



U. S. Steel Gary Works - Laboratory Report Data Review					
Laboratory Report ID:				170311131	
Laboratory Name:	ALS Environmental (Holland, MI)			Report Package Date:	3/31/2017
Project Name:	CAMU Semi-Annual Leak Detection - March 2017			Review Date:	8/17/2017
Project Number:	4262-303-01-01 Phase 03				
Reviewer Name:	Angela Bouche			No. of Environ. Samples?*	2
Parameters:	PCBs, VOCs*, SVOCs*, ammonia as N, total dissolved solids, total suspended solids, total metals (As, Ba, Cd, Cr, Pb, Li, Hg, Se, Ag); hexavalent chromium, field pH, field temp, field specific conductance (*list of compounds is in accordance with the CAMU Monitoring Program)			No. of QC Samples?*	1
Method IDs:	SW8082; SW8260B; SW846 8270D (SVOCs); SW8270D SIM (PAHs); EPA 350.1 R2.0; A2540 C-97; A2540 D-97; SW 6020A; SW7470A; SW7196A, A4500-H B (pH), electrode (specific conductance), thermometer			Rejected Results?	No
Matrix:	Aqueous + QC (TB)				
*Attach copy of lab report showing sample IDs and corresponding lab IDs.				Yes	No
				N/A	Comment
Report Completeness & Sample Log-In Condition					
1 Was a signature page with appropriate authority signature provided?				X	
2 Was there a case narrative noting all known problems or anomalies?				X	
3 Were all samples received under chain-of-custody (seals used) and within appropriate temperature?					X (1)
4 Were all departures from standard conditions narrated (i.e., preservation acceptable, no headspace)?					X No departures
5 Are all field sample ID numbers cross-referenced to the laboratory ID numbers?				X	(1)
6 Are all laboratory ID numbers cross-referenced to the corresponding QC data (batch IDs provided)?				X	(1)
7 Were reference methods provided and cited appropriately?				X	
8 Were samples prepared and analyzed within holding times?				X	
Date Collected:	3/20/2017		Date Received:	3/20/2017	
9 Were all soil results reported on a dry-weight basis?					X
10 Was a percent moisture result reported for all soil and sediment samples?					X
11 If required for the project, was supporting documentation (CLP-like) provided?					X
12 If required for the project, were TICs reported?					X
13 Were all MDLs and/or RLs in accordance with project DQOs & reported in the test report?					X
14 Was justification provided for elevated RLs (e.g., non-target interferences, etc.)?				X	
15 Is there a QAPP or SAP available as a reference for the project performed?				X	(1)
16 Are non-detects identified as ND at RL with a "U", or other (less than "<")?				X	
17 Are laboratory flags defined?				X	
Laboratory Method Blanks and Field Blanks					
1 Were appropriate types of laboratory method blanks analyzed?				X	
2 Were the laboratory method blanks analyzed at the appropriate frequency?				X	
3 Was the method blank free of contamination (i.e., less than the MDL or RL)?				X	
4 Did the method blank contamination affect the final results? If so, note on page 2.					X
5 Was a trip blank required and submitted with the samples?				X	
6 Was the trip blank free of contamination (i.e., less than the MDL or RL)?				X	
7 Did the trip blank contamination affect the final results? If so, note on page 2.					X
8 Was an equipment blank required and submitted with the samples?					X
9 Was the equipment blank free of contamination (i.e., less than the MDL or RL)?					X
10 Did the equipment blank contamination affect the final results? If so, note on page 2.					X
11 Was a source water blank required and submitted with the samples?					X
12 Was the source water blank free of contamination (i.e., less than the MDL or RL)?					X
13 Did the source water blank contamination affect the final results? If so, note on page 2.					X
Surrogates					
1 Were surrogates added prior to extraction for all appropriate methods?				X	
2 Were surrogate percent recoveries within laboratory control limits?					X
3 Did the surrogate percent recoveries affect the final results? If so, note on page 2.				X	(2)
Laboratory Control Samples					
1 Were LCS performed for all appropriate methods?				X	
2 Were LCSs spiked with appropriate list of target compounds?				X	
3 Were LCS percent recoveries within laboratory control limits?				X	
4 Did the LCS percent recoveries affect the final results? If so, note on page 2.					X
5 If performed, were LCS Duplicate data provided?					X
6 Were the LCS/LCSD RPD values within laboratory control limits?					X
Matrix Spikes					
1 Were MS/MSDs required to be performed on a project sample?					X
Sample used/methods:					
2 Were MS/MSDs performed on a project sample selected by the laboratory?					X
Sample used/methods:					
3 Were MS/MSDs spiked with appropriate list of target compounds?					X
4 Were MS/MSD percent recoveries within laboratory control limits?					X
5 Did the MS/MSD percent recoveries affect the final results? If yes, narrate.					X
6 Were the MS/MSD RPD values within laboratory control limits?					X

U. S. Steel Gary Works - Laboratory Report Data Review					
Laboratory Report ID:		170311131			
Laboratory Name:	ALS Environmental (Holland, MI)	Report Package Date:	3/31/2017		
Project Name:	CAMU Semi-Annual Leak Detection - March 2017	Review Date:	8/17/2017		
Project Number:	4262-303-01-01 Phase 03				
Reviewer Name:	Angela Bouche	No. of Environ. Samples?*	2		
Parameters:	PCBs, VOCs*, SVOCs*, ammonia as N, total dissolved solids, total suspended solids, total metals (As, Ba, Cd, Cr, Pb, Li, Hg, Se, Ag); hexavalent chromium, field pH, field temp, field specific conductance (*list of compounds is in accordance with the CAMU Monitoring Program)	No. of QC Samples?*	1		
Method IDs:	SW8082; SW8260B; SW846 8270D (SVOCs); SW8270D SIM (PAHs); EPA 350.1 R2.0; A2540 C-97; A2540 D-97; SW 6020A; SW7470A; SW7196A, A4500-H B (pH), electrode (specific conductance), thermometer	Rejected Results?	No		
Matrix:	Aqueous + QC (TB)				
*Attach copy of lab report showing sample IDs and corresponding lab IDs.		Yes	No	N/A	Comment
7 Did the MS/MSD RPDs affect the final results? If so, note on page 2.				X	
Field and Laboratory Duplicates					
1 Was a field duplicate submitted with this SDG?			X		
Field Duplicate ID:					
2 Was the RPD values less than review criteria?				X	
3 Did the field duplicate RPD results affect the final results? If so, narrate.				X	
4 Was a laboratory method duplicate (MD) performed?			X		
MD ID:					
5 Were the RPD values less than review criteria?				X	
6 Did the MD results affect the final results? If so, note on page 2.				X	
Other Laboratory QC Data					
1 Were internal standard data reported? (organics and inorganics by 6020)				X	(3)
2 Were IS area counts and retention times within method required limits?				X	
3 Were data associated with manual integration flagged on the test reports?				X	
4 Did dual-column confirmation results (PCBs) meet method-required QC limits of <25% difference?				X	(4)
5 Was an interference check sample analyzed and were percent recoveries within QC limits?				X	
6 If serial dilutions were analyzed using a project sample, were the percent differences within QC limits?				X	(5)
7 Was a CRDL check sample analyzed and were the percent recoveries within QC limits?				X	
8 If post-digestion spikes (PDS) were performed for metals, were percent recoveries within QC limits?				X	(5)
9 If ICV/CCV was reported in the case narrative, did the ICV/CCV affect the project samples?				X	
10 Were the total results greater than the dissolved results (e.g., metals)?				X	
Electronic Data Deliverable					
1 Was an EDD provided with the deliverable?		X			
2 Was the electronic data the same as the hardcopy data?				X	(6)
Comment No. Description (data usability; note any estimated and/or rejected data):					
1	<p>Sampling: The samples were collected by ALS staff.</p> <p>Login: A custody seal was not used on the cooler; because the cooler was not shipped by a commercial courier, this was not mandatory protocol.</p> <p>Dilutions: Dilutions were needed for the following chemicals due to elevated concentrations: VOCs (-01); PAHs (-01); ammonia as N (-01)</p> <p>QAPP: Uniform Federal Policy - Quality Assurance Project Plan, U. S. Steel Corporation, Gary Works, Gary, Indiana, April 2016.</p>				
2	<p>Surrogate Recoveries: Sample -01: dibromofluoromethane %Rec<LCL, but above >10% (target analytes 1,1,1,2-tetrachloroethane, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, 1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane, 1,1,2-trichloroethane, 1,1-dichloroethane, 1,2,3-trichloropropane, 1,2-dibromo-3-chloropropane, 1,2-dibromomethane, 1,2-dichloroethane, 1,2-dichloropropane, bromodichloromethane, bromomethane, chloroethane, dibromochloromethane, dibromomethane, dichlorodifluoromethane, iodomethane, trichlorofluoromethane ND, revise to "UJ").</p>				
3	<p>ISTD: VOCs & SVOCs - Included in L4 lab report; no review required for general QC data evaluation.</p>				
4	<p>PCBs Dual Column Confirmation: Did not receive copy of the L4 lab report to verify dual column confirmation.</p>				
5	<p>The lab did not perform PDS or SD analysis for this batch report.</p>				
6	<p>Reporting: The laboratory provided an EDD to the database management contractor.</p>				
Signature of Validator:			8/17/2017		
Signature of Senior Review:			9/27/2017		

Attachment 1: Cross-reference of field IDs with laboratory IDs.

Acronyms:

CCV: Continuing Calibration Verification

CLP-Like: Level 4 Report

CL: Control Limit

DQOs: Data Quality Objectives

EDD: Electronic Deliverable Data

FD: Field Duplicate

GC/MS: Gas Chromatography/ Mass Spectrometry

ICV: Initial Calibration Verification

IS: Internal Standard

LCL: Lower Control Limit

LCS/LCSD: Laboratory Control Sample/Duplicate

MB: Method Blank

MD: Method Duplicate

MDL: Method Detection Limit

MS/MSD: Matrix Spike/Duplicate

ND: Non Detected

NQRR: No Further Qualification Required

NQR: No Qualification Required

PDS: Post Digestion Spike

%R: Percent Recovery

RL: Reporting Limit

RPD: Relative Percent Difference

SAP: Sampling Analysis Plan

SDG: Sampling Delivery Group

SVOC: Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds

TIC: Tentatively Identified Compound

QA/QC: Quality Assurance/Quality Control

QAPP: Quality Assurance Project Plan

UCL: Upper Control limit

VOC: Volatile organic compounds

Client: U.S. Steel - Gary Works
Project: USS Gary Semi-Annual Leak Detect 3.2017
Work Order: 17031131

Work Order Sample Summary

<u>Lab Samp ID</u>	<u>Client Sample ID</u>	<u>Matrix</u>	<u>Tag Number</u>	<u>Collection Date</u>	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Hold</u>
17031131-02	LDS-01	Aqueous	LDS-01	3/20/2017 10:30	3/20/2017 14:15	<input type="checkbox"/>
17031131-03	LDS-02	Aqueous	LDS-02	3/20/2017 10:18	3/20/2017 14:15	<input type="checkbox"/>
17031131-04	TRIP BLANK	Aqueous	TRIP BLANK	3/20/2017	3/20/2017 14:15	<input type="checkbox"/>