#### Radiochemical Data Review Checklist Schofield Barracks

Project: 07-3080.04 Work Order: 709115 - (Rad 7843)

LAB ID: GPL Analysis Type: Lead

Reviewer: Bachir Badaoui

Date: 12/13/2007

| Sample           | Matrix | Collection<br>Date | Date<br>Received | Extraction Date | Hold Times Met?<br>(Y, N< or N/A) | Analysis<br>Date | Hold Times Met?<br>(Y, N< or N/A) |
|------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| SB-CZ-SS-2020-ST | Soil   | 8/21/2007          | 9/17/2007        | 9/25/2007       | N/A                               | 09/28/2007       | N/A                               |
| SB-CZ-SS-2021-ST | Soil   | 8/21/2007          | 9/17/2007        | 9/25/2007       | N/A                               | 09/28/2007       | N/A                               |
| SB-CZ-SS-2022-ST | Soil   | 8/21/2007          | 9/17/2007        | 9/25/2007       | N/A                               | 09/28/2007       | N/A                               |
| SB-CZ-SS-2023-ST | Soil   | 8/21/2007          | 9/17/2007        | 9/25/2007       | N/A                               | 09/28/2007       | N/A                               |
| SB-CZ-SS-2024-ST | Soil   | 8/21/2007          | 9/17/2007        | 9/25/2007       | N/A                               | 09/28/2007       | N/A                               |

|        |  | Yes | No   | N/A | Sample Affected/Comments |  |  |
|--------|--|-----|------|-----|--------------------------|--|--|
| 1.0    | Sample Chain of Custody Review                         |     |      |     |                          |  |  |
| 1.1    | Are the printed names and signatures                   |     |      |     |                          |  |  |
|        | present in the Relinquished By and Received By Blocks? |     | X(1) |     |                          |  |  |
| 1.2    | Does the COC date match the Relinquished               |     |      |     |                          |  |  |
|        | By date?   | X   |      |     |                          |  |  |
| 1.3    | Is the Received By date consistent with                |     |      |     |                          |  |  |
|        | sample custody transfer (Relinquished By)?             | X   |      |     |                          |  |  |
| 1.4    | Have all the samples listed on the Chain of            |     |      |     |                          |  |  |
|        | Custody have been analyzed? (Verify this               |     |      |     |                          |  |  |
|        | by checking that the Memo and/or case                  |     |      |     |                          |  |  |
|        | narratives are consistent with the COC).               | X   |      |     |                          |  |  |
| 1.5    | Were the sample(s) preserved                           |     |      |     |                          |  |  |
|        | appropriately?   |     |      | X   |                          |  |  |
| 1.6    | Are all the samples included in the                    | X   |      |     |                          |  |  |
|        | analytical report listed correctly on the              | (2) |      |     |                          |  |  |
|        | Chain of Custody?                                      |     |      |     |                          |  |  |
| 1.7    | Are the analytes reported consistent with              |     |      |     |                          |  |  |
|        | the project requirements?                              | X   |      |     |                          |  |  |
| A 44:4 | Additional Comments:                                   |     |      |     |                          |  |  |

#### Additional Comments:

- Printed name not present in received by block. No data were qualified as a result of this omission.
   Sample collection date on the analytical summary report doesn't match the COC.

|       |   | Yes | No | N/A | Sample Affected/Comments |
|-------|---|-----|----|-----|--------------------------|
| 2.0   | Sample Receipt Checklist Review   |     |    |     |                          |
| 2.1   | Did the laboratory complete the Sample Receiving Checklist?                       | X   |    |     |                          |
| 2.2   | Are all receipt inspection items marked "Yes"? (If "No" are they acceptable?).    |     | X  |     |                          |
| Addit | ional Comments:   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
| 3.0   | Case Narrative/Analytical Report  |     |    |     |                          |
| 3.1   | Does the Case Narrative report submitted by                                       |     |    |     |                          |
|       | the laboratory indicate any problems with the                                     |     |    |     |                          |
|       | analysis or other factors which could impact the validity of the sample analysis? |     | X  |     |                          |
| 3.2   | Does the Analytical report agree with the analyte list specified for the project? | X   |    |     |                          |

|       |  | Yes | No | N/A | Sample Affected/Comments |
|-------|--|-----|----|-----|--------------------------|
| 3.3   | Were the samples analyzed using SW846 Method 6010C, or an equivalent?  | X   |    |     |                          |
| 3.4   | Are results that are flagged by laboratory necessary and complete, and are understandable comments provided? | X   |    |     |                          |
| 3.5   | Are the reporting units are correct and consistent?  | X   |    |     |                          |
| Addit | tional Comments:   |     | •  | •   |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
| 4.0   | <b>Laboratory Control Samples</b>  |     |    |     |                          |
| 4.1   | Was one LCS (laboratory control sample) analyzed per 20 samples or digestate analytical                      |     |    |     |                          |
|       | batch, whichever is more frequent?   | X   |    |     |                          |

|       |   | Yes | No | N/A | Sample Affected/Comments |
|-------|---|-----|----|-----|--------------------------|
| 4.2   | Were the LCS results within an acceptable |     |    |     |                          |
|       | range of % recovery?                      | X   |    |     |                          |
| Addit | ional Comments:                           |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       | T   |     |    | 1   |                          |
| 5.0   | Method Blank                              |     |    |     |                          |
| 5.1   | Was one preparation blank analyzed per 20 |     |    |     |                          |
|       | samples or digestate analytical batch,    |     |    |     |                          |
|       | whichever is more frequent?               | X   |    |     |                          |
| 5.2   | Were blank concentrations less than the   |     |    |     |                          |
|       | method detection limit?                   | X   |    |     |                          |
| Addit | cional Comments:                          |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
|       |   |     |    |     |                          |
| 1     |   |     |    |     |                          |

|       |  | Yes | No | N/A | Sample Affected/Comments |
|-------|--|-----|----|-----|--------------------------|
| 6.0   | Matrix Spike Sample  |     |    |     |                          |
| 6.1   | Was one MS sample analyzed per 20 samples or digestate analytical batch, whichever is more frequent?           | X   |    |     |                          |
| 6.2   | Were the MS results within the acceptable range?   | X   |    |     |                          |
| Addit | ional Comments:  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
| 7.0   | Duplicate Analysis   |     |    |     |                          |
| 7.1   | Was one duplicate analysis performed per 20 samples or digestate analytical batch, whichever is more frequent? | X   |    |     |                          |
| 7.2   | Was the sample selected for duplicate analysis a sample other than a field blank?                              | X   |    |     |                          |
| 7.3   | Were the RPD values for laboratory duplicates acceptable?  | X   |    |     |                          |
| Addit | ional Comments:  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |
|       |  |     |    |     |                          |

|      |   | Yes | No | N/A | Sample Affected/Comments |
|------|---|-----|----|-----|--------------------------|
| 8.0  | Other Blanks (e.g., field blanks, trip blanks, leachate blanks) |     |    |     |                          |
| 8.1  | List blank analyses performed                                   |     |    | X   |                          |
| 8.2  | Were all results below project detection limit?                 |     |    | X   |                          |
| Addi | Additional Comments:  |     |    |     |                          |
|      |   |     |    |     |                          |