



Data Review and Validation Report

General Information

Report Number (RIN): 12054532
Sample Event: May 3, 2012
Site(s): Riverton, Wyoming
Laboratory: ALS Laboratory Group, Fort Collins, Colorado
Work Order No.: 1205086
Analysis: Uranium
Validator: Gretchen Baer
Review Date: May 10, 2012

This validation was performed according to the *Environmental Procedures Catalog*, (LMS/PRO/S04325, continually updated) “Standard Practice for Validation of Laboratory Data.” The procedure was applied at Level 3, Data Validation. All analyses were successfully completed. The samples were prepared and analyzed using accepted procedures based on methods specified by line item code, which are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Analytes and Methods

Analyte	Line Item Code	Prep Method	Analytical Method
Uranium	LMM-02	SW-846 3005A	SW-846 6020A

Data Qualifier Summary

None of the sample results required additional qualification.

Sample Shipping/Receiving

ALS Laboratory Group in Fort Collins, Colorado, received six water samples on May 4, 2012, accompanied by a Chain of Custody (COC) form. The COC form was checked to confirm that all of the samples were listed with sample collection dates and times, and that signatures and dates were present indicating sample relinquishment and receipt. The sample submittal documents had no errors or omissions.

Preservation and Holding Times

The sample shipment was received intact and at ambient temperature, which complies with requirements. All samples were received in the correct container types and had been preserved

correctly for the requested analyses. All analyses were performed within the required holding times.

Detection and Quantitation Limits

The method detection limit (MDL) was reported for all analytes as required. The MDL, as defined in 40 CFR 136, is the minimum concentration of an analyte that can be measured and reported with 99% confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero. The practical quantitation limit (PQL) for these analytes is the lowest concentration that can be reliably measured, and is defined as 5 times the MDL.

The reported MDLs for all analytes demonstrate compliance with contractual requirements.

Laboratory Instrument Calibration

Compliance requirements for satisfactory instrument calibration are established to ensure that the instrument is capable of producing acceptable qualitative and quantitative data for all analytes. Initial calibration demonstrates that the instrument is capable of acceptable performance in the beginning of the analytical run and of producing a linear curve. Compliance requirements for continuing calibration checks are established to ensure that the instrument continues to be capable of producing acceptable qualitative and quantitative data. All laboratory instrument calibrations were performed correctly in accordance with the cited methods. All calibration and laboratory spike standards were prepared from independent sources.

Method SW-846 6020, Uranium

Calibrations for uranium were performed on May 7, 2012, using four calibration standards. The calibration curve correlation coefficient values were greater than 0.995 and the absolute values of the intercepts were less than 3 times the MDL. Initial and continuing calibration verification checks were made at the required frequency resulting in two verification checks. All calibration checks met the acceptance criteria. Reporting limit verification checks were made at the required frequency to verify the linearity of the calibration curve near the practical quantitation limit and all results were within the acceptance range. Mass calibration and resolution verifications were performed at the beginning of each analytical run in accordance with the analytical procedure. Internal standard recoveries associated with requested analytes were stable and within acceptable ranges.

Method and Calibration Blanks

Method blanks are analyzed to assess any contamination that may have occurred during sample preparation. Calibration blanks are analyzed to assess instrument contamination prior to and during sample analysis. All method blank and calibration blank results associated with the samples were below the MDL.

Inductively Coupled Plasma (ICP) Interference Check Sample (ICS) Analysis

ICP interference check samples ICSA and ICSAB were analyzed at the required frequency to verify the instrumental interelement and background correction factors. All check sample results met the acceptance criteria.

Matrix Spike Analysis

A post-digestion spike was prepared and analyzed for uranium. The post-digestion spike recovery met the ± 15 percent acceptance criteria.

Laboratory Replicate Analysis

Laboratory replicate analyses are used to determine laboratory precision for each sample matrix. The relative percent difference for replicate results that are greater than 5 times the PQL should be less than 20 percent. For results that are less than 5 times the PQL, the range should be no greater than the PQL. The replicate results met these criteria.

Laboratory Control Sample

Laboratory control samples were analyzed at the correct frequency to provide information on the accuracy of the analytical method and the overall laboratory performance, including sample preparation. All control sample results were acceptable.

Metals Serial Dilution

Serial dilutions were prepared and analyzed for the metals analyses to monitor chemical or physical interferences in the sample matrix. Serial dilution data are evaluated when the concentration of the undiluted sample is greater than 50 times the MDL. No serial dilution data required evaluation.

Completeness

Results were reported in the correct units for all analytes requested using contract-required laboratory qualifiers.

Electronic Data Deliverable (EDD) File

The EDD file arrived on May 9, 2012. The Sample Management System EDD validation module was used to verify that the EDD files were complete and in compliance with requirements. The module compares the contents of the files to the requested analyses to ensure all and only the requested data are delivered. The contents of the EDDs were manually examined to verify that the sample results accurately reflect the data contained in the sample data package.

Potential Outliers Report

Potential outliers are measurements that are extremely large or small relative to the rest of the data and, therefore, are suspected of misrepresenting the population from which they were collected. Potential outliers may result from transcription errors, data-coding errors, or measurement system problems. However, outliers may also represent true extreme values of a distribution and indicate more variability in the population than was expected.

Statistical outlier tests give probabilistic evidence that an extreme value does not "fit" with the distribution of the remainder of the data and is therefore a statistical outlier. These tests should

only be used to identify data points that require further investigation. The tests alone cannot determine whether a statistical outlier should be discarded or corrected within a data set.

There are three steps involved in identifying extreme values or outliers:

1. Identify extreme values that may be potential outliers by generating the Outliers Report using the Sample Management System from data in the SEEPro database. The application compares the new data set with historical data and lists the new data that fall outside the historical data range. A determination is also made if the data are normally distributed using the Shapiro-Wilk Test.
2. Apply the appropriate statistical test. Dixon's Extreme Value test is used to test for statistical outliers when the sample size is less than or equal to 25. This test considers both extreme values that are much smaller than the rest of the data (case 1) and extreme values that are much larger than the rest of the data (case 2). This test is valid only if the data without the suspected outlier are normally distributed. Rosner's Test is a parametric test that is used to detect outliers for sample sizes of 25 or more. This test also assumes that the data without the suspected outliers are normally distributed.
3. Scientifically review statistical outliers and decide on their disposition.

No values from this sampling event were identified as potential outliers. The data for this RIN are acceptable as qualified.

Sampling Protocol

Domestic wells were classified as Category IV and were sampled by filling bottles at the discharge point.

Field Duplicate Assessment

Field duplicate samples are collected and analyzed as an indication of overall precision of the measurement process. The precision observed includes both field and laboratory precision and has more variability than laboratory duplicates, which measure only laboratory performance. The relative percent difference for duplicate results that are greater than 5 times the PQL should be less than 20 percent. For results that are less than 5 times the PQL, the range should be no greater than the PQL. A duplicate sample was collected from location 0816. The duplicate results met the criteria, demonstrating acceptable overall precision.



Gretchen Baer
Data Validator
2012.05.10 10:19:47 -06'00'

Report Prepared By: _____

Gretchen Baer
Data Validator

Data Validation Outliers Report - No Field Parameters

Comparison: All Historical Data

Laboratory:

RIN: 12054532

Report Date: 5/10/2012

Site Code	Location Code	Sample ID	Sample Date	Analyte	Current			Historical Maximum			Historical Minimum			Number of Data Points	Statistical Outlier	
					Result	Lab	Data	Qualifiers	Lab	Data	Qualifiers	Lab	Data			N
RVT01	0813	N001	05/03/2012	Uranium	0.000100			0.000097	B	U	0.000089	B	U	5	5	No

STATISTICAL TESTS:

The distribution of the data is tested for normality or lognormality using the Shapiro-Wilk Test

Outliers are identified using Dixon's Test when there are 25 or fewer data points.

Outliers are identified using Rosner's Test when there are 26 or more data points.

See Data Quality Assessment: Statistical Methods for Practitioners, EPA QC/G-9S, February 2006.

SAMPLE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
General Data Validation Report

RIN: 12054532 Lab Code: PAR Validator: Gretchen Baer Validation Date: 5/10/2012

Project: Riverton Analysis Type: Metals General Chem Rad Organics

of Samples: 6 Matrix: WATER Requested Analysis Completed: Yes

Chain of Custody

Present: OK Signed: OK Dated: OK

Sample

Integrity: OK Preservation: OK Temperature: OK

Select Quality Parameters

- Holding Times
- Detection Limits
- Field/Trip Blanks
- Field Duplicates

All analyses were completed within the applicable holding times.

The reported detection limits are equal to or below contract requirements.

There was 1 duplicate evaluated.

SAMPLE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
Validation Report: Field Duplicates

Page 1 of 1

RIN: 12054532 Lab Code: PAR Project: Riverton Validation Date: 5/10/2012

Duplicate: 2339

Sample: 0816

Analyte	Sample				Duplicate				RPD	RER	Units
	Result	Flag	Error	Dilution	Result	Flag	Error	Dilution			
Uranium	0.09	B		10	0.1			10			UG/L

**SAMPLE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
Metals Data Validation Worksheet**

RIN: 12054532 Lab Code: PAR Date Due: 5/6/2012
 Matrix: Water Site Code: RVI Date Completed: 5/10/2012

Analyte	Method Type	Date Analyzed	CALIBRATION				Method LCS %R	MS %R	MSD %R	Dup. RPD	ICSAB %R	Serial Dil. %R	CRI %R
			Int.	R^2	ICV	CCV							
Uranium	ms	05/07/2012	-0.0010	1.0000	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	101.0	101.0	104.0	90.0