

Jakub, Barbara, Env. Health

From: David Hoexter [david@hoexterconsulting.com]
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 2:45 PM
To: Jakub, Barbara, Env. Health
Subject: Re: EDF Submittal #5136135280 Has Been Denied

Hi Barbara:

I looked at both the PDF and EDF versions of the McCampbell Analytical lab report. There are two elements here.

First, and least important, the actual ethylbenzene concentration for 8260B is **5.4** ug/L, both on the PDF and EDF versions. The concentration for 8021F is **5.5** ug/L on both versions. I think you may have mixed up on the 8260B and 8021F values.

Second, as to the RL for method 8260B, there is an **apparent** discrepancy which in reality, is **not**. It took a bit of puzzling out, and then I confirmed my conclusion with McCampbell's Lab Manager, Angela Rydelius. The RL with a dilution factor (DF) of 1.0 for 8260B ethylbenzene is 0.5 ug/L. This sample had a DF of 5.0, and thus the RL was increased from 0.5 to 2.5 ug/L, as shown on the EDF. However, the listed RLs as reported by the lab on the PDF/printed version are for DF of 1.0. McCampbell's software for the PDF version does not change the RL in this column even if there is a dilution. The PDF version RF column defaults to DL of 1.0. Ms Rydelius confirmed that they have always reported in this manner. You will note that when the DF exceeds 1.0 and there is no detection, the actual concentration ND value does correctly reflect the elevated RL. As an example, look at the reported value for 1,2-DCA for the same sample, MW-4. It has a DL of 5.0 as well, and is reported as ND<2.5 although in the RL column it is shown as 0.5.

So, in conclusion, the actual value and RL as shown on the EDF are each correct. And any time there is a dilution greater than 1.0 and no detection, the actual concentration value of ND correctly reflects the actual RL. Thus, other non-detections and actual concentrations are also correctly reported. For this reason, there are no corrections to be made to the data and therefore no resubmittal.

Hopefully I have been able to describe this clearly. Would you mind confirming that you received this message?

Please call me if you have further questions or require further clarification.

Best regards,

David F. Hoexter

Registered Environmental Assessor (REA)
Professional Geologist (PG)
Certified Engineering Geologist (CEG)

Hoexter Consulting, Inc.
734 Torrey Ct, Palo Alto, Ca 94303
Ph: 650-494-2505
Fax: 650-494-2515 fax

Email: david@hoexterconsulting.com

On Nov 17, 2008, at 10:42 AM, barbara.jakub@acgov.org wrote:

*** THIS EMAIL WAS AUTOMATICALLY GENERATED BECAUSE ONE OF YOUR SUBMITTALS HAS BEEN DENIED ***

SUBMITTAL TITLE: July 2008 Ground Water Sampling
SUBMITTAL DATE: 8/27/2008 10:36:48 AM
CONFIRMATION_NUMBER: 5136135280

GRIMIT AUTO REPAIR & SERVICE (T0600100667)
1970 SEMINARY
Oakland, CA
94621

DENIED BY

Barbara Jakub - ALAMEDA COUNTY LOP
510-639-1287
barbara.jakub@acgov.org

REASON FOR DENIAL

7/25/2008 1645 8/1/2008 W 37243 MW-4 MW-4 SW8260B Ethylbenzene 5.4 2.5 1.2 UG/L
Actual result from laboratory reported as 5.5 ug/L and detection limit reported by lab is 0.5 not 2.5. Please
rview data to ensure it is correct and resubmit.