

## Response to Specification Questions

### Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) Laboratory Accreditation

IDEQ does not have a laboratory accreditation program that applies to this Specification. The Specification has been revised to remove this as a qualification requirement.

### Exhibit "B" Revision – Sample Types

The table in Exhibit "B" with respect to the column labeled "Sample Volume or Type" has been revised. The reference to samples collected by XAD2 resin has been removed. This method of collection is no longer being considered for this RFQ. Please note that other revisions have been made to this table.

### Sample Details

A table has been added to Exhibit "A" (Scope of Work). This table provides additional details on sources being sampled and other details such as sample compositing for each event. Mean, median, mini, and max historical TSS values are provided. Where available, TSS information ~~for~~ specific to the samples will be provided.

The sampling collection method will be decided upon by SRRTTF-ACE based upon a combination of lowest cost and lowest method blank contamination level.

### CLAM Details

The following information is provided relative to the potential future use of CLAMs for sample collection:

- With respect to the sourcing of the CLAM, SRRTTF-ACE would purchase and supply the CLAM media to the laboratory for preparation (conditioning and pre-deployment spiking using labeled compounds used for cleanup standards by the laboratory). The cost for this preparation should be included in the per sample cost in the table in Exhibit "B". All field sample collection work will be performed by a separate contractor. No quotes for field equipment are required from bidders.
- Each CLAM is expected to have processed between 55 L and 90 L of water with an average of 60 L.
- No pre-filter would be used for any samples collected by a CLAM. The laboratory is to report the total amount extracted from the CLAM.
- With respect to "blank proofing", one conditioned and spiked CLAM for the Method Blank for each batch of 20 or fewer samples and one for the QRPQPR.
- Target Reporting Limits are provided in the table in the Reporting of Results Section, Paragraph 6.A. of Exhibit "A". Please note: Data reported below the lab's QL will not be within the calibration range, whether diluted or not, and must therefore be qualified as estimated.

**Commented [KF1]:** Will TSS be measured at each site? Since it is a 7-day holdtime, perhaps preliminary info can be provided to the lab performing the PCB analysis.

**Commented [KF2]:** I believe the original question was in regards to "Proof of Clean Certification must be provided for project sample containers". This should be clarified so that different labs do not provide different pricing. Are you requiring them to test the empty containers for contamination at a frequency of 1 in 20?

General Questions

Formatted: Keep with next

With respect to the table in Exhibit "B", pricing should be provided for each Method Blank column for each sample volume/type identified. If the Method Blank level cannot be achieved, enter "NB" in the column.

For reporting of blank levels requested in the Specification, please provide the mean and 2 sigma of the mean, as well as actual concentrations for each individual blank, reported to the EDL.

A section has been added to Exhibit "B" after the pricing table so that any additional information or qualifications can be provided.

Bookmarking of pdf documents is not required, but is preferred.

With respect to the requirement for labeled standard recovery in sample and Method Blanks, at a minimum the limits from the revised 1668A (2003) (15% - 150% for the monochlorobiphenyls) should be observed.

With respect to Exhibit "A", Reporting of Results Section, Paragraph 5G, the redrawn baseline must be visible to the data reviewer.

The additional CS-0.2 calibration standard must meet all method criteria.

Any GC column allowed for in the method may be used, regardless of co-elutions.

Commented [KF3]: Unless you have specific congeners you need to keep separate. Discuss?

The PCB naming convention described in the EPA document link is a standard requirement for all Ecology reporting of PCB congeners.

Commented [KF4]: Vista could not explain what did not "make sense" when asked.

~~Our IT Manager, Anne Wilhoit, accessed the PCB naming convention info, via the link in the RFQQ document, but it doesn't make sense given what's described in the RFQQ. Who may we talk with to get clarification?~~

~~(Vista Laboratory)~~

~~1. Analytical Details, #5 Does the additional CS 0.2 need to meet all method criteria?~~

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

~~2. Reporting of Results, #6F, b Data reported below the lab's QL will not be within the calibration range, whether diluted or not. This is understood, correct?!~~

~~Do you have a specific list of the 209 congeners with co-eluters identified? This, of course, relates to the GC column that is utilized.~~