**Lead Analysis Data Review Checklist**
**Schofield Barracks**

**Project: ____07-3080.04_Schofield Barracks____ Work Order: _____710183 (708130)_____**
**LAB ID: _____GPL_____ Analysis Type: _____Lead_____**
**Reviewer: Stacey Sedano**
**Date: _____1/7/08_____**

| 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-2322-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2323-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2324-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2325-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2326-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2327-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2328-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2329-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2330-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2331-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2332-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2333-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2334-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2335-ST | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-29-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2322-SD | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-30-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |
| SB-CZ-SS-2323-SD | Soil | 09-28-2007 | 10-25-2007 | 10-30-2007 | N/A | 11-19-2007 | N/A |

**Lead Analysis Data Review Checklist**
**Schofield Barracks**

| | | 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? | X | | | |
| 1.7 | Are the analytes reported consistent with the project requirements? | X | | | |

Additional Comments:

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

**Lead Analysis Data Review Checklist**
**Schofield Barracks**

| | | 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 | | | |
| Additional 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 | | | |
| Additional 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? | X | | | |
| Additional Comments: | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **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 | | | |
| Additional 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 | | | |
| Additional 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 | | | |
| Additional 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 | |
| Additional Comments: | | | | | |