NUTRIENTS AND GENERAL CHEMISTRY QUALITY ASSURANCE AND DATA AUTHORIZATION GUIDELINES

1. SCOPE AND APPLICATION

This document is a general guideline for supervisors to use when approving results from the raw analytical data. Refer to the relevant standard operating procedure (SOP) for quality control (QC) requirements that are specific to a given analysis. Also see DEP SOP LB-027 (Standard Operating Procedure for Reporting Qualified Data) for specific directions on how to qualify data when quality control results are outside established control limits.

2. QUALITY CONTROL PROCEDURES FOR SAMPLE ANALYSES

2.1. Batch Definition - Many of the QC samples will be associated with sample batches. Batches are groups of 20 or less samples that are analyzed concurrently. Samples are generally divided into batches based on matrix groups (see Appendix A).

2.2. Calibration Frequency and Limits - Calibrations must have correlation coefficients of 0.995 or higher. The recoveries of the calibrants must be within 85-115% for those calibrants that are above the PQL. Calibrations should be performed at the start of every analytical run. The lowest calibration standard must be at the PQL-level or below. Sample concentrations must fall within the calibration range or be diluted within the calibration range to be reported unqualified.

2.3. Analytical Run QC Controls and Limits

2.3.1. Method Blank (MBLK): There must be a method blank for every batch of samples. The digested/undigested method blank result is considered as passing if below the MDL.

2.3.2. Alternate Quality Control Standards (AltQC): Alternate quality control standards must be analyzed at the start of every analysis and the result must fall within the manufacturer's limits or 85 – 115 %. All digestions/distillations must include a standard that will demonstrate the efficiency of the procedure. Alternate standards have a different source from the calibrants and are analyzed to check the calibration standards. It is preferred that they be certified although it is not required.

2.3.3. Practical Quantitation Limit (PQL) standards: PQL standards should be analyzed at the start of every analytical run. For prepared chemistries there should be one PQL standard per preparation worksheet. The acceptance limits for PQL standards are 70-130 %.

2.3.4. Matrix Spikes and Duplicates: Analyze two matrix spikes and/or a sample duplicate for every batch of samples. The acceptance limits for sample or spike duplicates is a relative percent difference (RPD) of less than 20 % if both results are above the PQL. The sample spike recovery limits are 85-115 % for aqueous

The OFFICIAL COPY is the on-line version. All other copies are considered unofficial and uncontrolled.

matrices and 80-120 % for solid matrices. Duplicate spikes are analyzed to obtain precision data for analytes that are frequently below detection in the samples.

2.3.5. Laboratory Fortified Blanks (LFBs): An LFB must be analyzed with every batch of samples. Acceptance limits for recoveries should be 85-115 %.

2.3.6. Check Standards and Blanks: Analyze a low to mid level check standard and an instrument blank for every 20 samples and at the beginning and end of the run. The acceptance limits for blank results are below the MDL and above the negative value of the MDL (-MDL < blank < MDL). The check standards acceptance limits are 85-115 % recovery. It is preferable that check standards pass within 90-110 % recovery. If they fall in the ranges of 85-89 % and 111-115 % then the analysis still passes but the standards and/or instrument may need to be assessed for problems.

2.4. Field QC Controls and Limits

2.4.1. The acceptance limit for the precision for field duplicates is less than 20 % RPD.

2.4.2. The acceptance limit for results for equipment, field and trip blanks is a result below the MDL.

3. DATA REVIEW

3.1. Check to see that the analytical run meets the requirements for calibration and QC controls given in Section 2. Refer to Section 4 for protocols for handling QC control failures.

3.2. Check the peak shapes on the charts (where applicable) for anomalous results (poor peak shape, air spike etc.). In addition to seeing that the run meets the quality control requirements there are some additional potential checks listed below (many of these checks are performed using the calculations function of Data Review in LIMS):

3.2.1. Compare NH3 and TKN results when the ammonia results are greater than the TKN MDL.

3.2.2. Compare PO4 and TP results

3.2.3. Compare TOC and DOC results

3.2.4. Compare NO2NO3 and NO3 and NO2 results

3.2.5. Compare results of filtered samples versus unfiltered samples

3.2.6. Check field duplicates

3.2.7. Check blanks (field, trip, equipment)

3.2.8. Ensure that comments are entered when needed (confirmation of blank contamination etc.)

3.2.9. Compare results with field parameters (e.g. a sample with pH of 4 and a high alkalinity needs to be rechecked)

The OFFICIAL COPY is the on-line version. All other copies are considered unofficial and uncontrolled.

3.2.10. If applicable, check charge balance

3.2.11. Check for any applicable non-conformance reports (NCRs)

4. PROTOCOL IN CASE OF FAILURES OF THE QC LISTED IN SECTION 2

4.1. Calibration Problems

4.1.1. Failing Calibrations: If the correlation coefficient is lower than 0.995 then the calibration cannot be used and the instrument must be recalibrated. If the problem persists inform a supervisor.

4.1.2. Sample Results that are over Calibration: If a sample result is over calibration it needs to be diluted and reanalyzed. The result from the diluted sample can still be reported with the initial batch QC since there was nothing wrong with the result other than it was over calibration. If the sample cannot be reanalyzed then the result can be reported as long as it is qualified with a "J" and a comment.

4.2. Analytical QC Problems

4.2.1. Method Blanks: If a method blank is contaminated then report only samples that are 10 times the level of the method blank result or less than the MDL (i.e. not contaminated). The remainder within the associated batch need to be qualified (see DEP SOP LB-027) or redigested/reanalyzed. If a method blank has a negative result and the absolute value of the negative number is greater than the MDL then proceed as follows: A. Assess the cause of the problem. Negative blanks may be random failures, caused by a poor calibration or a loss of sensitivity during the analytical run. B. If there is no indication of a systematic problem (calibration, loss of sensitivity), reanalyze the batch on the same or a subsequent analytical run. Otherwise recalibrate the instrument new and reanalyze the batch. C. In cases where reanalysis is not an option: Multiply the negative number by 2 and use the absolute value of the result as the new MDL. Calculate a new PQL and apply both to the entire batch. Comment I qualified data with the following comment: Result may be biased low due to analytical difficulties.

4.2.2. AltQC: If the AltQC fails then the entire analytical run is in question and results cannot be reported unqualified. Either the calibration standards or the alternate QC standard could be prepared incorrectly and must be checked.

4.2.2.1. Exception 1: If the failure is due to an obvious mechanical error such as an air spike and the run is still in progress then the AltQC may be reanalyzed at a later point in the run.

4.2.2.2. Exception 2: If the run is still in progress and the failure is determined to be due to an improperly prepared AltQC standard then a properly prepared AltQC standard along with the failed AltQC standard can be placed side by side at a later point in the run. If the original AltQC

The OFFICIAL COPY is the on-line version. All other copies are considered unofficial and uncontrolled.

failure is confirmed and the correctly prepared AltQC passes then the calibration is considered valid.

4.2.3. PQL: At least one PQL standard is usually analyzed every time a calibration is performed, preferably at the beginning of the run (for some analyses a PQL is not appropriate). If the standard fails then samples at the low end of the calibration curve are in question. If the failure is due to contamination then report only samples that are 10 times the level of the contamination or less than the MDL (i.e. not contaminated). If it is due to a poor calibration then report samples that are higher than your next highest passing standard. Otherwise reanalyze samples.

4.2.4. Matrix Spikes: Samples that are digested or distilled prior to analysis have a separate set of guidelines than for those that have no preparation prior to analysis.

4.2.4.1. Digested /Distilled Analytes

a.: If one or both spikes fail and the background level is less than the spiked concentration, then the result for the spiked sample must be qualified or the batch must be redigested and reanalyzed. Prior to redigestion the cause of the spike failure needs to be evaluated (error, interference). If interferences are considered unique to a small set of samples within the batch then the original batch may be broken down into sub batches prior to redigestion. Each sub batch must then have a representative duplicate, spike and LFB.

b: If samples are diluted due to matrix interference then all samples within that batch, other than blanks (field, equipment or trip) must be diluted by at least as much as the spiked sample.

c: If the spike fails due to analytical interference, not digestion, then the original digestates of the samples and spikes can be diluted and reanalyzed.

4.2.4.2. Analytes Needing No Preparation

a: If one or both spikes fail and the background level is less than the spiked concentration, then the results of the spiked sample batch must be qualified or the samples must be reanalyzed. The cause of the spike failure needs to be evaluated (error, interference). If the analytical run is still in progress then samples can be respiked on the same run and it may not be necessary to reanalyze every sample in the affected batch. There are numerous causes for spike failures and many different methods of handling them. Some causes and methods are indicated below. Other situations not described below need to be evaluated by the supervisor.

b: If one or both spikes fail and a mechanical error is suspected (e.g. wrong pipet or solution used, air spike) then the sample can be respiked as long as the run is still in progress.

The OFFICIAL COPY is the on-line version. All other copies are considered unofficial and uncontrolled.

c: If the sample concentration is high enough to cause failure (sample concentration is greater than or equal to the spike concentration) then it is recommended that a sample of lower concentration within the batch be spiked. If this is not possible then the samples in the batch can be reported with the test comment "Matrix spike recovery data is unavailable due to the large amount of analyte in the QC sample".

d: Spikes fail due to matrix interference. If the interference appears to be limited to a small number of samples within the batch then sub batches can be designated. The samples with interferences can be treated separately from the rest of the samples in the original batch. The rest of the samples form a new batch and a sample from the new batch must be duplicated and spiked. The spiking protocol for the samples with the interference needs to be decided by the supervisor.

4.2.5. Matrix Replicates: Acceptance limits for precision for laboratory matrix duplicates are less than 20 % RPD or less than 15 % RSD for results that are greater than the PQL. If the precision fails outside these limits then the result for the sample must be qualified or the batch of samples needs to be redigested/reanalyzed. If interferences are considered unique to a small set of samples within the batch then the original batch may be broken down into sub batches prior to reanalysis. Each sub batch must then have a representative duplicate, matrix spike and LFB. If samples are diluted then all samples within that batch must be diluted by at least as much as the duplicate sample. Samples do not have to be redigested prior to reanalysis if the cause of the failure is due to the instrumental analysis rather than the digestion. If a mechanical error causes failure (air spike, poor injection) and the run is still in progress then the sample and duplicate can be placed at a later point in the run.

4.2.6. Check Standards and Blanks: If check standards fall outside the limits of 85 %-115 % then the samples that are bordered by the failed standard should be reanalyzed or reported qualified. If a blank result is greater than or equal to the MDL then samples that are bordered by the failed blank cannot be reported unqualified unless they are 10 times higher than the blank result or are confirmed on a run with acceptable QC. If a blank has a negative result and the absolute value of the negative number is greater than the MDL then reanalyze the samples bordered by the failing blank. In cases where reanalysis is not an option: Multiply the number by a factor of 2 and use the absolute value of the result as the new MDL. Calculate a new PQL and apply both to the samples bordered by the failing blank. Comment I qualified data with the following comment: Result may be biased low due to analytical difficulties.

4.3. Field QC Limits

4.3.1. Field Duplicates: If field duplicates do not duplicate within 20 % then there are several steps to be taken. First check to see if samples were logged in correctly. Also check to see if samples appear different (e.g. one might contain more

The OFFICIAL COPY is the on-line version. All other copies are considered unofficial and uncontrolled.

particulate matter than the other). If everything checks out OK then the samples need to be redigested and/or reanalyzed for confirmation. If the results do not confirm within 20 % of their original results then refer to Section 4.4 of this document.

4.3.2. Sampling Blanks (Field, Equipment and Trip): If the results for sampling blanks show contamination then the results need to be confirmed unless the associated sample results are at least 10 times higher than the blank results. Prior to confirmation check to see if the samples were logged in correctly and if the samples physically appear to be blanks. If everything checks out OK then the samples need to be redigested /reanalyzed. If the results do not match the original result then refer to Section 4.4 of this document.

4.4. Confirmation of Results: There are a number of situations which call for a sample to be redigested/reanalyzed to confirm a result. If the second analysis confirms the result then the result can be reported. If the second result does not match the initial result within 20 % (for values over the PQL) then the entire batch of samples associated with the initial result needs to be evaluated. There are a number of reasons why a sample result would vary greater than 20 % between runs e.g. the sample could be difficult to homogenize due to large amounts of particulate matter. In this case the other samples in the batch would not have to be analyzed unless they also contained a lot of particulate matter. Sample IDs could have been labeled incorrectly during the analysis. In this case all of the samples in the batch may need to be reanalyzed. Each situation needs to be evaluated by a supervisor.

5. REFERENCES

5.1. DEP SOP LB-027, Standard Operating Procedure for Reporting Qualified Data.

5.2. Quality Manual, Bureau of Laboratories, Florida DEP

APPENDIX A - Nutrients Matrix Groups

Group 1 - Surface fresh, ground water, drinking water
Group 2 - Salt water
Group 3 - Effluent, Influent
Group 4 - Solids, Wastes

Appendix of Significant Changes

11/02/2011	Section 4.2: Clarification on the procedure for reporting data associated with low failures for Method Blanks and Check Blanks.

The OFFICIAL COPY is the on-line version. All other copies are considered unofficial and uncontrolled.