

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION

CONTROLLED DOCUMENTS

The following document is controlled by the Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Officer. If you print this document, this page must be attached to the front of the document and you must fill in the information required below. The hard copy should be signed and dated the day it is printed by the user.

CAUTION: The attached controlled document was printed from the SAIC Quality Assurance Web Site, which resides on the SAIC ISSAIC home page, and is valid until the revision number changes. The user is responsible for checking that the revision number of the printed document matches the revision number of the controlled document on the SAIC Quality Assurance Web Site for as long as this printed copy is in use.

Manual Name: Quality Assurance Technical Procedures Volume I: Data Management

Document Number: TP-DM-300-7

Revision Number: 7

Date Printed: _____

Person Checking the Revision Number: _____

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION DATA MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE			
Title: Data Validation			
Procedure No: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Date: 3/03/2009	Page 1 of 20
Business Unit General Manager:	Date:	QA/QC Officer:	Date:
<i>A. J. ...</i>	<i>3/3/2009</i>	<i>C. A. Cowart</i>	<i>3/3/2009</i>

R

1.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this procedure is to define the process for validation of analytical sample results obtained from analyses of environmental samples collected for site characterization, assessment, determination of remedial actions, and risk assessment.

The primary goal of data validation is to provide an independent examination of the reported values and associated quality control. This will document that they are complete and accurately define the analytical context of the data set with respect to the project Data Quality Objectives (DQOs).

2.0 SCOPE

This procedure applies to all data generated as a result of analytical laboratory analyses of environmental samples for purposes of site characterization and environmental assessment activities conducted by Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC). This procedure is not applicable to in-situ field measurements, but may be applied to in-field analysis provided applicable documentation is available.

3.0 REFERENCES AND DEFINITIONS

3.1 REFERENCES

- 3.1.1 See the Common References at the front of the Data Management manual.
- 3.1.2 Science Applications International Corporation, Quality Assurance Administrative Procedure (SAIC QAAP) QAAP 15.1, Control of Nonconforming Items and Services.
- 3.1.3 Science Applications International Corporation, Quality Assurance Technical Procedure (SAIC QATP) TP-DM-300-2, Data Entry.
- 3.1.4 Science Applications International Corporation, Data Management Technical Procedure (SAIC DMTP) TP-DM-300-6, Data Package Receipt and Verification.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 2 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	------------------------------------

R

- 3.1.5 Science Applications International Corporation, Quality Assurance Technical Procedure (SAIC QATP) TP-DM-300-9, Database Changes.
- 3.1.6 SAIC, Laboratory Data Validation Guidelines for Evaluating Radionuclide Analyses, Thomas L. Rucker and C. Martin Johnson Jr., SAIC document number 143.20020404.001, Revision 7, April 2002.
- 3.1.7 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Statement of Work for Organics Analysis Multi-Media, Multi-Concentration, Contract Laboratory Program, Document Number OLM01.0, and subsequent versions.
- 3.1.8 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Statement of Work for Inorganics Analysis Multi-Media, Multi-Concentration, Contract Laboratory Program, Document Number ILM01.0, and subsequent versions.
- 3.1.9 U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review, EPA-540/R-99/008, October 1999.
- 3.1.10 U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Low Concentrations Organic Data Review, EPA-540/R-00/006, June 2001.
- 3.1.11 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Data Review, EPA-540-R-004, October 2004.
- 3.1.12 Region I, EPA New England, Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Environmental Analyses, December 1996.
- 3.1.13 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Methods for Chemical Analysis of Water and Wastes, EPA-600/4-79-020, Revised March 1983, PB84-128677.
- 3.1.14 U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods, SW-846, Third Edition, and all subsequent "Updates".
- 3.1.15 Science Applications International Corporation Quality Assurance Administrative Procedure (SAIC QAAP) QAAP 17.1, Records Management.

R

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 3 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	------------------------------------

R

3.2 DEFINITIONS

- 3.2.1 Data Validation - A systematic process for reviewing a body of data against a defined set of criteria to ensure that the data are adequate for their intended use. This review focuses on the technical aspects of the analytical process and quality control information. It should document that the analyses meet project specified QAPP and analytical SOW criteria.
- 3.2.2 Electronic Data Deliverable (EDD) - Electronic representation of sample and analytical QC data as specified in the laboratory statement of work.
- 3.2.3 Project – A finite, usually predetermined number of samples collected over a given time period for a particular site. A project consists of one or more Sample Delivery Groups.
- 3.2.4 Sample Delivery Group (SDG) - A group of 20 or fewer samples received over a period of up to 14 calendar days. Data from all samples in an SDG are due concurrently. An SDG is defined by one of the following, whichever occurs first:
- a) each 20 field samples;
 - b) each 14-day calendar period during which field samples are received, beginning with receipt of the first sample in the SDG; or
 - c) as determined and defined by a specific project need.
- 3.2.5 SAIC Environmental Information Management System (SEIMS) - A computerized repository of field and laboratory data arranged by project. If a given project has an identified alternate database, this should be substituted in this procedure where SEIMS is referenced.

4.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 See the Common Responsibilities at the front of the Data Management Manual.

4.2 PROJECT CHEMIST

The Project Chemist is responsible for:

- 4.2.1 preparing and disseminating appropriate guidance and project specific criteria for each verification and validation task;
- 4.2.2 ensuring that personnel are trained in and follow this procedure and all project specific requirements;
- 4.2.3 ensuring that data verification activities are conducted in accordance with this procedure and the defined project specific criteria;

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 4 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	------------------------------------

R

- 4.2.4 monitoring project budget and schedule;
- 4.2.5 ensuring availability of necessary personnel, equipment, subcontractors, and services;
- 4.2.6 reviewing project analytical deliverables, verification checklists, and validation checklists for technical content, quality, and completeness; and
- 4.2.7 issuing "Requests for Missing or Incomplete Laboratory SDG Information" a full size form is provided immediately following this procedure or "Nonconformance Reports" as necessary.

4.3 DATA BASE ADMINISTRATOR (DBA)

The DBA is responsible for:

- 4.3.1 writing, testing, and maintaining all computer programs in support of the SEIMS database;
- 4.3.2 writing, testing, and maintaining computer programs for downloading laboratory EDDs into the appropriate SEIMS project database; and
- 4.3.3 ensuring electronic files are properly maintained and back-up files are completed.

4.4 DATA COORDINATOR

The Data Coordinator is responsible for:

- 4.4.1 date stamping and logging in all SDG data packages when received;
- 4.4.2 loading all project specific Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) information into SEIMS and downloading all laboratory EDDs into the established SEIMS project database, if required by the project;
- 4.4.3 ensuring that all data packages, electronic data, data verification checklists, and data validation checklists are maintained and complete;
- 4.4.4 establishing SAIC data review files by SDG for subsequent review by verification and validation staff;
- 4.4.5 ensuring that the laboratory EDD values are consistent with laboratory data deliverables;

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 5 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	------------------------------------

R

4.4.6 ensuring original EDD files are stored properly;

4.4.7 ensuring data validation qualifiers and reason codes, (if validation is performed) are applied to each analytical result stored in the project database;

4.4.8 ensuring effective and efficient flow of project information; and

4.4.9 issuing "Requests for Missing or Incomplete Laboratory SDG Information" a full size form is provided immediately following this procedure or "Nonconformance Reports" as necessary.

4.5 DATA VALIDATORS

The Data Validators are responsible for:

4.5.1 ensuring that the appropriate guidance documents listed under references and outlined in the body of this procedure direct the data validation process;

4.5.2 ensuring that they are knowledgeable and informed of all project specific criteria and information necessary to complete the assigned validation task;

4.5.3 ensuring that appropriate checklists are used;

4.5.4 carefully reviewing the data packages;

4.5.5 completing the verification and validation checklists as identified in this procedure; and

4.5.6 issuing "Requests for Missing or Incomplete Laboratory SDG Information" a full size form is provided immediately following this procedure or "Nonconformance Reports" as necessary.

5.0 GENERAL

5.1 General direction is provided by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) in the form of the National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (EPA-540/R-99/008, October, 1999), the National Functional Guidelines for Low Concentration Organic Data Review (EPA-540/R-00/006, June 2001), and the National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Data Review (EPA-540/R-004, October 2004). These guidelines provide specific criteria for determining data usability, however, they also allow for professional judgment. The requirements for LCS recoveries in this procedure have been modified for organic constituents based on professional judgment (See LCS section of organic data checklists). EPA Region I has provided the environmental

R

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 6 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	------------------------------------

R

community with a useful "Tiered Approach" to validation that allows a program or project to establish the level of intensity and depth of review applicable to their needs. Guidance to this approach appears in "Region I, EPA-New England Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Evaluating Environmental Analyses", July 1996, revised December 1996. This document and its appendices may prove useful during project data validation development. Interpretation of this guidance and its application to individual programs and projects needs to be made at the operational level and incorporated into the Sampling and Analysis Plan for a given investigation. Direction for radionuclide validation is provided by the Rucker and Johnson publication cited in Reference 3.1.6.

R

5.2 Specific requirements for analytical data validation are defined in the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) and/or the site Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) and/or the project specific data validation plan and are used to direct the systematic process to validate project data. Verification and validation must be consistent with the project data quality objectives, laboratory scope of work, and designated analytical methods. Data are validated against this set of accepted criteria to provide assurance that data are adequate for their intended use.

5.3 The validation of environmental data is the process by which data are evaluated in context to field and analytical QA/QC samples associated with the environmental samples. This process consists of data checking, auditing, verification, flagging, review, and certification. Validation is independent of the analytical laboratory data review. The project-specific Data Validators certify in writing that data have been validated and flagged in accordance with the defined process. Examples of the items evaluated during the validation process are:

- technical holding times;
- blanks (laboratory and field/trip/equipment);
- duplicate samples (laboratory and field);
- laboratory control samples;
- matrix spike samples;
- matrix spike duplicate samples;
- surrogate / tracer recoveries;
- calibration;
- internal standards; and
- external standards.

5.4 Data base entry of all data validation flags (Attachment I) and reason codes (Attachment II) that have been entered on the sample results forms is completed according to TP-DM-300-2 (Reference 3.1.3).

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 7 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	------------------------------------

R

6.0 PROCEDURE

6.1 DATA VALIDATION

6.1.1 STANDARD DATA VALIDATION GUIDELINES

- a) Data packages are validated in accordance with the QAPP, the site SAP, and Data Validation Plan.
- b) Standard data validation includes all aspects of data verification and implements an evaluation of laboratory quality control data and analytical procedures. This ensures the analytical process and instrumentation used to perform the analyses met all of the data quality requirements specified in the Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) and Sampling and Analysis Plan. Focus is given to laboratory /instrument performance criteria, sample preparation and matrix effects evaluation, and field quality control measures. Standard data validation involves evaluating the laboratory analytical data packages to confirm that:

Deliverable verification

- the data packages are complete and contain all of the information specified in the Sampling and Analysis Plan [e.g., all samples and analyses requested, case narrative, summary data report, completed chain-of-custody form, analytical quality control data (blanks, matrix spikes, matrix spike duplicates, etc.), date and time when each analysis was performed],
- the laboratory ran the correct analytical methods specified in the Sampling and Analysis Plan,
- samples did not exceed the maximum analytical holding times specified in the Sampling and Analysis Plan,
- sample chain-of-custody was not broken from the time the sample was collected, analyzed, and the data reported, and
- the laboratory reported analytical results for each analytical method and each analyte required by the laboratory statement of work and the project Sampling and Analysis Plan.

Laboratory/instrument performance criteria

- laboratory case narrative documentation is clear and accurate,
- analytical preparation procedures are acceptable and documented,

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 8 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	------------------------------------

R

- instrument operational and method calibration criteria have been achieved,
- laboratory calibration blank contamination is under control, and
- laboratory control standard criteria are being met.

Sample preparation and matrix effects criteria

- laboratory method blank contamination is under control,
- sample surrogate compound recovery, tracer recovery, and internal standard criteria have been achieved,
- sample matrix spike recoveries meet minimum accuracy requirements specified in the DQOs and Sampling and Analysis Plan,
- sample matrix spike duplicate or duplicate comparisons meet minimum precision requirements specified in the DQOs and Sampling and Analysis Plan, and
- sample dilution review and re-analyses performance.

Field quality control measures

- field source water blank, equipment rinsate blank, and sample trip blank contents have not impacted the project data results, and
 - field duplicate comparisons meet minimum precision requirements specified in the DQOs and Sampling and Analysis Plan.
- c) Following application of TP-DM-300-6 (Reference 3.1.4) the Data Validator reviews the data package and data verification checklists. The appropriate work sheets (see checklist forms “Standard Validation Checklist”, Attachment III, full size forms are provided immediately following this procedure), or QAPP, SAP, or Data Validation Plan specified checklists, available from the Data Coordinator, are used when validating data.
- d) All data presented on standardized reporting forms are validated against guideline criteria in all data packages.
- e) After completion of the work sheets, nonconforming items identified by the validation process are summarized and reported following TP-DM-300-9 (Reference 3.1.5) or QAAP 15.1 (Reference 3.1.2).
- f) Copies of the sample result forms are made and marked “DATA VALIDATION COPY”.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 9 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	------------------------------------

R

- g) Failures to meet specified criteria are documented on the work sheets for each analyte. The data for each sample/analyte are flagged accordingly on the data reporting forms marked "DATA VALIDATION COPY". This will involve professional judgement on the part of the data validator.
- h) For each data package, a two part data validation deliverable is generated consisting of:
- data reporting forms marked "DATA VALIDATION COPY" with validation flags and reason codes; and
 - validation work sheet.

6.1.2 COMPREHENSIVE DATA VALIDATION GUIDELINES

Comprehensive data validation encompasses all Standard Data Validation information and adds an examination of the analytical raw data. This level of review requires all information generated by the laboratory to be presented as part of the data deliverable. This would include copies of all chromatograms, spectral printouts, quantification details, preparation logbooks, standard logbooks, calculation programs, etc., produced by the laboratory. In addition to the material reviewed during standard data validation, comprehensive data validation will include:

- a detailed examination of the raw data analyte identification,
- a check of calculations used to quantify analyte results, normally a minimum of 10% of the reported concentrations are checked by recalculation from original raw data information, and
- recalculated results are verified against final reported concentrations.

Following application of TP-DM-300-6 (Reference 3.1.4), the Data Validator reviews the data package and data verification checklists. The appropriate work sheets (see checklist forms "Comprehensive Validation Checklist", Attachment III, full size forms are provided immediately following this procedure), or QAPP, SAP, or Data Validation Plan specified checklists, available from the Data Coordinator, are used when validating data.

- 6.2 After completion of the validation, the Data Validator returns the validation package to the Data Coordinator. The Data Coordinator then sends the data validation package to the Project Chemist or another Data Validator for QA and technical review.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 10 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

6.3 After the QA and technical review is completed, the data validation flags and reason codes (when applicable) are entered into the database according to TP-DM-300-2 (Reference 3.1.3).

7.0 RECORDS

Documentation generated as a result of this procedure is submitted to the identified records system, in accordance with Section 17 of the Business Unit QAP.

R

8.0 ATTACHMENTS

- 8.1 Attachment I – Data Qualifiers (validation qualifiers and laboratory qualifiers)
- 8.2 Attachment II – Data Validation Reason Codes
- 8.3 Attachment III- Forms List

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 11 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

ATTACHMENT I DATA QUALIFIERS

Validation Data Qualifiers (Flags)

During the data validation process, all laboratory data are assigned appropriate data validation flags and reason codes. Validation flags are defined as follows:

- "U" Indicates the analyte was analyzed for, but not detected above the level of the associated value.
- "J" Indicates the analyte was positively identified, however, the associated numerical value is an estimated concentration of the analyte in the sample.
- "UJ" Indicates the analyte was analyzed for, but not detected, above the associated value, however, the reported value is an estimate and demonstrates a decreased knowledge of its accuracy or precision.
- "R" Indicates the analyte value reported is unusable. The integrity of the analyte's identification, accuracy, precision, or sensitivity have raised significant question as to the reality of the information presented.
- "=" Indicates the analyte has been validated, the analyte has been positively identified, and the associated concentration value is accurate.

Normal Laboratory Data Qualifiers

During the laboratory production and internal review laboratory data may be assigned data qualifiers. These are reported as part of the laboratory data deliverable and will eventually be replaced by the more concise set of Validation Data Qualifiers. Normal laboratory data qualifiers are defined as follows:

Laboratory Qualifiers for Organic Analytical Data

- U** — Indicates that the compound was analyzed for but not detected. The sample quantitation limit (SQL) must be corrected for dilution. For a soil/sediment sample, the value must also be corrected for percent moisture.
- J** — Indicates an estimated value. This qualifier is used either when estimating a concentration for tentatively identified compounds (TICs) where a 1:1 response is assumed, or when the mass spectral data indicates the presence of a compound that meets the identification criteria but the result is less than the SQL but greater than zero.
- N** — Indicates presumptive evidence of a compound. This qualifier is used only for TICs, where the identification is based on a mass spectral library search.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 12 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

ATTACHMENT I (continued)

- P** — Used for pesticide/PCB target analytes when there is greater than 25% difference for detected concentrations between the two GC columns.
- C** — Applies to pesticide results where the identification has been confirmed by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS). If GC/MS confirmation was attempted but was unsuccessful, this qualifier is not applied; instead a laboratory-defined qualifier is used.
- B** — Used when the compound is found in the associated blank as well as in the sample. It indicates possible/probable blank contamination and alerts the data user to take appropriate action. This qualifier is used for TICs as well as for positively identified target compounds.
- E** — Identifies compounds whose concentrations exceed the calibration range of the GC/MS instrument for that specific analysis.
- D** — Identifies all compounds identified in an analysis at a secondary dilution factor. This qualifier alerts data users that any discrepancies between the concentrations reported may be due to dilution of the sample or extract.
- A** — Indicates that a TIC was a suspected aldol-condensation product.
- X** — Indicates that other specific qualifiers were required to properly define the results. If used, the qualifier must be fully described and such description must be included in the Sample Data Summary Package and SDG narrative.

Laboratory Qualifiers for Inorganic Analytical Data

- B** — Indicates that the reported value was obtained from a reading that was less than the Contract Required Detection Limit (CRDL), but greater than or equal to the Instrument Detection Limit (IDL).
- U** — Indicates that the analyte was analyzed for but not detected.
- E** — Used when the reported value was estimated because of the presence of interference.
- M** — Indicates that the duplicate injection precision was not met.
- N** — Indicates that the spiked sample recovery was not within control limits.
- S** — Indicates that the reported value was determined by the method of standard additions (MSA).

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 13 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

ATTACHMENT I (continued)

W — Used when the post-digestion spike for furnace atomic absorption analysis was not within control limits (85 - 115%), while sample absorbance was less than 50% of spike absorbance.

***** — Indicates that the duplicate analysis was not within control limits.

+ — Indicates that the correlation coefficient for the MSA was less than 0.995.

Laboratory Qualifiers for Radiochemical Analytical Data

< — The numerical value reported was less than the MDA.

N — The sample results were qualified to denote poor spike recovery.

***** — The sample results were qualified to denote poor duplicate results.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 14 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

ATTACHMENT II DATA VALIDATION REASON CODES

Organic, Inorganic, and Radiological Analytical Data

Holding Times

- A01 Extraction holding times were exceeded.
- A02 Extraction holding times were grossly exceeded.
- A03 Analysis holding times were exceeded.
- A04 Analysis holding times were grossly exceeded.
- A05 Samples were not preserved properly.
- A06 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.

GC/MS Tuning

- B01 Mass calibration was in error, even after applying expanded criteria.
- B02 Mass calibration was not performed every 12 hours.
- B03 Mass calibration did not meet ion abundance criteria.
- B04 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.

Initial/Continuing Calibration - Organics

- C01 Initial calibration RRF was <0.05.
- C02 Initial calibration RSD was >30%.
- C03 Initial calibration sequence was not followed as required.
- C04 Continuing calibration RRF was <0.05.
- C05 Continuing calibration %D was not acceptable.
- C06 Continuing calibration was not performed at the required frequency.
- C07 Resolution criteria were not met.
- C08 RPD criteria were not met.
- C09 RSD criteria were not met.
- C10 Retention time of compounds was outside windows.
- C11 Compounds were not adequately resolved.
- C12 Breakdown of endrin or DDT was >20%.
- C13 Combined breakdown of endrin/DDT was >30%.
- C14 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 15 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

ATTACHMENT II (continued)

Initial/Continuing Calibration - Inorganics

- D01 ICV or CCV were not performed for every analyte.
- D02 ICV recovery was above the upper control limit.
- D03 ICV recovery was below the lower control limit.
- D04 CCV recovery was above the upper control limit.
- D05 CCV recovery was below the lower control limit.
- D06 Standard curve was not established with the minimum number of standards.
- D07 Instrument was not calibrated daily or each time the instrument was set up.
- D08 Correlation coefficient was <0.995.
- D09 Mid range cyanide standard was not distilled.
- D10 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.

ICP and Furnace Requirements

- E01 Interference check sample recovery was outside the control limit.
- E02 Duplicate injections were outside the control limit.
- E03 Post digestion spike recovery was outside the control limit.
- E04 MSA was required but not performed.
- E05 MSA correlation coefficient was <0.995.
- E06 MSA spikes were not at the correct concentration.
- E07 Serial dilution criteria were not met.
- E08 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.

Blanks

- F01 Sample data were qualified as a result of the method blank.
- F02 Sample data were qualified as a result of the field blank.
- F03 Sample data were qualified as a result of the equipment rinsate.
- F04 Sample data were qualified as a result of the trip blank.
- F05 Gross contamination exists.
- F06 Concentration of the contaminant was detected at a level below the CRQL.
- F07 Concentration of the contaminant was detected at a level less than the action limit, but greater than the CRQL.
- F08 Concentration of the contaminant was detected at a level that exceeds the action level.
- F09 No laboratory blanks were analyzed.
- F10 Blank had a negative value >2x's the IDL.
- F11 Blanks were not analyzed at required frequency.
- F12 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.
- F13 Reported blank net result is > than 1.65 sigma, radiochemistry.
- F14 Subtracted method blank exceeds 3 sigma of established blank value, radiochemistry.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 16 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

ATTACHMENT II (continued)

Surrogate/Radiological Chemical Recovery

- G01 Surrogate/radiological chemical recovery was above the upper control limit.
- G02 Surrogate/radiological chemical recovery was below the lower control limit.
- G03 Surrogate recovery was <10%.
- G04 Surrogate recovery was zero.
- G05 Surrogate/radiological chemical recovery data was not present.
- G06 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.
- G07 Radiological chemical recovery was <20%.
- G08 Radiological chemical recovery was >150%.
- G09 The 2 sigma uncertainty in the radiological sample specific chemical recovery was > 10%

Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD)

- H01 MS/MSD recovery was above the upper control limit.
- H02 MS/MSD recovery was below the lower control limit.
- H03 MS/MSD recovery was <10%.
- H04 MS/MSD pairs exceed the RPD limit.
- H05 No action was taken on MS/MSD results.
- H06 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.
- H07 Radiological MS/MSD recovery was < 20% .
- H08 Radiological MS/MSD recovery was >160% .
- H09 Radiological MS/MSD samples were not analyzed at the required frequency.

Matrix Spike

- I01 MS recovery was above the upper control limit.
- I02 MS recovery was below the lower control limit.
- I03 MS recovery was <30%.
- I04 No action was taken on MS data.
- I05 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.
- I06 MS samples were not analyzed at the required frequency.

Laboratory Duplicate

- J01 Duplicate RPD/radiological duplicate error ratio (DER) was outside the control limit.
- J02 Duplicate sample results were >5 x the CRDL.
- J03 Duplicate sample results were <5 x the CRDL.
- J04 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.
- J05 Duplicate was not analyzed at the required frequency.
- J06 Radiological duplicate RPD and duplicate error ratio (DER) were outside acceptable limits.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 17 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

ATTACHMENT II (continued)

Internal Area Summary

- K01 Area counts were outside the control limits.
- K02 Extremely low area counts or performance was exhibited by a major drop off.
- K03 IS retention time varied by more than 30 seconds.
- K04 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.

Pesticide Cleanup Checks

- L01 10% recovery was obtained during either check.
- L02 Recoveries during either check were >120%.
- L03 GPC Cleanup recoveries were outside the control limits.
- L04 Florisil cartridge cleanup recoveries were outside the control limits.
- L05 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.

Target Compound Identification

- M01 Incorrect identifications were made.
- M02 Qualitative criteria were not met.
- M03 Cross contamination occurred.
- M04 Confirmatory analysis was not performed.
- M05 No results were provided.
- M06 Analysis occurred outside 12 hr GC/MS window.
- M07 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.
- M08 The %D between the two pesticide/PCB column checks was >25%.

Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs

- N01 Quantitation limits were affected by large off-scale peaks.
- N02 MDLs reported by the laboratory exceeded corresponding CRQLs.
- N03 Professional judgement used to qualify the data.

Tentatively Identified Compounds (TICs)

- O01 Compound was suspected laboratory contaminant and was not detected in the blank.
- O02 TIC result was not above 10 x the level found in the blank.
- O03 Professional judgement was used to qualify analytical data.

Laboratory Control Samples (LCSs)

- P01 LCS recovery was above upper control limit.
- P02 LCS recovery was below lower control limit.
- P03 LCS recovery was <50%.
- P04 No action was taken on the LCS data.
- P05 LCS was not analyzed at required frequency.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 18 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

ATTACHMENT II (continued)

- P06 Radiological LCS recovery was <50% for aqueous samples; <40% for solid samples.
P07 Radiological LCS recovery was >150% for aqueous samples; >160% for solid samples.
P08 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.

Field Duplicate

- Q01 Field duplicate RPDs were >30% for waters and/or > 50% for soils.
Q02 Radiological field duplicate error ratio (DER) was outside the control limit.
Q03 Duplicate sample results were >5 x the CRDL.
Q04 Duplicate sample results were <5 x the CRDL.

Radiological Calibration

- R01 Efficiency calibration criteria were not met.
R02 Energy calibration criteria were not met.
R03 Resolution calibration criteria were not met.
R04 Background determination criteria were not met.
R05 Quench curve criteria were not met.
R06 Absorption curve criteria were not met.
R07 Plateau curve criteria were not met.
R08 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.
R09 Background quench curve criteria were not met.
R10 Errors found in calculations.
R11 Calibration required frequency not met.
R12 Dark current criteria were not met.

Radiological Calibration Verification

- S01 Efficiency verification criteria were not met.
S02 Energy verification criteria were not met.
S03 Resolution verification criteria were not met.
S04 Background verification criteria were not met.
S05 Cross-talk verification criteria were not met.
S06 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.
S07 Calibration verification required frequency not met.

Radionuclide Quantitation

- T01 Detection limits were not met.
T02 Analytical uncertainties were not met and/or not reported.
T03 Inappropriate aliquot sizes were used.
T04 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.
T05 Errors in calculation of reported result.
T06 Errors in calculation of reported uncertainty.
T07 Net negative result with absolute value greater than the reported uncertainty.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 19 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

ATTACHMENT II (continued)

- T08 Exceeded maximum mass/area on planchet for alpha/beta.
- T09 Quantification not possible due to interference.
- T10 Results do not compare with others related measurements on the same sample.
- T11 Reported result is less than 1.65 theta.
- T12 Analytical result is less than the associated MDA, but greater than the counting uncertainty.
- T13 Analytical result is less than both the associated counting uncertainty and the MDA.
- T14 Negative analytical result where absolute value exceeds 2x the associated MDA.

System Performance

- V01 High background levels or a shift in the energy calibration were observed.
- V02 Extraneous peaks were observed.
- V03 Loss of resolution was observed.
- V04 Peak-tailing or peak splitting that may result in inaccurate quantitation were observed.
- V05 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.
- V06 General degradation of system performance.

Radionuclide Identification

- W01 Peak energy difference greater than 40 keV (alpha) or 2 keV (gamma).
- W02 Interference peak in region of interest.
- W03 Less than 50% total gamma abundance for tentatively identified radionuclides (TIRs).
- W04 Professional judgement was used to qualify the data.

SAIC DATA MGMT TECHNICAL PROCEDURE	Procedure No.: TP-DM-300-7	Revision: 7	Page: 20 of 20
---	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

R

**ATTACHMENT III
Forms List**

Immediately following this procedure are the full size forms for the following:

- Organic Data Review Checklist – Standard Validation
- GC and LC Organic Data Review Checklist- Standard Validation
- Metals Data Review Checklist- Standard Validation
- Inorganic Data Review Checklist- Standard Validation
- Radiochemical Data Review Checklist- Standard Validation
- Organic Data Review Checklist – Comprehensive Validation
- GC and LC Organic Data Review Checklist- Comprehensive Validation
- Metals Data Review Checklist- Comprehensive Validation
- Inorganic Data Review Checklist- Comprehensive Validation
- Radiochemical Data Review Checklist- Comprehensive Validation
- Requests for Missing or Incomplete Laboratory SDG Information

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
Organic Data Review Checklist - Standard Validation

Project: _____

Page 1 of 11

SDG No: _____

Analysis: _____

Laboratory: _____

Method: _____

Matrix: _____

The above data package has been reviewed and the analytical quality control/quality assurance performance data have been summarized. The general criteria used to assess the analytical integrity of the data were based on an examination of the following:

Case Narrative	Analytical Surrogate Recoveries
Analytical Holding Times	Internal Standard Performance
Sample Preservation	MS/MSD Recoveries and Differences
Method Calibration	LCS Recoveries
Method and Project Blanks	Re-analysis and Secondary Dilution

Project Specific QA/QC or contract requirements may take priority over validation criteria in this procedure.

Overall Remarks: _____

Definition of Qualifiers:

"U", not detected at the associated level
"UJ", not detected and associated value estimated
"J", associated value estimated
"R", associated value unusable or analyte identity unfounded
"=", compound properly identified and value positive

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

QA Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

VII. Initial & Continuing Calibration (VOC, SVOC)

GC/MS instrument performance checks (BFB / DFTPP) Acceptable Y or N
 All compounds must have and RRF > 0.01, %RSD < 30, and %D < 25

VOC - Date of initial calibration: _____
 VOC - Date(s) of continuing calibration: _____
 Was the 12 hour criteria met? Y or N

SVOC- Date of initial calibration: _____
 SVOC - Date(s) of continuing calibration: _____
 Was the 12 hour criteria met? Y or N

Deviations:

Compound	Date	RRF	%RSD	%D	Samples Affected

* % Difference = $((RF_{CCV} - RF_{ICAL AVG}) / RF_{ICAL AVG}) \times 100$. In instances where the bias of the CCV impacts validation qualifiers, review the RF values or amount reported to confirm that the % Difference or % Drift are reported with the correct negative or positive value.

Actions:

1. If any compound has an initial or continuing RRF of < 0.01, qualify positive results as estimated (J)
2. If any compound has an initial or continuing RRF of < 0.01, qualify non-detects as unusable (R)
3. If any compound has a %RSD >30 or a %D >25, qualify positive results as estimated (J)
4. If any compound has a %RSD >40 or a %D >40, qualify non-detects as estimated (UJ)
5. If BFB or DFTPP mass assignment / ION abundance criteria are all associated data as unusable (R).
6. If samples were analyzed outside the 12 hour BFB or DFTPP performance check time period, qualify the affected sample data as estimated (J/UJ).
7. If separate calibration for water and soil were not performed, use professional judgement to evaluate the data. Data may be rejected (R).
8. If calibrations were not completed within the 12 hour criterion, qualify all associated data as estimated (J/UJ). If the 12 hour criterion was grossly exceeded, reject all associated data (R).

Remarks: _____

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
GC and LC Organic Data Review Checklist - Standard Validation
(Explosives, PAHs, Herbicides, GRO/DRO, Methanol, etc.)

Project: _____

Page 1 of 9

SDG No: _____

Analysis: _____

Method: _____

Laboratory: _____

Matrix: _____

The above data package has been reviewed and the analytical quality control/quality assurance performance data have been summarized. The general criteria used to assess the analytical integrity of the data were based on an examination of the following:

Case Narrative	Analytical Surrogate Recoveries
Analytical Holding Times	MS/MSD Recoveries and Differences
Sample Preservation	LCS Recoveries
Method Calibration	Re-analysis and Secondary Dilution
Method and Project Blanks	

Overall Remarks: _____

Definition of Qualifiers:

- "U", not detected at the associated level
- "UJ", not detected and associated value estimated
- "J", associated value estimated
- "R", associated value unusable or analyte identity unfounded
- "=", compound properly identified and value positive

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

QA Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

VI. Blanks

Review associated laboratory and project blank samples. List documented contamination below:

Laboratory Method Blanks:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Lab ID #</u>	<u>Fraction</u>	<u>Compound</u>	<u>Conc. (ppb)</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Associated Project Blanks (e.g., equipment rinsates, trip blanks, etc.)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Lab ID #</u>	<u>Fraction</u>	<u>Compound</u>	<u>Conc. (ppb)</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Remarks: _____

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
Metals Data Review Checklist - Standard Validation

Project: _____

Page 1 of 13

SDG No: _____

Analysis: _____

Method: _____

Laboratory: _____

Matrix: _____

The above data package has been reviewed and the analytical quality control/quality assurance performance data have been summarized. The general criteria used to assess the analytical integrity of the data were based on an examination of the following:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Case Narrative | MS/MSD Recoveries and Differences |
| Analytical Holding Times | Duplicate Relative Percent Differences |
| Sample Preservation | ICP Serial Dilution |
| Method Calibration | Furnace Atomic Absorption QC |
| Method and Project Blanks | Re-analysis and Secondary Dilution |
| LCS Recoveries | Internal Standard Performance (if applicable) |

Project specific QA/QC or contract requirements may take priority over validation criteria in this procedure.

Overall Remarks: _____

- Definition of Qualifiers:
- "U", not detected at the associated level
 - "UJ", not detected and associated value estimated
 - "J", associated value estimated
 - "R", associated value unusable or analyte identity unfounded
 - "=", compound properly identified and value positive

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

QA Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

IV. Initial & Contining Calibration (ICP, GFAA, CVAA, etc.) (continued)

Analytical Sequence and MS Tune

(Y/N)

- 1. Were the appropriate number of ICP standards used? _____
- 2. Were the appropriate number of AA standards used? _____
- 3. Was calibration performed and documented at the beginning of each run? _____
- 4. Were calibration check standards run at 10% frequency or every two hours? _____
- 5. Were low level standard checks analyzed at approximately 2X the PQL? _____
- 6. Was ICP-MS mass calibration within 0.1 AMU? _____
- 7. Was ICP-MS % RSD of the absolute signals for all analytes < 5%? _____

Deviations:

Element	Deviation	Samples Affected

Actions:

- 1. If instrument calibration is questionable, use professional judgement, qualify the data as estimated (J/UJ)
- 2. If instrument calibration documentation can not be obtained or is inadequate, qualify the data as unusable (R)
- 3. If mass calibration for ICP-MS was not within 0.1 AMU, qualify analyte results as estimated (J/UJ).
- 4. If % RSD for ICP-MS was > 5% for any analyte in the tuning solution, qualify associated results as estimated (J/UJ).

Remarks:

V. Blanks (continued)

B. Frequency Requirements

(Y/N)

- 1. Was a method (preparation) blank analyzed for each matrix? _____
- 2. Was a method blank processed for every analytical batch (20 samples)? _____
- 3. Was a calibration blank analyzed at 10% frequency or every two hours? _____

Deviations:

Element	Deviation	Samples Affected

Remarks: _____

C. Baseline Shift Evaluation

List the highest negative blank concentration for each analyte observed in laboratory or project blanks.

Deviations:

Blank ID	Element	Max. Neg. Conc.	Action Level	Samples Affected

Actions:

- 1. If the absolute value of the maximum negative blank result is > the CRQL, qualify positive results as estimated (J) and non-detects as estimated (UJ).

Remarks: _____

VII. Matrix Spike Evaluation

All MS recovery criteria are set at 75-125%

An MS must be analyzed for each matrix and for each digestion batch or set of twenty samples

Verify that a field blank or PE sample was not used for spiked sample analysis.

Verify that a post-digestion spike was analyzed for those analytes where the pre-digestion spike recovery is outside control limits and the sample result is < 4 x the spike added.

Project Sample(s) Spiked: _____

Deviations:

Element	Spiked Sample Result	Sample Result	Spike Amount	%R	Samples Affected

Actions:

1. If the sample concentration exceeds the spiking level by a factor of 4X or more, do not qualify the data
2. If the spike recovery is >125%, qualify all positive values as (J).
3. If the spike recovery is between 30-74%, qualify positive values as (J) and non-detect values as estimated (UJ)
4. If the spike recovery is <30%, qualify positive values as (J) and non-detects are qualified unusable (R) if the post-digestion spike recovery is < 75% (or none was performed); non-detects are qualified as estimated (UJ) if the post-digestion spike recovery is ≥ 75%. There is no post-digestion spike performed for mercury.
5. Qualify all samples of similar matrix to the spiked sample in the same manner
6. Use professional judgement to qualify data if the MS frequency criteria are not met.
7. Use professional judgement for qualification of data for unspiked elements

Remarks: _____

X. Furnace Atomic Absorption QC

A. Duplicate Precision (Y/N)

1. Were duplicate injections performed for all samples? _____
2. Were one point analytical spikes performed for all samples? _____
3. Did duplicate injections agree within $\pm 20\%$? _____

Deviations:

Element	Deviation	Sample Affected

Actions:

1. If duplicate injection results are outside $\pm 20\%$, qualify positive results as (J) and non-detect results as (UJ)

Remarks:

B. Post Digestion Spike Recoveries (Y/N)

1. Did post digestion spike recoveries meet an 85-115% recovery criteria? _____
2. If spike recoveries did not meet recovery criteria were samples analyzed by MSA? _____
3. If MSA was used to analyze samples, was its' correlation coefficient ≥ 0.995 ? _____

Deviations:

Element	Deviation	Sample Affected

Actions:

1. If post digestion spike recoveries are $>115\%$, qualify positive results as (J) and non-detect results as (U)
2. If post digestion spike recoveries are 11-84%, qualify positive results as (J) and non-detect results as (UJ)
3. If post digestion spike recoveries are $<10\%$, qualify positive results as (R) and non-detect results as (R)
4. If MSA was used to quantitate values and the correlation coefficient was <0.995 , qualify data as (J or UJ)
5. If MSA was used to quantitate values and the correlation coefficient was <0.95 , qualify data as (R)

Remarks:

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
Inorganic Data Review Checklist - Standard Validation
(Chloride, Fluoride, Nitrate/Nitrite, Sulfate, Sulfide, Phosphate, etc.)

Project: _____

Page 1 of 8

SDG No: _____

Analysis: _____

Method: _____

Laboratory: _____

Matrix: _____

The above data package has been reviewed and the analytical quality control/quality assurance performance data have been summarized. The general criteria used to assess the analytical integrity of the data were based on an examination of the following:

Case Narrative	Method and Project Blanks
Analytical Holding Times	Matrix Spike Recoveries
Sample Preservation	Duplicate Differences
Method Calibration	LCS Recoveries
	Re-analysis and Secondary Dilution

Overall Remarks: _____

Definition of Qualifiers:

- "U", not detected at the associated level
- "UJ", not detected and associated value estimated
- "J", associated value estimated
- "R", associated value unusable or analyte identity unfounded
- "=", compound properly identified and value positive

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

QA Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
Radiochemical Data Review Checklist - Standard Validation

Project: _____

Page 1 of 15

SDG No: _____

Analysis: _____

Laboratory: _____

Method: _____

Matrix: _____

The above data package has been reviewed and the analytical quality control/quality assurance performance data have been summarized. The general criteria used to assess the analytical integrity of the data were based on an examination of the following:

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Case Narrative | Chemical and/or Tracer Recoveries |
| Analytical Holding Times | Matrix Spike Results |
| Sample Preservation | Duplicate Error Ratios and RPDs |
| Method Calibration | LCS Recoveries |
| Method and Project Blanks | Re-analysis and Secondary Dilution |

Overall Remarks: _____

Definition of Qualifiers:

- "U", not detected at the associated level
- "UJ", not detected and associated value estimated
- "J", associated value estimated
- "R", associated value unusable or analyte identity unfounded
- "=", compound properly identified and value positive

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

QA Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

V.A1. Calibration Alpha Spectroscopy

Initial efficiency calibration must be demonstrated for each detector.
 Initial energy calibration must be demonstrated for each detector.
 Resolution (FWHM) must be demonstrated for each detector.
 Standards must be traceable and documentation must be provided.
 Standard preparation (dilutions, calculations, etc.) documentation must be provided.

V.A2. Continuing Calibration Alpha Spectroscopy

Continuing calibration efficiency verification must be performed at least quarterly.
 Continuing calibration efficiency must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial efficiency.
 Continuing energy calibration must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial calibration.
 Continuing FWHM must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial FWHM.
 A long background count for each detector must be performed weekly or bi-weekly.
 Pulser counts and demonstration of FWHM for each detector must be demonstrated daily.

Deviations:

Deficiency	IS Affected	Area Detectors Affected	Acceptable Range	RT Samples Affected	Std. RT Value

Actions:

1. If the initial calibration efficiencies, resolution, or standard information is not acceptable, qualify all affected results as estimated (J).
2. If the continuing calibration efficiency, energy, or FWHM are not acceptable, qualify all affected results as estimated (J).
3. If background counts or pulser counts are not acceptable, qualify the affected data as estimated (J).

Remarks:

V.B1. Calibration Gamma Spectroscopy

Initial efficiency calibration must be demonstrated on each detector for each geometry.
 Initial energy calibration must be demonstrated on each detector for each geometry.
 Resolution (FWHM) must be demonstrated for each detector for each geometry.
 Standards must be traceable and documentation must be provided.
 Standard preparation (dilutions, calculations, etc.) documentation must be provided.

V.B2. Continuing Calibration Gamma Spectroscopy

Continuing calibration efficiency verification must be performed for each detector at least quarterly.
 Continuing calibration efficiency must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial efficiency.
 Continuing energy calibration must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial calibration.
 Continuing FWHM must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial FWHM.
 A long background count for each detector must be performed monthly.
 Pulser counts and demonstration of FWHM for each detector must be demonstrated daily.

Deviations:

Deficiency	IS Affected	Area Detectors Affect	Acceptable Range	RT Samples Affected	Std. RT Value

Actions:

1. If the initial calibration efficiency, energy, resolution, or standard information is not acceptable, qualify all affected results as estimated (J).
2. If the continuing calibration efficiency, energy, or FWHM are not acceptable, qualify all affected results as estimated (J).
3. If background counts or pulser counts are not acceptable, qualify the affected data as estimated (J).

Remarks:

VI. Blanks

Review associated laboratory and project blank samples. List documented contamination below:

If the blank result is less than the associated uncertainty (error), no qualification will be warranted.

If the blank result is greater than its associated uncertainty, but less than the MDA, then no qualification will be warranted.

If the blank result is greater than the associated uncertainty and greater than the MDA, then qualification of sample results may be appropriate.

Laboratory Method Blanks:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Lab ID #</u>	<u>Radionuclide</u>	<u>Result and Error</u>	<u>MDA Result and Error</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Associated Project Blanks (e.g., equipment rinsates, etc.)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Lab ID #</u>	<u>Radionuclide</u>	<u>Result and Error</u>	<u>MDA Result and Error</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Remarks: _____

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
Organic Data Review Checklist - Comprehensive Validation

Project: _____

Page 1 of 14

SDG No: _____

Analysis: _____

Laboratory: _____

Method: _____

Matrix: _____

The above data package has been reviewed and the analytical quality control/quality assurance performance data have been summarized. The general criteria used to assess the analytical integrity of the data were based on an examination of the following:

Case Narrative	Analytical Surrogate Recoveries
Analytical Holding Times	Internal Standard Performance
Sample Preservation	MS/MSD Recoveries and Differences
Method Calibration	LCS Recoveries
Method and Project Blanks	Re-analysis and Secondary Dilution

Project Specific QA/QC or contract requirements may take priority over validation criteria in this procedure.

Overall Remarks: _____

Definition of Qualifiers:

"U", not detected at the associated level
"UJ", not detected and associated value estimated
"J", associated value estimated
"R", associated value unusable or analyte identity unfounded
"=", compound properly identified and value positive

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

QA Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

VII. Initial & Continuing Calibration (VOC, SVOC)

GC/MS instrument performance checks (BFB or DFTPP) acceptable Yes No
 All compounds must have and RRF ≥ 0.01 , %RSD ≤ 30 , and %D ≤ 25

VOC - Date of initial calibration: _____
 VOC - Date(s) of continuing calibration: _____
 Was the 12 hour criteria met? Y or N

SVOC- Date of initial calibration: _____
 SVOC - Date(s) of continuing calibration: _____
 Was the 12 hour criteria met? Y or N

Deviations:

Compound	Date	RRF	%RSD	%D	Samples Affected

* % Difference = $((RF_{CCV} - RF_{ICAL AVG}) / RF_{ICAL AVG}) \times 100$. In instances where the bias of the CCV impacts validation qualifiers, review the RF values or amount reported to confirm that the % Difference or % Drift are reported with the correct negative or positive value.

Actions:

1. If any compound has an initial or continuing RRF of < 0.01 , qualify positive results as estimated (J)
2. If any compound has an initial or continuing RRF of < 0.01 , qualify non-detects as unusable (R)
3. If any compound has a %RSD >30 or a %D >25 , qualify positive results as estimated (J)
4. If any compound has a %RSD >40 or a %D >40 , qualify non-detects as estimated (UJ)
5. If BFB or DFTPP mass assignment/ ION abundance criteria are in error, qualify all associated data as unusable (R).
6. If samples were analyzed outside the 12 hour BFB or DFTPP performance check time period quality the affected sample data as estimated (J/UJ).
7. If separate calibration for water and soil were not performed, use professional judgement to evaluate the data. Data may be rejected (R).
8. If calibration were not completed within the 12 hour criterion, qualify all associated data as estimated (J/UJ). If the 12 hour criterion was grossly exceeded reject all associated data (R).

Remarks:

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
GC and LC Organic Data Review Checklist - Comprehensive Validation
(Explosives, PAHs, Herbicides, GRO/DRO, Methanol, etc.)

Project: _____

Page 1 of 12

SDG No: _____

Analysis: _____

Method: _____

Laboratory: _____

Matrix: _____

The above data package has been reviewed and the analytical quality control/quality assurance performance data have been summarized. The general criteria used to assess the analytical integrity of the data were based on an examination of the following:

Case Narrative	Analytical Surrogate Recoveries
Analytical Holding Times	MS/MSD Recoveries and Differences
Sample Preservation	LCS Recoveries
Method Calibration	Re-analysis and Secondary Dilution
Method and Project Blanks	

Overall Remarks: _____

Definition of Qualifiers:

"U", not detected at the associated level
"UJ", not detected and associated value estimated
"J", associated value estimated
"R", associated value unusable or analyte identity unfounded
"=", compound properly identified and value positive

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

QA Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

VI. Blanks

Review associated laboratory and project blank samples. List documented contamination below:

Laboratory Method Blanks:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Lab ID #</u>	<u>Fraction</u>	<u>Compound</u>	<u>Conc. (ppb)</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Associated Project Blanks (e.g., equipment rinsates, trip blanks, etc.)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Lab ID #</u>	<u>Fraction</u>	<u>Compound</u>	<u>Conc. (ppb)</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Remarks: _____

XII. Analyte Quantitation Check

Original data information should fall within the established calibration range for the analytical run.
Confirm appropriate instrument and manual peak integration.
Confirm calculation of reported results for at least 10% of the data set.

Calculation Check:

Analyte:	Method:

Remarks: _____

Calculation Check:

Analyte:	Method:

Remarks: _____

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
Metals Data Review Checklist - Comprehensive Validation

Project: _____

Page 1 of 16

SDG No: _____

Analysis: _____

Method: _____

Laboratory: _____

Matrix: _____

The above data package has been reviewed and the analytical quality control/quality assurance performance data have been summarized. The general criteria used to assess the analytical integrity of the data were based on an examination of the following:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Case Narrative | MS/MSD Recoveries and Differences |
| Analytical Holding Times | Duplicate Relative Percent Differences |
| Sample Preservation | ICP Serial Dilution |
| Method Calibration | Furnace Atomic Absorption QC |
| Method and Project Blanks | Re-analysis and Secondary Dilution |
| LCS Recoveries | Internal Standard Performance (if applicable) |

Project specific QA/QC or contract requirements may take priority over validation criteria in this procedure.

Overall remarks: _____

Definition of Qualifiers:

- "U", not detected at the associated level
- "UJ", not detected and associated value estimated
- "J", associated value estimated
- "R", associated value unusable or analyte identity unfounded
- "=", compound properly identified and value positive

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

QA Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

IV. Initial & Contining Calibration (ICP, GFAA, CVAA, etc.)

Initial calibration linearity criteria is $r \geq 0.995$

ICV and CCV criteria are $\pm 10\%$ recovery, low level check standard allowed $\pm 30\%$

ICP inter-element check standard criteria $\pm 20\%$

Deviations:

Element	Date	Intial Calib.	ICV/CCV	%R	Samples Affected

Actions:

1. If any elements initial claibration linearity is <0.995 , qualify the data as estimated (J/UJ)
2. If any elements initial claibration linearity is <0.95 , qualify the data as unusable (R)
- 3a. If any elements ICV or CCV recovery is $<90\%$, qualify the data as estimated (J/UJ)
- 3b. If any elements ICV or CCV recovery is $> 110\%$, qualify results \geq MDL as estimated (J).
Do not qualify non-detects.
- 4a. If any elements ICV or CCV recovery is $<75\%$, qualify the data as unusable (R)
- 4b. If any elements ICV or CCV recovery is $> 125\%$ qualify positive results as estimated (J) or non-detects as unusable (R).
- 4c. If any element ICV or CCV recovery is $\geq 160\%$, qualify positive results \geq MDL as unusable (R).
Do not qualify non-detects.
- 5a. If any elements CRI recovery is 50 - 69% (30 - 49% for Sb, Pb, Tb), qualify results \geq MDL (but < 2 times CRQL) as estimated (UJ) and results > 2 times CRQL are not qualified.
- 5b. If any elements CRI recovery is $< 50\%$ ($<30\%$ for Sb, Pb, TI), qualify results \geq MDL (but < 2 times CRQL) and non-detectsas unusable (R). Results > 2 times CRQL are estimated (J).
- 5c. If any elements CRI recovery is $> 130\%$ but $< 180\%$ ($>150\%$ but $< 200\%$ for Sb, Pb, TI), qualify results \geq MDL (but < 2 times CRQL) as esimated (J). And non-detects and results \geq the CRQL are not qualified.
- 5d. If CRI or(R) $> 180\%$ ($> 200\%$ for Sb, Pb, TI), qualify results that are \geq MDL as unusable (R).

Remarks: _____

V. Blanks (continued)

B. Frequency Requirements

(Y/N)

- 1. Was a method (preparation) blank analyzed for each matrix? _____
- 2. Was a method blank processed for every analytical batch (20 samples)? _____
- 3. Was a calibration blank analyzed at 10% frequency or every two hours? _____

Deviations:

Element	Deviation	Samples Affected

Remarks: _____

C. Baseline Shift Evaluation

List the highest negative blank concentration for each analyte observed in laboratory or project blanks.

Deviations:

Blank ID	Element	Max. Neg. Conc.	Action Level	Samples Affected

Actions:

- 1. If the absolute value of the maximum negative blank result is > the CRQL, qualify positive results as estimated (J) and non-detects as estimated (UJ).

Remarks: _____

VII. Matrix Spike Evaluation

All MS recovery criteria are set at 75-125%

An MS must be analyzed for each matrix and for each digestion batch or set of twenty samples

Verify that a field blank or PE sample was not used for spiked sample analysis

Verify that a post-digestion was analyzed for those analytes where the pre-digestion spike recovery is outside control limits and the sample result is < 4 times the spike added.

Project Sample(s) Spiked: _____

Deviations:

Element	Spiked Sample Result	Sample Result	Spike Amount	%R	Samples Affected		

Actions:

1. If the sample concentration exceeds the spiking level by a factor of 4X or more, do not qualify the data
2. If the spike recovery is >125%, qualify all positive values as (J).
3. If the spike recovery is between 30-74%, qualify positive values as (J) and non-detect values as estimated (UJ)
4. If the spike recovery is <30%, qualify positive values as (J) and non-detects are qualified unusable (R) if the post-digestion spike recovery is < 75% (or none were performed); non-detects are qualified as estimated (UJ) If the post-digestion spike recovery is ≥ 75%. There is no post-digestion spike performed for mercury.
5. Qualify all samples of similar matrix to the spiked sample in the same manner
6. Use professional judgement to qualify data if the MS frequency criteria are not met.
7. Use professional judgement for qualification of data for unspiked elements

Remarks: _____

X. Furnace Atomic Absorption QC**A. Duplicate Precision**

(Y/N)

1. Were duplicate injections performed for all samples? _____
2. Were one point analytical spikes performed for all samples? _____
3. Did duplicate injections agree within $\pm 20\%$? _____

Deviations:

Element	Deviation	Sample Affected

Actions:

1. If duplicate injection results are outside $\pm 20\%$, qualify positive results as (J) and non-detect results as (UJ)

Remarks:

B. Post Digestion Spike Recoveries

(Y/N)

1. Did post digestion spike recoveries meet an 85-115% recovery criteria? _____
2. If spike recoveries did not meet recovery criteria were samples analyzed by MSA? _____
3. If MSA was used to analyze samples, was its' correlation coefficient ≥ 0.995 ? _____

Deviations:

Element	Deviation	Sample Affected

Actions:

1. If post digestion spike recoveries are $>115\%$, qualify positive results as (J) and non-detect results as (U)
2. If post digestion spike recoveries are 11-84%, qualify positive results as (J) and non-detect results as (UJ)
3. If post digestion spike recoveries are $<10\%$, qualify positive results as (R) and non-detect results as (R)
4. If MSA was used to quantitate values and the correlation coefficient was <0.995 , qualify data as (J or UJ)
5. If MSA was used to quantitate values and the correlation coefficient was <0.95 , qualify data as (R)

Remarks:

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
Inorganic Data Review Checklist - Comprehensive Validation
(Chloride, Fluoride, Nitrate/Nitrite, Sulfate, Sulfide, Phosphate, etc.)

Project: _____

Page 1 of 10

SDG No: _____

Analysis: _____

Method: _____

Laboratory: _____

Matrix: _____

The above data package has been reviewed and the analytical quality control/quality assurance performance data have been summarized. The general criteria used to assess the analytical integrity of the data were based on an examination of the following:

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Case Narrative | Method and Project Blanks |
| Analytical Holding Times | Matrix Spike Recoveries |
| Sample Preservation | Duplicate Differences |
| Method Calibration | LCS Recoveries |
| | Re-analysis and Secondary Dilution |

Overall Remarks: _____

- Definition of Qualifiers:
- "U", not detected at the associated level
 - "UJ", not detected and associated value estimated
 - "J", associated value estimated
 - "R", associated value unusable or analyte identity unfounded
 - "=", compound properly identified and value positive

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

QA Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
Radiochemical Data Review Checklist - Comprehensive Validation

Project: _____

Page 1 of 21

SDG No: _____

Analysis: _____

Laboratory: _____

Method: _____

Matrix: _____

The above data package has been reviewed and the analytical quality control/quality assurance performance data have been summarized. The general criteria used to assess the analytical integrity of the data were based on an examination of the following:

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Case Narrative | Chemical and/or Tracer Recoveries |
| Analytical Holding Times | Matrix Spike Results |
| Sample Preservation | Duplicate Error Ratios and RPDs |
| Method Calibration | LCS Recoveries |
| Method and Project Blanks | Re-analysis and Secondary Dilution |

Overall Remarks: _____

Definition of Qualifiers:
"U", not detected at the associated level
"UJ", not detected and associated value estimated
"J", associated value estimated
"R", associated value unusable or analyte identity unfounded
"=", compound properly identified and value positive

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

QA Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

V.A1. Calibration Alpha Spectroscopy

Initial efficiency calibration must be demonstrated for each detector.
 Initial energy calibration must be demonstrated for each detector.
 Resolution (FWHM) must be demonstrated for each detector.
 Standards must be traceable and documentation must be provided.
 Standard preparation (dilutions, calculations, etc.) documentation must be provided.

V.A2. Continuing Calibration Alpha Spectroscopy

Continuing calibration efficiency verification must be performed at least quarterly.
 Continuing calibration efficiency must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial efficiency.
 Continuing energy calibration must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial calibration.
 Continuing FWHM must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial FWHM.
 A long background count for each detector must be performed weekly or bi-weekly.
 Pulser counts and demonstration of FWHM for each detector must be demonstrated daily.

Deviations:

Deficiency	IS Affected	Area Detectors Affect	Acceptable Range	RT Samples Affected	Std. RT Value

Actions:

1. If the initial calibration efficiencies, resolution, or standard information is not acceptable, qualify all affected results as estimated (J).
2. If the continuing calibration efficiency, energy, or FWHM are not acceptable, qualify all affected results as estimated (J).
3. If background counts or pulser counts are not acceptable, qualify the affected data as estimated (J).

Remarks:

V.B1. Calibration Gamma Spectroscopy

Initial efficiency calibration must be demonstrated on each detector for each geometry.
 Initial energy calibration must be demonstrated on each detector for each geometry.
 Resolution (FWHM) must be demonstrated for each detector for each geometry.
 Standards must be traceable and documentation must be provided.
 Standard preparation (dilutions, calculations, etc.) documentation must be provided.

V.B2. Continuing Calibration Gamma Spectroscopy

Continuing calibration efficiency verification must be performed for each detector at least quarterly.
 Continuing calibration efficiency must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial efficiency.
 Continuing energy calibration must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial calibration.
 Continuing FWHM must be demonstrated to be within 10% of the initial FWHM.
 A long background count for each detector must be performed monthly.
 Pulser counts and demonstration of FWHM for each detector must be demonstrated daily.

Deviations:

Deficiency	IS Affected	Area Detectors Affect	Acceptable Range	RT Samples Affected	Std. RT Value

Actions:

1. If the initial calibration efficiency, energy, resolution, or standard information is not acceptable, qualify all affected results as estimated (J).
2. If the continuing calibration efficiency, energy, or FWHM are not acceptable, qualify all affected results as estimated (J).
3. If background counts or pulser counts are not acceptable, qualify the affected data as estimated (J).

Remarks:

VI. Blanks

Review associated laboratory and project blank samples. List documented contamination below:

If the blank result is less than the associated uncertainty (error), no qualification will be warranted.

If the blank result is greater than its associated uncertainty, but less than the MDA, then no qualification will be warranted.

If the blank result is greater than the associated uncertainty and greater than the MDA, then qualification of sample results may be appropriate.

Laboratory Method Blanks:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Lab ID #</u>	<u>Radionuclide</u>	<u>Result and Error</u>	<u>MDA Result and Error</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Associated Project Blanks (e.g., equipment rinsates, etc.)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Lab ID #</u>	<u>Radionuclide</u>	<u>Result and Error</u>	<u>MDA Result and Error</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Remarks: _____

X. Duplicate Sample or Matrix Spike Duplicate Analysis

Identify the method utilized to evaluate duplicate analyses; duplicate error ration (DER), relative percent difference (RPD), or relative error ratio (RER).

Duplicate actions should apply to all samples associated with the duplicate pair.

Duplicate Sample Identification: _____

Deviations:

Radionuclide	DER	RPD	RER	Samples Affected

Actions:

- 1. If both sample and duplicate activities are within 2X the MDA comparison is acceptable.
- 2. If the DER is greater than 1.00, qualify the data as estimated (J).
- 3. If the RPD is greater than 50% qualify the data as estimated (J).
- 4. If one sample is <MDA and the other sample is >2X the MDA, qualify the data as estimated (J).

Remarks: _____

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
Data Verification/Validation Review
Request for
Missing or Incomplete Laboratory SDG Information

Project: _____

SDG No: _____

Analyte Group: _____

Sample Matrix: _____

Date Requested: _____

Requested Missing or Incomplete Information:

Response Date: _____

Response:

