

# **Cover Page**

Order ID: Q1061

**Project ID:** PennDOT - Onvo Travel Plaza #50040379

**Client:** Dewberry Engineers Inc.

Lab Sample Number	Client Sample Number
Q1061-01	MW-1
Q1061-02	MW-2
Q1061-03	MW-3
Q1061-04	MW-4
Q1061-05	MW-5
Q1061-06	MW-6
Q1061-07	MW-7
Q1061-08	MW-8
Q1061-09	MW-9
Q1061-10	MW-10

I certify that the data package is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract, both technically and for completeness, for other than the conditions detailed above. Release of the data contained in this hard copy data package has been authorized by the laboratory manager or his designee, as verified by the following signature.

Signature :		
Signature .	 ate:	1/24/2025

NYDOH CERTIFICATION NO - 11376

NJDEP CERTIFICATION NO - 20012



284 Sheffield Street, Mountainside, NJ 07092 Phone: 908 789 8900 Fax: 908 789 8922

### **CASE NARRATIVE**

**Dewberry Engineers Inc.** 

Project Name: PennDOT - Onvo Travel Plaza #50040379

Project # N/A

Chemtech Project # Q1061 Test Name: Metals ICP-Group1

#### A. Number of Samples and Date of Receipt:

10 Water samples were received on 01/09/2025.

#### **B. Parameters:**

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: Anions, Anions Group1, Anions Group7, Mercury, Metals Group1, Metals ICP-Group, Metals ICP-Group1, Nitrate+Nitrite, Phosphorus-Total and TDS. This data package contains results for Metals ICP-Group1.

#### C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis and digestion of Metals ICP-Group1 was based on method 200.7.

#### D. QA/ QC Samples:

The Holding Times were met for all analysis.

The Blank Spike met requirements for all samples.

The Duplicate analysis met criteria for all samples.

The Matrix Spike analysis met criteria for all samples.

The Matrix Spike Duplicate analysis met criteria for all samples.

The Blank analysis did not indicate the presence of lab contamination.

The Calibration met the requirements.

The Serial Dilution met the acceptable requirements.

#### **E. Additional Comments:**

LLCCV & LLICV are not required for 200.7 method.

I certify that the data package is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract, both technically and for completeness, for other than the conditions detailed above. The laboratory manager or his designee, as verified by the following signature has authorized release of the data contained in this hard copy data package.

Signature			
Jignature			



284 Sheffield Street, Mountainside, NJ 07092 Phone: 908 789 8900 Fax: 908 789 8922

### CASE NARRATIVE

**Dewberry Engineers Inc.** 

Project Name: PennDOT - Onvo Travel Plaza #50040379

Project # N/A

**Chemtech Project # Q1061** 

Test Name: Anions Group7, Phosphorus-Total, TDS

### A. Number of Samples and Date of Receipt:

10 Water samples were received on 01/09/2025.

#### **B. Parameters:**

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: Anions, Anions Group1, Anions Group7, Mercury, Metals Group1, Metals ICP-Group, Metals ICP-Group1, Nitrate+Nitrite, Phosphorus-Total and TDS. This data package contains results for Anions Group7, Phosphorus-Total, TDS.

#### C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis of Anions Group7 was based on method 300.0, The analysis of Phosphorus-Total was based on method 365.3 and The analysis of TDS was based on method SM2540 C.

### D. QA/ QC Samples:

The Holding Times were met for all analysis.

Sample MW-1 was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-2 was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-3 was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-4 was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-5 was diluted due to high concentrations for Phosphorus, Total, Chloride, Nitrate, Sulfate & Sample MW-5DL was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-6 was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride, Sulfate & Sample MW-7DL was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-8 was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-8DL was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-9DL was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-9DL was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-9DL was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride & Sample MW-10 was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride, Nitrate, Sulfate & Sample MW-10DL was diluted due to high concentrations for Chloride.

The Blank Spike met requirements for all samples.

The Duplicate analysis met criteria for all samples.

The Matrix Spike (MW-1MS) analysis met criteria for all samples except for Chloride due to sample matrix interference.

The Matrix Spike Duplicate (MW-1MSD) analysis met criteria for all samples except for Chloride due to sample matrix interference.



The Blank analysis did not indicate the presence of lab contamination. The Calibration met the requirements.

E. Additional Comments:		

I certify that the data package is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract, both technically and for completeness, for other than the conditions detailed above. The laboratory manager or his designee, as verified by the following signature has authorized release of the data contained in this hard copy data package.

Signature\_\_\_\_\_



## DATA REPORTING QUALIFIERS- INORGANIC

For reporting results, the following "Results Qualifiers" are used:

J	Indicates the reported value was obtained from a reading that was less than the Contract Required Detection Limit (CRDL), but greater than or equal to the Instrument Detection Limit (IDL).
U	Indicates the analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.
ND	Indicates the analyte was analyzed for, but not detected
E	Indicates the reported value is estimated because of the presence of interference
M	Indicates Duplicate injection precision not met.
N	Indicates the spiked sample recovery is not within control limits.
S	Indicates the reported value was determined by the Method of Standard Addition (MSA).
*	Indicates that the duplicate analysis is not within control limits.
+	Indicates the correlation coefficient for the MSA is less than 0.995.
D	Indicates the reported value is from a secondary analysis with a dilution factor. The original analysis exceeded the calibration range.
M	Method qualifiers  "P" for ICP instrument  "PM" for ICP when Microwave Digestion is used  "CV" for Manual Cold Vapor AA  "AV" for automated Cold Vapor AA  "CA" for MIDI-Distillation Spectrophotometric  "AS" for Semi –Automated Spectrophotometric  "C" for Manual Spectrophotometric  "T" for Titrimetric  "NR" for analyte not required to be analyzed  Indicates the analyte's concentration exceeds the calibrated range of the instrument for that specific analysis.
Q	Indicates the LCS did not meet the control limits requirements
Н	Sample Analysis Out Of Hold Time





APPENDIX A

#### **QA REVIEW GENERAL DOCUMENTATION**

Project #: Q1061

	Completed
For thorough review, the report must have the following:	
GENERAL:	
Are all original paperwork present (chain of custody, record of communication, airbill, sample management lab chronicle, login page)	<u> </u>
Check chain-of-custody for proper relinquish/return of samples	<u> </u>
Is the chain of custody signed and complete	<u> </u>
Check internal chain-of-custody for proper relinquish/return of samples /sample extracts	<u> </u>
Collect information for each project id from server. Were all requirements followed	<u> </u>
COVER PAGE:	
Do numbers of samples correspond to the number of samples in the Chain of Custody on login page	<u> </u>
Do lab numbers and client Ids on cover page agree with the Chain of Custody	<u> </u>
CHAIN OF CUSTODY:	
Do requested analyses on Chain of Custody agree with form I results	<u> </u>
Do requested analyses on Chain of Custody agree with the log-in page	<u> </u>
Were the correct method log-in for analysis according to the Analytical Request and Chain of Castody	<u> </u>
Were the samples received within hold time	<u> </u>
Were any problems found with the samples at arrival recorded in the Sample Management Laboratory	
Chronicle	
ANALYTICAL:	
Was method requirement followed?	<u> </u>
Was client requirement followed?	<u> </u>
Does the case narrative summarize all QC failure?	<u> </u>
All runlogs and manual integration are reviewed for requirements	<u> </u>
All manual calculations and /or hand notations verified	<u> </u>

QA Review Signature: PRADIP PRAJAPATI Date: 01/24/2025