APPENDIX F:
DATA REVIEW CHECKLIST FOR LOCAL PARTNER
DATA SUBMISSION TO H-GAC

H-GAC Clean Rivers Program Local Partner

Data Submittal Form and Data Review Checklist

Please complete this form, sign where applicable, and submit with copies of Field Sheets, Chain-of-Custody Forms and Lab Data Reports pertaining to data in this submittal. One form is required for each submission. Failure to complete and submit this form will impede the process whereby data is submitted to TCEQ for inclusion in the State of Texas Surface Water Quality Monitoring (SWQM) database or included in the H-GAC Data Clearinghouse. This form applies to only those sampling sites listed in the Coordinated Monitoring Schedule for FY 2012 or FY2013.

Local Partner:	
Water Body:	
Data Start Date:	Data End Date:
Total Number of Events in this Data Submittal: (Total number of sample sites monitored times the numb	er of monitoring visits to each site)
Total Number of Results in this Data Submittal: (Each event contains multiple field and/or laboratory results)	ults)

Field Data Review

List instrument(s) used to collect	field measurements		
Was the instrument pre-calibrated Explain why not		Yes	No
Was an instrument post-calibratio	n check performed within 24-1	hours after ea	ich use?
Yes No	in check performed within 2 v i	nours unter co	ion asc.
Explain why not.			
Did all post-calibration checks pas	ss? Yes No		
What were the minimum and max		for the field in	nstrument? Please
express as a range.	initiani post canoration circis i	or the note in	and announce in round
•	saturation or ± 0.5 mg/L)		
Specific Conductance (+ 5	5 % standard)		
Temperature (+ 1.0 °C an	nnual calibration check)		
	nnual calibration check)		
Were all field parameters measure			
Were water samples collected for			
location? Yes No_		icis at every	Juntion .
Were water samples "iced" immed		ified in the fi	eld as
required? Yes No_			
Were all field sheets completed us		N	0
Were errors on field sheets correc			
and date corrected? Yes			•• •••••• • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
If no, explain			
Were empty sections of every fiel	d sheet closed-out with a diago	onal line, init	ials and date
closed-out? Yes			
Were problems encountered while		ments? Yes	s No
Explain.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
Were these problem(s) documente	ed on the field sheets? Yes	N	<u></u>
Were problems encountered in the			
	notified as required by the QA		
Were there any results (outliers) is			
than the minimum screening		No	Ü
Were outlier(s) documented on th			
Were all chain-of-custody forms a			y and accurately?
Yes No		•	
Were empty sections of every Cha	ain of Custody form and/or fie	ld data sheet	closed-out with a
	date closed-out? Yes		
Have field data sheet(s) or chain-	of-custody form(s) changed sin	nce the last d	ata submittal to
H-GAC? Yes			
Explain if yes or attach a r	new form		
Additional comments about Field			
Person who reviewed the field sho	eets for accuracy and complete	eness:	
	-		D .
Print Name	Signature		Date

Lab Data Quality Review

Were all holding times confirmed? Yes No	
Were samples received at the lab "iced down" and in the process of cooling to $4^{\circ}C \pm 2^{\circ}C$?	
Yes No	
Explain if no	
Were any water samples analyzed and reported that exceeded holding time requirements?	
Yes No	
Were empty sections of the Chain of Custody form closed-out with diagonal lines, initials and dat	e
closed-out? Yes No	
Are all lab values reported consistent with the Limit of Quantitation (LOQ) for each parameter lis	ted
in Table A7.1 of the Regional QAPP or Special Studies QAPP? Yes No	
Explain if no	
Have errors on lab sheets been corrected using a single line with initials of person making the	
correction and date corrected? Yes No	
Were empty sections of every lab sheet closed-out with a diagonal line, initials and date closed-out	ıt?
Yes No	
Did all field splits fall within the 30% Relative Percent Difference (RPD) used to determine poten	ıtial
excessive variability? Yes No	
Explain if no	
Were there any results that were not reported by the lab? Yes No Explain if yes	
 Data reasonableness and correctness of analysis have been confirmed and documented in the electronic database for the following situations. Are any ortho-phosphate phosphorus results greater than the companion total phosphorus result? Yes No For bacteria densities that are too few or too numerous to count, are values reported as < o the applicable minimum or maximum value? Yes No Are there any results in this data set greater than the maximum screening values or less that the minimum screening values? Yes No Are there any results in the data set that "Best Professional Judgment" would indicate a possible error and an investigation is warranted? Yes No 	an
 Are there results in the data set which are part of a "hold time exceeded" or "did not pass or "received hot, °C" but could still be included in the set because a parameter does not require special handling? (i.e. TDS does not have to be iced) Yes No If yes to any previously bulleted questions, have the results been reconfirmed and document in the database as being accurate? Yes No What kind of QA/QC data is provided with this data submittal? 	t nted
Additional comments about Lab Data	
Person who reviewed the lab sheets and results for accuracy and completeness:	
Print Name	

Data Entry, Formatting and Table Structure

24-hour clock form	nat with leading zeros as necessary?	Yes No
Were any samples collecte	eported in meters? Yes No_ ed from depths greater than 0.3 meters	? Yes No
Have all asterisks (*) been (An asterisk will interfo	was the composite information recorded removed from the database being subserve with queries, searches, etc.) Yes in the database? Yes No	omitted to H-GAC? No
explanation for the Are only sample sites listed recent amendment Yes No	nter due to lab or sampling problems, it blank field in the comment section? It is the current QAPP, Coordinated Mark included with data being submitted to	Yes No Monitoring Schedule (CMS), or most H-GAC?
"All STORET Are all outliers confirmed, can review them? Are appropriate quality ass for verification and Have at least 10% of data i Yes No_	ate.tx.us/compliance/monitoring/crp/data/store Codes" for file: sw parm.txt for Mins and M documented and identified so the H-C Yes No surance/quality control information or l validation by H-GAC? Yes in the data set been reviewed against f	faxs of every STORET code) GAC Data Manager results included with the data set No ield and laboratory data sheets?
Person who reviewed the d	database for accuracy and completenes	ss:
Print Name	Signature	Date
Electronic data set was sub	omitted to H-GAC on	
Electronic data set was sub	omitted to H-GAC by:	
Print Name	Signature_	