# DATA OF KNOWN QUALITY CONFORMANCE/NON-CONFORMANCE SUMMARY QUESTIONNAIRE

Labora	atory Name :	CHEMTECH	Client :	Sciacca General	Contr	actors	, LLC		
Project Location : Project Number :									
Labora	atory Sample ID(	s): Q2003	Sampling Date(s):	5/09/2025					
List Dł	KQP Methods Us	ed (e.g., 8260,8270, et Cetra)	8015D,8260D,NJEPH,SOP						
1	specified QA/Qe explain any crite	ical method referenced in this lab C performance criteria followed, ir eria falling outside of acceptable g Known Quality performance stan	ncluding the requirement to guidelines, as specified in the		<b>V</b>	Yes		No	
1A	Were the metho	od specified handling, preservation	n, and holding time requirements	s met?	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	Yes		No	
1B		las the EPH method conducted w .3 of respective DKQ methods)	rithout significant modifications		V	Yes		No	□ N/A
2		es received by the laboratory in a e associated chain-of-custody do			$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	Yes		No	
3	Were samples	received at an appropriate tempe	rature (4±2° C)?		V	Yes		No	□ N/A
4	Were all QA/Q0 standards achi	C performance criteria specified in eved?	the NJDEP DKQP			Yes		No	
5		g limits specified or referenced or to the laboratory prior to sample re	•		V	Yes		No	
	b)Were these re	eporting limits met?			V	Yes		No	□ N/A
6	results reported	ical method referenced in this lab d for all constituents identified in the DKQP documents and/or site-sp	he method-specific analyte lists		V	Yes		No	
7	Are project-spe	cific matrix spikes and/or laborato	ry duplicates included in this dat	a set?	V	Yes		No	

Notes: For all questions to which the response was "No" (with the exception of question #7), additional information should be provided in an attached narrative. If the answer to question #1, #1A, or #1B is "No", the data package does not meet the requirements for "Data of Known Quality."

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

# **Cover Page**

Order ID: Q2003

**Project ID:** 32 Sayer Pl, Hillsdale

Client: Sciacca General Contractors, LLC

# Lab Sample Number Client Sample Number Q2003-01 WASTE Q2003-02 VOC Q2003-03 1 Q2003-04 2 Q2003-05 3 Q2003-06 4 Q2003-07 5

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 .	——————————————————————————————————————	5/21/2025

NYDOH CERTIFICATION NO - 11376

NJDEP CERTIFICATION NO - 20012





# CASE NARRATIVE

Sciacca General Contractors, LLC Project Name: 32 Sayer Pl, Hillsdale

Project # N/A Order ID # Q2003

**Test Name: VOC-TCLVOA-10** 

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

7 Solid samples were received on 05/09/2025.

#### **B.** Parameters

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: EPH\_F2, TPH GC and VOC-TCLVOA-10. This data package contains results for VOC-TCLVOA-10.

#### C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis performed on instrument MSVOA\_Y were done using GC column Rxi-624SIL MS 30m, 0.25mm, 1.4 um, Cat. #13868.The analysis of VOC-TCLVOA-10 was based on method 8260D.

# D. QA/ QC Samples:

The Holding Times were met for all analysis.

The Surrogate recoveries met the acceptable criteria except for VOC [4-Bromofluorobenzene - 57%], VOCRE [4-Bromofluorobenzene - 59%], These compound did not meet the NJDKQP criteria but met the in-house criteria.

The Internal Standards Areas met the acceptable requirements except for VOC, VOCRE.sample was reanalyzed to confirm the failure and both are Reported.

The Retention Times were acceptable for all samples.

The RPD met criteria.

The Blank Spike for {VY0519SBS01} with File ID: VY022305.D met requirements for all samples except for Vinyl chloride[134%], these compounds did not meet the NJDKQP criteria and in-house criteria, it is failing high but no positive hit in associate sample therefore no corrective action taken.

The Blank Spike Duplicate met requirements for all samples. The Blank analysis did not indicate the presence of lab contamination.

The Initial Calibration met the requirements.



The Continuous Calibration File ID VY022303.D met the requirements except for Acetone,is failing marginally low therefore no corrective action taken.

The Tuning criteria met requirements.

#### E. Additional Comments:

Samples for MS/MSD for VOC analysis were not provided with this set of samples. The Blank Spike Duplicate is reported with the data.

Trip Blank was not provided with this set of samples.

The soil samples results are based on a dry weight basis.

Please use %D calculated based on Avg RF and CCRF for all compounds using Average Response Factor when the %RSD value for a compound is <20% for the Initial Calibration curve and use %D calculated based on Amount added and Calculated amount for all compounds using Linear Regression when the %RSD value for a compound is > 20% for the Initial Calibration curve for SW-846 analysis.

#### **F. Manual Integration Comments:**

Please refer to the Manual integration Report included with the Run Logs for information on the manual integrations performed.

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		





# **CASE NARRATIVE**

Sciacca General Contractors, LLC Project Name: 32 Sayer Pl, Hillsdale

Project # N/A Order ID # Q2003 Test Name: TPH GC

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

7 Solid samples were received on 05/09/2025.

#### **B.** Parameters

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: EPH\_F2, TPH GC and VOC-TCLVOA-10. This data package contains results for TPH GC.

#### C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis of TPH GC was based on method 8015D and extraction was done based on method 3541.

## **D. QA/ QC Samples:**

The Holding Times were met for all analysis.

The Surrogate recoveries met the acceptable criteria.

The Retention Times were acceptable for all samples.

The MS recoveries met the requirements for all compounds.

The MSD recoveries met the acceptable requirements.

The RPD met criteria.

The Blank Spike met requirements for all samples.

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

The Initial Calibration met the requirements.

The Continuous Calibration met the requirements .

#### E. Additional Comments:

The soil samples results are based on a dry weight basis.





# **F. Manual Integration Comments:**

Please refer to the Manual integration Report included with the Run Logs for information on the manual integrations performed.

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\_\_\_\_\_





#### **CASE NARRATIVE**

Sciacca General Contractors, LLC Project Name: 32 Sayer Pl, Hillsdale

Project # N/A Order ID # Q2003 Test Name: EPH\_F2

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

7 Solid samples were received on 05/09/2025.

#### **B.** Parameters

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: EPH\_F2, TPH GC and VOC-TCLVOA-10. This data package contains results for EPH F2.

#### C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis were performed on instrument FID\_G. The column is RXI-1MS which is 20 meters, 0.18mm ID, 0.18 um df, catalog 13302. The analysis of EPH\_F2s was based on method NJEPH and extraction was done based on method 3541.

# D. QA/ QC Samples:

The Holding Times were met for all analysis.

The Surrogate recoveries met the acceptable criteria.

The Retention Times were acceptable for all samples.

The MS recoveries met the requirements for all compounds.

The MSD recoveries met the acceptable requirements.

The RPD met criteria.

The Blank Spike met requirements for all samples.

The Blank Spike Duplicate met requirements for all samples.

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

The Initial Calibration met the requirements .

The Continuous Calibration met the requirements.

#### E. Additional Comments:

The soil samples results are based on a dry weight basis.





# **F. Manual Integration Comments:**

Please refer to the Manual integration Report included with the Run Logs for information on the manual integrations performed.

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- ORGANIC

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

Value	If the result is a value greater than or equal to the detection limit, report the value
U	Indicates the compound was analyzed for but was not detected. Report the minimum detection limit for the sample with the U, i.e. "10 U". This is not necessarily the instrument detection limit attainable for this particular sample based on any concentration or dilution that may have been required.
ND	Indicates the analyte was analyzed for, but not detected
В	<ul> <li>Indicates an estimated value. This flag is used:</li> <li>(1) When estimating a concentration for a tentatively identified compound (library search hits, where a 1:1 response is assumed.)</li> <li>(2) When the mass spectral data indicated the identification, however the result was less than the specified detection limit greater than zero. If the detection limit was 10ug/L and a concentration of 3 ug/L was calculated report as 3 J. This is flag is used when similar situation arise on any organic parameter i.e. Pest, PCB and others.</li> <li>Indicates the analyte was found in the blank as well as the sample report as "12 B".</li> </ul>
Е	Indicates the analyte 's concentration exceeds the calibrated range of the instrument for that specific analysis.
D	This flag identifies all compounds identified in an analysis at a secondary dilution factor.
P	This flag is used for Pesticide/PCB target analyte when there is >25% difference for detected concentrations between the two GC columns. The lower of the two values is reported on Form 1 and flagged with a "P".
N	This flag indicates presumptive evidence of a compound. This is only used for tentatively identified compounds (TICs), where the identification is based on a mass spectral library search. It applies to all TIC results. For generic characterization of a TIC, such as chlorinated hydrocarbon, the flag is not used.
A	This flag indicates that a Tentatively Identified Compound is a suspected aldol-condensation product.
Q	Indicates the LCS did not meet the control limits requirements





Fax: 908 789 8922

#### APPENDIX A

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

Project #: Q2003

	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: SOHIL JODHANI Date: 05/21/2025