Correction

Correction: Shrader-Frechette, K.; Biondo, A.M. Data-Quality Assessment Signals Toxic-Site Safety Threats and Environmental Injustices. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2021, 18, 10293

Kristin Shrader-Frechette ^{1,*} and Andrew M. Biondo ²

¹ Department of Biological Sciences, 100 Malloy Hall, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA

² Department of Economics, 3060 Jenkins Nanovic Hall, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA; abiondo@nd.edu

* Correspondence: kshrader@nd.edu

Citation: Shrader-Frechette, K.; Biondo, A.M. Correction: Shrader-Frechette, K.; Biondo, A.M. Data-Quality Assessment Signals Toxic-Site Safety Threats and Environmental Injustices. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2021, 18, 10293. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph181910293>

Received: 4 May 2021

Accepted: 27 July 2021

Published: 29 September 2021

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

The authors would like to make the following corrections (1 and 2) to this paper [1].

Regarding correction 1, in the earlier paper we inadvertently used the statistics for no sampling of currently occupied site buildings instead of current site buildings. Regarding correction 2, we made a typographical error in an earlier draft, exchanging references [41] and [43]. This caused us to misplace data from reference [41] for data from reference [43] in the earlier paper.

1. As a result, part of line 6 of the first paragraph on p. 8 was published as:

“collected no sub-slab samples for 89% of 26 currently occupied buildings”
but, instead, the preceding material should be corrected to:

“collected no required sub-slab samples for 86% of 29 current buildings”.

2. As a result, the third paragraph of p. 12 was published as:

“Second, CBRE/TCC’s 2018 below-all-screening-levels claim is false because when the Canoga Park sampling was conducted in 2018, the 2018 EPA TCFM-screening/health-protective level was 730 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ [53]. Yet this is a TCFM level that 100% of Canoga Park soil-gas samples violate; indeed, 80% of Canoga Park soil-gas samples violate this 730 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ level by three orders of magnitude [43]. Moreover, CBRE/TCC used a 2017 screening/health-protective level at other sites of 1300 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ TCFM [39], and 93% of all Canoga Park soil-gas samples violate CBRE/TCC’s own protective level; 80% of all Canoga Park soil-gas samples violate this health-protective level by at least two orders of magnitude [43].”

Instead, the preceding paragraph should be corrected to:

“Second, CBRE/TCC’s 2018 below-all-screening-levels claim is false because, when the Canoga Park sampling was conducted, the ATSDR/EPA TCFM-screening/health-protective soil-gas/indoor-air levels, respectively, were 7300/730 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ [53]. Yet, 92% of Canoga Park soil-gas samples violated this ATSDR/EPA level, and 77% violated this level by two orders of magnitude [41]. Moreover, CBRE/TCC used a 2017 screening/health-protective level at other sites of 1300 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ TCFM [39], and 92% of all Canoga Park soil-gas samples violated CBRE/TCC’s own protective level; 77% of all Canoga Park soil-gas samples violated this health-protective level by at least two orders of magnitude [41].”

The authors would like to apologize for any inconvenience to the readers caused by these errors.

Reference

1. Shrader-Frechette, K.; Biondo, A.M. Data-Quality Assessment Signals Toxic-Site Safety Threats and Environmental Injustices. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2021, 18, 10293. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]