

284 Sheffield Street, Mountainside, New Jersey 07092, Phone : 908 789 8900, Fax : 908 789 8922

Cover Page

Order ID:	P4462			
Project ID:	R36724			
Client :	Tetra Tech, EMI			
Lab Sampl	e Number	Client Sample	Numbe	er
P4462-02		C0AL2		
for completeness, for other t	than the conditions detaile	ne terms and conditions of the contred above. Release of the data containanager or his designee, as verified	ned in tl	nis hard copy
Signature :			Date:	11/4/2024
NYDOH CERTIFICATION NO	- 11376		NJDEP	CERTIFICATION NO - 20012





CASE NARRATIVE

Tetra Tech, EMI Project Name: R36724

Project # N/A

Chemtech Project # P4462 Test Name: TCLP Herbicide

A. Number of Samples and Date of Receipt:

1 Water sample was received on 10/19/2024.

B. Parameters

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: TCLP Extraction and TCLP Herbicide. This data package contains results for TCLP Herbicide.

C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis was performed on instrument ECD_S. The front column is RTX-CLPesticides which is 30 meters, 0.32 mm ID, 0. 5 um df,: Catalog # 11139. The rear column is RTX-CLPesticides2 which is 30 meters, 0.32 mm ID, 0.25 um df, Catalog #: 11324The analysis of TCLP Herbicides was based on method 8151A and extraction was done based on method 3510 and TCLP extraction method was 1311.

D. QA/ QC Samples:

The Holding Times were met for all analysis.

The Surrogate recoveries met the acceptable criteria except for WB-301-BOTMS [2,4-DCAA(1) - 28%, 2,4-DCAA(2) - 23%], WB-301-BOTMSD [2,4-DCAA(1) - 28%, 2 and4-DCAA(2) - 22%]due to matrix interference.

The Retention Times were acceptable for all samples.

The MS {P4397-06MS} with File ID: PS028042.D recoveries met the requirements for all compounds except for 2,4,5-TP(Silvex)[212%] due to matrix interference.

The MSD {P4397-06MSD} with File ID: PS028043.D recoveries met the acceptable requirements except for 2,4,5-TP(Silvex)[226%] due to matrix interference.

The RPD met criteria.

The Blank Spike met requirements for all samples.

The Blank analysis did not indicate the presence of lab contamination.

The Initial Calibration met the requirements.

The Continuous Calibration met the requirements.



E. Additional Comments:

F. Manual Integration Comments: Please refer to the Manual integration Report included with the Run Logs for information on the manual integrations performed.

I certify that the data package is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the
contract, both technically and for completeness, for other than the conditions detailed
above. The laboratory manager or his designee, as verified by the following signature has
authorized release of the data contained in this hard copy data package.

Signature_			
Signature_			



DATA REPORTING QUALIFIERS- ORGANIC

For reporting results, the following "Results Qualifiers" are used:

Value	If the result is a value greater than or equal to the detection limit, report the value
U	Indicates the compound was analyzed for but was not detected. Report the minimum detection limit for the sample with the U, i.e. "10 U". This is not necessarily the instrument detection limit attainable for this particular sample based on any concentration or dilution that may have been required.
ND	Indicates the analyte was analyzed for, but not detected
В	 Indicates an estimated value. This flag is used: (1) When estimating a concentration for a tentatively identified compound (library search hits, where a 1:1 response is assumed.) (2) When the mass spectral data indicated the identification, however the result was less than the specified detection limit greater than zero. If the detection limit was 10ug/L and a concentration of 3 ug/L was calculated report as 3 J. This is flag is used when similar situation arise on any organic parameter i.e. Pest, PCB and others. Indicates the analyte was found in the blank as well as the sample report as "12 B".
Е	Indicates the analyte 's concentration exceeds the calibrated range of the instrument for that specific analysis.
D	This flag identifies all compounds identified in an analysis at a secondary dilution factor.
P	This flag is used for Pesticide/PCB target analyte when there is >25% difference for detected concentrations between the two GC columns. The lower of the two values is reported on Form 1 and flagged with a "P".
N	This flag indicates presumptive evidence of a compound. This is only used for tentatively identified compounds (TICs), where the identification is based on a mass spectral library search. It applies to all TIC results. For generic characterization of a TIC, such as chlorinated hydrocarbon, the flag is not used.
A	This flag indicates that a Tentatively Identified Compound is a suspected aldol-condensation product.
Q	Indicates the LCS did not meet the control limits requirements





Fax: 908 789 8922

APPENDIX A

QA REVIEW GENERAL DOCUMENTATION

Project #: P4462

	Completed
For thorough review, the report must have the following:	
GENERAL:	
Are all original paperwork present (chain of custody, record of communication, airbill, sample management lab chronicle, login page)	<u> </u>
Check chain-of-custody for proper relinquish/return of samples	<u> </u>
Is the chain of custody signed and complete	<u> </u>
Check internal chain-of-custody for proper relinquish/return of samples /sample extracts	<u> </u>
Collect information for each project id from server. Were all requirements followed	<u> </u>
COVER PAGE:	
Do numbers of samples correspond to the number of samples in the Chain of Custody on login page	<u> </u>
Do lab numbers and client Ids on cover page agree with the Chain of Custody	<u> </u>
CHAIN OF CUSTODY:	
Do requested analyses on Chain of Custody agree with form I results	<u> </u>
Do requested analyses on Chain of Custody agree with the log-in page	<u> </u>
Were the correct method log-in for analysis according to the Analytical Request and Chain of Castody	<u> </u>
Were the samples received within hold time	<u> </u>
Were any problems found with the samples at arrival recorded in the Sample Management Laboratory	
Chronicle	
ANALYTICAL:	
Was method requirement followed?	<u> </u>
Was client requirement followed?	<u> </u>
Does the case narrative summarize all QC failure?	<u> </u>
All runlogs and manual integration are reviewed for requirements	<u> </u>
All manual calculations and /or hand notations verified	<u> </u>

QA Review Signature:	PRIYANKA DAVE	Date:	11/04/202
----------------------	---------------	-------	-----------