

Data Validation & AQS Coding

National Ambient Air Monitoring Conference August 12, 2024

New Orleans, LA

Welcome!

- Data Validation
 - Breathe in Breathe out
 - Stand up sit down
- AQS Coding
 - 30-minute break after presentation
- Important Resources
 - This presentation is designed to serve as a desk reference with a lot of links



title: "How your Conference Presentation Goes" - originally published 1/21/2013

ENGAGING

Q&A

15 MINUTES

POWER

30 SLIDES.

H 15

€EPA

MINUTES

Disclaimer

The statements in this presentation, with the exception of referenced requirements, are intended solely as guidance. This presentation is not intended, nor can it be relied upon, to create any rights enforceable by any party in litigation with the United States. This presentation serves as guidance to EPA's approach to implementing 40 CFR Parts 50, 53, and 58.

Mention of commercial products or trade names should not be interpreted as endorsement. Some types of instruments currently in use in monitoring networks may be described within this presentation or shown. Sometimes these products are given as a typical and perhaps well-known example of the general class of instruments. Other instruments in the class are available and may be fully acceptable.

Disclaimer's Disclaimer

The thoughts and opinions of the presenter and within this presentation represent those primarily from Region 3's perspective. Be sure to always reach out to your Regional QA Contact for the most current and Region-specific guidance.



Data Validation

Dive into the flow for data validation and tools

Remember to define acronyms \bigcirc

ACCORDING TO THIS POLLING DATA, AFTER KIRK AND PICARD, THE MOST POPULAR STAR TREK CHARACTER ARE DATA. AUGH! ANNOY GRAMMAR PEDANTS ON ALL SIDES BY MAKING "DATA" SINGULAR EXCEPT WHEN REFERRING TO THE ANDROID. https://xkcd.com/

Data Validation- A word from our sponsors!

- This presentation, brought to you by:
 - The letter **Q** for:

Quality Assurance (QA) Handbook Volume II



• The Best Practices for Review and Validation of Air Monitoring Data



- EPA River Delta Cruises
- And viewers like you!

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Data Validation – Why?

- Importance of Data validation
 - Regulatory requirements of the Clean Air Act
 - Regulations codified in the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR)
 - Title 40 CFR Chapter I, Subchapter C, Parts 50, 53, and 58 for Air.
 - Determines the confidence in the data &
 - Produces legally defensible data



Data Validation – A Reminder

The mission of United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) is to protect human health and the environment...

Insert your organization in place of EPA and it's a safe bet the mission is similar or the same





Members of Region 3 and Philadelphia Air Management Services



Data Validation – Important QAPP Elements

- Criteria and processes for Data Validation must be detailed in your Quality Assurance Project/Program Plan (QAP/rP)
- Elements A6 and B4 cover criteria in DQOs, DQIs, and MQOs
- Group D Elements cover the process for Data Verification, Validation, Data Quality Assessment, and Data Usability



Figure 5: Comparison of DQOs, DQIs, and MQOs

Data Validation - Hierarchy

- Everyone has a role in data validation!
- Independence is key!
- Data validators should not be directly involved in data collection
- <u>Strongly Recommend</u> <u>a Data Validation</u> <u>Standard Operating</u> <u>Procedure (SOP) for</u> <u>consistency!</u>



Data Validation – Hierarchy Part II

	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Schedule	Hourly	Daily to Weekly	Weekly to Monthly	Monthly to Quarterly	Quarterly to Annually	Annually and Greater
Method	Range Checks QC Verifications	Data Verification QC Evaluation Situational Evaluation Documentation	Document Verification QA/QC Assessment Manual Verification Graphical Analysis	Data Comparisons Statistical Assessment Trend Evaluation Graphical Analysis	Database Verification Statistical Assessment Audits of Data Quality PE Results Evaluation	Data Set Reviews User Needs Evaluation Network Reviews Evaluation of DQOs
	Verification					
Function			Validation			
Function				Assessment		
					Reconciliation	
	Instrument / Logger					
Data Flow		Real-time Reporting	System			
Data 110 W			Local Database			
					Permanent Database	AQS
_	Instrument / Logger /	Datasytem			QA Manager	
Reviewers		Technician / Operator /	Forcaster		Program Managers /	Planners / EPA
		Peers	Managers			
			Independent Validator			

Figure 9: Tiered Data Review Structure for an Ambient Air Monitoring Program

Data Validation – Tools: Data Validation Templates

1) Requirement (O3)	2) Frequency	3) Acceptance Criteria	Information /Action
	ci	RITICAL CRITERIA-OZONE	
Meniser	NA	Meets requirements listed in FRM/FEM	1) 40 CFE Part 58 App C Sec. 2.1 2) NA
		designation	3) 40 CFR Part 53 & FEM FEM method list
One Point QC Check	Dom Hilling	< ±7.1% (percent difference) or < ±1.5 ppb	3) Recommendation based on DQO in 40 CFR Part 58
Single analyzer	Zvery Iv mys	difference whichever is greater	App A Sec. 2.3.1.2. QC Check Conc range 0.005 - 0.08
		Zere drift < + 3.1 ppb (24 hr)	1 and 2) OA Handbook Volume 2 Sec. 12.3
Zero/span check	Every 14 days	< ± 5.1 ppb (>24hr-14 day)	3) Recommendation and related to DQO
	OPFI	ATIONAL CRITERIA OTONT	
	OTE	CATIO. CAL CRITERIA - OLO CE	1, 2 and 3) QA Handbook Volume 2 Sec. 7.2.2
		ALA	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Daily	20.0 to 30.0° C. (Hourly svg) or	Cenerally, the 20-30.0" C range will apply but the most restrictive operable range of the instruments in the shelp
Sheller Temperature Range	(hourly values)	per manufacturers specifications if designated	may also be used as guidance. FRM FEM list found on
		to a water temperature mage	AMTR: provides temp: range for given instrument. FRM/FEM menitor testing is received at 20-30° C range
			per 40 CFR Part 53.32
Shelter Temperature Device	Every 182 days and 2/ calendar year	< 2.1°C SD after 24 boart	1, 2 and 3) QA Handbook Volume 2 Sec. 7.2.2
Check		· ≥ 2.1° C of instants	
Annual Performance	Every site every 365 days and 1/	Percent difference of sould levels 3-10 <±15.1%	 and 2) 40 CFR PHT 58 App A Sec. 5.1.2 Recommendation- Jandit concentrations not includin
Eveluation Single analyzer	monitor operation,	Audit levels 1&2 < ± 1.5 ppb difference or	pero. AMTIC guidance 2/17/2011
	Mer of allow an Read in color for	Andr Israls 3.87 c + 1 5 mill difference all	1 and 31 45 CTP Part St Ame & Sar 31 3
Federal Audits (NPAP)	2070 of sites andited in calendar year	other levels percent difference < ± 10.1%	3) NPAP QAPPISOP
	Upon receipt adjustment repair/		
	restantion moving and repair and recalibration of standard of history	10	1) 40 CFR Hatt 50 App D 2) Recommendation
	level	All points < ± 2.1 % or < ±1.5 ppb difference of best-fit straight line whichever is reader	3) 40 CFR Part 50 App D Sec 4.5.5.6
Verification/Calibration	Every 182 day and 2/ calendar year if	and Slope 1 ± .05	Multi-point calibration (I) and 4 searcale points)
	timeekiy		
	Every 365 day and 1/ calendar year if continuous performed daily		Slope criteria is a recommendation
Zero Air/Zero Air Check	Every 365 days and 1/calendar year	Concentrations below LDL	1) 40 CFR Part 50 App D Sec. 4.1
Orona Laval 2 Standard			2 Mid 3) Kecommendition
			QA Handbook Volume II, Append Revision 2 Dated
			QA Handbook Volume II, Append Revision J Date 0. Fage 6
1) Requirement (Oc)	2) Framewor	3) Arcentone Criteria	QA Handbook Volume II, Append Revision Date 0: Page 6 o Information / Artion
1) Requirement (O3)	2) Frequency	3) Acceptance Criteria	QA Handbook Volume II. Append Revnan Date:0 Page 6 Information /Action 1) 40 CFR Part 50 App D Sec. 54
1) Requirement (O3) Conflocation to correlation to	2) Frequency Every 156 days and 12-sheets use	3) Acceptance Criteria ungle pear difference < 2.336	QA Handbook Volume II, Appendi Bernian J Fuge 6 11 40 CFR 20 5 App D Sec. 54 11 40 CFR 20 5 App D Sec. 54 11 40 CFR 20 5 App D Sec. 54
1) Requirement (03) Conficacion recordination to Standard Reference Photomater (Level 1)	2) Frequency Every 365 days and 3 kalendar year	 Acceptance Criteria uagis pear difference < ± 1.1% 	QA Handbook Volume II, Append Revision Date 6 Information / Acries 1) 40 CR5 Page 50 App 3 Sec. 54 7 and 7) Transfer Standard Guidance ZPA action. 10:00 7 and 70 Transfer Standard Column 20 Action 10:00 7 and 70 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 7 and 70 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 7 and 70 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 7 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 7 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 7 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 Action 10:00 7 Action 10:00 Action
1) Requirement (O ₂) Certplasientecertplasien to Sundard Reference Photometer (Level 1)	2) Frequency Every 365 days and 3 coloradar year	3) Acceptance Criteria stagle year difference < ± 3.7%	QA Handbook Volume II, Appendi Bernan Dage 6 Deformation (Action 19 40 CF 2000 (SAge 25 46: 14) 19 40 (SF 2000 (SAge 25 46: 14) 19 40 3) Transfer for the Context of the Context 19 40 (SF 2000 (SAge 25 46: 14) 19 40 (SF 2000 (SAge 25 46: 14) 19 40 (SF 2000 (SF 26 46: 14) 19 40 (SF 2
1) Requirement (O ₂) Cereffection treentfloatine to Sandard Reference Phonomice (Level) Level 3 and Grossie Transfer	2) Frequency Every 365 days and 1 kalesdar year Every 365 days and 1 kalesdar year	 Acceptance Criteria stagle point dDirect < _3.3% Danderd Deviation Scie Ana 6.80 ppm or 	QA Handbook Volume II, Append Revenue Date (Control of the Control of the Control Of CFR mer No App D Soc. 54 200 F7 Date (Sar Date Soc. 54 201 F7 Date Soc. 55 201 F7
1) Requirement (O) Conflociono reconflocione o Sundaré Réprese Phonomene (Lord 1) Lord 1 and Genera Transfer Sundaré Provision	2) Frequency Every 365 days and 1 colorador year Every 365 days and 1 colorador year	3) Acceptance Criteria ingle path difference = 2.3% Standard Designes for Anno 1997 or J. All values for Anno 1997 or a J. All values for Anno 1997	QA Handrock Volume II, Aryonal Barrow II, San January
1) Requirement (O ₂) Complexion recomplexion or Similar L Reference Processor (Level 1) Level 2 and Grease Transfor Souther Previous Conferences of the University Conference of the University of the University Souther Previous Conference of the University Souther Devices of the University of the University of the University Souther Devices of the University of the Univ	2) Frequency Rvey 365 days and Lucinster year Rvey 365 days and Lucinster year Rvey 365 days and Lucinster year	3) Acceptance Criteria stagle point difference - ± 1.7% Standard Develope Joy Anna E 827 gam er RAM Signer / 10 = 513 and the macrosom on 0.51 pp	QA Hashbok Volum II. Append Derman Dasie Jacob Karon Jacob Karon J
1) Requirement (O ₂) Confliction reconfliction re Sandard Reference Phononaux (Levil 2) Levil 2 of Graves Transfer Sandard Frections (If confliction via tunalar readerd) Orace Transfer standard	2) Frequency Every 165 days and Linkowskie year Every 165 days and Linkowskie year Every 165 days and Linkowskie year	3) Acceptance Criteria ingle para difference - ± 3 % Donderd Devices for And #49 per or Regroups upper \$10 per offset intercept are 0 ± 3 po	QA Handrock Values II, Arpend Barten Barten 1997 - State State 1997 - State State 2007 The State State State State 2007 The State State State State 2007 The State State State State State 2007 The State State State State State State 2007 The State State State State State State State State 2007 The State State State State State State State State 2007 The State
1) Requirement (O) Certification recentification to Sender Reference Phonoment (Levin 1) Levin 2 and Grosser Transfer Sander Previous (If excertised via a transfer sanderd) Coress Transfer standard Coress Transfer standard Coress Transfer standard Coress Transfer standard	2) Frequency Every 365 days and Lookador year Every 365 days and Lookador year Every 365 days and Lookador year Every 365 days and Lookador year	3) Acceptance Criteria single pair difference + 2:1 Ye Isoafter Domans for Alas I All you er Jeffer Makhard II you Depanderwyn ei Sci Japh - + 2:1 Ser + 2 pair beidaner genedi.	QA Radiosk Volum II, Append Den Statistics (Construction) Den Stat
1) Requirement (O ₂) Cereflocities becomplication to Photometer (Level 2) Level 2 and General Parageter (Creared and General Parageter (Creared and Create Standard General Tander Standard General Tander Standard General Tander Standard General Tander Standard	2) Frequency Every 165 days and Lindmaker year Every 165 days and Lindmaker year Every 165 days and Lindmaker year Upon security of transfer standard	5) Acceptance Criteria angle year difference < 2.1 % Isanete Devices to vote 16 M3 per 1.M whichers pares Representation of the second second another in the second second second another in the second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second secon	QA Hashbek Valum H. Append Barness David David Company (1997) (19
1) Requirement (O). Certification seconfloction on Sanded Advector Homesene (Levil A Homesene (Levil A	2) Frequency Every 343 days and 1 colorador year	3) Acceptance Criteris ingle point difference + () 1% Extended Providence for that 6 401 years for the second second second second second second for the second second second second second second second for the second seco	QA Hanflook Volum II, Argunt Eran Tarta Tarta Tarta Tarta Tarta Tarta Tarta Control (Control
PRepairment (O) Confloction second/science in Amount (Confl) Confloction second/science Confloction Confloction Confloction Confloction Confloction Confloction Confloction Confloction Confloction	2) Frequency Every 55 days and 1 calcular year Every 565 days and 1 calcular year Every 565 days and 1 calcular year Upon recipt of marcher staded After quad.crime as d space After quad.crime as d space	3) Acceptance Celeris unpopular difference (= 1) 1% Baseder Developer for the AH prove AH which have the grant assession or a start of the assession or a start of the assession or a start of the start of the assession of the assession of the assession of the start of the assession of the assession of the assession of the assession of the assession of the assession of the assession of the assess	QA Hashbek Valum H. Appent David David David 2007 (2007) 2007 (200
1) Requirement (O). Conflocture to veryfloctur a Sanderd Bytever Pannene (End. 9) Late) and Conver Sander Horizon Carlos and Sander Carlos and Sander Carlos and Sander Carlos and Sander Carlos and Sander Carlos and Sander Carlos and Sander Sander Horizon Carlos and Sander Sander Horizon Sander Sander Sander Horizon Sander	2) Frequency: Every 35 days and Linkedar year Every 36 days and Linkedar year Every 36 days and Linkedar year Every 36 days and Linkedar year Hergining and set of O'D soons of Hergining and set of O'D soons of Hergining and set of O'D soons of	D) Acceptance Criteria unpip para difference + 2.1 % Inductor Declaration on that 5.81 ppr or 1/8 mathematic para at large para at large management = 0.1 pp. The Control of the Declaration of the Declaration of the Declaration The Declaration of the	QA Hardrock Values II, Agreed Teams Description of the second second second second second team of the second secon
I) Requirement (O) Confections recordpoints or Phenome (Incol) Loci and Course Proofies Monome (Incol) Course Proofies Course	3) Frequency Dary 36 days and 1 clouder part Every 36 days and 1 clouder part Every 36 days and 1 clouder part Dary 36 days and 1 clouder part Cloues receipt of much emailed Margo and dark cloues and Regimma and Regimma and Regimma and Regimma	3) Acceptance Criteria supported Administry 2:17% (administry 2:17%) (administry 2:17%) (administry 2:17%) (administry 2:17%) (administry 2:17%) (administry 2:17%) (administry 2:17%) (administry 2:17%) (administry 2:17%) (administry 2:17%	OA Handhook Vusium II, Argenal Tana Tana Tana Tana Tana Tana Tana Tana
1) Requirement (O). Certification score/ficiality of Research (Erd 0) Level and Particle Standor (Free Standorf) Cardination Standorf) Qualitation Qualitation Centensian Deserting the Institution Deserting Standorf (Construction Deserting Standorf) Deserting Standorf (Construction Deserting Standorf) Deserting Standorf (Construction) Deserting S	2) Frequency Every 54 days and 1 calcular year Every 54 days and 1 calcular year Every 54 days and 1 calcular year They are also and the second second second and productions and any antipole of tander states and the second sec	D) Acceptance Criteria unpip part difference < 11% Statest Defaults on task SHI part H/M Middlers part after H/M Middlers part after Tegenstatements on task SHI part H/M Middlers part after H/M - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 -	QA Handrock Values II, Agnesis Determining Control of the second second second second second technical second seco
1) Requirement (O) Confections recordposed or Heatmanne (Level) Local and Genera Promples Local and Genera Promples Local and Genera Promples Confections Confections Confections Confections Confections	3) Frequency Ency 56 days and 1 solidade year Ency 56 days and 1 solidade year Ency 56 days and 1 solidade year Days and a solidade year and 1 solidade year Solidade year and the solid year and the solid Theory induced solid year and the solid Bargane gal and a (40 to some free weakness the solid year and the solid Bargane gal and (40 to some free weakness the solid year) and the solid Bargane gal and (40 to some free weakness the solid year) and the solid Bargane gal and (40 to some free weakness the solid year) and the solid year and the	3) Acceptance Criteria apple pair difference - (21%) locater phones and apple of the particular apple of the second apple of the particular apple - (21%) apple - (21%) - (21%) (21%)	QA Hardrock Values II, Aspeni Zang Daries (Construction) (Construc
J) Regularisment (O). Conference investment of the second of th	2) Frequency Rosy 34 days and 1-sidead year Dary 34 days and 1-sidead year Days and year and have a sidead year (Spin morp of standard standard Rosen and Standard St	5) Acceptance Criteria ingle per adhenes + 2.1% Indeed per daments + 2.1% Annual Control of the adhenesis + 2.1% Sector of the adhenesis + 1% Sector of the a	QA Handrick Yuhum II, Agneni Barangen (1997)
1) Requirement (O). Complexence severy features or Sensorial (2007) Lote 2 and General March 2 and	2) Frequency: Drop 36 days and Lobadary per Every 36 days and Lobadary per Every 36 days and Lobadary per Cyses every of management and the generation of the second second second Bargement and eff of D hansa or every second second second second second bargement and second	D) Acceptance Criteria ingle pair difference + 2.1 No Databet Processes for Almost Aff Type or The Almost Aff Type or The Almost Aff Type of Almost Aff Type or The Almost Aff Type of Almost Aff Type of Almost Research and Almost Aff Type of Almost Aff Type of Almost The Almost Aff Type of Almost Aff Type of Almost The Almost Aff Type of Almost Aff Type of Almost The Almost Aff Type of Almost Aff Type of Almost The Almost Aff Type of Almost Aff Type of Almost The Almost Aff Type of Alm	QA Handhok Vahum H, Agnani Jang L (1997) (19
Beguirremat (O) Collection revealed as a Planemer (Level) Manamer (Level) Lond 2 and Course Prospile Manamer (Level) Lond 2 and Course Prospile Manamer (Level)	3) Frequency Tray 56 days and 1 colordary per they 50 days and 1 colordary per 12 for days and 1 colordary per they 56 days and 1 colordary per they 56 days and 1 colordary per they 56 days and 1 colordary per	3) Acceptance Chierish supprive difference - 2:176 International Control (International Control (International International Control (International Control (Internation	QA Handhesk Yushum II, Agnund, Barcan Sharon J, Barcan Sharon J, Barcan Sharon J, Shar
1) Requirement (O). Confidence averyflexiae or Senement (End) Leed J and Group: Transfor Senement (End) Leed J and Group: Transfor Confidence Decision (2014) Martines Second confidence Decision (2014) Martines Decision (2014) Martines Decisi	2) Frequency Every 364 years all cloaded year Every 364 years all cloaded year Every 364 years all cloaded year Every 364 years all cloaded year Marging Language and all cloaded year Frequency and all cloaded year Frequency and all cloaded years Every 364 styre all styre all years Every 364 styre all styre all years Every 364 styre all styre all years Every 364 styre all y	D) Acceptance Criteria upip para difference + 2.1 % Subardo Donana los natas 6.81 para Regnona subor 0.52 para Regnona Su	OA Handhok Vahur II, Agnah Sangar
1) Requirement (0,) Confloctum secret/basis or Research (2, ed.) Confloctum secret/basis or Research (2, ed.) Confloctum secret/basis of Confloctum se	D) Frequency Every Stel any and London's year	B) Acceptance Criteria ingle pair difference - 21 No acceptance Acceptance - 21 No acceptance and acceptance - 21 No acceptance and acceptance - 21 No accepta	O A Hachosk Values II, Agenal Zang Dan January (Company) Dan Janua
1) Requirement (O). Configurate supervises as Annual (Configurate Supervises) Configurate Supervises Configurate Supervises Configurate Supervises Configurate	2) Erregener: Evey 54 days and 1 soleadar year Evey 54 days and 1 soleadar year Evey 54 days and 1 soleadar year Evey 54 days and 1 soleadar year and performant logan solead and the soleadar year 15 days and 15 soleadar year Evey 54 days and 1 soleadar year Evey 54 day	D) Acceptance Criteria unpip para difference < 2.1% Statest deformes es na 6.8% para Al Mohden San and San and San Al Mohden San and San and San San and San and San and San and San San and San and San and San and San San San and San San San and San	QA Handrock Values II, Agreent Derson Der Schler (1997) 100 (CFR mit 26 gelf 100 (CFR) 100 (CFR mit 26 gelf 100 (CFR) 100 (CFR mit 26 gelf 100 (CFR) 100 (CFR) (CFR) 100 (CF
1) Requirement (O). Corploates around a second base of a second b	2) Frequency Every 56 days and 1-toleader year Every 56 days and 1-toleader year Every 56 days and 1-toleader year Tolean toleader year and 1-toleader year Marcel and 20 toleaner year Marcel and 20	D). Acception of Chinese + 2.1 To ingle pairs difference + 2.1 To Standard Devices by in All of Standard Bergenson Lines - 4.2 Standard Standard - 2.2 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.2 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.2 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.0 Standard - 2.0 Standard	QA Hanhosh Vashur H, Agnani Zung Dage 1 Dage
I) Requirement (O) Coploates neorgivates an Pressure (Excl) To and Course Transition Control and Course Transition Contreand Course Transition Course Transition Contransition	3) Frequency Bray 56 days and 1 colordary per Bray 56 days and 1 colordary per Bray 56 days and 1 colordary per Bray 56 days and colordary per Bray 56 days and colordary per Bray 56 days and colordary per Bray 15 days and colordary per Bray 56 da	3) Acceptance Criteria supprised difference (2) Ten Acceptance (2)	A Handhok Values II, Agena David State (State 1997) Barrowski (State
The sequence of the seque	2) Frequency Droy 36 ayout 1 clouder year Fray 36 ayout 1 clouder year Fray 36 ayout 1 clouder year Types recept of tables and the States and the states and the States and the states and the Fraymage and a state of the states and Fraymage and the states and Fray the states and Fraymage and the states and Fraymage and Fraym	D). Acceptance Criteria upper pair difference + (1)% Landerd Dorotex by the diff pair or Annote Control to the diff pair or Annote Control to the diff pair or Annotex the difference and the difference and Annotex the di	QA Handhosk Vashum H, Agnani Jang L (1990) (
Sequence of the second se	D) Frequency Deep Hold pay and Lindedry Her Every 354 days and Lindedry Her Every 354	B) Acceptance Criteria app part difference - 211% app part difference - 211% app part difference - 211% app and the set of	QA Hachosk Values II, Agnesi Kang Dan January (Comparison of the comparison of the c
1) Requirement (O) Corploates incompletes in Security of the secu	D) Frequency Tory 16 days and 1-loader year Tory 161 days and 1-loader	D) Acceptance Criteria upp part difference + 2.1 % Lander Definition for the State State part Jon Action 1 and State Action 1 and State Action Jon Action 1 and State Action 1 and State Action Jon Action 1 and State Action 1 and State Action Jon Action 1 and State Action 1 and State Action Jon Action 1 and State Action 1 and State Action Jon Action 1 and State Action 1 and State Action Jon Action 1 and State Action 1 and State Action Jon Action 1 and Action 1 and State Action Jon Action 1 and Action 1 and State Action Jon Action 1 and Action 1 and State Action Jon Action 1 and Action 1 and Action Jon Actio	QA Handhonk Vanimer II, Argeneta Derson 3 Der der Sterner Architekter 1 och 742 mehr 1 der Geschlanden 1 2 och 732 mehr 1 der Geschlanden 1 2 och 733 mehr 1 der Geschlanden 1 2 och 743 mehr 1 der 1 2 och 743 mehr 1 der Geschlanden 1 2 och 743 mehr 1 der Geschla
1) Requirement (O). Corploates a source/foreir as source/foreir a	2) Frequency Resp 36 days and 1:0.000d ryne Resp 36 days and	D). Acception of Christian imple point difference + (1) The imple point difference + (1) The imple point difference + (2) The imple point	QA Hanhosh Vashar H, Agnani Zang Dag to Sang Dag to Sang Dag to Sang Dag to Sang Dag to Sang Dag to Sang Dag to Sang Dag

QA Handbook Volume II, Appendix D Revision No. 1

			QA Handbook Volume II, Appendi Revision N Date:03 Page 7 of
1) Requirement (O ₂)	2) Frequency	3) Acceptance Criteria	Information /Action
			3) 40 CER Part 58 App E. Sec. 9 (c)
Sample Probe, Inice, Sampling crein	.42 sites	Borosilicate giass (e.g., $P_{\rm Trac}^{0}$) or Tefton 0	1) 40 CFR Pure 35 App E. Sec. 56 (9) 2) Recommendation 3) 40 CFR Part 51 App E, Sec. Sec. 9 (a) FEP and FFA have been accepted as in equivalent material to Teffon. Registerement or cleaning is suggested as 1/year and more theyases if pollatant load ce contamination dictute
Siding	Every 365 days and 1 calendar year	Meets siding criteria or weiver documented	1) 40 CFR Part 58 App E, Sec. 2-6 2) Recommendation 3) 40 CFR Part 58 App E, Sec. 2-6
EPA Standard Ozone Reference Photometer (SRP) Recertification (Level 1)	Every 365 days and 1 calendar year	Regression slope = 1.00 ± 0.01 and intercept < 3 ppb	1, 2 and 3) Transfer Standard Guidance EPA-454/B-10- 001 This is usually at a Regional Office and is compared against the maveing 52P
Precision (using 1-point QC checks)	Calculated annually and as appropriate for design value estimates	90% CL CV < 7.1%	1) 40 CFR Part 58 App A 2.3.1.2 & 3.1.1 2) 40 CFR Part 58 App A Sec. 4 (b) 3) 40 CFR Part 58 App A Sec. 4 1.2
Bins (using 1-point QC checks)	Colculated annually and as appropriate for design value extmans	95%6 CL < <u>+</u> 7.2%6	1) 40 CFR Part 58 App A 2.3.1.2 & 3.1.1 2) 40 CFR Part 58 App A Sec. 4 (b) 3) 40 CFR Part 58 App A Sec. 4 (b)

- <u>Appendix D</u>* to the <u>QA Handbook Volume II</u>
- Measurement Quality Objectives (MQOs) & Data Quality Indicators (DQIs)
- Color Coded
 - Pink = Critical Criteria
 - Yellow = Operational Criteria
 - Blue = Systematic Criteria
- Often adopted in the QAP(r)P
- Note: Particulate Matter (PM) templates will have a field and laboratory component

*<u>T640</u> and <u>x's</u> have Separate Templates

Data Validation Templates – Road Map

1) Requirement (O ₃)	2) Frequency	3) Acceptance Criteria	Information /Action								
CRITICAL CRITERIA-OZONE											
Monitor	NA	Meets requirements listed in FRM/FEM designation	 40 CFR Part 58 App C Sec. 2.1 NA 40 CFR Part 53 & <u>FRM/FEM method list</u> 								
One Point QC Check Single analyzer	Every 14 days	< <u>+</u> 7.1% (percent difference) or < <u>+</u> 1.5 ppb difference whichever is greater	 1 and 2) <u>40 CFR Part 58 App A Sec. 3.1</u> 3) Recommendation based on DQO in 40 CFR Part 58 App A Sec. 2.3.1.2. QC Check Conc range 0.005 - 0.08 ppm and 05/05/2016 <u>Technical Note on AMTIC</u> 								
Zero/span check	Every 14 days	Zero drift < <u>+</u> 3.1 ppb (24 hr) < <u>+</u> 5.1 ppb (>24hr-14 day) Span drift < <u>+</u> 7.1 %	1 and 2) <u>QA Handbook Volume 2</u> Sec. 12.3 3) Recommendation and related to DQO								

- 1) Requirement Quality Control Check or other criteria
- 2) Frequency How often the check is performed
- 3) Acceptance Criteria Watch for multiple criteria and "or"
- Information / Action Column provides a citation for, 1) Requirement, its 2) Frequency, and its 3) Acceptance Criteria

Data Validation Templates – Critical Criteria

1) Requirement (O ₃)	2) Frequency	3) Acceptance Criteria	Information /Action								
CRITICAL CRITERIA-OZONE											
Monitor	NA	Meets requirements listed in FRM/FEM designation	 40 CFR Part 58 App C Sec. 2.1 NA 40 CFR Part 53 & <u>FRM/FEM method list</u> 								
One Point QC Check Single analyzer	Every 14 days	< <u>+</u> 7.1% (percent difference) or < <u>+</u> 1.5 ppb difference whichever is greater	 1 and 2) <u>40 CFR Part 58 App A Sec. 3.1</u> 3) Recommendation based on DQO in 40 CFR Part 58 App A Sec. 2.3.1.2. QC Check Conc range 0.005 - 0.08 ppm and 05/05/2016 <u>Technical Note on AMTIC</u> 								
Zero/span check	Every 14 days	Zero drift < <u>+</u> 3.1 ppb (24 hr) < <u>+</u> 5.1 ppb (>24hr-14 day) Span drift < <u>+</u> 7.1 %	1 and 2) <u>QA Handbook Volume 2</u> Sec. 12.3 3) Recommendation and related to DQO								

- Critical Criteria have the greatest implications on overall data quality with most related to a regulation per the citation
- Data not meeting each critical criteria should be invalidated*
 - *Using a Weight of Evidence Approach, a limited amount of data may be considered valid but qualified (flagged) if there is sufficient compelling evidence
 - Presentation on Weight of Evidence Approach after the break

Data Validation Templates – Operational Criteria

1) Criteria (PM2.5 LC)	2) Frequency	3) Acceptable Range	Information /Action
Pressure Verification/Calibration	on installation, and on one- point verification failure	< <u>+</u> 10.1 mm Hg	1) 40 CFR Part 50, App. L, Sec. 9.3 2 and 3) Method 2.12 Sec. 6.5 Sampler BP verified against independent standard verified against a lab primary standard that is certified as NIST traceable 1/year
Flow Rate Multi-point Verification/ Calibration	<i>Electromechanical</i> <i>maintenance or transport</i> or every 365 days and once a calendar year	$\leq \pm 2.1\%$ of transfer standard	 40 CFR Part 50, App. L, Sec. 9.2. 40 CFR Part 50, App. L, Sec. 9.1.3, Method 2.12 Sec. 6.3 & Table 6-1 3) Recommendation
Other Monitor Calibrations	per manufacturers' op manual	per manufacturers' operating manual	1, 2 and 3) Recommendation
Precision			

- Operational criteria are important for maintaining and evaluating the quality of the data collection system
- Violation(s) of these criteria may be cause for data invalidation, depending on the severity of the violation(s)
- A Weight of Evidence Approach, with documentation of additional QC information (compelling evidence) will be needed to support data validity*
 - *If valid, data should still be qualified (flagged)

Data Validation Templates – Systematic Criteria

Field Activities											
Verification/Calibration Standards Recertifications – All standards should have multi-point certifications against NIST Traceable standards											
Flow Rate Transfer Std.	every 365 days and once a calendar year	< <u>+</u> 2.1% of <u>NIST Traceable</u> Std.	 40 CFR Part 50, App. L Sec. 9.1 & 9.2 Method 2-12 Sec. 4.2.2 & 6.4.3 40 CFR Part 50, App. L Sec. 9.1 & 9.2 								
Field Thermometer	every 365 days and once a calendar year	\pm 0.1° C resolution, \pm 0.5° C accuracy	1, 2 and 3) Method 2.12 Sec. 4.2.2								
Field Barometer	every 365 days and once a calendar year	<u>+</u> 1 mm Hg resolution, <u>+</u> 5 mm Hg accuracy	1, 2 and 3) Method 2.12 Sec. 4.2.2								
Clock/timer Verification	Every 30 days	1 min/mo	1 and 2) Method 2.12 Sec. 4.2.1 3) <u>40 CFR Part 50, App. L</u> Sec. 7.4.12								
		Laboratory Activities									
Microbalance Readability	At purchase	1 µg	1, 2 and 3) 40 CFR Part 50, App. L Sec. 8.1								
Microbalance Repeatability	At purchase	1 μg	1) Method 2.12 Sec. 4.3.6 2) Recommendation								

- Systemic Criteria are important for correct data interpretation, but violations do not usually impact the validity of the sample(s)
- This section includes information on data handling, completeness rules, reporting units and criteria related to Data Quality Indicators (DQIs)
- In some cases, violation of a systematic criterion may result in data qualification, while invalidation may be recommended under egregious circumstances

Data Validation Templates - Summary



- Violations of Critical Criteria typically result in data invalidation (null codes)
- Violations of Operational or Systematic Criteria typically result in data qualification (flagging)
- Perform all operational or systematic QA/QC checks that are required in the CFR, if you do not all associated data may be invalidated!
- The more violations, the assurance of data quality decreases
 - Compelling evidence using the Weight of Evidence Approach are needed to validate violations of Critical Criteria or compounding Operational and/or Systematic Criteria

Data Validation – Process

	<document control="" id=""></document>			
Organization:	<agency section=""></agency>	Data Reviewed:	<month> <year></year></month>	Revision 0.0
Monitor(s) Reviewed:	<site id(s)="" monitor="" name(s)=""></site>			Last revised: July 2021

The following is a checklist designed to <u>provide assistance to</u> the Levels 1 and 2 data reviewers of the associated ozone dataset. The checklist should be used along with professional judgment and experience with the goal of verifying data in a consistent and holistic manner. Generally, Level 1 and 2 data reviewers (e.g., site operators, QA staff) verify data on a daily, monthly, and/or quarterly frequency to distinguish measurements from measurement errors/interferences and to ensure data meets QC/QA requirements and the objectives of the data's, "No", or "N/A" column wherever an "L1" is found in the corresponding row. Similarly, the Level 2 data verifier must answer each question with a "X" in the "Yes", "No", or "N/A" column wherever an "L1" is found in the corresponding row. Similarly, the Level 2 data verifier must answer each question that contains "L2" in the corresponding row. After answering each question, belase provide comments in the "Comments" field in the corresponding row as needed. Information in the column second from the right is meant to detail the next steps to take if any problems are identified while reviewing the dataset. Some problems many highlight bigger subscripted to the agency's quality system or personnel training that must be addressed. For example, if an issue in the applicable QAPP or SOP is found, the document(s) should be revised as soon as possible to resolve that <u>on a provide a soon as possible to resolve</u>. All the column furthest to the right. Once all questions have been answered, please provide your name, signature or initials, and date of the completed othecklist of the completed checklist on your records either in hard-copy or in tigital cony that is "locked" to any fource edito be preserved. data worksheets, QC check forms, logbook documentation) to the next level data reviewer (i.e., Level 2 or Level 3). Retain a copy of the completed checklist for your records either in hard-copy or in tigital cony that is "locked" to any future edito be original record.

	Ozone Criteria (Levels 1-2)	L1/2	Yes	No	N/A	Comments	Recommended Response to Criteria Not Met	References	
	Levels 1 & 2: 1-point QC checks completed	L1					If not completed according to SOP, check should be considered invalid and documented as such. If checks were not completed every 14 days, determine	40 CFR Part 58, Appendix A, Section 3.1.1	
	according to the SOP and at least every 14 days?	L2					and document reason(s) why and confirm checks that did occur passed acceptance criteria.	<u>QA Handbook Volume II, Appendix D</u>	
	Levels 1 & 2: 1-point QC points within ± 7.1%	L1					Mark impacted concentration data as void. If other compelling evidence exists	40 CFR Part 58, Appendix A, Section 2.3.1.2	
	for ± 1.5 ppb, whichever is greater) of the transfer standard value?	L2					to validate the data, document such information.	QA Handbook Volume II, Appendix D	
	Level 2: 1-point QC check percent differences calculated correctly? At least 10% and a minimum of 1 (whichever is greater) of 1-point QC checks should be verified.	L2					Review all 1-point QC check calculations. Confirm checks did pass acceptance criteria. If check(s) exceeded acceptance criteria, mark impacted data as void. If other compelling evidence exists to validate the data, document such information. Investigate possible causes/solutions to this issue.	40 CFR Part 58, Appendix A, Section 4.1.1	
riteria	Levels 1 & 2: Zero/span checks completed	L1					If not completed according to SOP, check should be considered invalid and documented as such. If checks were not completed every 14 days, determine	QA Handbook Volume II. Section 12.3 and	
tical C	according to the SOP and at least every 14 days?	L2					and document reason(s) why and confirm checks that did occur passed acceptance criteria.	Appendix D	
Cri	Levels 1 & 2: Zero points within ± 3.1 ppb over 24 hours? Zero points within ± 5.1 ppb over	L1						QA Handbook Volume II, Appendix D	
	>24 hours - 14 days? Only answer "Yes" if the answer to both questions is "yes". Otherwise, answer "No".	L2					wark impacted concentration data as void. If other competing evidence exists to validate the data, document such information.	Revision to the Zero Drift Acceptance Criteria in the QA Handbook (6/3/14)	
	Levels 1 & 2: Span points within ± 7.1% of the	L1					Mark impacted concentration data as void. If other compelling evidence exists	OA Handbook Volume II. Annendix D	
	transfer standard value?	L2					to validate the data, document such information.	<u>ornandbook volume ii, rippendik b</u>	
	Level 2: Zero/span point differences calculated correctly? At least 10% and a minimum of 1 (whichever is greater) each of zero and span checks should be verified.	L2					Review all zero and/or span check calculations. Confirm checks did pass acceptance criteria. If check(s) exceeded acceptance criteria, mark impacted data as void. If other compelling evidence exists to validate the data, document such information. Investigate possible causes/solutions to this issue.	40 CFR Part 58, Appendix A, Section 4.1.1	

Regular review and <u>documentation</u> will make data validation easier!

- Recommend working in chunks, weeks or months depend on organization staffing
- Use <u>Appendix A Checklists</u> from the Best Practices for Data Validation as a framework or your memo
- If you have a process in place, review it to make sure all points are covered

Data Validation – Lets walk through it!

- QA Clichés, what are some yours?
- My top three:
 - Know your data.
 - If it wasn't documented, then it didn't happen!
 - Trust but verify.



Data Validation – Know your Data! Routine



- Review data every day possible, develop a routine!
- Hourly recommended but periodically review minute data (Trust but verify)
 - Operators should review minute data and document issues
- Review data behind null codes (Trust but verify)
- Review longer time periods and historical data

Data Validation – Know your Data! Routine



- Document anything unexpected:
 - Gaps (where expected)
 - Flatlines
 - Spikes
 - Buddy sites similar
 - Note exceedances of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)
 - Historically consistent

- Important to communicate issues to protect data completeness:
 - Monitor failures
 - Maintenance activities
 - Correct use of null codes
 - Network or power outages
 - Document corrective actions
 - (If it wasn't documented, then it didn't happen!)

Data Validation – If it wasn't documented....

Site	Notes
Site 1	
Site 2	
Site 3	Spike in temperature 90 degress, due to AC failure
Site 4	
Site 5	
Site 6	
Site 7	
Site 8	
Site 1	
Site 2	
Site 3	Temperature exceeded 30 C due to AC failure
Site 4	OC Check failed 8/12
Site 5	
Site 1	
Site 2	Flatlined 8/11 at 0900
Site 3	
Site 4	
Site 5	Calibration 8/1 0700 - 0900
Site 6	
Site 7	
Site 1	
Site 2	Flow check 8/12 1200
Site 2	
Site 4	data diverges from huddy site abnormally beginning 8/12 - 8/20, investigate
Site 5	and arrespession paged site appointing peblining of re-of rol intestigate
	Site 1 Site 2 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 6 Site 7 Site 8 Site 1 Site 2 Site 3 Site 4 Site 2 Site 3 Site 4 Site 2 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 6 Site 7 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 6 Site 7 Site 1 Site 2 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 6 Site 7 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 4 Site 5 Site 4 Site 5 Site 4 Site 5 Site 6 Site 7 Site 8 Site 7 Site 8 Site 1 Site 2 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 4 Site 5 Site 4 Site 5 Site 4 Site 5 Site 4 Site 5 Site 4 Site 5 Site 1 Site 2 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 1 Site 2 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 4 Site 5 Site 4 Site 5 Site 1 Site 2 Site 3 Site 4 Site 2 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 3 Site 4 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 3 Site 4 Site 5 Site 5 Si

- Develop a consistent process for notes:
 - Electronic recommended
 - Weekly notes
 - Monthly memos
 - Emails
 - Be careful, these can get lost especially attachments and chains
 - Break up in chunks
 - Site
 - Parameter
 - Region
 - Etc.
- Documentation is key!

Data Validation – Know your Data! QC Checks



- Review Quality Control (QC) Checks
 - Coded properly
 - Following SOPs
 - Appropriate levels
 - Allowing for stability
 - Frequency

BF Site 13

- Every 14 Days at a minimum
 - QC Check
 - Zero/Span Check
 - May be combined into Zero/Span/Precision (QC) Checks
- Recommend nightly automated checks one or both type
- Be mindful of data completeness rules!

Data Validation – Know your Data! QC Checks

Site 1 44201 (01-001-9991) Ozone QC Checks



Control Chart Checks

- Do one each for Zeros, Spans, and Precision (QC) Checks
- Look for trends and shifts
- Watch for zero drift
- Are exceedances documented and data coded appropriately (bracketed)?

Data Validation – Know your Data! QA/QC



- Review Calibration and Performance Evaluation (PE)/Audit Results
 - Null coded appropriately
 - Following SOP for stability, concentration levels, number of points
 - Clear stair steps
 - Frequency Annual at least

- Go deeper
 - Traceable standards
 - Expiration dates
 - Certified/Verified standards
 - Flow, Zero Air, Dilution Calibrators

Data Validation – Trust but verify – QA/QC



- Do not rely on automation or record review only!
- Spot check at different review levels
- Look behind the null codes

Data Validation – Process – Record Review

- Things to review beyond routine data:
 - QC Checks
 - Logbooks
 - Maintenance records
 - Calibration records
 - PE/Audit Records
 - Certification records
 - Chain of Custody
 - Document control features
 - Edit histories (documents and Data Acquisition System (DAS)
 - Firmware/Software Versions
 - Anything that could affect data quality!



Data Validation – Process – **Documentation**

- Strongly recommend development of a consistent documentation process:
 - Weekly L1 & L2
 - Monthly L1, L2 & L3
 - Quarterly L2 & L3
 - Annual Report L3 & others
- Make decisions and document them:
 - Data valid, invalid, or qualified?
 - Apply correct codes as applicable
 - Document compelling evidence
- Track QA/QC frequency
 - Review QA/QC codes
- Track data completeness
- Double check and use peer review as much as possible
- Track changes in codes or validation decisions, having audit trails are important!
- Submit only validated data to AQS!

		Data Validation - Continuous Monitors, NCore CSN and Toxics Samplers															
		ма	onth/Year:				Date	Reviewe	ed:					Reviewed by:	_		
					Data Submitted to AQS:						Completeness Check:						
		st	ation	Pa	rameter	Q/	VQC Chec	ks, Resul	ts		Validity	, Missing	, Comments	Data Capture	Action: Valid, Invalid Data Capture Flag?		
			ite 1		03	_			_								
		3	nei	v	VS/WD												
					\$02												
		s	ite 2		03												
				Temp,	RH, WS/V	VD											
					SO2												
					03				_								
				NO/	NO2/NO	(
				PM2.5	Continue	115			_								
		N	Core	1 11/2:3	BC												
		"	core	V	VS/WD				_								
				PM2.5	spec - carl	oon								Validated in DART			
	Ve	L	n and	PM2.5	spec - ior		heald		_								
	va	iluatio	on and	Data	mauc		лески	st									
							1			1		1					
Submitted to AQS																	
Parameter	1	2	3	4	5	6 M	onth 7	8	9	10	11	12	Comments				
PM _{2.5} Continuous																	
Metr. Check													Data reviewed but not submit	ed to AQS			
Partisol PMsc Continuous													Data reviewed but not submitt	ed to AOS until 2023			
SO ₂																1	
O ₃ Station Check													Data reviewed but not submitt	ed to AQS			
SO ₂																	
CO 03																	
NO/NO ₂ /NOx																	
NO/NOy																	
PM _{2.5} Continuous												<u> </u>					
PM ₁₀ Continuous																	
PM _{Coarse} Continuous BC																	
Metr. Check																	
UV/Solar Rain																	
Ceilometer																	
SASS													Data reviewed and validated i	n DART, EPA contracto	r submits to AQS		
PM2.5 spec - URG													Data reviewed and validated i	n DART, EPA contracto	r submits to AQS		
VOC canisters													Data from contract lab, validat	ed seperately and ma	nually submitted to AQ		
Carbonyls													PAMS Season only, validated s	perately and manual	y submitted to AQS		
Auto GC													PAMS Season only, validated s	perately and manual	y submitted to AQS		

Site 2

NCore & PAMS

Data Validation – Compelling Evidence



- If you need compelling evidence to support validation decisions:
- Box (or Violin) Plots, Linear regressions and other analyses can be used for compelling evidence in various ways:
 - Monthly comparisons
 - Site comparisons
 - Annual comparisons
 - Seasonal comparisons
- Be sure to stick around for the next presentation on the Weight of Evidence Approach!

Data Validation – Data Completeness

- Invalid data lowers the percentage of valid data capture, referred to as Data Completeness
- Rules for data completeness vary by pollutant see Systematic Criteria section of Validation Templates for each pollutant
- Invalid hours affect days which affect the completeness of a month which affect the completeness of a quarter which affect the completeness of a year
- Design values require 3 valid years of data

Day 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 Value 19 17 11 16 16 17 16 18 22 35 46 50 56 54 50 43 41 37 34 32 27 26 25 25 24 23 17 18 16 9 15

Quarter/Year123456789101112Percent989995756017889998979899

3 Year	1	2	3
Percent	85	99	95

Data Validation – Data Completeness

• An hour is complete if 75% of the minutes are valid

- Plan checks with data completeness in mind
 - To save hours have checks cross from 15 minutes in one hour to 15 minutes in the next

 Hour
 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24

 Value
 19
 17
 11
 16
 16
 17
 16
 18
 22
 35
 46
 50
 56
 54
 50
 43
 41
 37
 34
 32
 27
 26
 25
 25

- A day/24-hour average is complete if 75% of the hours are valid
 - Plan calibrations and maintenance with data completeness in mind
 - Be mindful of individual pollutant rules, some highlights:
 - Can affect PM 24 or Ozone 8-hour* averages either positively or negatively
 - *6 valid hours out of an 8-hour average count for completeness
 - Ozone season has high data completeness requirements
 - 1 in 3-, 6-, or 12-day sample schedules can miss fewer samples

Data Validation – Data Substitutions

Hour/Day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Primary Value	19	17	11	16	16	17	16	18	22	35	46	50	56	54	50									
Collocated Value	19	16	13	16	17	18	16	19	23	33	47	51	54	52	49	41	41	37	34	32	27	26	25	25

- In specific cases missing data from a primary monitor may be substituted with validated data from a collocated secondary monitor
- Secondary monitor data must be valid and validated with the same procedures the primary monitor
- Some of this occurs automatically in AQS, especially for PM monitors
- 40 CFR Parts 50 & 58 have rules on data substitutions

Data Validation – Data Certification

- Data Certification end of year review and certification of validated data in AQS to determine if Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) are being met.
 - Helpful AQS Reports:
 - AMP 430 Data completeness report
 - AMP 350 Data matrix report, data bracketed correctly, more on this later
 - AMP 600 Required, shows data completeness, precisions/bias calculations, sufficient audits
 - With a well documented and thorough data validation process there should be no surprises!
 - Recommend documenting any failing criteria or missing data in the cover letter



Data Validation – Know your Data! - Historical



- As you review data you will be more comfortable with the variability and be able to anticipate issues as they arise
- If you're new be sure to read your agency's:
 - 5-Year Network Assessment
 - Annual Network Plan
- Review longer periods of data
- Use data visualization tools such as Excel, R, or online resources
- Examples of additional data review:
 - Perform correlation analyses to help determine:
 - "buddy sites" Sites with similar readings and usually nearby
 - Unique sites

Data Validation – Know your Data! – Historical



- More example data review:
 - Time series
 - Diurnal patterns
 - Seasonal patterns
 - Compare different pollutants or meteorological data 2Y (NOx/Ozone or Ozone/Temperature)
 - Box (and whisker) plots:
 - Averages
 - Inner quartile ranges
 - Outer quartile ranges
 - Outliers
 - Violin plots, similar but show data distribution, can be combined with box plots

Data Validation – Tools: Data Quality Dashboards

An official website of the United States	government Here's how you know 🗸											
	antal Protection Search EPA.gov Q											
Environmental Topics \checkmark	Laws & Regulations \checkmark Report a Violation \checkmark About EPA \sim											
mbient Monitoring	Technology Information Center (AMTIC) CONTACT US											
AMTIC Home	AMTIC - Ambient Air Monitoring											
Basic Information Assessments												
Ambient Air Monitoring Networks	The following Web pages provide assessments and reports of ambient air quality data. Note: the											
Training and Conferences	assessments and reports presented are intended to help inform the quality of the data for the ambient air monitoring and quality assurance communities. For convenience, these assessments and reports are publicly available (i.e., they do not require a user-name and password).											
Air Monitoring Methods												
Quality Assurance												
Regulations, Guidance and Monitoring Plans	Particulate Matter (PM) Monitoring Assessments and Reports											
Program Review and	PM2.5 Continuous Monitor Comparability Assessments											
Oversight	<u>PM10 Continuous Monitor Comparability Assessments</u>											
Networks, Partners and	<u>PM2.5 FRM Data Quality Dashboard</u> Chamical Speciation Network Appual Site Peperts F ²											
Programs	<u>Unernical Speciation Network Annual Site Reports</u> [2] IMPROVE Annual Site Reports [7]											
Related Links	- Introve Annual Site Reports											
Ambient Air Monitoring	Gaseous Monitoring Assessments											
Listserv	Single Point Precision and Bias Report											
	• Carbon Monoxide (CO) Data Quality Dashboard 🗹											
	<u>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) Data Quality Dashboard</u>											
	• <u>Nitric Oxide (NO) Data Quality Dashboard</u>											
	<u>Ozone (O3) Data Quality Dashboard</u>											
	• <u>Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) Data Quality Dashboard</u>											
	 <u>Total Reactive Nitrogen (NOy) Data Quality Dashboard</u> 											
	Network Assessment Application											
	• <u>NetAssess2020</u>											

• Let's talk EPA's online dashboards.

- Links in the Important Resources section
- Limitations:
 - Data must have been submitted to AQS
 - Updated periodically
 - Can only review one year at a time
Data Quality Dashboards – PQAO Page



- Focusing on Gaseous pollutants
 - Select Year
 - Choose your Primary Quality Assurance Organization (PQAO)
 - Optional choose a specific method
 - First tab shows MQO's compared to other PQAOs
 - Can select and see how you compare to other PQAOs

Data Quality Dashboards – Monitor Tab



- Often missed is the Monitor Tab
- Shows all the chosen PQAO's monitors and various MQO's
- Select a monitor ID to explore the data related to that monitor in charts below:
 - Graphical matrix view of checks and validity
 - QC Check control charts*
 - QC check levels and responses
 - Data time series*
 - *Recommend developing these charts internally

Data Validation – Stats for higher ups...

- Give data validators their flowers!
 - 1 Continuous Parameter
 - Minutes in a day = 1,440
 - Hours in a week = 168
 - Hours in a month = 744 (31 days)
 - Hours in a year = 8,760



- Now multiply by at least 6 continuous criteria pollutants = 52,560
- R3 Largest agency ~64 sites, 2022, all parameter Raw Data in AQS = 3,242,379
- R3 Smallest agency ~5 sites, 2022, all parameter Raw Data in AQS = 725,419
- A lot of data is reviewed by people

Breathe in, breathe out



Breathe in, breathe out, breathe in, breathe out, breathe in, scream into the void while breathing out!

Stand up, Sit down



Stretch, grab a drink of water, start a conversation you won't be able to finish 😳



https://xkcd.com/

Air Quality System Coding

Guidance and recommendations on coding data.

AQS Coding - Resources

- Coding Manual
- <u>https://aqs.epa.gov/aqsweb/documents/codingmanual/html/index.h</u>
 <u>tml</u>
- AQS Code Lists
- <u>https://www.epa.gov/aqs/aqs-code-list</u>
- Best Practices for Review and Validation of Ambient Air Monitoring Data – Section 3.1
- <u>https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2021-10/data-validation-guidance-document-final-august-2021.pdf</u>

AQS Coding – Null Data Codes

AT - Calibration

- **BK** Site computer/data logger down
- **QV** Quality Control Multi-point Verification •
- **AS** Poor Quality Assurance Results **AQ** - Collection Error
- **AB -** Technician Unavailable
- **BA** Maintenance/Routine Repairs

- Data are invalidated
 - Indicates causes for data invalidation or QA/QC & maintenance activities
 - No concentration is shown
 - 1C and 1F may be applied to QA transactions for frequency credit
 - Affects data completeness
- Important to use appropriate null code to explain missing data, useful for analyses:
 - Determine frequency and type of QA/QC activities
 - Helps find associated QA Transactions
 - Determine frequency of maintenance or calibrations
- Always code missing data!
 - Recommend limiting use of Miscellaneous Void "AM", codes should be as specific as possible
 - NOTE: AQS Codes are periodically updated, usually with some notification, but agencies are encouraged to review the list routinely.
 - Some more appropriate for laboratory analyses
 - Consult with regional QA staff when in doubt

AQS Coding – Qualifier (flag) Codes

2 - Operational Deviation

QX - Does not meet QC criteria

SX - Does Not Meet Siting Criteria

- 6 QAPP Issue
 - V Validated Value
- **QT** Temperature Sensor Questionable
 - 1 Deviation from a CFR/ Critical Criteria Requirement

- Data qualified (flagged) but not invalidated
 - Indicates there are concerns with data quality
 - Qualifiers cannot be applied to invalidated data
 - Cannot be applied to QA transactions
 - Does not affect data completeness
- Maximum of 10 qualifiers
 - Reminder, depending on the number of and type of qualifier, it is important to consider whether data should actually be invalidated
 - Compelling evidence should be thoroughly <u>documented</u> in validation notes
- Some more appropriate for laboratory analyses
 - Consult with regional QA staff when in doubt

AQS Coding – Informational & Request Exclusion Codes

IA African Dust.

- IB Asian Dust.
- IC Chem. Spills & Indust Accidents.
- ID Cleanup After a Major Disaster.
- IE Demolition.
- IF Fire Canadian.
- IG Fire Mexico/Central America.
- IH Fireworks.
- II High Pollen Count.
- IJ High Winds.
- IK Infrequent Large Gatherings.
- IL Other.
- IM Prescribed Fire.
- IN Seismic Activity.
- IO Stratospheric Ozone Intrusion.
- IP Structural Fire.
- IQ Terrorist Act.
- IR Unique Traffic Disruption.
- IS Volcanic Eruptions.
- IT Wildfire-U. S.
- J Construction.

- RA African Dust. Asian Dust. RB RC Chemical Spills & Industrial Accidents. Cleanup After a Major Disaster. RD RE Demolition. RF Fire - Canadian. RG Fire - Mexico/Central America. RH Fireworks. High Pollen Count. RI High Winds. RJ RK Infrequent Large Gatherings. RL Other. RM Prescribed Fire. Seismic Activity. RN Stratospheric Ozone Intrusion. RO Structural Fire. RP RQ Terrorist Act. Unique Traffic Disruption. Volcanic Eruptions. RS
- RT Wildfire-U. S.

- Similar to Qualifier codes
 - Does not affect data completeness
- Used to provide additional information that may be impacting data, or
- First step in an exclusion request
 - Exceptional Events, work with your Region, will require additional documentation and information in AQS

AQS Coding – Confusing Terminology

- All codes contribute to "Qualified Data"
- Some are Null Data codes
- Codes that aren't null code are referred to as "Qualifier" codes or as "Flags" and "Flagged" data
- Some may use the term "Informational" in place of "Qualifier" or "Flag", this can also refer to specific type of Qualifier Code as noted previously

AQS Coding – Data Strings

Raw Data RD|I|00|001|9991|44201|1|1|007|047|20240812|00:00|0.020<mark>||</mark>|1V||||||

Position	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Name	<u>Transaction</u> Type	<u>Action</u> Indicat or	<u>State</u> <u>Code /</u> <u>Tribal</u> Indicator	<u>County</u> <u>Code /</u> Tribal Code	<u>Site</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>Parameter</u> <u>Code</u>	<u>POC</u>	<u>Sample</u> Duration <u>Code</u>	<u>Reported</u> <u>Unit Code</u>	<u>Method</u> <u>Code</u>	<u>Sample</u> Date	<u>Sample</u> Begin Time	<u>Reportec</u> <u>Sample</u> <u>Value</u>	<u>Null Data</u> <u>Code</u>	<u>Collection</u> Frequency Code	<u>Monitor</u> Protocol ID	<u>Qualifier</u> <u>Code - 1</u>	<u>Qualifier</u> <u>Code - 2</u>	<u>Qualifier</u> <u>Code - 3</u>	<u>Qualifier</u> Code - 4	<u>Qualifier</u> Code - 5	<u>Qualifier</u> Code - 6	<u>Qualifier</u> Code - 7	<u>Qualifier</u> Code - 8	<u>Qualifier</u> Code - 9	<u>Qualifier</u> <u>Code - 10</u>	Alternate Method Detection Limit	<u>Measureme</u> <u>nt</u> Uncertainty
Example	RD	I.	00	001	9991	44201	1	1	007	047	20240812	00:00	0.020				1V											

		• : :	× 🗸 .	<i>f</i> _× Seq.					Calibri 🔻 13	- A [^] A [×] \$ - %	,		
4 A	в	с	D	E	F	G	н		B I = 🔗 ~	A ~ H ~ 50 .00	Ś	ĸ	1
								Seq.		1		2	3
								Nam	e	Transaction Type		Action Indicator	State C
			Trans	pose	Featu	re		Desc	ription Paste Option	Raw Data Sample	er.	Indicator for Insert, Update, or Delete action.	The Fl the m indica field (is a Tr
								Form	atting Rules	Must = RD		Must = I, U, or D	Must (Refere 'TT' fo
								Requ	ired	Always		Always	Alway
								Key					Y
	Seq.	Name	Description	Formatting Rules	Required	Кеу							
2	1	Transaction Type	Raw Data Sample transaction identifier.	Must = RD	Always								
1	2	Action_ Indicator	Indicator for Insert, Update, or Delete action.	Must = I, U, or D	Always								

 Pro-Tip! Copy table and Right Click > Paste Options: "Transpose" is handy for going from vertical to horizontal tables and vice versa!

AQS Coding – Null Data Code Considerations

- Quality Control (QC) Activities
 - Use the appropriate code for the activity
 - Should be corresponding QA transaction for QC Checks to meet the minimum CFR criteria (some agencies submit all)
 - AX 1 Point, QC/Precision Check only, no zero or span
 - AY 2 Points, Zero/Span only, no QC check (if submitting zero/span checks)
 - BF 3 Points, Zero/Span/and QC/Precision
 - Calibrations
 - AT Calibration: Recommend used for continuous PM monitor calibrations
 - BC Multi-point Calibration: Recommend used for multi-point Gas calibrations
 - QV QC Multi-point Verification: May be used for un-adjusted gas linearity checks

AQS Coding – Null Data Code Considerations

• Quality Assurance (QA) Activities

- Performance Evaluations/Audits
 - Strongly recommend differentiating between agency audits and NPAP or other third-party audits, R3 Recommends:
 - AZ QC Audit: Agency audits
 - BL QA Audit: Third-party audits
 - Note: Use codes consistently!
 - Dates with these codes should have corresponding audit transactions, differentiating helps search for either Performance Evaluations or NPAP Results



- Bracketing Data
 - Null and qualifier codes should be informative, providing a "narrative" of the data quality
 - For QA/QC Null codes there should be corresponding QA Transaction records as applicable
 - <u>There must be supporting documentation for all</u> <u>codes!</u>

NOTE: For the next examples, the Qualifier column either indicates the meaning of the null code or a qualifier is applied

Date Time	Ozone ppb	Qualifier
8/12/2024 0:00	25	-
8/12/2024 1:00	AX	Precision Check
8/12/2024 2:00	17	-
8/12/2024 3:00	17	-
8/12/2024 4:00	15	-
8/12/2024 5:00	10	-
8/12/2024 6:00	10	-
8/12/2024 7:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/12/2024 8:00	45	-
8/12/2024 9:00	70	-
8/12/2024 10:00	80	-
8/12/2024 11:00	74	-
8/12/2024 12:00	73	-
8/12/2024 13:00	67	-
8/12/2024 14:00	77	-
8/12/2024 15:00	80	-
8/12/2024 16:00	67	-
8/12/2024 17:00	59	-
8/12/2024 18:00	50	-
8/12/2024 19:00	49	-
8/12/2024 20:00	54	-
8/12/2024 21:00	42	-
8/12/2024 22:00	36	-
8/12/2024 23:00	32	-
8/13/2024 0:00	32	-
8/13/2024 1:00	27	-
8/13/2024 2:00	21	-
8/13/2024 3:00	16	-
8/13/2024 4:00	14	-
8/13/2024 5:00	14	-
8/13/2024 6:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/13/2024 7:00	24	-
8/13/2024 8:00	35	-
8/13/2024 9:00	46	-

- Bracketing Data Example 1
 - "AX" Code likely an automatic Precision (QC) Check
 - "BF" codes indicating zero/span/precision checks (QC point)
 - One on 8/12 and on 8/13
 - Data between "BF" and "AX" are not qualified indicating checks passed criteria.
 - As applicable there should be a corresponding QA Transaction for those dates.
 - NOTE: not all agencies may report all automatic QC checks or Zero/Span checks.

DateTime	Ozone ppb	Qualifier
8/12/2024 0:00	25	-
8/12/2024 1:00	AX	Precision Check
8/12/2024 2:00	17	-
8/12/2024 3:00	17	-
8/12/2024 4:00	15	-
8/12/2024 5:00	10	-
8/12/2024 6:00	10	-
8/12/2024 7:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/12/2024 8:00	45	-
8/12/2024 9:00	70	-
8/12/2024 10:00	80	-
8/12/2024 11:00	74	-
8/12/2024 12:00	73	-
8/12/2024 13:00	67	-
8/12/2024 14:00	77	-
8/12/2024 15:00	80	-
8/12/2024 16:00	67	-
8/12/2024 17:00	59	-
8/12/2024 18:00	50	-
8/12/2024 19:00	49	-
8/12/2024 20:00	54	-
8/12/2024 21:00	42	-
8/12/2024 22:00	36	-
8/12/2024 23:00	32	-
8/13/2024 0:00	32	-
8/13/2024 1:00	27	-
8/13/2024 2:00	21	-
8/13/2024 3:00	16	-
8/13/2024 4:00	14	-
8/13/2024 5:00	14	-
8/13/2024 6:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/13/2024 7:00	24	-
8/13/2024 8:00	35	-
8/13/2024 9:00	46	-

- Bracketing Data Example 2a
 - "AX" code again indicating an automatic Precision (QC) Check
 - "BF" codes again indicating zero/span/precision checks (QC point)
 - Data between "BF" codes are null coded as "AS" (Poor QA) and then "BA" (Maintenance) right before the second check
 - This indicates the first "BF" check likely failed and data were null coded to indicate poor QA results followed by maintenance and a repeated check
 - NOTE: "EC" for exceeds criteria may also be used here, internal consistency is key
 - Data afterward are not qualified indicating the check passed and the problem was resolved
 - Reminder, this is all conjecture without documentation!

DateTime	Ozone ppb	Qualifier
8/12/2024 0:00	25	-
8/12/2024 1:00	AX	Precision Check
8/12/2024 2:00	17	-
8/12/2024 3:00	17	-
8/12/2024 4:00	15	-
8/12/2024 5:00	10	-
8/12/2024 6:00	10	-
8/12/2024 7:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/12/2024 8:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 9:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 10:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 11:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 12:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 13:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 14:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 15:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 16:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 17:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 18:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 19:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 20:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 21:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 22:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 23:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 0:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 1:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 2:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 3:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 4:00	BA	Maintenance
8/13/2024 5:00	BA	Maintenance
8/13/2024 6:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/13/2024 7:00	24	-
8/13/2024 8:00	35	-
8/13/2024 9:00	46	-

- Bracketing Data Example 2b
 - Is anything wrong with this coding?



DateTime	Ozone ppb	Qualifier
8/12/2024 0:00	25	-
8/12/2024 1:00	AX	Precision Check
8/12/2024 2:00	17	-
8/12/2024 3:00	17	-
8/12/2024 4:00	15	-
8/12/2024 5:00	10	-
8/12/2024 6:00	10	-
8/12/2024 7:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/12/2024 8:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 9:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 10:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 11:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 12:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 13:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 14:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 15:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 16:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 17:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 18:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 19:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 20:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 21:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 22:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 23:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 0:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 1:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 2:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 3:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 4:00	BA	Maintenance
8/13/2024 5:00	BA	Maintenance
8/13/2024 6:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/13/2024 7:00	24	-
8/13/2024 8:00	35	-
8/13/2024 9:00	46	-

- Bracketing Data Example 2c
 - Data must be invalidated forward **AND** back to the last passing QC check
 - Assuming the corresponding "BF" check itself was valid there should still be a QA Transaction using the 1F code to indicate result failed
 - See policy memo for more details: <u>Steps to Qualify or</u> <u>Validate Data after an Exceedance of Critical Criteria</u> <u>Checks</u>
 - This example now shows clear corrective actions being taken; the validation records should include the details of why data were coded in this manner

DateTime	Ozone ppb	Qualifier
8/12/2024 0:00	25	-
8/12/2024 1:00	AX	Precision Check
8/12/2024 2:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 3:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 4:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 5:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 6:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 7:00	1F	QC Check Failed Criteria
8/12/2024 8:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 9:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 10:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 11:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 12:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 13:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 14:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 15:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 16:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 17:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 18:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 19:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 20:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 21:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 22:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/12/2024 23:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 0:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 1:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 2:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 3:00	AS	Poor QA Result
8/13/2024 4:00	BA	Maintenance
8/13/2024 5:00	BA	Maintenance
8/13/2024 6:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/13/2024 7:00	24	-
8/13/2024 8:00	35	-
8/13/2024 9:00	46	-

- Bracketing Data Example 3a
 - "BF" code a indicating zero/span/precision check (QC point)
 - This time data after the "BF" is qualified with "1V" indicating a CFR Criteria was exceeded but data were reviewed and validated

DateTime	SO ₂ ppb	Qualifier
8/12/2024 0:00	2	-
8/12/2024 1:00	2	-
8/12/2024 2:00	3	-
8/12/2024 3:00	3	-
8/12/2024 4:00	2	-
8/12/2024 5:00	1	-
8/12/2024 6:00	1	-
8/12/2024 7:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/12/2024 8:00	2	1V
8/12/2024 9:00	0	1V
8/12/2024 10:00	0	1V
8/12/2024 11:00	4	1V
8/12/2024 12:00	3	1V
8/12/2024 13:00	4	1V
8/12/2024 14:00	4	1V
8/12/2024 15:00	2	1V
8/12/2024 16:00	1	1V
8/12/2024 17:00	1	1V
8/12/2024 18:00	0	1V
8/12/2024 19:00	1	1V
8/12/2024 20:00	2	1V
8/12/2024 21:00	3	1V
8/12/2024 22:00	4	1V
8/12/2024 23:00	2	1V
8/13/2024 0:00	2	1V
8/13/2024 1:00	3	1V
8/13/2024 2:00	1	1V
8/13/2024 3:00	2	1V
8/13/2024 4:00	1	1V
8/13/2024 5:00	1	1V
8/13/2024 6:00	0	1V
8/13/2024 7:00	2	1V
8/13/2024 8:00	3	1V
8/13/2024 9:00	4	1V

- Bracketing Data Example 3b
 - While this example contains limited data for visibility's sake, often this code will be used when the span between checks exceeds the 14-day criteria, but the agency has reviewed the data and has compelling evidence that data are valid
 - Compelling evidence must be recorded in the validation notes associated with the data
 - Reminder to stick around for Weight of Evidence Presentation
 - Data would be qualified from one passing check to the next passing check
 - NOTE: 1V code should be used sparingly and corrective actions must be taken to meet criteria!

DateTime	SO ₂ ppb	Qualifier
8/12/2024 0:00	2	-
8/12/2024 1:00	2	-
8/12/2024 2:00	3	-
8/12/2024 3:00	3	-
8/12/2024 4:00	2	-
8/12/2024 5:00	1	-
8/12/2024 6:00	1	-
8/12/2024 7:00	BF	Z/S/P Check
8/12/2024 8:00	2	1V
8/12/2024 9:00	0	1V
8/12/2024 10:00	0	1V
8/12/2024 11:00	4	1V
8/12/2024 12:00	3	1V
8/12/2024 13:00	4	1V
8/12/2024 14:00	4	1V
8/12/2024 15:00	2	1V
8/12/2024 16:00	1	1V
8/12/2024 17:00	1	1V
8/12/2024 18:00	0	1V
8/12/2024 19:00	1	1V
8/12/2024 20:00	2	1V
8/12/2024 21:00	3	1V
8/12/2024 22:00	4	1V
8/12/2024 23:00	2	1V
8/13/2024 0:00	2	1V
8/13/2024 1:00	3	1V
8/13/2024 2:00	1	1V
8/13/2024 3:00	2	1V
8/13/2024 4:00	1	1V
8/13/2024 5:00	1	1V
8/13/2024 6:00	0	1V
8/13/2024 7:00	2	1V
8/13/2024 8:00	3	1V
8/13/2024 9:00	4	1V

- Bracketing Data Example 4a
 - Using a continuous PM_{2.5} monitor example, a flow check "AX" (Precision) is performed prior to a calibration "AT"
 - Data are not qualified before the flow check or after the calibration indicating successful QC activities
- NOTE: It is a recommended best practice to perform an "as found" QC check before routine calibrations as well as an "as left" QC check although the final QC check may not be coded.

DateTime	PM _{2.5} μg/m³	Qualifier
8/12/2024 0:00	10	-
8/12/2024 1:00	12	-
8/12/2024 2:00	13	-
8/12/2024 3:00	13	-
8/12/2024 4:00	12	-
8/12/2024 5:00	10	-
8/12/2024 6:00	10	-
8/12/2024 7:00	AX	Precision (Flow) Check
8/12/2024 8:00	AT	Calibration
8/12/2024 9:00	AT	Calibration
8/12/2024 10:00	30	-
8/12/2024 11:00	34	-
8/12/2024 12:00	33	-
8/12/2024 13:00	34	-
8/12/2024 14:00	34	-
8/12/2024 15:00	36	-
8/12/2024 16:00	37	-
8/12/2024 17:00	37	-
8/12/2024 18:00	40	-
8/12/2024 19:00	41	-
8/12/2024 20:00	42	-
8/12/2024 21:00	43	-
8/12/2024 22:00	0	-
8/12/2024 23:00	0	-
8/13/2024 0:00	0	-
8/13/2024 1:00	0	-
8/13/2024 2:00	0	-
8/13/2024 3:00	0	-
8/13/2024 4:00	0	-
8/13/2024 5:00	0	-
8/13/2024 6:00	0	-
8/13/2024 7:00	0	-
8/13/2024 8:00	0	-
8/13/2024 9:00	0	-

- Bracketing Data Example 4b
 - Wait! Does this look right?



• Let's graph it!

DateTime	PM _{2.5} μg/m³	Qualifier
8/12/2024 0:00	10	-
8/12/2024 1:00	12	-
8/12/2024 2:00	13	-
8/12/2024 3:00	13	-
8/12/2024 4:00	12	-
8/12/2024 5:00	10	-
8/12/2024 6:00	10	-
8/12/2024 7:00	AX	Precision (Flow) Check
8/12/2024 8:00	AT	Calibration
8/12/2024 9:00	AT	Calibration
8/12/2024 10:00	30	-
8/12/2024 11:00	34	-
8/12/2024 12:00	33	-
8/12/2024 13:00	34	-
8/12/2024 14:00	34	-
8/12/2024 15:00	36	-
8/12/2024 16:00	37	-
8/12/2024 17:00	37	-
8/12/2024 18:00	40	-
8/12/2024 19:00	41	-
8/12/2024 20:00	42	-
8/12/2024 21:00	43	-
8/12/2024 22:00	0	-
8/12/2024 23:00	0	-
8/13/2024 0:00	0	-
8/13/2024 1:00	0	-
8/13/2024 2:00	0	-
8/13/2024 3:00	0	-
8/13/2024 4:00	0	-
8/13/2024 5:00	0	-
8/13/2024 6:00	0	-
8/13/2024 7:00	0	-
8/13/2024 8:00	0	-
8/13/2024 9:00	0	-

	DateTime	PM _{2.5} μg/m³	Qualifier
	8/12/2024 0:00	10	-
	8/12/2024 1:00	12	-
ANC Coding Brackating Data	8/12/2024 2:00	13	-
AUS COUING – DIACKELING DALA	8/12/2024 3:00	13	-
	8/12/2024 4:00	12	-
	<u>8/12/2024 5·00</u>	10	-
PM2.5 mg/m3		10	-
		AX	Precision (Flow) Check
50		AT	Calibration
45		AT	Calibration
40		30	-
30		34	-
25		33	-
20		34	-
15		34	-
10		36	-
5		37	-
0	· · · · · ·	37	-
	60, 60, 60, 60, 60, 60, 60, 60, 60, 60,	40	-
	A. 02A. 02A. 02A. 02A	41	-
	13/2/13/2/13/2/13/2	42	-
ی بې پې کې	יס יס יס י	43	-
	0/12/2024 22.00		-
• Earthic avample, wo'll cay the energy partor performing the	8/12/2024 23:00	0	-
• For this example, we it say the operator performing the	8/13/2024 0:00	0	-
OC activity forgot to put the sharp cut cyclone back on	8/13/2024 1:00	0	-
QC activity forgot to put the sharp cut cyclone back on	8/13/2024 2:00	0	-
and then the filter overloaded and the sampler flatlined.	8/13/2024 3:00	0	-
	8/13/2024 4:00	0	-
 How should we code this? 	8/13/2024 5:00	0	-
	8/13/2024 6:00	0	-
	8/13/2024 /:00	0	-
	8/13/2024 8:00	0	-
	8/13/2024 9:00	0	-

- Bracketing Data Example 4c
 - The most logical code is operator error "BJ" although others may be acceptable
 - Data are coded from the time of the error until the operator went back out and corrected their error as indicated by the maintenance code "BA"
 - Then they performed a flow check to verify operation as indicated by "AX".
 - After the passing flow check data were considered valid
 - Documentation in validation notes is essential!
 - If a flow check was not recorded or coded the validity of the data can be challenged
 - Auditors internal and external should be on the look out for these types of issues

DateTime	PM _{2.5} μg/m³	Qualifier
8/12/2024 0:00	10	-
8/12/2024 1:00	12	-
8/12/2024 2:00	13	-
8/12/2024 3:00	13	-
8/12/2024 4:00	12	-
8/12/2024 5:00	10	-
8/12/2024 6:00	10	-
8/12/2024 7:00	AX	Precision (Flow) Check
8/12/2024 8:00	AT	Calibration
8/12/2024 9:00	AT	Calibration
8/12/2024 10:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 11:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 12:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 13:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 14:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 15:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 16:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 17:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 18:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 19:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 20:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 21:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 22:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/12/2024 23:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/13/2024 0:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/13/2024 1:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/13/2024 2:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/13/2024 3:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/13/2024 4:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/20/2024 7:00	BJ	Operator Error
8/20/2024 8:00	BA	Maintenance
8/20/2024 9:00	AX	Precision (Flow) Check
8/20/2024 10:00	10	-
8/20/2024 11:00	10	-

AQS Coding – Best Practices

- Apply null codes for scheduled, but missed, manual samples, e.g. PM_{2.5} FRM or TSP Pb samples
- Limit the use of the CFR Criteria exceeded "1" QA qualifier flag. This code is not intended for widespread use and should only be applied under specific circumstances. Most importantly, the "1" flag is not intended to "save" weeks of data that should be otherwise invalidated. When the "1" flag is applied, EPA will expect to see compelling evidence and documentation to justify the validity of the data.
- Apply null codes and QA qualifiers consistently! Include practices in your Data Validation SOP.

AQS Coding – Useful Reports

- AMP360 Raw Data Qualifier Report
 - Shows all data qualifiers and null codes used based on applied filters
 - Recommend using the work file and either importing into Excel and using pivot table to explore or some coding language
- AMP350 Raw Matrix Report
 - Shows data as a matrix with day by hour or day by month for manual samples based on applied filters
 - Shows concentrations, null codes, or concentration plus first 2 qualifier characters (may be one or two codes depending on code characters)
 - Useful for evaluating if data are bracketed appropriately

Questions!

Complaints, gripes, groans, or pleas for mercy also accepted. No, it's not time for lunch!



Sepa



Contact Info:

Keith Hoffman (he/his)

Life Scientist | QA Coordinator Air Quality & Analysis Branch | Air & Radiation Division US EPA Mid-Atlantic Region 3 Email: hoffman.keith@epa.gov

> **Thanks to:** Colleen Williams – MDE, James Roberts – DNREC, and Verena Joerger – EPA R3 for examples and feedback!

And Zoe for being a very good doggo



Important Resources

Links to important resources take these and bookmark them, keep them handy!

Data Validation – Resources: 40 CFR...

- <u>https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/chapter-I/subchapter-C</u>
- 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 50, 53, and 58 specifically
 - Part 50 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)
 - Part 53 Reference and Equivalent Methods for Ambient Air Monitoring
 - Part 58 Ambient Air Monitoring Quality Assurance
- Useful online features
 - Ctrl + F (Find) is your friend if you click on the "text", the "Part" takes to >
 - Table of Contents (TOC) for that Part and can be helpful if you know where you want to go
 - Links & Citations can be created for most major sections

Data Validation – Resources: Quality Assurance

- EPA's Quality Program (Agency wide QA)
- <u>https://www.epa.gov/quality</u>
- Environmental Information Policy and Procedures
- <u>https://www.epa.gov/irmpoli8/environmental-information-policy-procedures-and-standards</u>
 - Quality Management Plan (QMP) Standard New standard implemented in 2023
 - Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) Standard New standard implemented in 2023

Data Validation – Resources: NAAQS

- <u>https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants/naaqs-table</u>
- Current National Ambient Air Quality Standards Table
 - Learn it, cite it, keep it handy!
- Useful features:
 - Clicking on the pollutant takes you to a sub table that shows a history of the standard and Federal Register Citation if available
 - Further in the sidebar there are links to learn more about the NAAQS process and specific pollutants.

Data Validation – Resources: AMTIC

- <u>https://www.epa.gov/amtic</u>
- Ambient Monitoring Technology Information (AMTIC)
- Hub for Air Monitoring Information:
 - Quality Assurance
 - Air Monitoring Methods
 - Air Monitoring Programs
 - Policy Memos and Guidance
 - Past conference information (where this presentation will live)
 - And more!

Where, you've seen it before but don't remember where?



Data Validation – Resources: AMTIC Part I

- <u>https://www.epa.gov/amtic/amtic-ambient-air-monitoring-networks</u>
- Air Monitoring Network Information
 - NCore and SLAMS and PAMS oh my!
 - Information about specific network/site types and programs
- <u>https://www.epa.gov/amtic/air-monitoring-methods</u>
- Air Monitoring Methods
 - Federal Reference and Equivalent Method List
 - These are the only monitors to be used for official NAAQS Determination
 - Air Toxics, inorganic (PM, metals, etc.) and organic (VOCs, etc.) methods

Data Validation – Resources: AMTIC Part II

- <u>https://www.epa.gov/amtic/ambient-air-monitoring-quality-assurance</u>
- Quality Assurance Resources
 - One stop shop for Air Monitoring Specific QA information
 - Highlights:
 - Most of the QA Documents referenced in this presentation can be found here
 - QA Handbook Volume II
 - Appendix D Validation Templates, <u>T640</u>, and <u>T640x</u>
 - <u>Best Practices for Review and Validation of Air Monitoring Data</u>
 - <u>Appendix A Checklists</u>
 - Tools to assist with calculations
 - Newsletters (QA Eye), index of topics and then links to old newsletters, note that some information
 may not be applicable to current requirements
 - QA Handbooks for Meteorological data
 - Links to Air Toxics, Chemical Speciation Network, and PAMS sites with QA
Data Validation – Resources: AMTIC Part III

- <u>https://www.epa.gov/amtic/amtic-ambient-air-monitoring-assessments</u>
- Air Monitoring Assessment Dashboards
 - R-Shiny Application QA Information
 - Bonus: PAMS Dashboard: <u>https://rstudio-</u> <u>connect.sonomatechdata.com/pams_dashboard/</u>
- Highlights:
 - PM2.5 FRM to FEM and collocation comparisons
 - Pollutant specific QA statistics, both compared to other agencies and by agency and monitor.

Data Validation – Resources: Training

- Air Knowledge
- <u>https://airknowledge.gov/</u>
- AMBM208-SI: Quality Assurance for Air Pollution Measurement Systems (formerly APTI/SI-470)
- <u>https://airknowledge.gov/SI/AMBM208-SI.html</u>
- EPA Conferences and Training on AMTIC
- <u>https://www.epa.gov/amtic/conferences-and-training</u>

Data Validation – Resources: AQS

- <u>https://www.epa.gov/aqs</u>
- Main page with further links to documentation, training, etc.
- Coding Manual
- <u>https://aqs.epa.gov/aqsweb/documents/codingmanual/html/index.h</u>
 <u>tml</u>
- AQS Code Lists
- <u>https://www.epa.gov/aqs/aqs-code-list</u>

Data Validation – Resources: AirNow, Etc.

- Ambient Air Data
 - https://www.epa.gov/aqs
 - https://www.epa.gov/outdoor-air-quality-data
 - https://www.airnow.gov/
 - https://fire.airnow.gov/
 - https://www.airnowtech.org/
- Meteorological and Climate Data
 - <u>https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cdo-web/datatools</u>
 - https://mesonet.agron.iastate.edu/
 - <u>https://rapidrefresh.noaa.gov/hrrr/HRRRsmoke/</u>



https://xkcd.com/

Data Validation – Resources: R

- Data Visualization with R
 - Openair https://davidcarslaw.github.io/openair/
 - Ggplot2 https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org/
 - Plotly <u>https://plotly.com/r/</u>
 - R For Excel Users <u>https://rforexcelusers.com/blog/</u>
 - R Graph Gallery <u>https://r-graph-gallery.com/</u>
 - Data to Viz https://www.data-to-viz.com/
- Other Resources
 - CARB <u>https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/capp-resource-center/data-portal/visualization-and-data-analysis-tools</u>



https://wikizilla.org/w/images/4/4a/King_Kong_vs._Godzilla_Japanese_Title_End_Title.png