

Analytical Issues You Don't Need to be a Chemist to See (...and Some You Do)

Jennifer Gable
Rock J. Vitale
Environmental Standards, Inc.

USWAG CCR Workshop
Crystal City, Virginia
August 10, 2022



Data Errors Happen!

- High-quality, correct analytical is critical to good decision-making
- Samples are subject to many field and laboratory handling steps that may introduce error
- 'Reasonability' review may help spot issues that require further investigation

What is a Reasonability Review?

- Simply: do the numbers make sense?
- Total results vs. Dissolved results
- Field Duplicates comparison
- Comparison between parameters
- Blank Results
- Consistency between lab report and EDD
- Comparison to historical results for same location*

** Useful to identify anomalies, but be careful not to make assumptions about what results 'should' be*

Not a Chemist? Be a Detective.

- Incorrect data or suspect data may be identified by carefully looking for clues
- Inquiries to field personnel and laboratory partners may be needed to resolve apparent issues



Clue: Mismatched Results

Parameters	Results	Units	Report Limit	MDL	DF	Prepared	Analyzed	CAS N
6020B MET ICPMS, Dissolved		Analytical Method: EPA 6020B Preparation Method: EPA 3020A						
[REDACTED]								
Thallium, Dissolved	ND	ug/L	0.10	0.041	1	12/17/21 09:50	12/22/21 15:15	7440-28-
Vanadium, Dissolved	0.43J	ug/L	1.0	0.16	1	12/17/21 09:50	12/22/21 15:15	7440-62-
Zinc, Dissolved	3.1J	ug/L	5.0	2.0	1	01/07/22 05:57	01/07/22 17:04	7440-66-

	Thallium, Dissolved	7440-28-0	D	ug/L		U	
	Vanadium	7440-62-2	T	ug/L	0.55	J	RL
	Vanadium, Dissolved	7440-62-2	D	ug/L	0.43	J	RL
	Zinc	7440-66-6	T	ug/L	2.5	J	RL
	Zinc, Dissolved	7440-66-6	D	ug/L	63.9	J	M-
SW946 7470A	Mercury	7439-97-8	T	ug/L		U	

Clue: Mismatched Results

- What did we see?
 - Mismatched results between the lab report and the EDD
- Why is that a clue?
 - Laboratory report and EDD must match exactly

Clue: Mismatched Results

- The lab indicated that the result reported in the data package was correct and that the result in the EDD was incorrect.
- A revised EDD was provided, and data were reloaded.

Clue: Inconsistent Field Duplicates

Sample ID:	MW-12				Duplicate Sample ID:	MW-12D					
Analyte	Sample Concentration	Qual	QL	MDL	Duplicate Concentratio	Qual	QL	MDL	Difference	RPD	Flag
arsenic	22		1	0.28	3.4		1	0.28	18.6	NA	J
barium	68		10	3.1	50		10	3.1	NA	31%	J
calcium	120000		500	130	64000		500	130	NA	61%	J
cobalt	11		0.5	0.26	0.98		0.5	0.26	10.02	NA	J
lead	0.36	J	1	0.17	0.81	J	1	0.17	NA	NA	
lithium	36		5	0.83	25		5	0.83	NA	36%	J
molvbdenum	17		5	0.61	39		5	0.61	22	NA	J
thallium	0.56	J	1	0.47	0.47	U	1	0.47	NA	NA	
TDS	1200		20	16	940		20	16	NA	24%	J
chloride	300		5	1.4	210		5	1.4	NA	35%	J
fluoride	200		50	24	29	J	50	24	171	NA	J
sulfate	240		1	0.35	150		1	0.35	NA	46%	J

Clue: Inconsistent Field Duplicates

- What did we see?
 - Disparity between parent and FD results
- Why is that a clue?
 - Imprecision between most or all parameters can indicate potential sample switch or incorrect association to parent
 - Homogeneous matrices (like GW) should be consistent with good sampling practices

Clue: Inconsistent Field Duplicates

- Additional similar inconsistencies observed for other field duplicates submitted on the same day
- Field duplicate had been switched with a field duplicate from a different SDG
 - 3 SDGs delivered to the laboratory on the same day; FDs in each SDG were named identically
- 3 reports and EDDs were revised
- Corrective action requested

Clue: Comparison Between Parameters

Parameter	Result	Qualifier	MDL	QL	Units
Total Dissolved Solids	3.40	U	3.40	14.3	mg/L
Chloride	4.71		0.0670	0.200	mg/L
Fluoride		U	0.0330	0.100	mg/L
Sulfate	0.685		0.133	0.400	mg/L
Alkalinity, Total	16.0		16.0	16.0	mg/L
Bicarbonate alkalinity	16.0		16.0	16.0	mg/L
Carbonate alkalinity		U	1.45	4.00	mg/L
Calcium	3640		80.0	200	ug/L
Magnesium	1670		10.0	30.0	ug/L
Potassium	120	J	80.0	300	ug/L
Sodium	3480		80.0	250	ug/L

Clue: Comparison Between Parameters

- What did we see?
 - “Not-detected” TDS result not supported by other parameters
- Why is that a clue?
 - TDS results can be checked using results for cations, anions, and alkalinity when available
 - Calculated TDS for this sample ~3500 mg/L
 - Cation/anion balance can also help identify potential errors

Clue: Comparison Between Parameters

- Standard Methods 1030E provides several equations for checking results
- Laboratory did not find any errors with analysis; sample was reanalyzed to confirm
- Reanalysis did NOT confirm original results, sample data were revised to report reanalysis

Clue: Suspicious Consistency in Rad Data

Analyte	Result pCi/l	<u>Qualifier</u>	Uncertainty + / -	MDA pCi/l
Radium-226	0.450		0.312	0.0500
<i>(T) Barium</i>	92.1			30.0-143

Analyte	Result pCi/l	<u>Qualifier</u>	Uncertainty + / -	MDA pCi/l
Radium-226	0.694		0.393	0.0500
<i>(T) Barium</i>	89.6			30.0-143

(MB) R3786317-2 04/27/22 15:26

Analyte	MB Result pCi/l	<u>MB Qualifier</u>	MB Uncertainty + / -	MB MDA pCi/l
Radium-226	0.189		0.140	0.0500
<i>(T) Barium</i>	90.1		90.1	

Clue: Suspicious Consistency in Rad Data

- What did we see?
 - Identical Minimum Detectable Activity (MDA) values for several samples and a method blank
- Why is that a clue?
 - Results, uncertainty, and MDAs are calculated on a sample-specific basis for radium analyses

Clue: Suspicious Consistency in Rad Data

- Upon inquiry, laboratory indicated that sample and QC results did not take detector background into account
- Results were revised for 2 investigatory samples, the field duplicate, field blank, and laboratory method blank
- Impacted radium-226 and combined radium-226+228 results

Clue: Multiple Lines of Evidence

- Reported copper result of 106 ug/L was inconsistent with historical data
 - Historical data < 10 ug/L, often ND
- Result was a new UPL exceedance (not previously observed at that location)
- Result did not agree with FD result (< 0.50 ug/L)

Clue: Multiple Lines of Evidence

- What did we see?
 - FD imprecision
 - Results significantly out of line with historical data
- Why is are those clues?
 - Multiple issues indicated a potential problem
 - Significant differences from historical data may indicate need for further investigation

Clue: Multiple Lines of Evidence

- Laboratory requested to check bottles to confirm labeling
- Laboratory reported distinct color difference between parent and field duplicate
- Both bottles indicated as preserved with nitric acid



Clue: Multiple Lines of Evidence

- Coloration of parent sample bottle was consistent with other unpreserved bottles for that location
- Laboratory requested to check pH of both bottles
- Parent sample bottle determined to be pH 7

- Laboratory added preservative and reanalyzed sample for all metals and mercury
 - Copper was 2.8 ug/L upon reanalysis

Data Errors Happen...

- ...and you don't necessarily need to be a chemist to spot them!
 - Relatively simple reasonability reviews can identify issues
- Use the clues in the data to identify results that may need further investigation
 - Work with field sampling personnel and laboratory partners to investigate suspect data
- When a result doesn't "feel" right but you can't find an issue – call a chemist friend!

Thank You



Headquarters 1140 Valley Forge Road | PO Box 810 | Valley Forge, PA 19482 | 610.935.5577

Virginia 1412 Sachem Place, Suite 100 | Charlottesville, VA 22901 | 434.293.4039

Tennessee 8331 East Walker Springs Lane, Suite 402 | Knoxville, TN 37923 | 865.376.7590

New Mexico PO Box 29432 | Santa Fe, NM 87592 | 505.660.8521

Illinois PO Box 335 | Geneva, IL 60134 | 630.262.3979

Georgia PO Box 3675 | Peachtree City, GA 30269 | 404.983.8356

North Carolina PO Box 83 | Clemmons, NC 27012 | 434.202.6016

Web www.envstd.com | **E-mail** solutions@envstd.com