

U. S. Steel Gary Works - Laboratory Report Data Review					
Laboratory Report ID:				1705606	
Laboratory Name:	ALS Environmental (Holland, MI)		Report Package Date:	5/22/2017	
Project Name:	CAMU Monthly Leachate - May 2017		Review Date:	6/22/2017	
Project Number:	4262-303-01-01 Phase 03				
Reviewer Name:	Suzanne Bonola		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 (*list of compounds is in accordance with the CAMU Monitoring Program)		No. of QC Samples?*	1	
Method IDs:	SW80825; SW8260B; SW8270D; SW8270D SIM (PAHs); EPA 350.1 R2.0; A2540 C-97; A2540 D-97; SW 6020A; SW7470A; SW7196A		Rejected Results?	Yes	
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		(1)
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:	5/10/2017	Date Received:	5/10/2017		
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	(2)
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	(3)
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	(4)
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:					
LCS-01 (-01B MS/-01B MSD): VOCs LCS-02 (-02D MS/-02D MSD): Ammonia as N					
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		(5)
6 Were the MS/MSD RPD values within laboratory control limits?			X		

U. S. Steel Gary Works - Laboratory Report Data Review				
Laboratory Report ID:			1705606	
Laboratory Name:	ALS Environmental (Holland, MI)	Report Package Date:	5/22/2017	
Project Name:	CAMU Monthly Leachate - May 2017	Review Date:	6/22/2017	
Project Number:	4262-303-01-01 Phase 03			
Reviewer Name:	Suzanne Bonola	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 (*list of compounds is in accordance with the CAMU Monitoring Program)	No. of QC Samples?*	1	
Method IDs:	SW80825; SW8260B; SW8270D; SW8270D SIM (PAHs); EPA 350.1 R2.0; A2540 C-97; A2540 D-97; SW 6020A; SW7470A; SW7196A	Rejected Results?	Yes	
Matrix:	Aqueous + QC (TB)			
*Attach copy of lab report showing sample IDs and corresponding lab IDs.		Yes	No	N/A
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		(6)
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		
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	(7)
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	(7)
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	(8)
Comment No. Description (data usability; note any estimated and/or rejected data):				
1	Sampling: The samples were collected by ALS staff. 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. Departures: Hexavalent chromium samples were received out of temperature requirements, but with visible ice. A sample was split off from another bottle and sent to the analytical laboratory within temperature. Dilutions: Dilutions were needed for the following chemicals due to elevated concentrations: VOCs (-01, -02); SVOCs (-01); PAHs (-01, -02); ammonia as N (-01, -02) QAPP: Uniform Federal Policy - Quality Assurance Project Plan, U. S. Steel Corporation, Gary Works, Gary, Indiana, April 2016.			
2	Method Blank: <u>Total metals: total Li</u> (MBLK-101838-101838) @ 0.0005159 J x 5 = 0.0025795mg/L (>5xMB for -01C and -02C, NQR).			
3	Trip Blank: Chloroform detected in trip blank sample (sample -03) @0.39 J ug/L; chloroform reported as ND for -01A and -02A, NQR.			
4	Surrogate Recoveries: <u>Samples -01A and -02A:</u> dibromofluoromethane %Rec<LCL, but >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, chloromethane, dibromochloromethane, dibromomethane, dichlorodifluoromethane, idomethane, trichlorofluoromethane ND, revise to "UJ").			
5	MS/MSD: <u>Sample -01B: 1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane</u> - MS and MSD %R<LCL and <10%; parent sample ND; reject result and replace with "R"; <u>2-butanone, 2-hexanone, and trichloroethane</u> - MS and MSD %R>UCL; parent samples are ND; NQR; <u>acetone</u> - MS and MSD %R>UCL; parent sample already "J" flagged; NQR; <u>tetrachloroethane</u> - MSD %R>UCL; parent sample is ND; NQR. <u>Sample -01D: Ammonia as N</u> - MS and MSD %R<LCL, but >30%; revise to "J". <u>Sample -02D:</u> Ammonia as N - MS and MSD %R<LCL, but >30%; revise to "J".			
6	Internal Standards: Included in L4 lab report; no review required for general QC data evaluation. Did not receive a copy of the L4 lab report.			
7	The lab did not perform PDS or SD analysis for this batch report.			
8	Reporting: The laboratory provided an EDD to the database management contractor.			
Signature of Validator:		Suzanne Bonola 6/22/2017		
Signature of Senior Review:		Suzanne Bonola 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

NFQR: 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) CAMU Monthly Leachate 5.2017
Work Order: 1705606

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>
1705606-01	LCS-01	Aqueous	LCS-01	5/10/2017 10:20	5/10/2017 16:45	<input type="checkbox"/>
1705606-02	LCS-02	Aqueous	LCS-02	5/10/2017 10:00	5/10/2017 16:45	<input type="checkbox"/>
1705606-03	Trip Blank	Aqueous	Trip Blank	5/10/2017 09:30	5/10/2017 16:45	<input type="checkbox"/>