APPENDIX G:
DATA SUMMARY REPORT /SHEET FOR
H-GAC'S DATA SUBMISSIONS TO TCEQ

## **DATA REVIEW CHECKLIST**

These questions and more are addressed by processing data through SAS. Only the Data Summary is submitted with the data sets as required.

Data Format and Structure		<b>√</b> , <b>X</b> , or N/A
A.	Are there any duplicate Tag Id numbers in the Events file?	
В.	Do the Tag prefixes correctly represent the entity providing the data?	
C.	Have any Tag Id numbers been used in previous data submissions?	
D.	Are TCEQ station location (SLOC) numbers assigned?	
E.	Are sampling Dates in the correct format, MM/DD/YYYY with leading zeros?	
F.	Are the sampling <i>Times</i> based on the 24 hour clock (e.g. 13:04) with leading zeros?	
G.	Is the Comment field filled in where appropriate (e.g. unusual occurrence, sampling problems, unrepresentative of ambient water quality)?	
Н.	Submitting Entity, Collecting Entity, and Monitoring Type codes used correctly?	
I.	Are the sampling dates in the Results file the same as the one in the Events file for each Tag Id?	
J.	Are values represented by a valid parameter code with the correct units?	
K.	Are there any duplicate parameter codes for the same Tag Id?	
L.	Are there any invalid symbols in the Greater Than/Less Than (GT/LT) field?	
M.	Are there any Tag Ids in the Results file that are not in the Events file or vice versa?	
Data Quality Review		<b>√</b> , <b>X</b> , or N/A
Α.	Arc all the "less-than" values reported at the LOQ? If no, explain in the Data Summary.	
B.	Have the outliers been verified and a "1" placed in the Verify_flg field?	
C.	Have checks on correctness of analysis or data reasonableness been performed?  e.g.: Is ortho-phosphorus less than total phosphorus?  Are dissolved metal concentrations less than or equal to total metals?  Is the minimum 24 hour DO less than the maximum 24 hour DO?  Do the values appear to be consistent with what is expected for that site?	
D. sheets?	Have at least 10% of the data in the data set been reviewed against the field and laboratory data	
E.	Are all parameter codes in the data set listed in the QAPP?	_
F.	Are all stations in the data set listed in the QAPP?	
Docu	mentation Review	√, X, or N/A
Α.	Are blank results acceptable as specified in the QAPP?	
В.	Were control charts used to determine the acceptability of field duplicates?	
C.	Was documentation of any unusual occurrences that may affect water quality included in the <i>Event</i> table's <i>Comments</i> field?	
D. require	Were there any failures in sampling methods and/or deviations from sample design ments that resulted in unreportable data? If yes, explain in Data Summary.	
E. and res	Were there any failures in field and/or laboratory measurement systems that were not resolvable ulted in unreportable data? If yes, explain in Data Summary.	
F.	Was the laboratory's NELAC Accreditation current for analysis conducted?	

## **DATA SUMMARY**

Data Set Information
Data Source:
Date Submitted:
Tag ID Range:
Date Range:
Comments:
<ul> <li>Please explain in the space below any data discrepancies discovered during data review including:</li> <li>Inconsistencies with AWRL specifications or LOQs</li> <li>Failures in sampling methods and/or laboratory procedures that resulted in data that could not be reported to the TCEQ (indicate items for which the Corrective Action Process has been initiated).</li> <li>Include completed Corrective Action Plans with the applicable Progress Report.</li> </ul>
<del></del>
☐ I certify that all data in this data set meets the requirements specified in Texas Water Code Chapter 5, Subchapter R (TWC §5.801 et seq) and Title 30 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 25, Subchapters A & B.
☐ This data set has been reviewed using the Data Review Checklist.
Planning Agency Data Manager:
Date: