

ER PROGRAM DATA ASSESSMENT
SUMMARY REPORT FORM

Batch No. 8912G719 Site 881 Hillside
Laboratory Roy F. Weston - Stockton No. of Samples/Matrix 2/Water
SOW # 10/86 (Rev. 2/88) Reviewer Org. TechLaw, Inc.
Sample Numbers GTB121589004J, G57861289004

Data Assessment Summary

	VOA	Comments
1. Holding Times	<u>A</u>	<u>Action Item 1</u>
2. GC/MS Tune/Instr. Perf.	<u>V</u>	<u></u>
3. Calibrations	<u>X</u>	<u>Action Item 2; Comments 1,2</u>
4. Blanks	<u>X</u>	<u>Action Item 3</u>
5. Surrogates	<u>V</u>	<u></u>
6. Matrix Spike/Dup.	<u>X</u>	<u>Comment 3</u>
7. Other QC	<u>V</u>	<u></u>
8. Internal Standards	<u>V</u>	<u></u>
9. Compound Identification	<u>V</u>	<u></u>
10. System Performance	<u>V</u>	<u></u>
11. Overall Assessment	<u>A</u>	<u>Data acceptable with qualifications.</u>

V = Data had no problems.
A = Data acceptable but qualified due to problems.
R = Data rejected.
X = Problems, but do not affect data.

Data Quality: Data contained in this batch were reviewed and found to be acceptable with qualifications. Acceptable, qualified data may be used provided that individual values impacted by the "Action Items" listed below are appropriately flagged. (Refer to attached Results Summary Tables.)

ADMIN RECORD

"REVIEWED FOR CLASSIFICATION" 1
By R. B. Hoffman
Date 7-11-90

REVIEWED FOR CLASSIFICATION/UCNI
By George H. [Signature]
Date 6/27/90

12g719/voa
A-0001-000032

Action Items: 1) All non-detected results for all compounds are estimated and undetected (UJ) because holding times exceeded fourteen days.

2) In the initial and continuing calibrations, Acetone's %RSD and %D exceeded their respective limits. The positive results for Acetone in both samples would have been estimated (J) had blank criteria been met. (See Action Item 3)

3) As a result of method blank contamination, the positive results for Acetone in both samples are estimated and undetected (UJ) as per the Functional Guidelines criteria (10x rule).

Comments: 1) In the initial calibration the surrogates had %RSDs exceeding 100%. Although surrogates were not run at five separate concentrations as they should have been, it appears that the RRFs were calculated as if the appropriate concentration was used. This did not require action.

2) The continuing calibration had compounds whose %Ds exceeded 25%. No action is required because there were no positive results for those compounds.

3) The matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate contained Methylene Chloride contamination which was not present in the blank or associated sample.

Note: Data Summary Tables are attached.

William T Fee
Reviewer Signature

3/26/90
Date

