



ICF Consulting / 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 Project Officer (TOPO)
Quality Assurance (QA) Program, PMD-3

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

ESAT Contract No.: 68-W-01-028
Technical Direction Form No.: 00905058 Amendment 2

DATE: November 14, 2005

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.:	34502
SDG No.:	Y21F1
Laboratory:	EnviroSystems, Inc. (ENVSYS)
Analysis:	Semivolatiles
Samples:	9 Water Samples (see Case Summary)
Collection Date:	September 6, 7, and 9, 2005
Reviewer:	Santiago Lee, ESAT/Laboratory Data Consultants (LDC)

This report has been reviewed by the EPA TOPO 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

cc: Dan Slizys, CLP PO USEPA Region 3
Steve Remaley, CLP PO USEPA Region 9

CLP PO: Attention Action

SAMPLING ISSUES: Yes No

Data Validation Report

Case No.: 34502
SDG No.: Y21F1
Site: Alhambra
Laboratory: EnviroSystems, Inc. (ENVSYS)
Reviewer: Santiago Lee, ESAT/LDC
Date: November 14, 2005

I. CASE SUMMARY

Sample Information

Samples: Y21E8 through Y21F6
Concentration and Matrix: Low Concentration Water
Analysis: Semivolatiles
SOW: OLM04.3 – Modification Reference No. 1275.0
Collection Date: September 6, 7, and 9, 2005
Sample Receipt Date: September 8, 9, and 10, 2005
Extraction Date: Not Applicable
Analysis Date: September 15, 2005

Field QC

Field Blanks (FB): Not Provided
Equipment Blanks (EB): Y21F0, Y21F4, and Y21F6
Background Samples (BG): Not Provided
Field Duplicates (D1): Y21F2 and Y21F3

Laboratory QC

Method Blanks & Associated Samples:
SBLK53: Y21E9, Y21F0, Y21F1, Y21F1MS, Y21F1MSD,
Y21F5, and Y21F6
SBLK55: Y21E8, Y21F2, Y21F3, and Y21F4

Tables

1A: Analytical Results with Qualifications
1B: Data Qualifier Definitions for Organic Data Review

CLP PO Action

None.

CLP PO Attention

Results for some analytes are qualified as estimated (J) due to calibration problems (see Comments A and B).

Sampling Issues

None.

Additional Comments

Tentatively identified compounds (TICs) were 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 USEPA Contract Laboratory Program Statement of Work for Organics Analysis, OLM04.2, May 1999; 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/GC Performance	Yes	
3.	Initial Calibration	No	A
4.	Continuing Calibration	No	B
5.	Laboratory Blanks	Yes	
6.	Field Blanks	Yes	
7.	Deuterated Monitoring Compounds	Yes	
8.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	Yes	
9.	Laboratory Control Samples/Duplicates	N/A	
10.	Internal Standards	Yes	
11.	Compound Identification	Yes	
12.	Compound Quantitation	Yes	
13.	System Performance	Yes	
14.	Field Duplicate Sample Analysis	Yes	

N/A = Not Applicable

III. VALIDITY AND COMMENTS

A. Results for the following analyte are qualified as estimated due to a large percent relative standard deviation (RSD) in the initial calibration and are flagged "J" in Table 1A.

X Benzaldehyde in all samples and all method blanks

A percent RSD of 32.8% was reported for benzaldehyde in the initial calibration. This value exceeds the #30.0% validation criterion.

The initial calibration demonstrates that the instrument is capable of acceptable performance in the beginning of the analytical run and of producing a linear calibration curve.

- B. Results for the following analytes are qualified as estimated due to high percent differences (%Ds) in the continuing calibration and are flagged "J" in Table 1A.

X 2,4-Dinitrophenol, 4-nitrophenol, 4-nitroaniline, and di-n-octylphthalate in all samples and all method blanks

The %Ds of -35.3%, -29.6%, -26.0%, and +29.4% were reported for 2,4-dinitrophenol, 4-nitrophenol, 4-nitroaniline, and di-n-octylphthalate in the continuing calibration. Since results are nondetected, false negatives may exist.

The RRF evaluates instrument sensitivity and is used in the quantitation of target analytes.

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 Low Concentration Organic Data Review," June 2001.

- U The analyte was analyzed for, but was not detected above 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; 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 adjusted CRQL. However, the reported adjusted CRQL is approximate and may be inaccurate or imprecise.

- R The sample results are unusable. The analyte may or may not be present in the sample.

