



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
 REGION VI  
 HOUSTON BRANCH  
 6608 HORNWOOD DRIVE  
 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77074

Ref. Case No. SAS-3354F

Site Name VERTAC

Date: 1-14-88

Subject: NO CLP Data Review

From: Michael L. Daggett, Chief, Organic Lab Section, 6E-HL

To: Hank Thompson, 6E-SH

A review of the laboratory raw data for the reference site has been completed by members of the Laboratory Section. Samples were:

INORGANIC: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

ORGANIC: 3354F-D1 → 3354F-78 (Inclusive) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

The data was found:

- ( ) Acceptable
- (✓) Provisional; use of data requires caution. Problems are noted in Review Summary
- ( ) Unacceptable; data should not be used. Problems are noted in Review Summary.

Questions regarding the review can be addressed to me.

Attachments

cc: David Stockton, 6E-HL  
 Duane Geuder, WH-548A

017201

80661

ORGANIC QA CHECKLIST

Site VERTAC Contract No. SAS# 3354F  
 Case No. SAS# 3354F Contractor CHEMWEST  
 Reviewed By M. L. Ritter Matrix Duck Tissue  
 Date 1/11/88 Acct. # 8TFAJN57 SF TFAU04

Sample No. SAS# 3354F-01 through 3354F-78. Samples from duck tissue  
analyzed for Pesticides/PCBs.

017202

OVERALL COMMENTS (. To Be Completed By EPA PERSONNEL)

	VOA	B/N	A	Pest	Other
1. Holding Times	_____	_____	_____	<u>A</u>	_____
2. Tuning/Performance	_____	_____	_____	<u>A</u>	_____
3. Calibrations	_____	_____	_____	<u>A</u>	_____
4. Blanks	_____	_____	_____	<u>P</u>	_____
5. Surrogates	_____	_____	_____	<u>A</u>	_____
6. Matrix Spike/Dup	_____	_____	_____	<u>A</u>	_____
7. Compound Identity	_____	_____	_____	<u>A</u>	_____
8. Case Assessment	_____	_____	_____	<u>P</u>	_____

COMMENTS OR CLARIFICATIONS (See Attached)

- A - Acceptable - All items delivered; all criteria met.
- P - Provisional - Data usable; some non-essential review items missing or criteria were not met.
- U - Unacceptable - Data unusable; essential review items missing or criteria not met.

COMMENTS/CLARIFICATIONS  
REGION VI CLP QA REVIEW

CASE SAS# 3354F SITE VERTAC LAB Chemwest

The following is a summary of sample qualifiers used by Region VI in reporting this CLP Case data:

<u>No.</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Provisional</u>	<u>Unacceptable</u>
VOA	_____	_____	_____
BNA	_____	_____	_____
PEST	<u>0</u>	<u>78</u>	_____
OTHER	_____	_____	_____

017203

COMMENTS:

Data package for SAS 3354F is provisional. The duck tissue samples were analyzed for Pesticides/PCBs by the organics IFB protocol after sample preparation and extraction as per the SAS request-see narrative. The samples were number-ed as units of three samples, each comprising an edible, a liver and a remainder (fatty portion) of the duck; thus sample Al consisted of three separate samples, F-01-Al, F-02-Al and F-03-Al, respectively. The case narrative details some of the problems related to the analyses of the these tissue samples.

Evaluation:

1. Holding times-Acceptable.
2. Tuning/Instrument Performance-Acceptable. Initial and continuing sequences for analytical runs were good- no problems evident from the chromatograms. Note that the narrative states that some column plugging was observed due to the nature and amount of oil in the samples.
3. Calibrations-Acceptable. Initial and continuing calibrations, as well as the evaluation or linearity runs were acceptable. The lab explained that some deviation from the allowable limit for %D for the continuing calibrations was found; the deviations did not affect the results. Those compounds out of %D limits, such as Aldrin and Methoxychlor in Sequence 91, were not found in the samples-see narrative.
4. Blanks-Provisional. Raw data is present for the blanks which were done as part of sample prep, but the Form IV blank summaries were missing. The pages between page 017 and page 024 of the package were blank. The lab has been contacted to correct this problem. Raw data shows acceptable blanks.

ORGANIC CLP/QA REVIEW  
CONTINUATION PAGE

CASE NO. SAS# 3354F

SITE Vertac

COMMENTS:

5. Surrogates- Acceptable. Surrogate recoveries for Pesticide/PCB are advisory only; in fact all surrogate (DBC) recoveries fell within the advisory limits.
6. Matrix spikes-Acceptable. Samples F-03-A1, F-21-B2, F-42-C6 and F-63-F1 were used for QC. The amount of spike added and that recovered for six spike compounds was within the QC limits for all four samples except for several slightly high recoveries in sample F-42-C6 for Aldrin and Endrin. Prior to the matrix spike analysis a method blank and a method blank spike analysis was done. All recoveries were within QC limits for the method blank spikes; for example, see data for F-01-ALMBS ( lab # Y0010MBS) on page 808.
7. Compound Identity/Results- Acceptable. Lab identified Pesticide DDE in numerous samples by two column GC, but was not confirmed by GC/MS. In all but one or two samples, the DDE found was reported for only the fatty portion or remainder of the duck. The following positive results were found:
- |               |                   |                                   |                |                |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| F-03-A1 (66); | F-06-A2 (78);     | F-09-A3 (430);                    | F-12-A4 (140); | F-15-A5(110);  |
| F-18-B1 (99); | F-21-B2 (64);     | F-24-B3 (110);                    | F-27-C1 (98);  | F-30-C2 (120); |
| F-33-C3 (79); | F-36-C4 (140);    | F-39-C5 (150);                    | F-42-C6 (150); | F-48-E1(220)   |
| F-51-E2 (54); | F-54-E3 (140);    | F-60-E5 (180);                    | F-63-F1 (53);  | F-66-F2(75);   |
| F-72-F4 (64)  | and F-75-F5 (53). | The amounts found in ( ) are ppb. |                |                |

Sample F-07-A3 was the only edible portion of the duck to have DDE reported at 50 ppb. Note that due to much lower sample size for the liver portion, the resulting detection limits were usually a factor of about X10 higher than for the same duck edible and the fatty remainder portion.

The amounts of DDE reported were also found for the matrix spike and duplicate samples F-03-A1, F-21-B2, F-42-C6, but not for F-63-F1. For the last QC sample, DDE was found and confirmed in both QC samples at less than the CRQL and so was reported as 47U, whereas the sample had 53 pp

The highest % lipid was found in the F-09-A3 at 26.2%; this was the

017204

ORGANIC CLP/QA REVIEW  
CONTINUATION PAGE

CASE NO. SAS# 3354F

SITE Vertac

COMMENTS:

sample that also showed the highest DDE at 430 ppb.

8. Case Assessment- Provisional pending submission or clarification of the  
blank pages for the Form IV. The raw data is present and no trace of DDE  
can be seen in any of the blanks associated with this data; the lab files  
were Y0010MB, Y0030MB, Y0050MB, Y0070MB and Y0086MB.

RECOMMENDATION:

As for as the results for the duck tissue, the DDE should be confirmed  
by GC/MS. The recommendation from 6E-HL is that further analysis be done  
on the following extracts: F-09-A3, F12-A4, F15-A5, F-42-C6, F-48-E1  
and F-60-E5. The six extracts mentioned all reported some of the highest  
amounts of DDE and should be done before any others. The extracts from  
those samples should be concentrated, if necessary, and DDE run. Other  
pesticides, especially DDT, could be monitored. It is not clear why DDE  
should show up and not DDT in these tissues.

A copy of the reanalysis request by 6E-HL is attached.

*M.C. Rotten*  
*6E-HL*

CONTRACT LABORATORY PROGRAM  
RAS RE-ANALYSIS REQUEST/APPROVAL RECORD

70; D. STOCKTON  
1/12/88  
From M.C. RITTER

1/12/88  
M.C. RITTER  
GEM

SECTION A

#1. Case No. \_\_\_\_\_ SAS No. 3354F #2. DPO of RSCC STOCKTON

#3. Details of Re-Analysis Request:

- o Laboratory Name: CHEM WEST
- o Sample No(s). + Fraction(s): F-09-A3, F-12-A4, F-15-A5  
F-42-C6 AND F-48-E1 DUCK TISSUE  
PESTICIDE/PCBS FRACTIONS.
- o Reason for Re-Analysis: DUCK TISSUE SAMPLES SHOWED DDE  
LOW - 400 ppb BY GC/ECD PER SAS METHOD. NEED  
TO CONFIRM BY GC/MS
- o Procedure for Re-Analysis: IFB ORGANICS FOR GC/MS, DDE/PCBS  
STANDARDS METHOD TO BE RUN PRIOR TO SAMPLES.  
AT 50 PPM.

206  
0

#4. Name of PO Contacted: \_\_\_\_\_ Date 1 1

REQUEST: Approved  Not Approved   
RE-ANALYSIS: Billable  Not Billable

#5. Name of SMO Contact: \_\_\_\_\_ Date 1 1

SECTION B (TO BE COMPLETED BY SMO)

#1. Date of Laboratory Notification (Verbal) 1 1

#2. Re-Analysis Start Date 1 1 #3. Data Due Date 1 1

SECTION C (PROJECT OFFICER CONCURRENCE)

Concurrence By \_\_\_\_\_ Date 1 1  
Project Officer Signature

Return intact form to:  
Sample Management Office  
P.O. Box 818  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313

Distribution: (1) PO Copy (2) DPO/RSCC Copy (3) SMO File Copy (4) Lab Copy

7/22/86