

Cover Page

Order ID : Q2309

Project ID : Pre Treatment Plant 2025

Client : Holland Manufacturing Co.

Lab Sample Number

Q2309-01
Q2309-02
Q2309-03
Q2309-04
Q2309-05

Client Sample Number

EFFLUENT
Q2309-01MS
Q2309-01MSD
AERATION
INFLUENT

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 : _____

Date: 6/24/2025

NYDOH CERTIFICATION NO - 11376

NJDEP CERTIFICATION NO - 20012



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

CASE NARRATIVE

Holland Manufacturing Co.

Project Name: Pre Treatment Plant 2025

Project # N/A

Order ID # Q2309

Test Name: Ammonia,BOD5,Oil and Grease,Phosphorus-Ortho,Phosphorus-Total,TSS

A. Number of Samples and Date of Receipt:

5 Water samples were received on 06/12/2025.

B. Parameters:

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: Ammonia, BOD5, Oil and Grease, Phosphorus-Ortho, Phosphorus-Total and TSS. This data package contains results for Ammonia,BOD5,Oil and Grease,Phosphorus-Ortho,Phosphorus-Total,TSS.

C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis of Oil and Grease was based on method 1664A, The analysis of Phosphorus-Total was based on method 365.3, The analysis of TSS was based on method SM2540 D, The analysis of Ammonia was based on method SM4500-NH3, The analysis of Phosphorus-Ortho was based on method SM4500-P E and The analysis of BOD5 was based on method SM5210 B.

D. QA/ QC Samples:

The Holding Times were met for all analysis.

Sample EFFLUENT was diluted due to high concentrations for Ammonia as N & Sample INFLUENT was diluted due to high concentrations for Ammonia as N.

The Blank Spike met requirements for all samples.

The Duplicate analysis met criteria for all samples.

The Matrix Spike (MH-6-10-2025MS) analysis met criteria for all samples except for Oil and Grease due to matrix interference.

The Matrix Spike (LAW-25-0084MS) analysis met criteria for all samples except for Ammonia as N due to matrix interference.

The Matrix Spike Duplicate(MH-6-10-2025MSD) analysis met criteria for all samples except for Oil and Grease due to matrix interference.

The Matrix Spike Duplicate(LAW-25-0084MSD) analysis met criteria for all samples except for Ammonia as N due to matrix interference.

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

The Calibration met the requirements.



E. Additional Comments:

For Ammonia, The initial volume taken 1 ml instead of 50 ml for both samples as per client history.

As per method, aqueous sample for Ortho-Phosphorus analysis should be filtered within 15 minutes of collection time. However, samples were not filtered as per method requirement therefore Lab has filtered the samples in-house upon receipt.

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
OR	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
H	Sample Analysis Out Of Hold Time

APPENDIX A

QA REVIEW GENERAL DOCUMENTATION

Project #: Q2309

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)

✓

Check chain-of-custody for proper relinquish/return of samples

✓

Is the chain of custody signed and complete

✓

Check internal chain-of-custody for proper relinquish/return of samples /sample extracts

✓

Collect information for each project id from server. Were all requirements followed

✓

COVER PAGE:

Do numbers of samples correspond to the number of samples in the Chain of Custody on login page

✓

Do lab numbers and client Ids on cover page agree with the Chain of Custody

✓

CHAIN OF CUSTODY:

Do requested analyses on Chain of Custody agree with form I results

✓

Do requested analyses on Chain of Custody agree with the log-in page

✓

Were the correct method log-in for analysis according to the Analytical Request and Chain of Castody

✓

Were the samples received within hold time

✓

Were any problems found with the samples at arrival recorded in the Sample Management Laboratory Chronicle

✓

ANALYTICAL:

Was method requirement followed?

✓

Was client requirement followed?

✓

Does the case narrative summarize all QC failure?

✓

All runlogs and manual integration are reviewed for requirements

✓

All manual calculations and /or hand notations verified

✓

QA Review Signature: SOHIL JODHANI

Date: 06/24/2025