

# QUALITY CONTROL REPORT

For July 1997 – June 1998



**Water Quality Monitoring Division  
Water Resources Evaluation Department  
South Florida Water Management District  
P.O. Box 24680  
3301 Gun Club Road  
West Palm Beach, FL 33416-4680**

## SUMMARY BY PROJECT AND QUALITY CONTROL TYPE

QC	PROJECT									
	CAMB		ENP		ENRG		ENRH		ENRP	
	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL
SAMPLES	15765	57.38%	4323	57.93%	254	27.46%	1607	76.85%	7183	55.35%
EB	2728	9.93%	729	9.77%	160	17.30%	104	4.97%	1366	10.53%
FB	2544	9.26%	635	8.51%	160	17.30%	100	4.78%	1107	8.53%
FD	164	0.60%							144	1.11%
RS	2873	10.46%	865	11.59%	160	17.30%	212	10.14%	1052	8.11%
SS	3238	11.79%	871	11.67%	160	17.30%			1163	8.96%
TS	162	0.59%	40	0.54%	31	3.35%	68	3.25%	963	7.42%
TOTAL	27474	100%	7463	100%	925	100%	2091	100%	12978	100%

QC	PROJECT									
	ENRR		ENRU		EVER		EVPA		HOLY	
	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL
SAMPLES	7732	61.25%	2774	62.72%	2885	70.30%	15215	72.38%	977	56.05%
EB	1647	13.05%	579	13.09%	282	6.87%	1695	8.06%	97	5.57%
FB	1094	8.67%	520	11.76%	282	6.87%	1222	5.81%	155	8.89%
FD	375	2.97%	32	0.72%			777	3.70%		
RS	878	6.95%			328	7.99%	1113	5.29%	219	12.56%
SS	879	6.96%	502	11.35%	327	7.97%	944	4.49%	251	14.40%
TS	19	0.15%	16	0.36%			55	0.26%	44	2.52%
TOTAL	12624	100%	4423	100%	4104	100%	21021	100%	1743	100%

NOTES:

EB - Equipment Blank  
 FB - Field Blank  
 FD - Field Duplicate  
 RS - Replicate Sample  
 SS - Split Sample  
 TS - Trip Spike



## SUMMARY BY PROJECT AND FLAG TYPE

	PROJECT									
	CAMB		ENP		ENRG		ENRH		ENRP	
	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL
No Flag	26728	97.28%	7346	98.43%	919	99.35%	1972	94.31%	12629	97.31%
!									8	0.06%
?	1	0.00%								
J	526	1.91%	97	1.30%	6	0.65%	36	1.72%	202	1.56%
J3	57	0.21%	4	0.05%			52	2.49%	33	0.25%
J4									32	0.25%
J5	67	0.24%					26	1.24%	42	0.32%
K	39	0.14%	3	0.04%					11	0.08%
NVZ									2	0.02%
PMR	1	0.00%								
Q	12	0.04%								
V	38	0.14%	13	0.17%			5	0.24%	19	0.15%
Y	5	0.02%								
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27474</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7463</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>925</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2091</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12978</b>	<b>100%</b>

	PROJECT									
	ENRR		ENRU		EVER		EVPA		HOLY	
	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL	COUNT	% OF TOTAL
No Flag	12304	97.47%	4359	98.55%	3855	93.93%	20849	99.18%	1697	97.36%
!										
?										
J	84	0.67%	26	0.59%	190	4.63%	40	0.19%	32	1.84%
J3	46	0.36%	21	0.47%	4	0.10%	24	0.11%	2	0.11%
J4										
J5					47	1.15%			12	0.69%
K										
NVZ										
PMR							2	0.01%		
Q										
V	190	1.51%	17	0.38%	8	0.19%	106	0.50%		
Y										
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12624</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4423</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4104</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>21021</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1743</b>	<b>100%</b>

### FLAG CODES SUMMARY

!	Data deviates from historically established concentration ranges.	NVZ	Not a valid zero value; request original value from lab.
?	Data is rejected and should not be used.	PMR	Flag set at project managers request; invalid data.
J	Estimated value: value not accurate.	Q	Sampled, but analysis lost or not performed.
J3	Precision or Accuracy Criteria Not Met.	V	Indicates that the analyte was detected in both the sample and the associated method blank.
J4	Matrix Interference.	Y	The laboratory analysis was from an unpreserved or improperly preserved sample. The data may not be accurate.
J5	Improper Lab or Field Protocol.		
K	Off-scale low. Actual value is known to be less than the value given.		



## FIELD AUDITS

PROJECT	DATE	FIELD AUDIT SUMMARY
CAMB	6/9/98	Sampling procedures were conducted in accordance with the SFWMD sampling protocol as specified by the District Quality Assurance Plan approved by the district Quality Assurance Unit and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. No deficiencies were found for the field audit conducted on 6/9/98 by SFWMD field auditor Dave Hemela.
ENP	8/5/98	Sampling procedures were conducted in accordance with the SFWMD sampling protocol as specified by the District Quality Assurance Plan approved by the district Quality Assurance Unit and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Niskin sampler was not DI rinsed between sites and Field Blank was not maintained open during routine sample processing. No other deficiencies were found for the field audit conducted on 8/5/98 by SFWMD field auditor Jenny Wingate
ENRG	7/1/97	Sampling procedures were conducted in accordance with the SFWMD sampling protocol as specified by the District Quality Assurance Plan approved by the district Quality Assurance Unit and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. No deficiencies were found for the field audit conducted on 7/1/97 by SFWMD field auditor Jenny Wingate.
ENRH		No audit conducted in period evaluated.
ENRP	7/8/97	Sampling procedures were conducted in accordance with the SFWMD sampling protocol as specified by the District Quality Assurance Plan approved by the district Quality Assurance Unit and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Processing bucket was rinsed once with sample instead of three times as required by Quality Assurance Plan. No other deficiencies were found for the field audit conducted on 7/8/97 by SFWMD field auditor Jenny Wingate.
ENRR		No audit conducted in period evaluated.
ENRU		No audit conducted in period evaluated.
EVER		No audit conducted in period evaluated.
EVPA		No audit conducted in period evaluated.
HOLY	6/9/98	Sampling procedures were conducted in accordance with the SFWMD sampling protocol as specified by the District Quality Assurance Plan approved by the district Quality Assurance Unit and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. No deficiencies were found for the field audit conducted on 6/9/98 by SFWMD field auditor Dave Hemela.