW101-1016	EPA 200.8	Lead	0.00069 mg/L	J FD
	SM 4500B	pH	8.6 SU	J HT

Notes:
mg/L = milligrams per liter
SU = standard units

Methods:
EPA 300.0 = Ions
EPA 200.7 = Metals
EPA 200.8 = Low Level Metals
SM2540C = Total Dissolved Solids
SM4500 = pH

Qualifier Definitions:
J = The analyte was positively identified; the associated numerical value is approximate.
UJ = The analyte was not detected above the RL. However, the RL is approximate.

Reason Codes:
FD = Field duplicate RPD exceeded established criteria
HT = Holding time exceeded
SE = Excessive RPD between redundant analytical results.