



ICF International / Laboratory Data Consultants

Environmental Services Assistance Team, Region 9
1337 South 46th 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.: 00105123

DATE: March 6, 2008

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 QB01
CERCLIS ID No.:	CAD980818579
Case No.:	Not Provided
SDG No.:	07H274
Laboratory:	EMAX Laboratories, Inc.
Analysis:	1,2,3-Trichloropropane (1,2,3-TCP)
Samples:	5 Water Samples (see Case Summary)
Collection Date:	August 20, 2007
Reviewer:	April Martinez, 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

Data Validation Report - Tier 3

Case No.: Not Provided
SDG No.: 07H274
Site: Alhambra
Laboratory: EMAX
Reviewer: April Martinez, ESAT/LDC
Date: March 6, 2008

I. CASE SUMMARY

Sample Information

Samples: Y3ES6 through Y3ET0
Concentration and Matrix: Low Concentration Water
Analysis: 1,2,3-TCP (GC/MS/SIM)
SOW: EPA Methods 8260B/SIM
Collection Date: August 20, 2007
Sample Receipt Date: August 20, 2007
Analysis Date: August 26 and 29, 2007

Field QC

Field Blanks (FB): Not Provided
Trip Blanks (TB): Not Provided
Equipment Blanks (EB): Y3ET0
Background Samples (BG): Not Provided
Field Duplicates (D1): Not Provided

Laboratory QC

Method Blanks & Associated Samples:
MBLK1W: Y3ES6, Y3ES8, Y3ES9, and Y3ET0
MBLK2W: Y3ES7

Tables

1B: Data Qualifier Definitions for Organic Data Review

Sampling Issues

None.

Additional Comments

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 USEPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Superfund
Organic Methods Data Review, July 2007.

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 and GC Performance	Yes	
3.	Initial Calibration	Yes	
4.	Continuing Calibration	Yes	
5.	Laboratory Blanks	Yes	
6.	Field Blanks	Yes	
7.	Surrogate (Method 524.2)	Yes	
8.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	N/A	
9.	Laboratory Control Samples/Duplicates	Yes	
10.	Internal Standard	Yes	
11.	Compound Identification	Yes	
12.	Compound Quantitation	Yes	A
13.	System Performance	Yes	
14.	Field Duplicate Sample Analysis	N/A	

N/A = Not Applicable

III. VALIDITY AND COMMENTS

- A. Sample Y3ES7 was analyzed at a 10-fold dilution (see Case Narrative). Consequently, the 1,2,3-TCP reporting limit for sample Y3ES7 was elevated to 0.050 ug/L.

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 Superfund Organic Methods Data Review," July 2007.

- U The analyte was analyzed for, but was not detected at a level greater than or equal to the level of the adjusted Contract Required Quantitation Limit (CRQL) for sample and method.
- 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 and the associated numerical value is the approximate concentration of the analyte in the sample (due either to the quality of the data generated because certain quality control criteria were not met, or the concentration of the analyte was below the CRQL).
- 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 at a level greater than or equal to the adjusted CRQL. However, the reported adjusted CRQL is approximate and may be inaccurate or imprecise.
- R The sample results are unusable due to the quality of the data generated because certain criteria were not met. The analyte may or may not be present in the sample.