Project:
 07-3080.04_Schofield Barracks
 Work Order:
 710048_(7927)_____

 LAB ID:
 ______GPL_____
 Analysis Type:
 Lead______

 Reviewer:
 _____Stacey Sedano______
 Stacey Sedano_______
 Stacey Sedano_______

Date: _____12/28/2007____

Sample	Matrix	Collection Date	Date Received	Extraction Date	Hold Times Met? (Y, N< or N/A)	Analysis Date	Hold Times Met? (Y, N< or N/A)
SB-CZ-SS-2187-ST	SOIL	9/24/07	10/08/07	10/10/07	N/A	10/16/07	N/A
SB-CZ-SS-2188-ST	SOIL	9/24/07	10/08/07	10/10/07	N/A	10/16/07	N/A
SB-CZ-SS-2189-ST	SOIL	9/24/07	10/08/07	10/10/07	N/A	10/16/07	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 analytical report listed correctly on the Chain of Custody?	Х			
1.7	Are the analytes reported consistent with the project requirements?	X			
Addit	tional Comments:				

1. Printed name not present in received by block. No data were qualified as a result of this omission.

		Yes	No	N/A	Sample Affected/Comments
2.0	Sample Receipt Checklist Review				
2.1	Did the laboratory complete the Sample				
	Receiving Checklist?	Х			
2.2	Are all receipt inspection items marked "Yes"?				
	(If "No" are they acceptable?).	Х			
Addit	ional Comments:				
3.0	Case Narrative/Analytical Report				
5.0	Cuse I with the firm and the point				
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?		Х		
3.2	Does the Analytical report agree with the				
	analyte list specified for the project?	Х			

		Yes	No	N/A	Sample Affected/Comments
3.3	Were the samples analyzed using SW846				
	Method 6010C, or an equivalent?	Х			
3.4	Are results that are flagged by laboratory				
	necessary and complete, and are understandable				
	comments provided?	Х			
3.5	Are the reporting units are correct and				
	consistent?	Х			
Addit	ional Comments:				
4.0	Laboratory Control Samples				
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?	Х			
Addit	ional Comments:				
5.0	Method Blank				
5.1	Was one preparation blank analyzed per 20				
	samples or digestate analytical batch,				
	whichever is more frequent?	Х			
5.2	Were blank concentrations less than the method	37			
A .1.1:4	detection limit?	Х			
Addit	ional Comments:				

		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			
Additi	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?	Х			
Additi	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	8.2 Were all results below project detection limit?			X	
	ional Comments:				