Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls

September 2015 Monitoring Round



Prepared for:

Department of Environmental Stewardship
City of New Bedford
133 William Street
New Bedford, Massachusetts 02740

Prepared by:

TRC Environmental Corporation
Wannalancit Mills
650 Suffolk Street
Lowell, Massachusetts 01854
(978) 970-5600

November 2015

Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls

September 2015 Monitoring Round

Prepared for:

Department of Environmental Stewardship
City of New Bedford
133 William Street
New Bedford, Massachusetts 02740

Prepared by:

TRC Environmental Corporation
Wannalancit Mills
650 Suffolk Street
Lowell, Massachusetts 01854
(978) 970-5600

TRC Project No. 223832

November 2015

DISCLAIMER

This report is intended for use solely by the City of New Bedford (City), for the specific purposes described in the contractual documents between TRC Environmental Corporation and the City. All professional services performed and reports generated by TRC have been prepared for the City's purposes as described in the contract. The information, statements and conclusions contained in the report have been prepared in accordance with the work statement and contract terms and conditions. The report may be subject to differing interpretations and/or may be misinterpreted by third persons or entities who were not involved in the investigative or consultation process. TRC Environmental Corporation therefore expressly disclaims any liability to persons other than the City who may use or rely upon this report in any way or for any purpose.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC) of Lowell, Massachusetts was retained by the City of New Bedford (the City) to provide sampling support in conducting foundation vent stack and indoor air sampling for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) at the Keith Middle School (KMS) in New Bedford, Massachusetts. This report documents the indoor air and vent stack sampling performed by TRC during September 2015.

The sampling and analysis of vent stack and indoor air for the KMS is described in the *Revised Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Implementation Plan* (LTMMIP), revision 5.5, dated August 2012. The indoor air PCB sampling program involved the collection of one indoor air sample from the ground floor of each of the three school building sections (Building A, Building B, and Building C). Concurrently with the indoor air sampling, air sampling of the sub-slab foundation ventilation system for PCBs was performed from four selected rooftop vent stacks, including VS-1 which vents building Section A west side (near the front of the school), VS-4 which vents building Section A east side (near the front of the school), VS-7 which vents Section B (near the auditorium), and VS-11 which vents the gymnasium. The passive sub-slab ventilation system was installed to allow sub-slab soil vapors to migrate from beneath the vapor barrier to the vent stacks, installed through the school building roof. An air sample was also collected immediately outside of the school during this round to provide comparative background results.

The samples were analyzed for PCBs according to EPA Method 680 (PCB homologues) by Pace Analytical Services of Schenectady, New York. This PCB method reliably quantifies total PCB concentrations, making analytical results directly comparable to total PCB concentration data for indoor air at New Bedford High School.

During the September 2015 sampling round, PCBs were detected at the three indoor air sampling locations and in the corresponding outdoor air background sample. However, PCBs were not detected in any of the vent stack air samples.

Detected concentrations for PCBs in indoor air samples were generally consistent with urban ambient air background levels. PCB concentrations in indoor air have fluctuated slightly between August 2006 and September 2015, consistent with background conditions, but all detected concentrations are below indoor air concentrations that would be of concern for the health of building occupants.

PCB indoor air concentrations were compared to site-specific outdoor air concentrations and risk-based air concentrations (RBACs). Two PCB RBACs have been developed for the KMS, assuming occupational exposures within the school (8 hours/day, 250 days/year, for 25 years). The first RBAC is the Action Level (AL; 0.05 ug/m^3), which is used as an initial indicator that PCB air concentrations above background levels have been detected. The second RBAC is the Acceptable Long-Term Average Exposure Concentration (ALTAEC; 0.3 ug/m^3), indicative of the air concentration that should not be exceeded for an extended time period. PCB indoor air concentrations were also compared to EPA's Exposure Levels (ELs) (USEPA, 2015; 0.5 ug/m^3)

developed to be protective of indoor school air exposures for adult employees and 12 to <15 year-old students. Indoor air PCB concentrations were lower than RBACs and EPA's EL.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ES-1

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1-1

1.1 Overview 1-1
1.2 Scope of Work 1-3

2.0 SAMPLING LOCATIONS 2-1

2.1 Indoor Air Quality Sample Locations 2-1
2.2 Foundation Vent Air Monitoring Sample Locations 2-1

3.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE 3-1

3.1 Data Validation Summary 3-1
3.2 Collocated Sampler Precision 3-1

4.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS 4-1

4.1 Indoor Air Quality Results 4-1
4.2 Vent Stack Air Results 4-1

5.0 COMPARISON OF INDOOR AIR PCB RESULTS TO RISK-BASED AIR CONCENTRATIONS 5-1

6.0 CONCLUSIONS 6-1

7.0 REFERENCES 7-1

TABLES

Table 2-1. September 2015 Sample Summary
Table 3-1. Comparison of PCB Indoor Air Sample Results – Collocated Sampler Precision
Table 3-2. Comparison of PCB Vent Stack Air Sample Results – Collocated Sampler Precision
Table 4-1. Indoor Air Quality Sample Results – September 2015
Table 4-2. Vent Stack Sample Results – September 2015
Table 4-3. Total PCB Results in KMS Indoor Air Quality Samples – August 2006 through September 2015
Table 5-1. Comparison of PCB Indoor Air Quality Samples Results to Risk-Based Air Concentrations – September 2015

FIGURES

Figure 2-1. Indoor Air Sampling Locations
Figure 2-2. Vent Stack Sample Locations
Figure 5-1. Total PCB Trends in KMS Indoor Air Quality Samples – August 2006 through September 2015

APPENDICES

Appendix A Summary of Field Sampling Program, Analytical Program, Quality Assurance, and Inventory of Cleaning Supplies used at KMS
Appendix B Field Sampling Data Sheets
Appendix C Field Reduced Data
Appendix D Equipment Calibration Sheets
Appendix E Laboratory Data Reports (on CD)
Appendix F Laboratory Data Validation Memoranda
Appendix G Discussion of Risk-Based Comparison Criteria

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC) of Lowell, Massachusetts was retained by the City of New Bedford (the City) to provide sampling support in conducting foundation vent stack and indoor air sampling for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) at the Keith Middle School (KMS) in New Bedford, Massachusetts. This report documents the indoor air and vent stack sampling performed by TRC during September 2015.

Soil gas sampling was performed under the location of the KMS building in December 2001. In addition to PCBs present in soil at this location, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were also detected in the soil gas samples. The results of the December 2001 soil gas sampling event were evaluated for potential adverse impacts on indoor air quality, assuming no vapor barrier was installed. Despite the conclusion that no significant risk to human health is posed by the measured soil gas concentrations, the City and School Department decided to install a vapor barrier on top of the soil beneath the school building concrete floor as an added layer of protection against intrusion of any gases that may accumulate under the building. Passive ventilation has been installed to allow any sub-slab soil gases to migrate from beneath the vapor barrier to the vent stacks, installed through the school building roof.

Sampling and analysis of vent stack and indoor air was performed between July 2007 and April 2012 as part of United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved *Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Implementation Plan* (LTMMIP), revision 4, dated October 20, 2006. The LTMMIP was prepared by The BETA Group, Incorporated (BETA) in accordance with the August 31, 2005 *Approval for Risk-Based PCB Cleanup and Disposal under 40 CFR §761.6(c)* letter issued by EPA to the City. The LTMMIP set forth a vent stack and indoor air sampling schedule consisting of three monitoring events per year for the first year (July/August, December, April 2007), with the understanding that the City may submit a written request to EPA to reduce the indoor air sampling frequency after the first year of monitoring. However, per the order of the Mayor of the City, vent stack and indoor air monitoring took place monthly during the period of September 2006 to July/August 2007. Following the July/August 2007 sampling event, monitoring was reduced to once every four months, consistent with the 2006 LTMMIP. Monitoring from September 2006 through February 2007 was conducted by BETA and is reported elsewhere.

The sampling program described in the 2006 LTMMIP consisted of the collection of indoor air quality and vent stack samples for the analysis of PCBs and VOCs. Sampling of indoor air quality and vent stack air for PCBs and VOCs has been conducted for 29 monitoring events between July 2007 and April 2012 to confirm the proper functioning of the passive ventilation system. Between 2007 and 2012, PCBs and VOCs were detected in both indoor air and vent stack air samples. However, concentrations of PCBs and VOCs in indoor air samples were lower, in general, than those observed in vent stack air samples. The presence of higher levels of VOCs and PCBs in vent stack air samples is an expected finding for a sub-slab ventilation system and indicates that the passive ventilation system is performing as designed.

Based on the sampling data collected between 2007 and 2012, VOCs were determined to be present in indoor air due to off-gassing from building materials and the storage and use of cleaners, adhesives, paints, and other VOC-containing products indoors at the school. Concentrations of PCBs detected in indoor air samples are consistent with background levels measured in outdoor air samples collected simultaneously. Levels of VOCs detected in indoor air fluctuated and demonstrated noticeable decreasing trends over time.

Although PCBs and VOCs were measured in indoor air and vent stack air samples, the concentrations detected were determined to not pose a significant risk to human health, based on the comparison of concentrations to both background concentrations and applicable risk-based criteria (TRC, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c, 2008d, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c, 2010a, 2010b, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011d, 2012a and 2012b).

In 2011, the City proposed modifying the 2006 LTMMIP to reflect the detailed understanding of the site conceptual model (e.g., impacts from indoor use of commercially available cleaners, paints, adhesives, etc.), the relationship between vent measurements and historical soil gas measurements that illustrate the proper functioning of the passive sub-slab ventilation system, and long-term downward trends for indoor air and passive vent system concentrations of VOCs originating from building materials.

On August 27, 2012, USEPA approved the City's proposed revision to the LTMMIP, revision 5.5. This report presents monitoring data collected during September 2015, the seventh round of air sampling data collected under the 2012 LTMMIP. The results for the first six rounds of air sampling data collected under the 2012 LTMMIP are presented in TRC, 2012d, TRC, 2013a, TRC,2013b, TRC, 2014a, TRC, 2014b and TRC, 2015. The 2012 LTMMIP differs from the 2006 LTMMIP in a number of ways that are reflected in this report:

1. Analysis of indoor air and vent stack air samples for VOCs has been eliminated because VOCs are not the principal contaminants in soil and fill, and air monitoring conducted to date indicates that the remedy implemented for the KMS site is functioning as intended.

2. Indoor air and vent stack air sampling frequency has been reduced from three times per year to two times per year because air monitoring conducted to date demonstrates that the remedy implemented for the KMS site is preventing airborne release of PCBs that remain in the soil to the building.

3. The number of background air samples has been reduced from two samples to one sample because the single sample is sufficient to determine outdoor air concentrations of PCBs.

4. PCB analysis of indoor air and vent stack air samples includes quantification of homologue groups, but not Aroclors or individual congeners, because the homologue groups provide a sufficient and accurate measure of total PCB concentrations in air.

5. The comparison of vent stack air samples to health-based air concentrations has been eliminated because vent samples are not representative of the air that people breathe.

Therefore, vent stack air concentrations are not comparable to the health-based air concentrations.

1.2 Scope of Work

Sampling and analysis of vent stack and indoor air is performed as part of United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved *Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Implementation Plan* (LTMMIP), revision 5.5, dated August 2012 and approved by EPA on August 27, 2012.

The September 2015 sampling occurred prior to the opening of school for the 2015 academic year. Details concerning the sample collection procedures and analytical methods are described in Appendix A. Sampling data sheets are provided in Appendix B and the reduced data are presented in Appendix C. The calibration certifications can be found in Appendix D. Laboratory analytical results are presented in Appendix E.

Field sampling data were validated by the Field Team Leader and/or the Field Quality Control Coordinator based on their review of adherence to each approved sampling protocol and written sample collection procedure. Details concerning quality assurance procedures are described in Appendix A. The laboratory data validation memoranda can be found in Appendix F.

The following sections describe those features of the field sampling program, quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) program, and data analysis that are specific to the September 2015 event. Generic information on the sampling and QA/QC programs and data analysis procedures can be found in Appendices A and G, respectively.

2.0 SAMPLING LOCATIONS

2.1 Indoor Air Quality Sample Locations

During the sampling event, one indoor air PCB sample was collected from the ground floor of each of the three school building sections (Building A, Building B, and Building C). Each sampling location was selected to be representative of portions of the school building normally occupied by students and teachers. The Building A sampling location is located within a hallway in an area of student classrooms. The Building B sampling location is located in the school cafeteria. The Building C sampling location is in the community room. These indoor air sampling locations have remained consistent throughout TRC's sampling program, with the exception of the December 2007 Building B sample which was collected in the school cafeteria at the request of the City. An outdoor air sample was collected from near the flagpole area immediately outside of the school to provide comparative background results. A duplicate outdoor air samples is routinely collected at the same location. However, the sampler for the duplicate canister malfunctioned. Therefore, no duplicate background outdoor air sample was sent to the laboratory for analysis.

Figure 2-1 presents the approximate locations of indoor air sampling. Table 2-1 summarizes the indoor air samples collected during the September 2015 sampling event. These samples were assigned sample identification numbers that include (1) the letter A, B, or C to identify the building section from which the sample was collected; and (2) a unique sample identification suffix indicating the sampling event number (e.g., A-36).

2.2 Foundation Vent Air Monitoring Sample Locations

The KMS foundation venting system is comprised of six sub-slab vapor collection zones, each vented by two or four vent stacks penetrating the roof. A total of four vent stacks are sampled during each round, including VS-1 and VS-4 which vent from the two collection zones located under building Section A (classrooms), and two other vent stacks which are rotated to cover the remaining collection zones (i.e., VS-7 and VS-11 for this sampling event). A duplicate sample was also collected from the VS-7 sampling location. PCB concentrations in vent stack air were compared to the outdoor air samples described in Section 2.1 that define background conditions.

Figure 2-2 presents the approximate locations of the vent stack sample locations. Table 2-1 summarizes the vent stack samples collected during the September 2015 sampling event. Vent stack samples collected during the September 2015 sampling event were designated with the vent stack number (e.g., VS-4) and a unique sample identification suffix indicating the sampling event number (e.g., VS-4-36).

3.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE

This section highlights the results of the QA/QC review for the September 2015 sampling event. Please refer to Appendix A for additional QA/QC details.

3.1 Data Validation Summary

Limited (Tier II) validation was performed on the data for nine air samples and two trip blank samples collected at the Keith Middle School in New Bedford, Massachusetts. The samples were collected on September 4, 2015 and submitted to Pace Analytical Services (Pace) in Schenectady, New York for analysis. All air vent samples were collected on polyurethane foam (PUF) cartridges in accordance with EPA method TO-10A; all indoor and background outdoor air samples were collected on particulate filters and PUF cartridges in accordance with EPA method TO-4A. The samples were analyzed for polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) homologues using EPA method 680. Pace reported the results under job number 13090035.

The sample results were assessed using the *EPA New England Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Environmental Analyses*, revised December 1996. Modification of these guidelines was performed to accommodate the non-CLP methodology.

In general, the data appear to be valid as reported and may be used for decision-making purposes. Appendix F contains the complete Laboratory Data Validation Memoranda.

3.2 Collocated Sampler Precision

Samples VS-7-36/VS-7-36-DUP (PUF) were submitted as the field duplicate (collocated) pair with this sample set. Samples BG-36/BG-36 DUP were intended to be submitted as a field duplicate (collocated) pair. However, as previously described, failure of the BG-36 DUP sampler prevented submission of a duplicate sample for the outdoor air background sampling locations. PCBs were not detected in samples VS-7-36/VS-7-36-DUP (PUF). Tables 3-1 and 3-2 summarize the relative percent differences (RPDs) of the detected analytes in sample pairs BG-65/BG-36 DUP and VS-7-36/VS-7-36 DUP, respectively. As shown in Tables 3-1 and 3-2, RPDs could not be calculated because the BG-36 DUP sample was not submitted for laboratory analysis and non-detect results were reported in the VS-7-36/VS-7-36 DUP collocated sample pair. All results are usable for project objectives.

4.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Table 2-1 provides a summary of the types, numbers, and locations of the samples collected. Appendices E and F contain the laboratory data reports and data validation memoranda, respectively. Along with the samples, TO-4A and TO-10A trip blanks were analyzed as a quality assurance measure to check for shipping and laboratory-related sources of contamination.

All results represent "total PCB" concentrations. PCBs were not detected in the indoor air quality or vent stack air trip blanks. Low level fluctuations of PCB concentrations in indoor air are generally consistent with urban indoor background levels. Sporadic detected concentrations of PCBs in vent stack air are expected, and indicate that the passive ventilation system is performing as designed.

4.1 Indoor Air Quality Results

On September 4, 2015, TRC collected three indoor and one outdoor background 24-hour TO-4A air samples at the KMS. Table 4-1 provides a summary of PCB indoor air results. Table 4-3 provides a complete list of total PCB indoor air results from August 2006 thru September 2015.

PCBs were detected in the three indoor air samples and in the background outdoor air sample. PCB concentrations in the indoor air samples ranged from 0.00112 ug/m^3 in the Building C sample to 0.000213 ug/m^3 in the Building B sample. PCBs were detected at a concentration of 0.000218 ug/m^3 in the background outdoor air sample. The PCB concentration in the Building C sample is consistent with the maximum concentrations reported in the April 2009, August 2010, April 2011, August 2012, January 2013, August 2013, February 2014, October 2014 and December 2014 sampling rounds.

4.2 Vent Stack Air Results

On September 4, 2015, TRC collected four (plus one duplicate) vent stack 4-hour TO-10A samples at the KMS. Table 4-2 provides a summary of results for the vent stack samples, and the results of the outdoor background 24-hour TO-4A air sample.

PCBs were not detected in the vent stack samples. As previously stated in Section 4.1, PCBs were detected in the background outdoor air sample at a concentration of 0.000218 ug/m^3.

5.0 COMPARISON OF INDOOR AIR PCB RESULTS TO RISK-BASED AIR CONCENTRATIONS

This section of the report compares PCB concentrations in indoor air to outdoor air and risk-based air concentrations (RBACs). These concentrations are presented in Table 5-1.

A detailed discussion of the RBACs can be found in Appendix G. Two PCB RBACs have been developed for the KMS. The first RBAC is the Action Level (AL; 0.05 ug/m^3) used as an initial indicator that PCB air concentrations above background levels have been detected. The second RBAC is the Acceptable Long-Term Average Exposure Concentration (ALTAEC; 0.3 ug/m^3), indicative of the air concentration that should not be exceeded for an extended time period. The ALTAEC could be exceeded over the short-term and still result in acceptable risk levels. In July 2015, EPA published Exposure Levels (ELs) for Evaluation of PCBs in School Indoor Air which are indoor air concentrations that EPA believes protect building occupants (USEPA, 2015). The ELs supersede EPA's 2009 Public Health Levels (PHLs). ELs were calculated for all ages of children from toddlers in day care to adolescents in high school as well as for adult school employees. In this report, indoor air PCB concentrations are compared to the EL for adult school employees and children 12 to <15 years old, representative of the middle school age range.

Indoor air sampling results, outdoor air background results, and RBACs are presented in Table 5-1. As noted in Section 4.1, PCBs were detected at all three of the indoor air sampling locations (Buildings A, B, and C) and in the outdoor air background sample. The highest indoor air PCB concentration (Building C sample) was approximately 45-fold lower than the PCB AL and roughly 270-fold lower than the ALTAEC; the Building A and Building B samples displayed concentrations of PCBs up to 235-fold lower than the AL and 1,400-fold lower than the ALTAEC. Because the PCB AL is used as an initial indicator that PCB air concentrations above background levels for indoor air have been detected and the detected concentrations of PCBs are significantly less than the AL, concentrations of PCBs in indoor air are consistent with levels associated with ambient conditions. The indoor air samples were also between 450- and 2,350-fold lower than the EPA EL. Because there are no indoor air PCB concentrations in excess of the RBACs, no specific follow-up actions are recommended at this time.

Temporal trends for PCB indoor air concentrations at the sampling locations in Building A (classrooms), Building B (auditorium), and Building C (faculty dining area) are shown in Figure 5-1. Figure 5-1 also shows concentration trends at the outdoor air background sampling location. Data included on this figure are for the time period August 2006 to September 2015. The highest indoor air PCB concentration was detected during the April 2009 sampling event when the school was likely experiencing lower than normal air exchange (school vacation) and the potential for volatilization of PCBs from outdoor ambient sources is greater due to the warmer weather. The lowest indoor air PCB concentration was detected during the November 2006 sampling event.

No clear trends are noted for PCB concentrations in indoor air. Measured concentrations fluctuate over time, with slightly higher concentrations noted during the summer school vacation period when the building is experiencing lower than normal air exchange and the potential for volatilization of PCBs from outdoor ambient sources is greatest due to warmer weather. The low

level PCB indoor air concentrations are generally consistent with urban ambient background conditions. Based on the PCB indoor air results collected between August 2006 and September 2015, it appears that there is variability in indoor air concentrations and the slightly higher concentrations sporadically detected are not part of a trend. Despite this slight variability, PCBs have never been detected at concentrations above the RBACs or the EPA EL.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

Indoor air quality and vent stack air sampling was conducted at the KMS during September 2015 for PCBs. Indoor and vent stack air data were evaluated for quality and reliability, and indoor air concentrations were compared to risk-based air concentrations and analyzed for concentration trends over the period August 2006 to September 2015. The following summarizes the conclusions of the air sampling data evaluation.

In general, all TO-4A and TO-10A data collected during September 2015 were determined to be valid as reported and usable for decision-making purposes.

PCBs were detected in the three indoor air samples and in the outdoor air background sample. The detected PCB concentrations for the indoor air samples were below risk-based action levels. The low level fluctuations of PCB indoor air concentrations are generally consistent with concentrations found in urban ambient air background.

PCBs were not detected in the four vent stack air samples or the duplicate vent stack air sample. The sporadic presence of PCBs in vent stack air is expected, and indicates that the passive ventilation system is performing as designed.

December 2015 is the date for the next sampling event.

7.0 REFERENCES

BETA Group, Inc. (BETA). 2006. Final Completion and Inspection Report: Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan. McCoy Field/Keith Middle School, 225 Hathaway Boulevard, New Bedford, Massachusetts. Prepared for the City of New Bedford. October 4, 2006.

Buckland et al, 1999. Organochlorines in New Zealand: Ambient Concentrations of Selected Organochlorines in Air. Simon J. Buckland, Howard K. Ellis, and Ray T. Slater. Ministry for the Environment, Wellington, New Zealand. December 1999.

Hunt and Lihzis, 2009. PCBs in Ambient Air – Method Evaluation and Background Monitoring, The Hudson River, NY Sediment Remediation Project. Gary T. Hunt and Melita Lihzis. Presented at the 29th International Symposium on Halogenated Persistent Organic Pollutants. Beijing, China. August 2009.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2008a. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – 2007 Monthly Monitoring Rounds: March, April, May, June, and July/August. May 2008.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2008b. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – December 2007 Monitoring Round. July 2008.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2008c. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – April 2008 Monitoring Round. October 2008.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2008d. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – July 2008 Monitoring Round. December 2008.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2009a. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – December 2008/February 2009 Monitoring Round. May 2009.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2009b. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – April 2009 Monitoring Round. July 2009.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2009c. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – August 2009 Monitoring Round. December 2009.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2010a. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – December 2009/February 2010 Monitoring Round. April 2010.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2010b. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – April 2010 Monitoring Round. December 2010.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2011a. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – August 2010 Monitoring Round. March 2011.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2011b. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – December 2010 Monitoring Round. April 2011.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2011c. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – April 2011 Monitoring Round. July 2011.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2011d. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – August 2011 Monitoring Round. October 2011.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2012a. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – December 2011 Monitoring Round. March 2012.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2012b. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Volatile Organic Compounds – April 2012 Monitoring Round. June 2012.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2012c. Revised Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Implementation Plan. Revision 5.5. Keith Middle School, 225 Hathaway Boulevard, New Bedford, Massachusetts. Prepared for the City of New Bedford. August 2012.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2012d. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls – August 2012 Monitoring Round. October 2012.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2013a. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls – January 2013 Monitoring Round. April 2013.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2013b. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls – August 2013 Monitoring Round. November 2013.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2014a. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls – February 2014 Monitoring Round. April 2014.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2014b. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls – October 2014 Monitoring Round. December 2014.

TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC). 2015. Sampling Results for the Keith Middle School Foundation Vent Stack and Indoor Air for Polychlorinated Biphenyls – December 2014 Monitoring Round. March 2015.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2015. Exposure Levels for Evaluation of PCBs in Indoor School Air. July 30, 2015. http://www3.epa.gov/epawaste/hazard/tsd/pcbs/pubs/caulk/exposure_levels.htm

TABLES

Table 2-1. September 2015 Sample Summary
Keith Middle School
New Bedford, Massachusetts

Sample ID	Sample Location	Sample Collected	Sample Type
A	Building A, center of west hallway	X	IAQ
B	Building B, Café	X	IAQ
C	Building C, Community room	X	IAQ
BG	Background, flagpole area outside main entrance to Building A	XX*	IAQ
VS-1	Building A, vent stack 1	X	Vent Stack
VS-4	Building A, vent stack 4	X	Vent Stack
VS-5	Building B, vent stack 5		Vent Stack
VS-7	Building B, vent stack 7	XX	Vent Stack
VS-8	Building B, vent stack 8		Vent Stack
VS-9	Building B, vent stack 9		Vent Stack
VS-10	Building B, vent stack 10		Vent Stack
VS-11	Gymnasium , vent stack 11	X	Vent Stack
VS-12	Gymnasium, vent stack 12		Vent Stack
VS-13	Gymnasium, vent stack 13		Vent Stack
VS-14	Gymnasium, vent stack 14		Vent Stack
VS-16	Building A , vent stack 16		Vent Stack
VS-BG	On the ground at main entrance to Building A		Vent Stack

X - Sample collected at this location during this sampling round.
XX - Sample and duplicate collected at this location during this sampling round.

Table 3-1. Comparison of PCB Indoor Air Sample Results - Collocated Sampler Precision
Keith Middle School
New Bedford, Massachusetts

		Sep-15		
Analysis	**Analyte**	**BG-36**	**BG-36 Dup**	**RPD (%)**
PCBs				
(µg/m3)	monochlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000140	No Sample	NC
	dichlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000140	No Sample	NC
	trichlorobiphenyl	**0.0002180**	No Sample	NC
	tetrachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000280	No Sample	NC
	pentachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000280	No Sample	NC
	hexachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000280	No Sample	NC
	heptachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000420	No Sample	NC
	octachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000420 UJ	No Sample	NC
	nonachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000710	No Sample	NC
	decachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000710 UJ	No Sample	NC
($\mu g/m^3$)	Total PCBs	**0.0002180 J**	No Sample	NC

Notes:

RPD - Relative Percent Difference = ABS(Dup-Sample)/((Dup+Sample)/2)*100

NC - Not Calculated; RPD could not be calculated due to a non-detect in one or both of the collocated samples

Detected values are shown in bold

Table 3-2. Comparison of PCB Vent Stack Air Sample Results - Collocated Sampler Precision
Keith Middle School
New Bedford, Massachusetts

Analysis	Analyte	Sep-15 VS-7-36		Sep-15 VS-7-36 DUP	RPD (%)
PCBs					
(µg/m3)	monochlorobiphenyl	< 0.00397	UJ	< 0.00397	NC
	dichlorobiphenyl	< 0.00397	UJ	< 0.00397	NC
	trichlorobiphenyl	< 0.00397	UJ	< 0.00397	NC
	tetrachlorobiphenyl	< 0.00794	UJ	< 0.00794	NC
	pentachlorobiphenyl	< 0.00794	UJ	< 0.00794	NC
	hexachlorobiphenyl	< 0.00794	UJ	< 0.00794	NC
	heptachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0119	UJ	< 0.0119	NC
	octachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0119	UJ	< 0.0119	NC
	nonachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0198	UJ	< 0.0198	NC
	decachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0198	UJ	< 0.0198	NC
($\mu g/m^3$)	Total PCBs	< 0.0198	UJ	< 0.0198	NC

Notes:
RPD - Relative Percent Difference = ABS(Dup-Sample)/((Dup+Sample)/2)*100
NC - Not Calculated; RPD could not be calculated due to a non-detect in one or both of the collocated samples
Detected values are shown in bold

Table 4-1. Indoor Air Quality Sample Results - September 2015
Keith Middle School
New Bedford, Massachusetts

		Sample Locations			Background		QA/QC
Analysis	**Analyte**	**A-36**	**B-36**	**C-36**	**BG-36**	**BG-36 DUP**	**Trip Blank**
PCBs							
(µg/m3)	monochlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000290	< 0.0000290	< 0.0000290	< 0.0000140	No Sample	< 0.00500 ug UJ
	dichlorobiphenyl	**0.000462**	< 0.0000290	< 0.0000290	< 0.0000140	No Sample	< 0.00500 ug UJ
	trichlorobiphenyl	**0.000140**	**0.000213**	**0.00112**	**0.000218**	No Sample	< 0.00500 ug UJ
	tetrachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000570	< 0.0000590	< 0.0000590	< 0.0000280	No Sample	< 0.0100 ug UJ
	pentachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000570	< 0.0000590	< 0.0000590	< 0.0000280	No Sample	< 0.0100 ug UJ
	hexachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000570	< 0.0000590	< 0.0000590	< 0.0000280	No Sample	< 0.0100 ug UJ
	heptachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000860	< 0.0000880	< 0.0000880	< 0.0000420	No Sample	< 0.0150 ug UJ
	octachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0000860 UJ	< 0.0000880 UJ	< 0.0000880 UJ	< 0.0000420 UJ	No Sample	< 0.0150 ug UJ
	nonachlorobiphenyl	< 0.000144	< 0.000147	< 0.000147	< 0.0000710	No Sample	< 0.0250 ug UJ
	decachlorobiphenyl	< 0.000144 UJ	< 0.000147 UJ	< 0.000147 UJ	< 0.0000710 UJ	No Sample	< 0.0250 ug UJ
($\mu g/m^3$)	Total PCBs	**0.000603 J**	**0.000213 J**	**0.00112 J**	**0.000218 J**	No Sample	< 0.025 ug UJ

Notes:

$\mu g/m^3$ - micrograms per cubic meter
PCBs - polychlorinated biphenyls
µg - micrograms; trip blank results are presented in micrograms (µg) due to no air volume being collected during analysis.
Reporting Limit for Total PCBs is the highest individual homolog PQL (practical quantitation limit) per sample.
No Sample - The BG-36 DUP sampler malfunctioned; therefore, no sample was submitted to the laboratory for analysis.
Values in **Bold** indicate the compound was detected.
< - less than laboratory reporting limit
J - Detected result reported is estimated
UJ - Non-Detect result reported is estimated

Table 4-2. Vent Stack Sample Results - September 2015
Keith Middle School
New Bedford, Massachusetts

Analysis	Analyte	Sample Locations					Background		QA/QC
		VS-1-36	VS-4-36	VS-11-36	VS-7-36	VS-7-36-DUP	BG-36	BG-36 DUP	Trip Blank-VS
PCBs									
(µg/m3)	monochlorobiphenyl	< 0.00420 UJ	< 0.00420	< 0.00385 UJ	< 0.00397 UJ	< 0.00397	< 0.0000140	No Sample	< 0.00500 ug UJ
	dichlorobiphenyl	< 0.00420 UJ	< 0.00420	< 0.00385 UJ	< 0.00397 UJ	< 0.00397	< 0.0000140	No Sample	< 0.00500 ug UJ
	trichlorobiphenyl	< 0.00420 UJ	< 0.00420	< 0.00385 UJ	< 0.00397 UJ	< 0.00397	**0.000218**	No Sample	< 0.00500 ug UJ
	tetrachlorobiphenyl	< 0.00840 UJ	< 0.00840	< 0.00769 UJ	< 0.00794 UJ	< 0.00794	< 0.0000280	No Sample	< 0.0100 ug UJ
	pentachlorobiphenyl	< 0.00840 UJ	< 0.00840	< 0.00769 UJ	< 0.00794 UJ	< 0.00794	< 0.0000280	No Sample	< 0.0100 ug UJ
	hexachlorobiphenyl	< 0.00840 UJ	< 0.00840	< 0.00769 UJ	< 0.00794 UJ	< 0.00794	< 0.0000280	No Sample	< 0.0100 ug UJ
	heptachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0126 UJ	< 0.0126	< 0.0115 UJ	< 0.0119 UJ	< 0.0119	< 0.0000420	No Sample	< 0.0150 ug UJ
	octachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0126 UJ	< 0.0126	< 0.0115 UJ	< 0.0119 UJ	< 0.0119	< 0.0000420	No Sample	< 0.0150 ug UJ
	nonachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0210 UJ	< 0.0210	< 0.0192 UJ	< 0.0198 UJ	< 0.0198	< 0.0000710	No Sample	< 0.0250 ug UJ
	decachlorobiphenyl	< 0.0210 UJ	< 0.0210	< 0.0192 UJ	< 0.0198 UJ	< 0.0198	< 0.0000710	No Sample	< 0.0250 ug UJ
($\mu g/m^3$)	Total PCBs	< 0.0210 UJ	< 0.0210	< 0.0192 UJ	< 0.0198 UJ	< 0.0198	**0.000218**	No Sample	< 0.0250 ug UJ

Notes:

$\mu g/m^3$ - micrograms per cubic meter

PCBs - polychlorinated biphenyls

µg - micrograms; trip blank results are presented in micrograms (µg) due to no air volume being collected during analysis.

Reporting Limit for Total PCBs is the highest individual homolog PQL (practical quantitation limit) per sample.

No Sample - The BG-36 DUP sampler malfunctioned; therefore, no sample was submitted to the laboratory for analysis.

Values in **Bold** indicate the compound was detected.

< - less than laboratory reporting limit

J - Detected result reported is estimated

UJ - Non-Detect result reported is estimated

Table 4-3. Total PCB Results in KMS Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) Samples August 2006 through September 2015 (24hr Sample, Method TO-4A [ug/m3])

Sampling Date	Hallway Building A	Auditorium Building B	Faculty Dining Building C	Background Outside	Background Outside (DUP)
AL	*0.05*	*0.05*	*0.05*	*0.05*	*0.05*
ALTAEC	*0.3*	*0.3*	*0.3*	*0.3*	*0.3*
8/5/2006	< 0.0000007	< 0.0000007	< 0.0000007	**0.0006**	NS
8/19/2006	< 0.0000007	**0.00023**	< 0.0000007	**0.00031**	NS
9/15/2006	**0.00273**	**0.0011**	**0.00052**	**0.00989**	**0.00995**
10/24/2006	**0.00087**	**0.00027**	**0.00008**	**0.00007**	NS
11/30/2006	**0.00105**	**0.00079**	**0.00003**	**0.00014**	**0.00014**
12/29/2006	**0.00005**	< 0.0000007 [2]	**0.00005**	**0.00008**	**0.00004**
1/20/2007	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
3/31/2007	**0.0015**	**0.00064**	**0.00037**	< 0.0001850	< 0.0001900
4/18/2007	**0.0013**	**0.00031**	**0.0016**	< 0.0000950	< 0.0000950
5/19/2007	**0.00038**	**0.001**	**0.00051** [3]	< 0.0001050	< 0.0001000
6/21/2007	**0.003**	**0.0032**	**0.0016**	< 0.0001000	< 0.0001000
8/1/2007	**0.0018**	< 0.0001900	**0.0057**	< 0.0000750	< 0.0000750
12/27/2007	**0.003**	**0.00094** [2]	**0.0011**	< 0.0001850	**0.000035**
4/25/2008	< 0.0000700	< 0.0000360	< 0.0000355	< 0.0000355	< 0.0000355
7/16/2008	**0.0018**	**0.0075**	**0.0017**	< 0.0000700	< 0.0000370
12/29/2008	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
2/19/2009	< 0.0001900	< 0.0001900	< 0.0000750	< 0.0000400	< 0.0000390
4/23/2009	**0.013**	**0.0034**	**0.0095**	< 0.0000400	< 0.0000400
8/20/2009	**0.00875** [1]	**0.00577**	**0.00366** [3]	**0.000759**	**0.00072**
12/29/2009	**0.00288**	**0.00165**	**0.00616**	< 0.0000389	NS
4/20/2010	**0.006163**	**0.000384**	**0.000882**	**0.0000614**	**0.000226**
8/24/2010	**0.0064**	**0.0049**	**0.0114**	**0.0029**	**0.0029**
12/29/2010	**0.0012**	**0.0027**	**0.0135**	< 0.0000500	NS
4/21/2011	**0.0036**	**0.0040**	**0.0115**	< 0.0000380	**0.0002**
8/24/2011	**0.0062**	**0.0090**	**0.0085**	< 0.0000425	**0.0005**
12/29/2011	**0.0036**	**0.0057**	**0.0054**	< 0.0000340	< 0.0000330
4/18/2012	**0.00499**	**0.0130**	**0.00578**	**0.000832**	< 0.0000330
8/30/2012	**0.00452**	**0.0061**	**0.01090**	**0.00158**	< 0.0000395
1/28/2013	**0.00333**	**0.0039** [2]	**0.00414** [3]	< 0.0000780	NS
8/30/2013	**0.00452**	**0.0054**	**0.00655**	< 0.0000730	< 0.0000710
2/20/2014	**0.00345**	**0.00339**	**0.00407**	< 0.0000730	< 0.0000730
10/14/2014	**0.0114**	**0.0104**	**0.00566** [3]	**0.000104**	< 0.0000180
12/30/2014	**0.00405**	**0.0087**	**0.00744** [3]	< 0.0000830	< 0.0000720
9/4/2015	**0.00060**	**0.00021** [2]	**0.00112**	**0.0000218**	NS

AL = Action Level = 0.05 ug/m^3

ALTAEC = Acceptable Long-Term Average Exposure = 0.3 ug/m^3

NS = Not Sampled

BOLD = Positive Detection

1. Sampler moved to front lobby due to work in halls
2. Sampler moved to cafeteria due to auditorium in use
3. Sampler moved to hallway outside of community room due to room in use.

Table 5-1. Comparison of PCB Indoor Air Quality Sample Results to Risk-Based Air Concentrations - September 2015
Keith Middle School
New Bedford, Massachusetts

Analysis	Analyte	Sample Locations			Background Location		QA/QC	Comparison Values		
		A-36	B-36	C-36	BG-36	BG-36 Dup	Trip Blank			
PCBs								**AL***	**ALTAEC***	**EL****
($\mu g/m^3$)	Total PCBs	**0.000603 J**	**0.000213 J**	**0.00112 J**	**0.000218 J**	No Sample	< 0.0250 ug UJ	0.05	0.3	0.5

Notes:

$\mu g/m^3$ - micrograms per cubic meter
PCBs - polychlorinated biphenyls
ug - micrograms; trip blank results are presented in micrograms (ug) since no air volume is collected for the trip blank
J - Detected result reported is estimated
No Sample - The BG-36 DUP sampler malfunctioned; therefore, no sample was submitted to the laboratory for analysis.
PCB results for indoor air are compared to contemporary outdoor air (background) sample and MassDEP indoor air background values.
* PCBs are compared to the EPA site specific Action Level (AL) and the Acceptable Long-Term Average Exposure Concentration (ALTAEC).
** Results are compared to the EPA Exposure Levels (ELs) for Evaluation of PCBs in School Indoor Air (July 2015) for adult employees and children 12-<15 year olds (http://www3.epa.gov/epawaste/hazard/tsd/pcbs/pubs/caulk/exposure_levels.htm)
Reporting Limit for Total PCBs is the highest individual homolog PQL (practical quantitation limit) per sample.

FIGURES

Keith Middle School
Indoor Air Sampling Locations



● = Indoor Air Sampling Point

● = Sample Locations

KEITH MIDDLE SCHOOL
NEW BEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

INDOOR AIR SAMPLING LOCATIONS

TRC
Wannalancit Mills
650 Suffolk Street
Lowell, MA 01854
(978) 970-5600

FIGURE
2-1

DRAWN BY: ---
CHECKED BY: DMS
DATE:
MAY 2008

FILE: T:\E_CAD\115058\indoorventsys1.dwg

Keith Middle School
Foundation Venting System



● = Vent Riser / Vent Stack Sampling location

═══ = Passive Venting and Collection System

KEITH MIDDLE SCHOOL
NEW BEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

VENT STACK SAMPLE LOCATIONS

TRC
Wannalancit Mills
650 Suffolk Street
Lowell, MA 01854
(978) 970-5600

FIGURE 2-2

DRAWN BY: ---
CHECKED BY: DMS
DATE: MAY 2008

FILE: T:\E_CAD\115058\ventsys1A.dwg

Figure 5-1. Total PCB Trends in KMS Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) Samples - August 2006 through September 2015



Each bar represents a single measurement. Bars outlined in black represent values reported by the laboratory as nondetect. For charting purposes these nondetect values are plotted as one half the reporting limit.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF FIELD SAMPLING PROGRAM, ANALYTICAL PROGRAM, AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

1.0 FIELD SAMPLING PROGRAM

1.1 Overview

This section describes the procedures that TRC followed during the field sampling program.

1.2 Indoor Air Quality Sampling

Each of the indoor air quality field samples was collected by TRC over the course of one 24-hour test period. Indoor air quality samples were collected for analysis of PCBs by EPA Method TO-4A.

Indoor air quality (IAQ) samples were collected for PCBs following the procedures described in the EPA Compendium Method TO-4A, ***Determination of Pesticides and Polychlorinated Biphenyls in Ambient Air Using High Volume Polyurethane Foam (PUF) Sampling followed by Gas Chromatographic/Multi-Detector Detection (GC/MD)***, *Compendium of Methods for the Determination of Toxic Organic Compounds in Ambient Air, Second Edition*, USEPA, January 1999.

TRC placed a high volume sampler at each PCB indoor air sampling location. A multi-point calibration was performed on each high volume sampler prior to sample collection using a calibrated orifice. A polyurethane foam (PUF) sampling cartridge was then unsealed and inserted into the high volume sampler and the sampler turned on. The start time, elapsed hours counter reading, and flow rate (magnehelic reading) were then recorded on a data sheet. After 24 hours of sampling, the elapsed hours counter reading and flow rate (magnehelic reading) were recorded on a data sheet along with the stop time. The PUF cartridge was then removed from the sampler, sealed, and labeled. A single-point post sampling calibration audit was performed to document that the high volume sampler remained calibrated.

Following the collection of the TO-4A samples, the total volume of ambient air sampled for each cartridge was calculated based on the duration of sampling and the average flow rate, as determined from the initial and final flow rates.

The data sheets are provided in Appendix B and the reduced data are presented in Appendix C. The calibration certifications of the critical orifice can be found in Appendix D.

1.3 Foundation Vent Air Sampling

Each of the vent air field samples was collected by TRC over the course of a 4-hour test period. Vent air samples were collected for analysis of PCBs by EPA Method TO-10A. Prior to sampling, all of the foundation vents were temporarily capped for approximately 24 hours. Just prior to sampling, TRC removed the caps from all vent stacks that were not being sampled to allow for the inflow of air. This approach is a modification to the procedure outlined in the LTMMIP to improve representativeness by allowing sample air to be drawn from the entire vent stack zone without potential stagnation of flow impacted by capped vent stacks.

Vent stack air samples were collected for PCBs following the procedures described in the EPA Compendium Method TO-10A, ***Determination of Pesticides and Polychlorinated Biphenyls in Ambient Air Using High Volume Polyurethane Foam (PUF) Sampling followed by Gas Chromatographic/Multi-Detector Detection (GC/MD)***, *Compendium of Methods for the Determination of Toxic Organic Compounds in Ambient Air, Second Edition*, USEPA, January 1999.

In order to sample each vent stack without collecting ambient air, a cap with Teflon™ tubing penetrating through it was placed over the vent stack. Prior to capping the stack, a PUF sampling cartridge was unsealed and connected to the length of tubing that would extend inside the vent stack. The tubing on the opposite side of the cap (that would be outside of the vent stack after the cap was installed) was attached to a Dawson® vacuum pump. A vacuum was applied to the tubing and cartridge using the pump and the vacuum was adjusted so that a flow rate of five liters per minute (LPM) of air was flowing through the PUF. The flow rate was confirmed using a Bios Defender™ 520 primary gas flow calibrator. The cap was then placed over the vent stack with the PUF cartridge suspended in the stack. The start time and flow rate was then recorded on a data sheet. After 4 hours of sampling, the flow rate was confirmed using the bubble meter. The final flow rate and stop time are then recorded on the data sheet. The PUF cartridge was then disconnected from the tubing, sealed with the supplied end caps, placed into a sample jar and labeled.

Following the collection of all the TO-10A samples, the total volume of ambient air sampled for each cartridge was calculated based on the duration of sampling and the average flow rate, as determined from the initial and final flow rates.

The data sheets can be found in Appendix B and the reduced data can be found in Appendix C. The calibration certifications of the Bios Defender™ 520 primary gas flow calibrator can be found in Appendix D.

2.0 ANALYTICAL PROGRAM

Samples collected by EPA Method TO-10A and TO-4A were prepared by the Soxhlet Extraction Method (EPA Method 3540C/TO-4A) and analyzed by gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy (EPA Method 680) for PCB Homologue distribution. The homologue analytical method is a reliable method to quantify total PCBs to levels below the EPA Action Level (0.05 µg/m^3) and Acceptable Long-Term Average Exposure Concentration (0.3 µg/m^3) described in Section 5 and Appendix G. By quantifying PCB homologues, total PCB air data gathered at the KMS are directly comparable to total PCB air data gathered at the high school since both are based on homologues rather than congeners, which greatly facilitates communication and discussion with the general public on the results of analyses.

Laboratory analytical results are presented in Appendix E.

3.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE

3.1 Overview

TRC management is fully committed to an effective Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Program whose objective is the delivery of a quality product. For much of TRC's work, that product is data developed from field measurements, sampling and analysis activities, engineering assessments, and the analysis of gathered data for planning purposes. TRC's QA/QC Program works to provide complete, precise, accurate, representative data in a timely manner for each project, considering both the project's needs and budget.

This section highlights the specific QA/QC procedures that were followed during this sampling and analysis program.

3.2 Field Quality Control Summary

Calibrations of the field sampling equipment were performed prior to the field sampling effort. Copies of the calibration sheets were submitted to the Field Team Leader to take onsite and placed in the project file. Calibrations were performed as described in the EPA 40 CFR Part 50 Appendix B. All calibrations were available for review during the test program. Copies of the equipment calibration forms can be found in Appendix D. All instrument calibrations met the performance criteria defined in 40 CFR 50 Appendix B.

3.3 Data Reduction and Validation

Specific QC measures were used to ensure the generation of reliable data from sampling and analysis activities. Proper collection and organization of accurate information followed by clear and concise reporting of the data is a primary goal in all projects.

3.3.1 Field Data Reduction

Appendix B of this document presents the standardized forms that were used to record field sampling data. The data collected was reviewed in the field by the Field Team Leader and at least one other field crewmember. Errors or discrepancies were noted in the field book.

3.3.2 Data Validation

TRC supervisory and QC personnel used validation methods and criteria appropriate to the type of data and the purpose of the measurement. Records of all data were maintained, including that judged as an "outlying" or spurious value. The persons validating the data have sufficient knowledge of the technical work to identify questionable values.

Field sampling data was validated by the Field Team Leader and/or the Field QC Coordinator based on their review of adherence to each approved sampling protocol and written sample collection procedure.

The following criteria were used to evaluate the field sampling data:

- Use of approved test procedures;
- Proper operation of the process being tested;
- Use of properly operating and calibrated equipment;
- Proper chain-of-custody maintained.

Laboratory analytical data was validated by TRC chemists. The sample results were assessed using the EPA New England Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Environmental Analyses, revised December 1996. Modification of these guidelines was performed to accommodate the non-CLP methodology.

Sample data were reviewed for the following parameters:

- Agreement of analyses conducted with TRC requests
- Holding times and sample preservation
- Gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS) tunes
- Initial and continuing calibrations
- Method blanks
- System Monitoring Compound recoveries
- Laboratory control sample (LCS) and LCS Duplicate (LCSD) results
- Internal standard performance
- Field duplicate results
- Quantitation limits and sample results

The laboratory data validation memoranda can be found in Appendix F. All data are reported in standard units depending on the measurement and the ultimate use of the data.

3.4 Collocated Sampler Precision

Single collocated sampler pairs were included for both indoor and vent stack air during each sampling event. Collocated samplers were operated for the same duration at near identical flow rates and were in close proximity to each other so as to represent near identical air space. The data resulting from the analyses of the collocated sampler pairs were used to define the precision of the combined sample collection and analyses scheme.

Precision was determined by the collection and analysis of replicate samples and is expressed as the relative percent difference (RPD), which is determined according to the following equation:

$$RPD = \left[\frac{X_1 - X_2}{\frac{X_1 + X_2}{2}} \right] x\ 100$$

where X_1 and X_2 are the measurement results of each replicate sample expressed as an absolute value (always positive).

APPENDIX B

SAMPLING DATA

Keith Middle School Sampling Data Sheet
Ambient / Vent Air Sampling

36

Setup Date: 9/3/15 **Sampler(s):** D.Gill

Recovery Date: 9/4/15 **Sampler(s):** J. Mulhern

TO-4A (Ambient)							
Location	Time (clock)		Sampler				
			Serial Number	Counter (Hrs)		Flow Rate (Mag Reading)	
	Start	Stop		Start	Finish	Initial	Final
C Lounge	1637	~~1611~~ 1611	005	727.26	750.83	50	49
B Cafe	1643	1606	003	730.15	753.54	51	51
A Hallway RIG	1646	1600	001	557.47	557.47	50	48
BG	1655	~~Died~~ 1620	002	336.32	359.74	53	51
BG Dup	Broken						

Sample Date: 9/4/15 **Sampler(s):** DG / JM

TO-10A (Vent)				
Location	Time (clock)		Flow Rate (LPM)	
	Start	Stop	Start	Finish
VS-1	10:15	14:10	5.11	5.03
VS-4	10:18	14:11	5.21	5.01
VS-7	10:31	14:35	5.15	5.21
VS-7 Dup	10:31	14:35	5.11	5.18
VS-11	10:40	14:55	5.19	5.00

	Temp	Pressure
OUT	72.7 °F	29.98 mmHg
IN	68 °F	

TRC

APPENDIX C

FIELD REDUCED DATA

INDOOR SAMPLING LOCATIONS

Average Temp (oF/ K): **68.0** 293.0

Average Baro. Press ("Hg / mmHg): **29.98** 761.5

Friday, September 04, 2015

Location		Serial #	m_s	b_s	Start Reading ("H2O)	Start Reading (lpm)	Stop Reading ("H2O)	Stop Reading (lpm)	Avg. Reading ("H2O)	RPD of Start and Stop Readings	Avg. Flow (lpm)	Start time (hr)	Start time (clock)	Stop Time (hr)	Stop Time (clock)	Total Sample Time (min)	Total Actual Sample Volume (m^3)
C-36 Lounge	TO-4A	**821/005**	0.030	-0.25345	**50**		**49**		49.5	2.02	241	**727.26**	**16:37**	**750.83**	**16:11**	1414	340.3
B-36 Café	TO-4A	**823/003**	0.033	-0.94279	**51**		**51**		51	0.00	242	**730.15**	**16:43**	**753.54**	**16:06**	1403	340.2
A-36 hallway, Rm 169	TO-4A	**825/001**	0.029	-0.31583	**50**		**48**		49	4.08	250	**557.47**	**16:46**	**557.47**	**16:00**	1394	348.2
1-110	TO-10A					**5.16**		**5.36**		3.80	5.26		**15:53**		**15:44**	1431	7.53
1-110D	TO-10A					**5.22**		**5.33**		2.09	5.28		**15:53**		**15:44**	1431	7.55
1-315	TO-10A					**5.21**		**5.34**		2.46	5.28		**15:26**		**15:26**	1440	7.60
1-315D	TO-10A					**5.21**		**5.47**		4.87	5.34		**15:26**		**15:26**	1440	7.69
2-203	TO-10A					**5.23**		**5.51**		5.21	5.37		**15:40**		**15:34**	1434	7.70
2-203D	TO-10A					**5.23**		**5.37**		2.64	5.30		**15:40**		**15:34**	1434	7.60
													16:55		0.68	1405	

OUTDOOR SAMPLING LOCATIONS

Average Temp (oF/ K): **72.7** 295.6

Average Baro. Press ("Hg / mmHg): **29.98** 761.5

Friday, September 04, 2015

Location		Serial #	m_s	b_s	Start Reading ("H2O)	Start Reading (lpm)	Stop Reading ("H2O)	Stop Reading (lpm)	Avg. Reading ("H2O)	RPD of Start and Stop Readings	Avg. Flow (lpm)	Start time (hr)	Start time (clock)	Stop Time (hr)	Stop Time (clock)	Total Sample Time (min)	Total Actual Sample Volume (m^3)
BG-36	TO-4A	**820/002**	0.030	-0.37102	**53**		**51**		52	3.85	251	**336.32**	15:41	**359.74**	14:41	1405	353.3
BG-36-Dup	TO-4A	**822/004**															
VS-7-36	TO-10A					**5.15**		**5.21**		1.16	5.18		**10:31**		**14:35**	244	1.26
VS-7-36 Dup	TO-10A					**5.11**		**5.18**		1.36	5.15		**10:31**		**14:35**	244	1.26
VS-11-36	TO-10A					**5.19**		**5.00**		3.73	5.10		**10:40**		**14:55**	255	1.30
VS-1-36	TO-10A					**5.11**		**5.03**		1.58	5.07		**10:15**		**14:10**	235	1.19
VS-4-36	TO-10A					**5.21**		**5.01**		3.91	5.11		**10:18**		**14:11**	233	1.19

Note:
BG-35 motor died near the end of the sampling period.

Date	Time (edt)	Wind (mph)	Vis. (mi.)	Weather	Sky Cond.	Temperature (°F) Air	Dwpt	6 hour Max.	6 hour Min.	Relative Humidity	Wind Chill (°F)	Heat Index (°F)	Pressure altimeter (in)	Pressure sea level (mb)	Precipitation (in.) 1 hr	3 hr	6 hr	
5	6:53	Calm	10	Fair	CLR	55	54			96%	NA	NA	30.27	1025.1				
5	5:53	N 3	10	Fair	CLR	53	52			96%	NA	NA	30.26	1024.6				
5	4:53	Calm	2	Fog/Mist	CLR	53	53			100%	NA	NA	30.23	1023.6				
5	3:53	Calm	10	Fair	CLR	54	54			100%	NA	NA	30.22	1023.3				
5	2:53	N 3	10	Fair	CLR	55	55			100%	NA	NA	30.22	1023.3				
5	1:53	N 3	5	Fog/Mist	CLR	52	52	65	52	100%	NA	NA	30.23	1023.6				
5	0:53	Calm	4	Fog/Mist	CLR	56	55			97%	NA	NA	30.24	1023.9				
4	23:53	N 3	10	Fair	CLR	60	58			93%	NA	NA	30.24	1023.9				
4	22:53	NE 5	10	Fair	CLR	61	59			93%	NA	NA	30.23	1023.8				
4	21:53	Calm	10	Fair	CLR	62	60			93%	NA	NA	30.24	1023.8				
4	20:53	N 5	10	Fair	CLR	63	60			90%	NA	NA	30.22	1023.4				
4	19:53	N 6	10	Fair	CLR	65	60	74	65	84%	NA	NA	30.2	1022.6				
4	18:53	NE 12	10	Mostly Cloudy	BKN022	67	59			76%	NA	NA	30.18	1022.1				
4	17:53	NE 12	10	Partly Cloudy	SCT023	69	59			70%	NA	NA	30.17	1021.7				
4	16:53	NE 14 G 21	10	Fair	CLR	72	60			66%	NA	NA	30.16	1021.1				
4	15:53	NE 14	10	Partly Cloudy	SCT021	***73***	61			66%	NA	NA	***30.15***	1020.9				Post Cal
4	14:53	NE 9 G 20	10	Mostly Cloudy	BKN019	72	62			71%	NA	NA	30.15	1021				
4	13:53	NE 16 G 23	10	Mostly Cloudy	BKN022	75	62	76	70	64%	NA	NA	30.15	1020.9				
4	12:53	NE 15 G 26	10	Mostly Cloudy	BKN023	73	62			69%	NA	NA	30.14	1020.6				
4	11:53	N 12 G 22	10	Mostly Cloudy	BKN021	74	62			67%	NA	NA	30.13	1020.4				
4	10:53	NE 15 G 23	10	A Few Clouds	FEW021	73	61			66%	NA	NA	30.12	1019.9				
4	9:53	NE 14 G 20	10	Fair	CLR	72	62			71%	NA	NA	30.1	1019.4				
4	8:53	NE 9	10	Mostly Cloudy	BKN014 BKN029	71	63			76%	NA	NA	30.08	1018.4				
4	7:53	NE 12	10	Overcast	OVC010	69	65	72	69	87%	NA	NA	30.06	1017.8				
4	6:53	N 8 G 18	8	Overcast	SCT010 OVC027	70	66			87%	NA	NA	30.03	1016.7				
4	5:53	N 7	9	A Few Clouds	FEW100	70	67			90%	NA	NA	29.98	1015.3				
4	4:53	N 6	9	Overcast	FEW070 OVC100	70	66			87%	NA	NA	29.96	1014.5				
4	3:53	N 3	8	A Few Clouds	FEW085	69	66			90%	NA	NA	29.94	1013.9				
4	2:53	N 5	9	A Few Clouds	FEW100	70	67			90%	NA	NA	29.93	1013.4				
4	1:53	NE 6	7	Overcast	FEW055 BKN085 OVC100	72	69	76	70	91%	NA	NA	29.92	1013				
4	0:53	Calm	6	Fog/Mist	CLR	71	70			96%	NA	NA	29.92	1013				
3	23:53	N 3	6	Fog/Mist	CLR	71	70			96%	NA	NA	29.91	1012.6				
3	22:53	Calm	6	Fog/Mist	CLR	71	69			94%	NA	NA	29.9	1012.2				
3	21:53	Calm	6	Fog/Mist	CLR	71	70			96%	NA	NA	29.89	1012				
3	20:53	Calm	9	Fair	CLR	73	71			94%	NA	NA	29.87	1011.3				
3	19:53	Calm	10	Fair	CLR	75	70	87	75	84%	NA	NA	29.85	1010.7				
3	18:53	Calm	10	Fair	CLR	78	70			76%	NA	80	29.84	1010.5				
3	17:53	E 3	10	Fair	CLR	81	69			67%	NA	84	29.84	1010.5				Average for sampling period
3	16:53	SE 6	10	Partly Cloudy	SCT039	82	69			65%	NA	85	29.83	1010.2				29.98 72.7
3	15:53	E 6	10	Mostly Cloudy	BKN037 BKN048	***83***	70			65%	NA	87	***29.82***	1009.7				Pre cal
3	14:53	S 5	10	Partly Cloudy	SCT034	86	70			59%	NA	91	29.82	1009.7				
3	13:53	SE 5	10	Mostly Cloudy	BKN048 BKN060	86	71	86	70	61%	NA	91	29.83	1009.8				
3	12:53	S 6	10	A Few Clouds	FEW043	85	70			61%	NA	90	29.83	1010.1				
3	11:53	Calm	10	Partly Cloudy	SCT036	85	67			55%	NA	88	29.84	1010.4				
3	10:53	SW 3	10	Fair	CLR	82	69			65%	NA	85	29.85	1010.8				
3	9:53	Calm	10	Fair	CLR	80	68			67%	NA	83	29.85	1010.9				
3	8:53	W 3	10	Fair	CLR	75	67			76%	NA	NA	29.85	1010.9				
3	7:53	Calm	9	Fair	CLR	70	67	70	63	90%	NA	NA	29.85	1010.8				
3	6:53	Calm	7	Fair	CLR	65	63			93%	NA	NA	29.85	1010.6				
3	5:53	Calm	7	Fair	CLR	64	63			96%	NA	NA	29.84	1010.3				
3	4:53	SW 3	10	Fair	CLR	67	64			91%	NA	NA	29.83	1010.2				
3	3:53	SW 3	9	Fair	CLR	65	63			93%	NA	NA	29.84	1010.5				
3	2:53	SW 5	9	Fair	CLR	66	65			96%	NA	NA	29.85	1010.6				
3	1:53	SW 3	10	Fair	CLR	67	65	73	67	93%	NA	NA	29.85	1010.9				
3	0:53	SW 3	10	Fair	CLR	69	65			87%	NA	NA	29.86	1011.1				
2	23:53	SW 6	10	Fair	CLR	70	65			84%	NA	NA	29.87	1011.5				
2	22:53	SW 7	10	Fair	CLR	70	64			82%	NA	NA	29.88	1011.8				
2	21:53	SW 9	10	Fair	CLR	72	63			73%	NA	NA	29.89	1012.1				
2	20:53	SW 9	10	Fair	CLR	72	63			73%	NA	NA	29.89	1012.1				
2	19:53	SW 9	10	Fair	CLR	73	62	84	73	69%	NA	NA	29.88	1011.9				
2	18:53	SW 9	10	Fair	CLR	75	62			64%	NA	NA	29.88	1011.9				
2	17:53	SW 9	10	Fair	CLR	78	64			62%	NA	80	29.89	1012				
2	16:53	SW 13	10	Fair	CLR	80	66			62%	NA	82	29.9	1012.3				
2	15:53	SW 13	10	Fair	CLR	82	68			63%	NA	85	29.91	1012.7				
2	14:53	SW 10	10	Fair	CLR	83	68			61%	NA	86	29.93	1013.3				
2	13:53	S 12	10	Fair	CLR	83	68	83	69	61%	NA	86	29.94	1014				
2	12:53	SW 10	10	Fair	CLR	83	68			61%	NA	86	29.96	1014.4				
2	11:53	SW 9	10	Fair	CLR	82	68			63%	NA	85	29.98	1015.1				
2	10:53	SW 8	10	Fair	CLR	80	68			67%	NA	83	29.99	1015.6				
2	9:53	SW 7	10	Fair	CLR	76	69			79%	NA	77	30	1015.9				
2	8:53	SW 8	6	Fog/Mist	BKN005	71	69			94%	NA	NA	30.01	1016.2				
2	7:53	SW 7	3	Fog/Mist	BKN004	68	68	68	65	100%	NA	NA	30.01	1016.3				
Date	Time (edt)	Wind (mph)	Vis. (mi.)	Weather	Sky Cond.	Temperature (°F) Air	Dwpt	6 hour Max.	6 hour Min.	Relative Humidity	Wind Chill (°F)	Heat Index (°F)	Pressure altimeter (in)	Pressure sea level (mb)	Precipitation (in.) 1 hr	3 hr	6 hr	

APPENDIX D

EQUIPMENT CALIBRATION SHEETS

MesaLabs

NVLAP Lab Code 200661-0

Calibration Certificate

Certificate No.	5046362	**Sold to:**	TRC Environmental Corporation - CT
Product	Defender 530 High Flow		Wannalancit Mills 650 Suffolk Street Suite 200
Serial No.	119011		Lowell, MA 01854
Cal. Date	12-Aug-2014		USA

All calibrations are performed in accordance with ISO 17025 at Mesa Laboratories, Inc., 10 Park Place, Butler, NJ, 07405, 800-663-4977, an ISO 17025:2005 – accredited laboratory through NVLAP. This report shall not be reproduced except in full without the written approval of the laboratory. Results only relate to the items calibrated. This report must not be used to claim product certification, approval, or endorsement by NVLAP, NIST, or any agency of the Federal Government.

As Received Calibration Data

Technician Zenaida Ortiz

Lab. Pressure 754 mmHg
Lab. Temperature 22.4 °C

Instrument Reading	Lab Standard Reading	Deviation	Allowable Deviation	As Received
500.78 ccm	500.61 ccm	0.03 % %	1.00%	In Tolerance
4992.3 ccm	5002.85 ccm	-0.21 % %	1.00%	In Tolerance
29774 ccm	30051.5 ccm	-0.92 % %	1.00%	In Tolerance
23.4 °C	22.4 °C	1.0 °C	±0.8°C	Out of Tolerance
755 mmHg	754 mmHg	1.0 mmHg	±3.5mmHg	In Tolerance

Mesa Laboratories Standards Used

Description	Standard Serial Number	Calibration Date	Calibration Due Date
ML 500-44	113761	22-Apr-2014	22-Apr-2015
Precision Thermometer	300907	7-May-2014	7-May-2015
Precision Barometer	2981392	24-Jun-2014	24-Jun-2015

MesaLabs

NVLAP Lab Code 200661-0

As Shipped Calibration Data

Certificate No. 5046362
Technician Zenaida Ortiz

Lab. Pressure 752 mmHg
Lab. Temperature 22.0 °C

Instrument Reading	Lab Standard Reading	Deviation	Allowable Deviation	As Shipped
504.80 ccm	501.075 ccm	0.74 %%	1.00%	In Tolerance
5016.1 ccm	5006.95 ccm	0.18 %%	1.00%	In Tolerance
29875 ccm	30042 ccm	-0.56 %%	1.00%	In Tolerance
22.0 °C	22.0 °C	-	±0.8°C	In Tolerance
752 mmHg	752 mmHg	-	±3.5mmHg	In Tolerance

Mesa Laboratories Standards Used

Description	Standard Serial Number	Calibration Date	Calibration Due Date
ML-500-44	113761	22-Apr-2014	22-Apr-2015
Precision Thermometer	305460	27-Aug-2013	27-Aug-2014
Precision Barometer	2981392	24-Jun-2014	24-Jun-2015

Calibration Notes

The expanded uncertainty of flow, temperature, and pressure measurements all have a coverage factor of k = 2 for a confidence interval of approximately 95%.

Flow testing is in accordance with our test number PR18-13 with an expanded uncertainty of 0.27% using high-purity nitrogen or filtered laboratory air.

Pressure testing is in accordance with our test number PR18-11 with an expanded uncertainty of 0.16 mmHg.

Temperature testing is in accordance with our test number PR18-12 with an expanded uncertainty of 0.04 °C.

Traceability to the International System of Units (SI) is verified by accreditation to ISO/IEC 17025 by NVLAP under NVLAP Code 200661-0.

Technician Notes:

David W. Wilson, Chief Metrologist

TISCH ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
145 SOUTH MIAMI AVE
VILLAGE OF CLEVES, OH
45002
513.467.9000
877.263.7610 TOLL FREE
513.467.9009 FAX

ORIFICE TRANSFER STANDARD CERTIFICATION WORKSHEET TE-5040A

Date - Aug 01, 2014 Rootsmeter S/N 0438320 Ta (K) - 298
Operator Jim Tisch Orifice I.D. - 1125 Pa (mm) - 754.38

PLATE OR VDC #	VOLUME START (m3)	VOLUME STOP (m3)	DIFF VOLUME (m3)	DIFF TIME (min)	METER DIFF Hg (mm)	ORFICE DIFF H2O (in.)
1	NA	NA	1.00	6.6060	3.6	2.00
2	NA	NA	1.00	3.9750	10.0	5.50
3	NA	NA	1.00	3.1740	15.5	8.50
4	NA	NA	1.00	2.7030	21.0	11.50
5	NA	NA	1.00	2.3890	26.5	14.50
6	NA	NA	1.00	2.2440	30.2	16.50

DATA TABULATION

Vstd	(x axis) Qstd	(y axis)		Va	(x axis) Qa	(y axis)
0.9878	0.1495	1.4090		0.9951	0.1506	0.8888
0.9794	0.2464	2.3365		0.9867	0.2482	1.4740
0.9722	0.3063	2.9047		0.9794	0.3085	1.8324
0.9649	0.3569	3.3786		0.9721	0.3596	2.1314
0.9577	0.4008	3.7938		0.9648	0.4038	2.3933
0.9529	0.4246	4.0470	-	-0.9600	0.4278	2.5530
Qstd slope (m) =		9.53442		Qa slope (m) =		5.97029
intercept (b) =		-0.01678		intercept (b) =		-0.01058
coefficient (r) =		0.99991		coefficient (r) =		0.99991
y axis = SQRT[H2O(Pa/760)(298/Ta)]				y axis = SQRT[H2O(Ta/Pa)]		

CALCULATIONS

Vstd = Diff. Vol[(Pa-Diff. Hg)/760](298/Ta)
Qstd = Vstd/Time

Va = Diff Vol [(Pa-Diff Hg)/Pa]
Qa = Va/Time

For subsequent flow rate calculations:

Qstd = 1/m{[SQRT(H2O(Pa/760)(298/Ta))]- b}
Qa = 1/m{[SQRT H2O(Ta/Pa)]- b}

Network: **New Bedford** Site: **Keith Middle** Serial #: **825/001** Station #: **A - Hallway**

Technician: **DG/JM** Date: **9/3/2015** OrificeS/N: **1125** Orif. Cal. Date: **1-Aug-14**

Reason for Puff Sampler Calibration: *Monthly Recal*

Amb. Temp, Ta (^{o}C)	**21**	Bar. Press., Pa (in Hg)	**29.82**
Amb. Temp, Ta (K)	294.1	Bar. Press., Pa (mmHg)	757.4

Orifice Data

Qstd (m_o) = **9.53442** Qstd (b_o) = **-0.01678** Qstd (r_o) = **0.99991**

ΔH	Q_{std}	I	I_c
7.70	294.221	**70**	8.41
6.90	278.611	**60**	7.78
5.80	255.586	**50**	7.10
4.70	230.252	**40**	6.35
3.40	196.100	**30**	5.50

I_c = sqrt[I x 0.392 x (Pa/Ta)]

Qstd = {(1/mo) x sqrt[DH x (Pa/760) x (298/Ta) - bo]} x 1000

m_s = 0.029 b_s = -0.31583 r_s = 0.99714



Desired Flow Rate (lpm): 250 Sampler Setting: 49.6

m_{mag} = 0.401 b_{mag} = -50.69570 r_{mag} = 0.99069

Network: **New Bedford** Site: **Keith Middle** Serial #: **823/003** Station #: **B - Café**

Technician: **DG/JM** Date: **9/3/2015** OrificeS/N: **1125** Orif. Cal. Date: **1-Aug-14**

Reason for Puff Sampler Calibration: *Monthly Recal*

Amb. Temp, Ta (^{o}C)	**21**	Bar. Press., Pa (in Hg)	**29.82**
Amb. Temp, Ta (K)	294.1	Bar. Press., Pa (mmHg)	757.4

Orifice Data

Qstd (m_o) = **9.53442** Qstd (b_o) = **-0.01678** Qstd (r_o) = **0.99991**

ΔH	Q_{std}	I	I_c
7.20	284.566	**70**	8.41
6.30	266.301	**60**	7.78
5.40	246.677	**50**	7.10
4.40	222.839	**40**	6.35
3.40	196.100	**30**	5.50

I_c = sqrt[I x 0.392 x (Pa/Ta)]

Qstd = {(1/mo) x sqrt[DH x (Pa/760) x (298/Ta) - bo]} x 1000

m_s = 0.033 b_s = -0.94279 r_s = 0.99978



Desired Flow Rate (lpm): 250 Sampler Setting: 53.0

m_{mag} = 0.451 b_{mag} = -59.65871 r_{mag} = 0.99667

Network: **New Bedford** Site: **Keith Middle** Serial #: **821/005** Station #: **C - Lounge**

Technician: **DG/JM** Date: **9/3/2015** OrificeS/N: **1125** Orif. Cal. Date: **1-Aug-14**

Reason for Puff Sampler Calibration: *Monthly Recal*

Amb. Temp, Ta (^{o}C)	**21**	Bar. Press., Pa (in Hg)	**29.82**
Amb. Temp, Ta (K)	294.1	Bar. Press., Pa (mmHg)	757.4

Orifice Data

Qstd (m_o) = **9.53442** Qstd (b_o) = **-0.01678** Qstd (r_o) = **0.99991**

ΔH	Q_{std}	I	I_c
7.10	282.595	**70**	8.41
6.30	266.301	**60**	7.78
5.30	244.399	**50**	7.10
4.30	220.313	**40**	6.35
3.10	187.328	**30**	5.50

I_c = sqrt[I x 0.392 x (Pa/Ta)]

Qstd = {(1/mo) x sqrt[DH x (Pa/760) x (298/Ta) - bo]} x 1000

m_s = 0.030 b_s = -0.25345 r_s = 0.99775



Desired Flow Rate (lpm): 250 Sampler Setting: 54.1

m_{mag} = 0.416 b_{mag} = -49.89072 r_{mag} = 0.99180

Network: **New Bedford** Site: **Keith Middle** Serial #: **820/002** Station #: **BG**

Technician: **DG/JM** Date: **9/3/2015** OrificeS/N: **1125** Orif. Cal. Date: **1-Aug-14**

Reason for Puff Sampler Calibration: *Monthly Recal*

Amb. Temp, Ta (^{o}C)	**21**	Bar. Press., Pa (in Hg)	**29.82**
Amb. Temp, Ta (K)	294.1	Bar. Press., Pa (mmHg)	757.4

Orifice Data

Qstd (m_o) = **9.53442** Qstd (b_o) = **-0.01678** Qstd (r_o) = **0.99991**

ΔH	Q_{std}	I	I_c
7.40	288.467	**70**	8.41
6.50	270.467	**60**	7.78
5.60	251.171	**50**	7.10
4.40	222.839	**40**	6.35
3.30	193.220	**30**	5.50

I_c = sqrt[I x 0.392 x (Pa/Ta)]

Qstd = {(1/mo) x sqrt[DH x (Pa/760) x (298/Ta) - bo]} x 1000

m_s = 0.030 b_s = -0.37102 r_s = 0.99829



Desired Flow Rate (lpm): 250 Sampler Setting: 52.0

m_{mag} = 0.414 b_{mag} = -51.59258 r_{mag} = 0.99321

Network: **New Bedford** Site: **Keith Middle** Serial #: **822/004** Station #: **BG**

Technician: **DG/JM** Date: **9/3/2015** OrificeS/N: **1125** Orif. Cal. Date: **1-Aug-14**

Reason for Puff Sampler Calibration: *Monthly Recal*

Amb. Temp, Ta (^{o}C)	**21**	Bar. Press., Pa (in Hg)	**29.82**
Amb. Temp, Ta (K)	294.1	Bar. Press., Pa (mmHg)	757.4

Orifice Data

Qstd (m_o) = **9.53442** Qstd (b_o) = **-0.01678** Qstd (r_o) = **0.99991**

ΔH	Q_{std}	I	I_c
0.00	1.760	**70**	8.41
0.00	1.760	**60**	7.78
0.00	1.760	**50**	7.10
0.00	1.760	**40**	6.35
0.00	1.760	**30**	5.50

I_c = sqrt[I x 0.392 x (Pa/Ta)]

Qstd = {(1/mo) x sqrt[DH x (Pa/760) x (298/Ta) - bo]} x 1000

m_s = #DIV/0! b_s = #DIV/0! r_s = #DIV/0!



Desired Flow Rate (lpm): 250 Sampler Setting: #DIV/0!

m_{mag} = #DIV/0! b_{mag} = #DIV/0! r_{mag} = #DIV/0!

PS-1 Post-Sampling Flow Audit

Qstd Orifice (m^3/min) = $(1/m_o)*(SQRT(H_o*(Tstd/Pstd))-b_o)$)

Qstd Sampler (m^3/min) = $(1/m_s)*(SQRT(H_s*(Tstd/Pstd))-b_s)/1000$

% Difference = ((Qact Orifice - Qact Sampler) / Qact Orifice)*100

9/4/2015 Press ("Hg): **30.10** Press - P_a (mmHg): 764.5

	Temp (^oC):	Temp - T_a (K):	Sampler Serial #	Sampler Reading - H_s ("h20)	Orifice Reading - H_o ("h20)	Orifice #	Orifice Slope - m_o	Orifice Intercept - b_o	**Qstd Orifice**	Sampler #	Sampler Slope - m_s	Sampler Intercept - b_s	**Qstd Sampler**	**% Difference**
A-36	20.0	293.0	825	**50**	**5.80**	1125	**9.53442**	**-0.01678**	**0.257**	825	**0.029**	**-0.31583**	**0.258**	**-0.10**
B-36	20.0	293.0	823	**50**	**5.50**	1125	**9.53442**	**-0.01678**	**0.251**	823	**0.033**	**-0.94279**	**0.245**	**2.10**
C-36	20.0	293.0	821	**50**	**5.30**	1125	**9.53442**	**-0.01678**	**0.246**	821	**0.030**	**-0.25345**	**0.247**	**-0.35**
BG-36	22.8	295.8	820	**50**	**5.60**	1125	**9.53442**	**-0.01678**	**0.252**	820	**0.030**	**-0.37102**	**0.250**	**0.78**
BG-DUP-36	22.8	295.8	822	**0**	**0.00**	1125	**9.53442**	**-0.01678**	**0.002**	822	**0.000**	**0.00000**	**#DIV/0!**	**#DIV/0!**

Acceptance Limit </= 10% Difference

PS-1 Post-Sampling Flow Audit

Qstd Orifice (m^3/min) = $(1/m_o)*(SQRT(H_o*(Tstd/Pstd))-b_o)$)

Qstd Sampler (m^3/min) = $(1/m_s)*(SQRT(H_s*(Tstd/Pstd))-b_s)/1000$

% Difference = ((Qact Orifice - Qact Sampler) / Qact Orifice)*100

9/4/2015 Press ("Hg): **30.10** Press - P_a (mmHg): 764.5

	Temp (^oC):	Temp - T_a (K):	Sampler Serial #	Sampler Reading - H_s ("h20)	Orifice Reading - H_o ("h20)	Orifice #	Orifice Slope - m_o	Orifice Intercept - b_o	**Qstd Orifice**	Sampler #	Sampler Slope - m_s	Sampler Intercept - b_s	**Qstd Sampler**	**% Difference**
A-36	20.0	293.0	825	**50**	**5.80**	1125	**9.53442**	**-0.01678**	**0.257**	825	**0.029**	**-0.31583**	**0.258**	**-0.10**
B-36	20.0	293.0	823	**50**	**5.50**	1125	**9.53442**	**-0.01678**	**0.251**	823	**0.033**	**-0.94279**	**0.245**	**2.10**
C-36	20.0	293.0	821	**50**	**5.30**	1125	**9.53442**	**-0.01678**	**0.246**	821	**0.030**	**-0.25345**	**0.247**	**-0.35**
BG-36	22.8	295.8	820	**50**	**5.60**	1125	**9.53442**	**-0.01678**	**0.252**	820	**0.030**	**-0.37102**	**0.250**	**0.78**
BG-DUP-36	22.8	295.8	822	**0**	**0.00**	1125	**9.53442**	**-0.01678**	**0.002**	822	**0.000**	**0.00000**	**#DIV/0!**	**#DIV/0!**

Acceptance Limit </= 10% Difference

APPENDIX E

LABORATORY DATA REPORTS (ON CD)

APPENDIX F

LABORATORY DATA VALIDATION MEMORANDA

Memo

To: David Sullivan

From: Lorie MacKinnon

CC:

Date: 10/12/15

Re: Data Validation Review: Air Samples: Keith Middle School/New Bedford, MA: SDG 15090194

SUMMARY

Limited (Tier II) validation was performed on the data for nine air samples and two trip blank samples collected at the Keith Middle School in New Bedford, Massachusetts. The samples were collected on September 4, 2015 and submitted to Pace Analytical Services, Inc. in Schenectady, New York for analysis. All air vent samples were collected on polyurethane foam (PUF) cartridges in accordance with EPA method TO-10A; all ambient air samples were collected on particulate filters and PUF cartridges in accordance with EPA method TO-4A. The samples were analyzed for polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) homolog distribution using EPA method 680. The results were reported under job number 15090194.

The sample results were assessed using the *EPA New England Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Environmental Analyses*, revised December 1996. Modification of these guidelines was performed to accommodate the non-CLP methodology.

In general, the data appear to be valid as reported and may be used for decision-making purposes. Potential low bias exists for results in samples VS-7-36, VS-11-36, VS-1-36, VS-TB-36, and TB-36 due to low surrogate recoveries. Potential low bias exists for octachlorobiphenyl, decachlorobiphenyl, and total PCB in samples A-36, B-36, C-36, BG-36, and TB-36 due to low laboratory control sample recoveries. These issues have a minor impact on the data usability; all results are still usable for project objectives.

SAMPLES

Samples included in this review are listed below:

VS-7-36	VS-7-36-DUP[1]	VS-11-36
VS-1-36	VS-4-36	VS-TB-36
A-36	B-36	C-36
BG-36	TB-36	

[1] - Field duplicate of VS-7-36

REVIEW ELEMENTS

Sample data were reviewed for the following parameters:

- Agreement of analyses conducted with TRC requests
- Holding times and sample preservation
- Gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS) tunes
- Initial and continuing calibrations
- Blanks
- Surrogate spike recoveries
- Laboratory control sample (LCS) results
- Internal standard performance
- Field duplicate results
- Quantitation limits and sample results

DISCUSSION

Agreement of Analyses Conducted with TRC Requests

Sample reports were checked to verify that the results corresponded to analytical requests as designated on the chain-of-custody and any correspondence between TRC and the laboratory.

Holding Times and Sample Preservation

All samples were extracted and analyzed within the method-specified holding time.

GC/MS Tunes

The frequency and abundance of all decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tunes were within the acceptance criteria. The samples were analyzed within 12 hours from the DFTPP tunes. Window defining mixtures were analyzed following each DFTPP tune.

Initial and Continuing Calibrations

The %RSDs and %Ds of all PCB homologs used in the initial and continuing calibrations were within the acceptance criteria.

Blanks

Target compounds were not detected in the laboratory method blanks and trip blanks associated with the PCB homologue analyses.

Target compounds were not detected in the VER PUF sample (Lot #s 68389, 67183, and 68582) and VER Filter sample (Lot #s 080215-4 and 090715-4) which were analyzed and reported under job numbers 15080722, 15080723, and 15090326.

Surrogate Spike Recoveries

Select samples exhibited surrogate recoveries outside the acceptance criteria. The following table summarizes the surrogate recoveries in the affected samples.

Sample ID Control Limit (PUF)	TCMX 44.4-104	DCB 70.1-116	Validation Actions
VS-7-36	Criteria Met	55.4%	Estimate (UJ) the nondetect results for sample VS-7-36; Low bias.
VS-11-36	40.2%	68.2%	Estimate (UJ) the nondetect results for sample VS-11-36; Low bias.
VS-1-36	Criteria Met	51.9%	Estimate (UJ) the nondetect results for sample VS-1-36; Low bias.
VS-TB-36	Criteria Met	61.9%	Estimate (UJ) the nondetect results for sample VS-TB-36; Low bias.
Sample ID Control Limit (Filter)	**TCMX 17.9-137**	**DCB 42.5-134**	**Validation Actions**
TB-36	15.8%	Criteria met	Estimate (UJ) the nondetect results for sample TB-36; Low bias.

LCS Results

LCS and LCS Duplicate (LCSD) samples were extracted and analyzed with each extraction batch. The following table summarizes the analytes recoveries and relative percent differences (RPDs) outside of the control limits.

LCS ID	Compound	Recovery (%)	RPD (%)	Control Limits	Validation Actions
LCS/LCSD-12	2,2',3,4,5'-Pentachlorobiphenyl	Criteria Met	42.6	40	Validation action was not required as all affected analyte results were nondetect in the associated samples and therefore not affected by the high precision results.
	2,2',3,4',5,6,6'-Heptachlorobiphenyl	Criteria Met	44.8	40	
	2,2',3,3',4,5',6,6'-Octachlorobiphenyl	LCSD 43.0	Criteria Met	43.2-102	Estimate (UJ) the nondetect results for octachlorobiphenyl and decachlorobiphenyl in the associated samples; Low bias.
	Decachlorobiphenyl	LCSD 46.3	Criteria Met	46.4-102	
Associated samples: A-36, B-36, C-36, BG-36, TB-36					

Additionally, the results for total PCBs in samples A-36, B-36, C-36, BG-36, and TB-36 were estimated (J) as homolog results were estimated in these samples.

Internal Standard Performance

All internal standard criteria were met for the project samples.

Field Duplicate Results

Samples VS-7-36/VS-7-36-DUP (PUF) were submitted as the field duplicate (collocated) pairs with this sample set. PCBs were not detected in these samples.

Quantitation Limits and Sample Results

The quantitation limits met the requirements in the Sampling Plan for this program.

Due to sample matrix, two fold dilutions were performed on samples A-36, B-36, and C-36. Quantitation limits were elevated accordingly in these samples.

APPENDIX G

DISCUSSION OF RISK-BASED COMPARISON CRITERIA

DISCUSSION OF RISK-BASED COMPARISON CRITERIA

Two PCB risk-based air concentrations (RBACs) have been developed for the KMS, assuming occupational exposures within the school (8 hours/day, 250 days/year, for 25 years). Both non-carcinogenic and carcinogenic health endpoints were considered in the calculation of the RBACs; however, RBACs are based on noncarcinogenic effects as the most sensitive endpoint. The first RBAC is the Action Level (AL; 0.05 ug/m^3) used as an initial indicator that PCB air concentrations above background levels have been detected. The risk basis for the AL is a noncarcinogenic hazard index of approximately 0.2. The second RBAC is the Acceptable Long-Term Average Exposure Concentration (ALTAEC; 0.3 ug/m^3), indicative of the air concentration that should not be exceeded for an extended time period. The ALTAEC could be exceeded over the short-term and still result in acceptable risk levels. The risk basis for the ALTAEC is a noncarcinogenic hazard index of one.

Both RBACs were developed to be applied to a total PCB air concentration. PCB homologues have been quantified and summed to generate total PCB air concentrations. By quantifying PCB homologues, total PCB air data gathered at the KMS are directly comparable to total PCB air data gathered at the high school since both are based on homologues rather than congeners, which greatly facilitates communication and discussion with the general public on the results of analyses.

In September 2009, EPA published Public Health Levels (PHLs) for PCBs which are calculated indoor air concentrations that maintain PCB exposures at a level that EPA believes does not cause harm. In July 2015, EPA revised the PHLs and published Exposure Levels (ELs) for Evaluation of PCBs in Indoor School Air. ELs were calculated for all ages of children from toddlers in day care to adolescents in high school as well as for adult school employees. In this report, indoor air PCB concentrations are compared to the EL (0.5 ug/m^3) for adult school employees and children 12 to <15 years old, representative of the middle school age range. In calculating the EL, EPA considered average PCB exposures from both school (e.g., school indoor and outdoor air, indoor dust and nearby outside soils) and non-school (e.g., diet, outside soils, indoor dust, and indoor and outdoor air) environments. EPA assumed that middle school children spend 6.5-hours per day at school (with 6 hours spent inside the school) for a 180-day school year.