

DATA QUALITY REVIEW SHEET

Facility ID: 752711
 Station Name: Puckett 151879
 Sample Date: 11/5/2015
 Field Sample ID: GM 323-28-151879

Project: GM 323-28 BWQ: Sub1
 Lab Work Order: 1511116
 QA/QC Review Date: 1/4/2016
 Reviewer: S. Kipp

Field Sampling Data Review	Yes	No	N/A
1. Well properly purged?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Flow rate reduced prior to sampling?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Water quality parameters stable prior to sampling?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Field instruments calibrated properly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Sampling methods performed according to SAP procedures?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Procedures consistent with obtaining a representative sample?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lab Data Report Review			
7. Proper sample custody maintained until laboratory receipt?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Receipt form is without discrepancies? <i>If no, list in comments.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. All samples analyzed for the requested analyses?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Proper laboratory methods used?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. All sample holding times met (other than lab pH)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Lab QA samples (e.g., matrix spikes and matrix spike duplicates) collected and analyzed according to lab method and results within method acceptance limits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Was the field investigation sample matrix used by the lab for matrix QC for all analyses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Laboratory qualifiers for data (other than non-detect)? <i>List in comments.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Additional qualifiers assigned (other than pH)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Are corrective actions required? <i>If yes, list actions and dates to be completed by:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Corrective Action</i>	<i>Date to be completed</i>		
None			

Calculated Parameters	Calculated Value	Lab Value	Ratio/Percent Difference	Acceptable Limit	Meets QC Criteria?
Cation/Anion Balance, % (CAB)	0.427	N/A	N/A	±5%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Total Dissolved Solids, mg/L (TDS)	974	810	1.20	0.8 – 1.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Specific Conductance, µS/cm (SpC)	1209	1322	0.91	0.8 – 1.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments: Parameters were stabilized according to the WPX Sampling and Analysis Plan stabilization criteria with the exception of field dissolved oxygen. ALS, Fort Collins forwarded the sample to an ALS lab in Kelso, WA for the anions analysis by EPA Method 300.0. Laboratory pH, nitrate, and nitrite were analyzed out of analysis holding time, WWL qualified with "H"; result considered estimated. MS recoveries were outside of control limits for bromide, fluoride, nitrite, and nitrite (11%, 74%, 53%, and 6% respectively), and MSD recoveries were outside of control limits for bromide, fluoride, nitrite, and nitrite (11%, 73%, 54%, and 6% respectively); the lab reported the matrix spike outlier suggested a potential low bias in this matrix. RPD for lab duplicate analysis was outside control limits for

fluoride (31%); RPD considered acceptable due to low duplicate and sample concentrations.