DATA OF KNOWN QUALITY CONFORMANCE/NON-CONFORMANCE SUMMARY QUESTIONNAIRE

| Labora | atory Name : | Alliance Technical Group LLC | Client : | Europastry | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--------------|--------------|--------|--------|-------|
| Project Location : NJ | | Project Number : | - MCUA Permit N | lo 14241 - | 571 . | Jersey | Ave NB | |
| Laboratory Sample ID(s): Q2441 Sampling Date(s): 6/27/2025 | | 6/27/2025 | | | | | | |
| List DI | KQP Methods U | sed (e.g., 8260,8270, et Cetra) | 1664A,Sampling,SOP | | | | | |
| 1 | specified QA/C explain any crit | tical method referenced in this la C performance criteria followed, teria falling outside of acceptable f Known Quality performance sta | including the requirement to guidelines, as specified in the | , L | √ Yes | | No | |
| 1A | Were the meth | od specified handling, preservati | ion, and holding time require | ments met? | √ Yes | | No | |
| 1B | | Was the EPH method conducted respective DKQ methods) | without significant modificati | ons (see | ☐ Yes | | No | ✓ N/A |
| 2 | | es received by the laboratory in ne associated chain-of-custody d | | at [| Yes | | No | |
| 3 | Were samples | received at an appropriate temp | erature (4±2° C)? | [| √ Yes | | No | □ N/A |
| 4 | Were all QA/Qe standards ach | C performance criteria specified ieved? | in the NJDEP DKQP | [| √ Yes | | No | |
| 5 | | ng limits specified or referenced to the laboratory prior to sample | | [| √ Yes | | No | |
| | b)Were these r | eporting limits met? | | | √ Yes | | No | □ N/A |
| 6 | results reporte | tical method referenced in this la ed for all constituents identified ir e DKQP documents and/or site- | the method-specific analyte | | √ Yes | | No | |
| 7 | Are project-spe | ecific matrix spikes and/or labora | tory duplicates included in th | is data set? | √ 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: | Q2441 |
|-----------|-------|
|-----------|-------|

Project ID: MCUA Permit No 14241 - 571 Jersey Ave NB NJ

Client: Europastry

Lab Sample Number Client Sample Number

Q2441-01 MH-6272025 Q2441-02 MH-6272025MS Q2441-03 MH-6272025MSD

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 . | Date: | 7/3/2025 |

NYDOH CERTIFICATION NO - 11376

NJDEP CERTIFICATION NO - 20012



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

CASE NARRATIVE

Europastry

Project Name: MCUA Permit No 14241 - 571 Jersey Ave NB NJ

Project # N/A Order ID # Q2441

Test Name: Oil and Grease, TPH

A. Number of Samples and Date of Receipt:

3 Water samples were received on 06/27/2025.

B. Parameters:

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: Oil and Grease and TPH. This data package contains results for Oil and Grease, TPH.

C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis of Oil and Grease, TPH was based on method 1664A.

D. QA/ QC Samples:

The Holding Times were met for all analysis.

The Blank Spike met requirements for all parameters.

The Duplicate analysis met criteria for all parameters.

The Matrix Spike analysis met criteria for all parameters.

The Matrix Spike Duplicate analysis met criteria for all parameters.

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

The Calibration met the requirements.

E. Additional Comments: As per method 1664A (TPH), MS/MSD is required to be performed with the sample analysis. However, Lab did not receive sufficient volume to perform the MS/MSD therefore MS/MSD were not performed for this project.

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 #: Q2441

| | 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 | <u> </u> |
| 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: MOHAMMAD AHMED Date: 07/03/2025