



**ICF International / Laboratory Data Consultants**

Environmental Services Assistance Team, Region 9  
1337 South 46<sup>th</sup> Street, Building 201, Richmond, CA 94804-4698  
Phone: (510) 412-2300; Fax: (510) 412-2304.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lisa Hanusiak, Remedial Project Manager  
Site Cleanup Section 3, SFD-7-3

THROUGH: Rose Fong, ESAT Task Order Manager (TOM)  
Quality Assurance (QA) Program, MTS-3

FROM: Doug Lindelof, Data Review Task Manager  
Region 9 Environmental Services Assistance Team (ESAT)

ESAT Contract No.: EP-W-06-041  
Technical Direction Form No.: 00105050 Amendment 1

DATE: April 24, 2007

SUBJECT: Review of Analytical Data, Tier 3

Attached are comments resulting from ESAT Region 9 review of the following analytical data:

Site:	Alhambra
Site Account No.:	09 ES LA01
CERCLIS ID No.:	CAD980818579
Case No.:	Not Provided
SDG No.:	06F050 and A654718
Laboratory:	EMAX and Maxxam Analytics
Analysis:	1,2,3-Trichloropropane (1,2,3-TCP) and n-Nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA)
Samples:	3 Water Samples (see Case Summary)
Collection Date:	June 5, 2006
Reviewer:	Calvin Tanaka, ESAT/Laboratory Data Consultants (LDC)

This report has been reviewed by the EPA TOM for the ESAT contract, whose signature appears above.

If there are any questions, please contact Rose Fong (QA Program/EPA) at (415) 972-3812.

Attachment

SAMPLING ISSUES:  Yes  No

00105050-7715/G5C+/06F050-NT

## Data Validation Report – Tier 3

Case No.: Not Provided  
SDG No.: 06F050 and A654718  
Site: Alhambra  
Laboratory: EMAX and Maxxam Analytics  
Reviewer: Calvin Tanaka, ESAT/LDC  
Date: April 24, 2007

### I. CASE SUMMARY

#### Sample Information

Samples: Y2HN7, Y2HN8, and Y2HN9  
Concentration and Matrix: Low Concentration Water  
Analysis: 1,2,3-TCP (GC/MS/SIM) and NDMA (GC/HRMS)  
Method: EPA Methods 8260B/SIM and 1625 Modified  
Collection Date: June 5, 2006  
Sample Receipt Date: June 5, 2006 (EMAX) and June 6, 2006 (Maxxam)  
Extraction Date: June 12, 2006 (NDMA)  
Analysis Date: June 6, 2006 (EMAX) and June 20, 2006 (Maxxam)

#### Field QC

Field Blanks (FB): Not Provided  
Trip Blanks (TB): Not Provided  
Equipment Blanks (EB): Y2HN9  
Background Samples (BG): Not Provided  
Field Duplicates (D1): Not Provided

#### Laboratory QC

Method Blanks & Associated Samples:  
MBLK1W: (1,2,3-TCP) All samples  
kr28150015: (NDMA) All samples

#### Tables

1B: Data Qualifier Definitions for Organic Data Review

#### Sampling Issues

The samples were received by Maxxam Analytics with a cooler temperature of 7.0EC, which exceeds the 4±2EC sample preservation criterion. Since the cooler temperature is below 10EC, no adverse effect on data quality is expected.

#### Additional Comments

Method specific quality control (QC) limits are used to evaluate the quality of data. For QC where method does not specify limits, laboratory QC limits are used. Data Users should note that recoveries for the surrogate NDMA-d6 were low, ranging from 17% to 23% only.

The NDMA result summary for sample Y2HN8 is missing in the data package. The raw data indicates that the NDMA result is nondetect (2.00U) and the NDMA-d6 recovery is 17%.

Although NDMA was found in the equipment blank Y2HN9 (2.37 ng/L), no data are qualified since NDMA was not found in the samples.

This report was prepared in accordance with the following documents:

- X ESAT Region 9 Standard Operating Procedure 901, *Guidelines for Data Review of Contract Laboratory Program Analytical Services (CLPAS) Volatile and Semivolatile Data Packages*;
- X EPA Method 8260B, *Volatile Organic Compounds by Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry (GC/MS)*, Revision 2, 1996;
- X EPA Method 1625C, *Semivolatile Organic Compounds by Isotope dilution GC/MS*, June 1989; and
- X *USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review*, October 1999.

## II. VALIDATION SUMMARY

The data were evaluated based on the following parameters:

	<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Comment</u>
1.	Holding Time/Preservation	Yes	
2.	GC/MS Tune and GC Performance	Yes	
3.	Initial Calibration	Yes	
4.	Continuing Calibration	Yes	
5.	Laboratory Blanks	Yes	
6.	Field Blanks	Yes	
7.	Surrogate (Method 8260)	Yes	
8.	Labeled Compound (Method 1625)	Yes	
9.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	N/A	
10.	Laboratory Control Samples/Duplicates	Yes	
11.	Internal Standard	Yes	
12.	Compound Identification	Yes	
13.	Compound Quantitation	Yes	
14.	System Performance	Yes	
15.	Field Duplicate Sample Analysis	N/A	

N/A = Not Applicable

## III. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF DATA

All method requirements specified in Methods 8260B and 1625C have been met. Reported results for 1,2,3-TCP and NDMA in the samples were correctly calculated.

## TABLE 1B

### DATA QUALIFIER DEFINITIONS FOR ORGANIC DATA REVIEW

The definitions of the following qualifiers are prepared according to the document, "USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review," October 1999.

- U The analyte was analyzed for but was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit.
- L Indicates results which fall below the Contract Required Quantitation Limit. Results are estimated and are considered qualitatively acceptable but quantitatively unreliable due to uncertainties in the analytical precision near the limit of detection.
- J The analyte was positively identified; the associated numerical value is the approximate concentration of the analyte in the sample.
- NJ The analysis indicates the presence of an analyte that has been "tentatively identified" and the associated numerical value represents its approximate concentration.
- UJ The analyte was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit. However, the reported quantitation limit is approximate and may or may not represent the actual limit of quantitation necessary to accurately and precisely measure the analyte in the sample.
- R The sample results are rejected due to serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and meet quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be verified.