Project: 07-3080.04 Work Order: 710084 (Rad-7932)

LAB ID: GPL Analysis Type: Lead

Reviewer: Bachir Badaoui

Date: ____ 12/21/2007

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-2000-BD	Soil	9/25/2007	10/11/2007	10/11/2007	N/A	10/18/2007	N/A
SB-CZ-SS-2001-BD	Soil	9/25/2007	10/11/2007	10/11/2007	N/A	10/18/2007	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?						
	T (() T T J			X			
1.6	Are all the samples included in the analytical						
	report listed correctly on the Chain of Custody?	X					
1.7	Are the analytes reported consistent with the						
	project requirements?	X					
Δddit	Additional Comments:						

Additional Comments:

. 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?	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				
3.2	the validity of the sample analysis? Does the Analytical report agree with the		X		
3.2	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	Λ			
	necessary and complete, and are understandable comments provided?	X			
3.5	Are the reporting units are correct and				
Δddi	consistent?	X			
Auui	tional 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	1			
	range of % recovery?	X			
Addit	ional Comments:				
7 0	M AL IDI I				
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	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			
Addit	ional Comments:	•			
					T
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:	.1			,

		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	
Addit	Additional Comments:				