To: Brian Mikucki[bmikucki@tierrasolutionsinc.com]
Cc: Sy, William[Sy.William@epa.gov]
From: Butler, Elizabeth
Sent: Wed 11/16/2016 3:59:21 PM
Subject: RE: DASS October Effluent Sampling- Reporting

OK, thanks!

From: Brian Mikucki [mailto:bmikucki@tierrasolutionsinc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 8:53 AM
To: Butler, Elizabeth <Butler.Elizabeth@epa.gov>
Cc: Sy, William <Sy.William@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: DASS October Effluent Sampling- Reporting

Hi Elizabeth,

Thanks for the quick response. The 2,4-D duplicate sample was a field duplicate collected at the same time as the primary sample in the field. Per the QAPP we analyze the duplicate samples for MS/MSD for all parameters as well.

Sent from iPhone

On Nov 16, 2016, at 8:45 AM, Butler, Elizabeth <Butler.Elizabeth@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Brian.

EPA finds your proposal for reporting the duplicate results for this month for 2,4-D acceptable. However, could you please clarify whether the duplicate 2,4-D sample was a result of reanalysis for MS/MSD after the failed recoveries from the primary sample? Or was it a field duplicate that was also designated for MS/MSD?

Thanks,

Elizabeth

From: Brian Mikucki [mailto:bmikucki@tierrasolutionsinc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 3:30 PM
To: Butler, Elizabeth <Butler.Elizabeth@epa.gov>
Cc: Enrique Castro <ecastro@tierrasolutionsinc.com>
Subject: DASS October Effluent Sampling- Reporting

Good Afternoon Elizabeth,

I wanted to update you on the October effluent data for the DASS sampling. I was informed today that the matrix spike and the matrix spike duplicate percent recoveries failed for the 2,4-D parameter in the primary effluent sample. The percent recovery range for 2,4-D in the QAPP is 25-150%. The primary sample yielded a percent recovery of -118% and -138% for the MS and MSD respectively. As a result, the data was qualified as rejected, and is unable to be used.

While I am still confirming the reason behind the poor recoveries it appears there was an issue on the laboratories end, as the 2,4-D duplicate sample resulted in acceptable recoveries in the MS/MSD and did not have any detections. Under normal circumstances the primary and duplicate results are averaged together and reported in the DMR. However, since the primary results for 2,4-D are rejected, I was wondering if it was acceptable to EPA if we only reported the duplicate results in the DMR this month for 2-4-D parameter?

Please let me know if this is acceptable.

Thanks

Brian Mikucki

Senior Environmental Scientist

Tierra Solutions Inc.

bmikucki@tierrasolutionsinc.com

Office: 732-246-5920

Cell: 732-579-7586

2 Tower Center Blvd.

10th Floor

East Brunswick, NJ 08816