

DRAFT

**BMI COMPLEX OFF SITE AIR MONITORING
SUMMARY REPORT**

Prepared for:

**BASIC REMEDIATION COMPANY
HENDERSON, NEVADA**



Prepared by:



**TETRA TECH EM INC.
6000 S. EASTERN AVENUE,
SUITE 5A
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89119**

JANUARY 26, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	SAMPLING APPROACH	3
2.1	SITE SELECTION AND LOCATIONS	3
2.2	SAMPLING EQUIPMENT CALIBRATION AND OPERATION	3
2.3	SAMPLE NOMENCLATURE	4
2.4	SAMPLE PARAMETERS	4
2.4.2	<i>Organic Compounds</i>	5
2.4.3	<i>total suspended Particulate Matter and Metals</i>	5
2.4.4	<i>Asbestos</i>	5
3.0	ANALYTICAL RESULTS	6
3.1	UPWIND AND DOWN WIND ANALYSIS	6
3.1.1	<i>Data Summary</i>	6
3.1.2	<i>Approach</i>	6
3.1.3	<i>Determine Predominant Wind Direction</i>	7
3.1.4	<i>Assign Upwind/Downwind Stations</i>	7
3.1.5	<i>Compare Upwind/Downwind Results</i>	8
3.2	TSP AND METALS RESULTS	8
3.3	ORGANIC COMPOUND RESULTS	9
3.4	ASBESTOS RESULTS	10
4.0	REFERENCES	12

APPENDICES

A	FIELD DOCUMENTATION FORMS
B	LABORATORY ANALYTICAL AND DATA VALIDATION RESULTS
C	CALIBRATION AND SAMPLE VOLUME CALCULATION WORKSHEETS
D	CD CONTAINING ELECTRONIC COPY OF REPORT AND TABLES

FIGURES

FIGURE 1	AIR MONITORING STATION LOCATIONS
----------	----------------------------------

TABLES

TABLE 1	METEOROLOGICAL DATA RECORD DURING OFF SITE AIR SAMPLING NOVEMBER 4 – DECEMBER 27, 2008 HENDERSON, NEVADA
TABLE 2	SAMPLE COLLECTION SAMPLE HANDLING AND ANALYSIS SPECIFICATIONS FOR OFF SITE AIR-SAMPLING STATIONS, BMI COMPLEX, HENDERSON, NEVADA
TABLE 3	OFF SITE SAMPLING METALS (TSP) SUMMARY DATA, BMI COMPLEX, HENDERSON, NEVADA
TABLE 4	OFF SITE AIR SAMPLING ORGANOCHLORINE PESTICIDES (TO-4A) SUMMARY DATA, BMI COMPLEX, HENDERSON, NEVADA
TABLE 5	OFF SITE AIR SAMPLING PCDDs/PCDFs (TO-9A) SUMMARY DATA, BMI COMPLEX, HENDERSON, NEVADA
TABLE 6	OFF SITE AIR SAMPLING VOCs/SVOCs (TO-13A) SUMMARY DATA, BMI COMPLEX, HENDERSON, NEVADA
TABLE 7	OFF SITE AIR SAMPLING ASBESTOS SUMMARY DATA, BMI COMPLEX, HENDERSON, NEVADA

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Basic Remediation Company (BRC) retained Converse Consultants (Converse) and Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Tetra Tech) to complete a short-term air sampling project to evaluate off site emissions from material hauling operations at the Eastside Area of the Basic Environmental Company property located in Clark County, Nevada. This off site air sampling project is the first of a 3-phased approach to evaluate emissions from material hauling, dry pit excavations, and CAMU slit trench excavations.

Tetra Tech set up two temporary air-monitoring stations along Warm Springs Road and collected two air samples per week from November 4, 2008 – December 2, 2008. One additional sample was collected on December 27, 2008 from each station to evaluate background emissions when no hauling was occurring. Equipment was set up at each of the two stations to collect ambient air samples over a twelve hour (hr) period from approximately 7:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.

The sampling parameters were based on the BRC *Perimeter Air Monitoring Plan* (PAMP) (October 2008) and *Revised Draft BMI Complex Air Quality Monitoring Project – Phase III – Summary of Sampling Approach and Chemicals of Concern at Eastside and CAMU Areas* (Tetra Tech October 2008) reviewed and approved by the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP). Two identical air-sampling stations were constructed and the sampling equipment at each of the two sites consisted of:

- Three identical polyurethane foam (PUF) hi-volume federal reference method (FRM) samplers designed to collect samples on three PUF cartridges for analysis of organic compounds contained in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) compendium methods TO-4, TO-9 and TO-13
- One portable BGI PQ100 low-volume FRM (PQ100) sampler designed to collect samples on 47mm Teflon filters for analysis of total suspended particulate (TSP) and total metal
- One SKC Model 224-PCXR8 (SKC) low-volume sample pump designed to collect samples on mixed cellulose ester (MCE) filters for analysis of asbestos using National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Method 7400 for phase contrast microscopy
- One Honda EB 6500 gasoline-powered generators (or equivalent)

This report summarizes sample collection, analyses methodology, and analytical data collected between November 4, 2008 and December 27, 2008. The sampling approach, methodology, and summary of

activities are presented in Section 2.0. The analytical data results are presented in Section 3.0. Field documentation forms are provided in Appendix A; laboratory analytical data reports are provided in Appendix B; calibration and sample volume calculation worksheets are provided in Appendix C; a CD containing an electronic copy of the report and tables is provided in Appendix D.

2.0 SAMPLING APPROACH

Two temporary air monitoring stations were set up along Warm Springs Road in Henderson, Nevada to collect air samples during nighttime material hauling operations from the Eastside area to the Corrective Area Management Unit (CAMU) area.

2.1 SITE SELECTION AND LOCATIONS

Based on the prevailing wind direction at the BMI Complex, two air monitoring stations were placed along the north and south side of Warm Springs Road. Site OFF02 was located to represent potential upwind conditions and Site OFF01 was located to represent potential downwind conditions. The air monitoring station locations are presented in Figure 1.

2.2 SAMPLING EQUIPMENT CALIBRATION AND OPERATION

Tetra Tech assembled and calibrated the PUF, PQ100, and SKC air samplers prior to sample collection and after equipment had been serviced (battery changes). All samplers were calibrated using National Institute of Standards and Testing (NIST) or other authoritative reference certified equipment.

The initial calibrations on the PUF, BGI PQ100, and SKC samplers only required minor adjustments to set correct flow rates, but no major adjustments or equipment failures were observed. All equipment was checked again before sample collection began to ensure the correct flow rate(s) and timer operation.

Tetra Tech performed all calibrations according to EPA reference methods and all equipment was found to be within the calibration acceptance criteria prior to sample collection and equipment was operating within project goals. Equipment calibration worksheets are provided in Appendix C.

All samplers were powered by portable gas-powered generators for each sample event. At the beginning of each sample event, Tetra Tech transported the generators and air sampling equipment to each sample station. Samplers were set up and programmed at each station prior to sampling and subsequently removed after the completion of each sample event. Each station consisted of a sampling platform enclosed in an approximately 16 foot (ft) by 16 ft by 8 ft high chain link fence secured with a locking gate. Air samplers were secured to the platforms during the sample events.

The sampling approach proposed by BRC and Tetra Tech and approved by NDEP was to collect 12-hr samples twice per week from approximately 7:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. over a four week period during daily nighttime hauling operations.

The first sample event occurred on November 4, 2008 and sampling continued through December 2, 2008. Based on subsequent discussions with NDEP, BRC and Tetra Tech agreed to collect additional samples on December 27, 2008 to evaluate background emissions when material hauling was not occurring. A generator was stolen from site OFF01 on or about November 20, 2008 and as a result no samples were collected on November 21, 2008. In addition, only one sample was collected during the week of Thanksgiving (November 27, 2008).

All sample parameters were documented on BMI Complex field documentation forms before and after each sample event. In total, eight sample events were completed on the following dates:

- November 4, November 7, November 10, November 14, November 18, November 25, December 2, December 8 (Field Blank) and December 27, 2008 (background/non-hauling sample)

2.3 SAMPLE NOMENCLATURE

All samples collected at the BMI Complex were given a sample ID according to the sample location and sample date as follows:

- OFF01-110408 (where OFF denotes off site location, 01 denotes site #1 and 0110408 denotes that sample was collected on November 4, 2008)

2.4 SAMPLE PARAMETERS

Air samples were collected at the established monitoring stations for the analysis of site related chemicals including organochlorine pesticides, Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDDs), Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-furans (PCDFs), Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), VOCs/SVOCs, TSP, metals, and asbestos fibers. The sampling and analysis procedures are summarized below. For all samples collected at the BMI Complex, field blanks were collected on a frequency of 10 percent (one in 10 samples) for quality control purposes. Upon completion of each sample event, the samples and associated information was recorded on chain-of-custody (COC) sheets and submitted to the respective laboratories for analysis. The COC included the sample identification number, sample location, sample time, beginning and ending flow rate (to calculate sample volume) and the required analysis. A summary of sample collection, sample handling, and analysis specifications procedures is provided in Table 2.

2.4.2 2.4.1 ORGANIC COMPOUNDS

At each sampling location, three PUF samplers were used to collect PUF samples for the analysis of organochlorine pesticides, PCDDs, PCDFs, PCBs, and VOCs/SVOCs using EPA Compendium Methods TO-4, TO-9, and TO-13. The PUF samplers draw approximately 0.2 cubic meters per minute of ambient air onto a 102 millimeter (mm) diameter quartz glass filter followed by a polyurethane foam plug and XAD resin contained in a glass cartridge. The TO-9 and TO-13 samples were analyzed using gas chromatography and mass spectrometry (GC/MS) and the TO-4 samples were analyzed using GC/Multi-Detector Detection (GC/MD). All PUF (organic) samples were submitted with COC form(s) to Air Toxics Ltd. Laboratory and Frontier Ltd. Laboratory for analysis. A summary of sample collection, sample handling, and analysis specifications procedures is provided in Table 2.

2.4.3 TOTAL SUSPENDED PARTICULATE MATTER AND METALS

At each sampling location, one PQ100 sampler was used to collect samples for TSP and metals. The PQ100 sampler draws approximately 0.0167 cubic meters per minute (approximately 12 total cubic meters) of ambient air onto the filter media. The TSP and metals samples were collected using 47 mm Teflon filter media and analyzed using USEPA Compendium Method IO-2.1 (gravimetric analysis). The TSP samples underwent additional analysis for metals using USEPA Compendium Method IO-3.3 X-Ray Fluorescence (Protocol number 6). All TSP and metals samples were submitted with COC form(s) to Chester Labnet Laboratory for analysis. A summary of sample collection, sample handling, and analysis specifications procedures is provided in Table 2.

2.4.4 ASBESTOS

At each sampling location, one SKC low volume sampler was used to collect samples for asbestos analysis using NIOSH Method 7400. The sampling system consisted of a low-flow pump attached to a 25-millimeter MCE filter. The SKC samplers draw approximately 1 liter per minute (lpm) (approximately 720 total liters) of ambient air onto the MCE filter. The samples were analyzed using NIOSH Method 7400 (Phase Contrast Light Microscopy). All asbestos samples were submitted with COC form(s) to AESL Laboratory for analysis. A summary of sample collection, sample handling, and analysis specifications procedures is provided in Table 2.

3.0 ANALYTICAL RESULTS

The air quality sample data collected at the off site locations represents a wide range of chemical compounds as presented in the PAMP. All sample data was compared to EPA Region 3 risk-based concentrations (RBC) table (April 2006), EPA Region 9 preliminary remediation goals (PRG) table (October 2004), and EPA Region 6 human health medium-specific screening levels (MSSL) table (March 2008) to determine if ambient concentrations exceeded criteria. In most cases the RBC, PRG, and MSSL were either identical or very close in chemical concentration.

The sample results demonstrate that the majority of organic (PUF) compounds were not detected in measurable concentrations in ambient air at the off site locations. However, a limited number of organic compounds were detected and have been further evaluated. In addition, TSP, metals, and airborne fibers were detected. A summary of analytical results for each subset of chemical compounds is provided below.

3.1 UPWIND AND DOWN WIND ANALYSIS

Tetra Tech developed an approach for the quantification of upwind versus downwind air quality monitoring data collected during this short-term air sampling project at the BMI Complex Site. The objective of the upwind/downwind evaluation is to evaluate if the material hauling operations contributed to the degradation of the existing air quality in the vicinity of the work area. However, it must be noted that this analysis was performed with a very limited meteorological dataset of only seven sample events and only represents meteorological conditions measured during November and December 2008.

3.1.1 DATA SUMMARY

The upwind/downwind evaluation was conducted using meteorological data and on-site data collected at sites OFF01 and OFF02. Meteorological data including wind speed and direction were measured continuously at the on-site meteorological monitoring station operated by Tetra Tech near the Eastside entrance gate.

3.1.2 APPROACH

The general approach for conducting the upwind/downwind evaluation consists of the following steps:

- Determine predominant wind directions
- Assign upwind/downwind stations
- Compare upwind/downwind results
- Determine those air sample results that exceeded either the RBC or PRG screening criteria
- Conduct a statistical analysis

3.1.3 DETERMINE PREDOMINANT WIND DIRECTION

If the wind is variable, assigning a predominant wind direction may be subject to qualitative interpretations.

Tetra Tech defined predominant wind direction based on the following criteria:

- At least 50 percent of wind direction measurements occur in two quadrants (southeast-southwest, or northeast-northwest)
- sustained wind speeds in excess of 5 meters per second (m/s)

3.1.4 ASSIGN UPWIND/DOWNWIND STATIONS

Meteorological data was recorded for the duration of the eight sample events and the prevailing wind direction was generally from the southwest and southeast. A summary of meteorological data during the sample events is presented in Table 1 below.

**TABLE 1
METEOROLOGICAL DATA RECORD DURING OFF SITE AIR SAMPLING
NOVEMBER 4 – DECEMBER 27, 2008
HENDERSON, NEVADA**

Sample Date	Average Wind Degrees	Average Wind Speed (m/s)	Quadrant Wind Blowing From	Respective Upwind Site	Respective Downwind Site
11/3-11/4/08	202	3.7	S-SW	OFF02	OFF01
11/6-11/7/08	193.2	1.03	S	OFF02	OFF01
11/10-11/11/08	167.8	0.8	S-SE	OFF02	OFF01
11/13-11/14/08	170.5	1	S	OFF02	OFF01
11/17-11/18/08	166.8	0.7	S-SE	OFF02	OFF01
11/24-11/25/08	164.7	0.9	S-SE	OFF02	OFF01
12/1-12/2/08	176.7	0.6	S	OFF02	OFF01
12/26-12/27/08	226.8	1.58	SW	OFF02	OFF01

3.1.5 COMPARE UPWIND/DOWNWIND RESULTS

To meet project objectives the upwind concentrations of chemical constituents were compared to their corresponding downwind concentrations. The comparison consisted of calculating the percent difference between the upwind and downwind concentrations. This has been completed for all detected chemical compounds. However, based on the criteria established above, none of the sample events meet this criterion and conclusions based on upwind versus downwind analysis are not conclusive.

3.2 TSP AND METALS RESULTS

TSP was detected in all samples and concentrations ranged from $11.85 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to $87.77 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The average concentration was $31.1.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. No screening criteria or federal standards currently exist for TSP. An analysis of the percent difference calculation between the upwind site (OFF02) and downwind site (OFF01) demonstrated an average percent difference of approximately -17 percent. Therefore it does not appear that material hauling directly impacted ambient TSP concentrations. A complete summary and statistical analysis of all TSP results are presented in Table 3.

Metals were detected in a majority of the TSP samples and concentrations were reported with an uncertainty of plus/minus 2 standard deviations. The XRF detection method identifies concentrations in extremely low concentration ranges (of less than $0.001 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The results were compared to the RBC, PRG, and MSSL screening criterion (of those available) and four metals exceeded the criterion: Manganese, Cobalt, Arsenic, and Cadmium.

Manganese concentrations ranged from $0.0596 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to $1.2290 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and the average concentration was $0.3553 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The Manganese PRG and MSSL of $0.051 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (RBC of $0.052 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) was exceeded by all sixteen samples. Cobalt concentrations ranged from $0.0003 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to $0.0203 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and the average concentration was $0.0037 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The Cobalt PRG and MSSL of $0.001 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was exceeded by five samples. Four of these samples were collected at Site OFF01 and one sample was collected at Site OFF02. Arsenic concentrations ranged from $0.0003 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to $0.0023 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and the average concentration was $0.0011 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The Arsenic PRG of $0.0004 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, RBC of $0.00041 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, and MSSL of $0.00045 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was exceeded by four samples. Two of these samples were collected at Site OFF01 and two samples were collected at Site OFF02. Cadmium concentrations ranged from $0.0014 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to $0.0059 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and the average concentration was $0.0038 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The Cadmium RBC of $0.001 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and PRG/MSSL of $0.0011 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ were exceeded by four samples. One of those samples was collected at Site

OFF01 and three samples were collected at Site OFF02. It must be noted that all Cobalt, Arsenic, and Cadmium concentrations were reported at less than three times the XRF analytical uncertainty and have been flagged.

With the limited metals dataset, it is difficult to draw any conclusions regarding air quality impacts from material hauling. However, Manganese warrants further discussion due to the overwhelming amount of exceedances. A review of the *BMI Complex Perimeter Background Air Monitoring Summary Report* (Tetra Tech, September 2008) demonstrates that the Manganese screening criteria was exceeded by nine out of 33 samples. Furthermore, an analysis of the percent difference calculation between the upwind site (OFF02) and downwind site (OFF01) demonstrated an average percent difference of approximately -24 percent. Therefore it does not appear that material hauling directly impacted ambient Manganese concentrations. A complete summary and statistical analysis of metals results are presented in Table 3.

3.3 ORGANIC COMPOUND RESULTS

Two out of twenty seven Organochlorine pesticides (TO-4) chemical compounds were detected above laboratory detection limits and included alpha-BHC and 4,4'-DDE. These compounds were detected during only two of the eight sample events. Alpha-BHC and 4,4'-DDE were detected at both the upwind site (OFF02) and downwind site (OFF01) on 12/2/08 and Alpha-BHC was detected at the upwind site (OFF02) on 11/25/08. With only two sample events resulting in detections for each of these compounds this is not enough data to draw conclusions. However, an upwind versus downwind statistical analysis completed for this event demonstrated a drop of approximately 68 percent and 72 percent for Alpha-BHC and 4,4'-DDE, respectively. A complete summary and statistical analysis of Organochlorine pesticides (TO4A) chemical compounds results are presented in Table 4.

Twenty three PCDDs/PCDFs (TO-9) chemical compounds were detected above laboratory detection limits, but in extremely low concentrations, ranging from 0.02 picograms (pg)/m³ (0.00000002 µg/m³) to 9.89 pg/m³. All detected PCDDs/PCDFs concentrations were well below any RBC, PRG, or MSSSL screening criteria. The upwind versus downwind statistical analysis completed for the data appears to show a consistent increase in concentrations from upwind to downwind. However, extremely low sample concentrations coupled with variations in sample volumes could explain these differences. Based on these factors, it is difficult to draw any conclusions from this data or conclusively attribute impacts from

material hauling. A complete summary and statistical analysis of PCDDs/PCDFS (TO-9) chemical compounds results are presented in Table 5.

Fourteen VOCs/SVOCs (TO-13) chemical compounds were detected above laboratory detection limits. Of the eighteen detected compounds, two exceeded RBC, PRG, or MSSL screening criteria and included 1,4-Dichlorobenzene and Hexachlorobenzene. Three 1,4-Dichlorobenzene samples exceeded the screening criteria; two from the downwind site and one from the upwind site. Eleven Hexachlorobenzene samples exceeded the screening criteria; five from the downwind site and six from the upwind site. The upwind versus downwind statistical analysis completed for this data shows a consistent increase in measureable concentrations from upwind to downwind and prompted the additional sample event on December 27, 2008 when material hauling was not occurring. BRC contended that significant haul truck emissions could explain the increase in upwind versus downwind VOCs/SVOCs concentrations and initiated subsequent discussions with NDEP. As part of this discussion, BRC provided NDEP with several scientific research journals that evaluated diesel exhaust emissions.

Five (of the fourteen) chemical compounds were detected during the December 27, 2008 (background) sample event and Hexachlorobenzene exceeded the screening criteria for both the upwind and downwind sites demonstrating that other potential sources of these compounds were prevalent in the vicinity of the monitoring sites and may help to better explain the complex nature of chemical emissions near the off site monitoring locations. A complete summary and statistical analysis of VOCs/SVOCs (TO-13) chemical compounds results are presented in Table 6.

3.4 ASBESTOS RESULTS

The asbestos samples were analyzed using NIOSH Method 7400 PCM. The PCM method gives a number index of airborne fibers. It is primarily used for estimating asbestos concentrations, though PCM does not differentiate between asbestos and other fibers. Asbestos fibers include chrysotile, cummingtonite-grunerite asbestos (amosite), anthophyllite asbestos, tremolite asbestos, crocidolite, and actinolite asbestos and any of these minerals which have been chemically treated or altered. The precise chemical formulation of each species varies with the location from which it was mined. Therefore, the use of PCM is a generally accepted method for screening airborne fibers. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has set an exposure limit of 0.1 fiber per cubic centimeter (cc) of air as an

8-hour time-weighted average (TWA) and a limit of 1.0 fiber per cc averaged over a sampling period of thirty (30) minutes.

The asbestos samples ranged in concentration from 0 fibers per cc to 0.0026 fibers per cc and the average concentration was 0.0013 fibers per cc. The OSHA TWA limit of 0.1 fibers per cc was not exceeded in any samples and asbestos concentrations at the off site locations were consistent with asbestos concentrations during the perimeter background sampling. A complete summary of all asbestos results are presented in Table 7.

4.0 REFERENCES

- Basic Remediation Company 2006. “*Perimeter Air Monitoring Plan for Soil Remediation Activities, BMI Upper and Lower Ponds and Ditches, Clark County, Nevada.*” August 2006. Revised 2008.
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration. 1994. “*Asbestos and Other Fibers by PCM.*” August 1994
- U.S. EPA 1999. “*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)*”
- U.S. EPA 1999. “*Compendium Method TO-9A Determination Of Polychlorinated, Polybrominated And Brominated/Chlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins And Dibenzofurans In Ambient Air.*” January 1999.
- U.S. EPA 1999. “*Compendium Method TO-13A Determination of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) in Ambient Air Using Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry (GC/MS.*” January 1999.
- U.S. EPA 1999. “*Compendium Method IO-3.3 Determination of Metals in Ambient Particulate Matter Using X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) Spectroscopy.*” June 1999.

APPENDIX A

FIELD DOCUMENTATION FORMS

APPENDIX B

LABORATORY ANALYTICAL RESULTS

APPENDIX C

**CALIBRATION AND SAMPLE VOLUME CALCULATION
WORKSHEETS**

APPENDIX D

CD CONTAINING ELECTRONIC COPY OF REPORT AND TABLES

FIGURES

FIGURE 1 INSERTED HERE

TABLES

TABLE 2
SAMPLE COLLECTION SAMPLE HANDLING AND ANALYSIS SPECIFICATIONS FOR OFF SITE AIR-SAMPLING STATIONS
BMI COMPLEX
HENDERSON, NEVADA

Analytical Parameter	Equipment Manufacturer/ Model	Sample Media	Sample Frequency/ Sample Events	Sample Handling Temperature/ hold time	Laboratory/ Analytical Method
Organochlorine Pesticides (TO-4A)	Tisch Environmental/ TE-1000	Polyurethane foam cartridge/102 mm quartz fiber filter	24hr. cont. sample/every 3 days/10 events	<4°C/7 days	Air Toxics Ltd./Method TO-4A
PCDDs/PCDFs (TO-9A)	Tisch Environmental/ TE-1000	Polyurethane foam cartridge/102 mm quartz fiber filter	24hr. cont. sample/every 3 days/10 events	<4°C/7 days	Frontier Ltd./Method TO-9A
VOCs/SVOCs (TO-13A)	Tisch Environmental/ TE-1000	Polyurethane foam cartridge/102 mm quartz fiber filter	24hr. cont. sample/every 3 days/10 events	<4°C/7 days	Air Toxics Ltd./Method TO-13A
TSP/Metals	BGI, Inc./PQ100	47mm Teflon fiber filter	24hr. cont. sample/every 3 days/10 events	None/30 days	Chester Labnet/ Method IO-2.1; Method IO-3.3
Asbestos	SKC, Inc. 224-PCXR8	25mm mixed cellulose ester filter	24hr. cont. sample/every 3 days/10 events	None/N/A	AES Laboratory/ NIOSH 7400

Notes:

< = less than
°C = degree Celsius
cont. = continuous
hr = hour
PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10-microns
mm = millimeter
N/A = not applicable



$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ = microgram per cubic meter

